City of
New Westminster

Report to Council

To:	New Westminster City Council in Workshop	**Meeting Date:**	March 2, 2026
From:	Jackie Teed, Director, Planning & Development	**Report No.:**	[Report Number]

Re: Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program

---

Staff Recommendation

1. *THAT the Official Community Plan amendment bylaw being drafted to implement the Infill Housing Accelerator Program incorporate the "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" land use designation in Attachment 3 of the report titled "Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program" dated March 2, 2026.*

2. *THAT the Official Community Plan amendment bylaw being drafted to implement the Infill Housing Accelerator Program designate properties "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" as shown on Map 1 in Attachment 4 of the report titled "Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program" dated March 2, 2026.*

3. *THAT the Zoning Bylaw amendment bylaw being drafted to implement the Infill Housing Accelerator Program incorporate the infill housing zoning district recommendations in Attachment 6 of the report titled "Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program" dated March 2, 2026.*

4. *THAT the Zoning Bylaw amendment bylaw being drafted to implement the Infill Housing Accelerator Program pre-zone properties to enable infill housing up to four units or up to six units as shown in Attachment 7 of the report titled "Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program" dated March 2, 2026.*

5. *THAT staff either:*
    a. *designate the properties in the block bounded by Eighth Ave/Hamilton St/Fourteenth St/Sixteenth St "Residential – Townhouse", or*
    b. *designate the properties in the block bounded by Eighth Ave/Hamilton St/Fourteenth St/Sixteenth St "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" and pre-zone the properties to enable infill housing.*

Purpose

To seek Council direction on the implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program, a Housing Accelerator Fund initiative, through amendments to the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw.

Summary

Council's 2023-2026 Strategic Priorities Plan, which serves as a guiding document, identifies infill housing as an outcome towards allowing diverse housing options in New Westminster. Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) legislation enacted in November 2023 and 2025 requires municipalities to allow a minimum of between three and six units of housing on residential properties, depending on lot size and proximity to transit. Under this legislation, the City is currently required to implement SSMUH zoning changes by June 30, 2026.

In February 2024, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) awarded the City an $11.4 million grant from the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) program. To qualify for funding, the City was required to develop an action plan of initiatives that facilitate an increase in the housing supply beyond what would be achieved without action. The Infill Housing Accelerator Program (Infill Program), which is the subject of this report, is one of the action plan initiatives and, if approved, would also meet the requirements of the provincial SSMUH legislation.

The Infill Program proposes updates to enable more housing options on a single property, rather than the consolidation of multiple properties. The program is aimed at providing more housing choice in the city, and included housing forms are: duplexes, triplexes, quadraplexes, multiplexes, secondary suites, laneway houses, side-by-side townhouses (strata)/rowhouses (fee simple). The updates would designate approximately 3,000 properties for up to six units in the Official Community Plan, create new development permit guidelines, create new zoning districts, and pre-zone approximately 1,900 properties for up to four units and approximately 1,100 properties for up to six units. Pre-zoning would mean that no rezoning application would be required to build infill housing, streamlining the approvals process. A Development Permit would still be required.

As identified to CMHC in the City's scope of work, for the Infill Program the City explored permitting up to six residential dwelling units as-of-right in the City's low-density single detached residential zones across the city. The outcome of the Infill Program's technical analysis determined this to be infeasible, due to limited infrastructure capacity. The result is that all eligible properties would be designated in the OCP to allow up to six units, and all would be pre-zoned for an increased number of units, but not all would be pre-zoned for six units (i.e. some will be permitted four and some six, whereas only two or three are currently permitted).

The outcomes of the Infill Program further highlight the need for senior government funding support for the infrastructure needed to enable growth and support the housing

needs of the community. Opportunities to pre-zone additional properties for six units could be considered over time, as the City implements infrastructure upgrades as part of ongoing work to implement sewer separation and replacement of aging infrastructure, but this will take time and funding. In the meantime, the Infill Program is proposed to allow those properties pre-zoned for only four units to apply for a spot rezoning to allow six units. All development would need to bear the costs of infrastructure improvements. It is anticipated that this would be cost prohibitive for most applications given the small scale of development.

Staff is seeking direction from Council on the provisions to be included in the amendment bylaws needed to implement the Infill Program, which would be brought forward for Council consideration.

Background

The Infill Housing Accelerator Program was identified as one of the City's key CMHC's Housing Accelerator Fund grant actions, in alignment with Council's 2023-2026 Strategic Priorities Plan. While it was initiated prior to the enactment of provincial housing legislation, the Infill Program responds to Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) legislation, which requires municipalities to pre-zone single detached and duplex areas for a minimum of three to six units, depending on lot size and proximity to frequent transit (detailed in Attachment 1).

Infill Housing Accelerator Program Summary

This program explores pre-zoning (i.e. no site-specific rezoning application) to permit up to six ground oriented residential units in single detached dwelling and duplex zones. Ground oriented housing provides a separate, exterior entrance directly accessible without passing through a common lobby or corridor from a street or open space. The Program enables more choice of ground oriented housing in the city.

The scope of the program includes:

- updating the OCP's "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" land use designation as shown in Attachment 3;
- applying this OCP "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" land use designation to low density residential properties shown in Attachment 4;
- establishing new Infill Housing Development Permit Area guidelines, based on the categories in Attachment 5;
- creating new zoning regulations for Infill Housing, as described in Attachment 6; and
- pre-zoning approximately 1,900 properties to allow up to four units, and approximately 1,100 properties to allow up to six units, as shown in Attachment 7.

Non-residential properties and higher density residential properties, such as those designated for apartment buildings, are not part of the scope of this program. Properties in the Transit Oriented Development Areas were previously approved by Council to include such infill development, and are therefore being considered through that work.

Queensborough is not included as it has received an extension for compliance with the SSMUH legislation. (See Attachment 1).

Discussion

A. Official Community Plan Amendments

Land Use Designation

The "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" land use designation would be revised to allow for up to six units per property. The six units would be inclusive of principal units, detached accessory units, and secondary suites. The proposed revised text is included in Attachment 3.

Staff recommend:

1. *THAT the Official Community Plan amendment bylaw being drafted to implement the Infill Housing Accelerator Program incorporate the "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" land use designation in Attachment 3 of the report titled "Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program" dated March 2, 2026.*

Approving this recommendation would direct staff to update the definition of "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" in the Official Community Plan, identifying properties within this designation for potential development of up to six units, but not pre-zoning, which would need to be approved through a separate bylaw as detailed in following sections.

Land Use Designation Map

Aligning with Council direction and Provincial legislation, it is proposed that approximately 3,000 properties in the city's low density residential areas would be designated "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing", as shown in Attachment 4. This includes:

- Primarily properties that are currently designated "Residential – Detached and Semi-Detached Housing", which allows single detached dwellings and duplexes.
- Properties already designated "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing".
- Approximately 30 properties currently designated "Residential – Townhouse", would be changed to "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing". Analysis indicates that these properties are better suited for the infill housing program due to site conditions.

Properties already identified for higher density land uses in the Official Community Plan were not considered as part of the program. This includes:

- Single detached dwelling and duplex properties now included in Provincial Transit Oriented Development Areas, implementation of which was given first and second reading on December 15, 2025.
- Properties being considered for an extension of the "Residential – Limited Mid Rise" land use designation, which is the land use designation being applied in the outer tier of the Transit Oriented Development Areas. These properties identified on the outer edges would be designated higher density to enable a

smoother transition in density from the Transit Oriented Development Areas to the neighbouring areas.

Staff recommend:

2. *THAT the Official Community Plan amendment bylaw being drafted to implement the Infill Housing Accelerator Program designate properties "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" based on Map 1 in Attachment 4 of the report titled "Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program" dated March 2, 2026.*

Approving this recommendation would direct staff to update the Official Community Plan Land Use Designation Map to apply the "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" designation to the properties identified above, allowing them to potentially be rezoned to permit up to six ground oriented units, but not pre-zoning, which would need to be approved through a separate bylaw as detailed in following sections.

Designation for Block Bounded by Eighth Ave/Hamilton St/Fourteenth St/Sixteenth St

In October 2025, Council directed staff to explore further areas in the city to be included in the Townhouse Program. This work included technical analysis related to improving site access conditions. The block bounded by Eighth Ave/Hamilton St/Fourteenth St/Sixteenth St (shown in Figure 1), previously proposed for infill housing, has been identified as a candidate.

The subject block is on a busy road without a functional and continuous lane or unopened right-of way. There is a partial lane operating in this block, but it is not sufficient width and crosses private property. Future redevelopment as townhouse would require consolidation, enabling completion of a functional and continuous lane which could not otherwise be achieve through individual parcel redevelopment as envisioned in the Infill Program.

Figure 1 – Proposed Properties for Infill Housing and Townhouse Programs part 1



Two options are presented for consideration:

5. *THAT staff either:*

    a. *designate the properties in the block bounded by Eighth Ave/Hamilton St/Fourteenth St/Sixteenth St "Residential – Townhouse", or*

    b. *designate the properties in the block bounded by Eighth Ave/Hamilton St/Fourteenth St/Sixteenth St "Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing" and pre-zone the properties to enable infill housing.*

Should Council direct the subject block be designated *"Residential – Townhouse"* the related properties would not be included in the Infill Program. The properties would

undergo further analysis to be undertaken through the next phase of the townhouse program exploring the correct tools to deliver future lanes.

Should Council direct the subject block be designated "*Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing*" it would be included in the amendment bylaw that would designate the properties, as well as the zoning bylaw amendment to pre-zone the properties. Pre-zoning would allow infill housing of up to six units within 400 metres from bus stops as prescribed in Provincial legislation (31 properties) and up to four units outside of that area (nine properties).

Development Permit Area Guidelines

Applications for infill housing projects would require a Development Permit. The OCP update would include creating new development permit guidelines for the Ground Oriented Housing Development Permit Area. The categories proposed for infill housing guidelines are set out in Attachment 5, and focus on ensuring high quality housing and site design that fits well within city neighbourhoods, and encouraging best practices for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting water and energy conservation. The guidelines would also ensure alignment with citywide policies and strategies.

B. Zoning Bylaw Amendments


New Zoning Districts

Two new zoning districts are proposed, one zone allowing up to four units and one allowing up to six units, which would allow a variety of infill housing forms (examples shown in Figure 2). The new zoning districts would allow:

- Up to four **or** up to six units;
- Multiple principal buildings on the same property;
- Buildings up to three storeys, with a maximum of two units stacked on top of each other; and
- Property owners to retain, renovate or rebuild detached houses, with/without secondary suites and/or laneway/carriage houses, as currently permitted.

The new zoning districts would give flexibility to build the type of housing and number of units up to permitted maximum of four or six; but ultimately the number of units that could be constructed on a property would be informed by site context. As an example, on small or oddly shaped lots it may not be possible to build the maximum permitted number of units due to other zoning requirements, such as parking.


Figure 2. Examples of Infill Housing Types



Multi-Building Type (4 units)



Townhouse Type (3 units)



Multiplex Type (6 units)

Draft zoning regulations have been prepared, including unit type, density, vehicle parking, and tenure, which are summarized below, and others (e.g. site coverage, setbacks, height) which are included in Attachment 6.

- *Unit Type*: Single detached dwellings (houses), detached accessory dwelling units (laneway or carriage houses), secondary suites, multiplexes (e.g. duplex or quadraplex), side-by-side townhouses, and other equivalent ground oriented housing forms would be permitted. A maximum of one unit can stack on top of another unit. Typical accessory uses would be permitted such as childcare and home based business.
- *Density* (regulated through Floor Space Ratio (FSR)): The density permitted is greater the more units that are proposed, starting with one unit at between 0.50 and 0.60 FSR depending on existing base entitlements, and increasing to 1.00 FSR for six units. This would allow livable sized units, without encouraging larger single detached houses. Enclosed vehicle parking (garages) would be included in floor space calculations, as the intent of FSR is to control the overall size of buildings, including all uses.
- *Vehicle Parking:* Parking requirements are not permitted by provincial legislation for properties in proximity to prescribed bus stops with frequent bus service. Outside of these areas, the following parking rates are proposed:
    - 1.0 parking space per principal dwelling unit,
    - 1.0 parking space for the first secondary dwelling unit on the property, 0 for the second, and 0.5 for any additional (total required spaces rounded up to nearest whole number).

  The recommended parking minimums are similar to existing regulations. The approach aims to balance observed vehicle ownership rates with the need to maximize space for other elements such as tree retention and planting, open space, garbage storage, and electrical infrastructure.
- *Tenure:* Different tenures (i.e. rental housing, ownership or a combination) and ownership models (i.e. freehold, strata, co-op) would not be restricted.

The zoning district recommendations have been prepared based on:

- Architectural modelling, completed by an external consultant, considering

building massing and site analysis on typical New Westminster properties;

- Input from an inter-departmental staff team, providing subject matter expertise and ensuring program alignment with City-wide goals and policies;
- Provincial Policy Manual & Site Standards, issued by the Province as an implementation resource for SSMUH legislation;
- Review of peer municipalities' regulations for infill housing; and
- Feedback from public consultation.

Staff recommend:

3. *THAT the zoning amendment bylaw being drafted to implement the Infill Housing Accelerator Program reflect the infill housing zoning district recommendations in Attachment 6 of the report titled "Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of Infill Housing Accelerator Housing Accelerator Fund Initiatives" dated March 2, 2026.*

Approving this recommendation would direct staff to prepare a bylaw that would create two new zoning districts with regulations to guide the development of infill housing as described in this report.

Zoning Map Amendments (Pre-Zoning)

Pre-zoning of all eligible properties is proposed, which would remove the requirement for site-specific rezoning. The City explored the potential to allow up to six infill housing units as-of-right on all of the identified properties, but the outcome of the Infill Program's technical analysis determined this to be infeasible, due to limited infrastructure capacity and access:

- Current utilities have been designed for the previous zoning entitlements of up to three units. Upgrades are required to facilitate the additional units envisioned by the legislation. The City would explore upgrading infrastructure over time as part of ongoing work to implement sewer separation and replacement of aging infrastructure. Additional opportunities to allow six units could be considered as the City implements these infrastructure upgrades. In the meantime, all projects would have to undertake all necessary infrastructure upgrades at their cost, and it is anticipated that this would be cost prohibitive for most applications given the small scale of development.
- Accommodating parking and on-site vehicle turnaround for six units without a lane would be challenging. Technical analysis included evaluating properties for a functional and continuous lane, or a legal but unopened lane right-of-way, which would support access to on-site parking and loading.

Based on that analysis and taking into consideration public feedback (see Attachments 8 and 9), the recommended approach for the Infill Housing program is that all eligible properties will be pre-zoned for an increased number of units, but not all will be pre-zoned for six units (i.e. some will be permitted four and some six, whereas only two or three are currently permitted). As a result (see Attachment 7):

- Approximately 1,900 properties would be pre-zoned to allow up to four units.

- Approximately 1,100 properties would be pre-zoned to allow up to six units.
- This would include pre-zoning the approximately 50 properties that are legislatively required to permit three units, to allow up to four units or six units (to align with the rest of the block), for simplicity of regulation given that there are very few such properties.
- This would include pre-zoning approximately 150 properties for up to six units, over-and-above SSMUH requirements, in blocks with accessible lanes that:
    - have other properties where the Province requires a minimum of six units and/or,
    - have apartment buildings.
- Properties pre-zoned for four units would be able to apply for a spot rezoning to be permitted six units.
- The areas proposed for pre-zoning align with the provincial SSMUH requirements to allow a minimum of three, four, or six units, based on property size and location, plus limited additional areas proposed to be pre-zoned based on technical analysis.

Staff recommend:

4. *THAT the zoning amendment bylaw being drafted to implement the Infill Housing Accelerator Program pre-zone to enable infill housing up to four units or up to six units on the properties as outlined in Attachment 7 of the report titled "Our City, Our Homes: Implementation of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program" dated March 2, 2026.*

Approving this recommendation would direct staff to prepare a bylaw that would pre-zone eligible single detached dwelling and duplex properties for either four or six units.

C. Other Discussion

Heritage Protection

The SSMUH legislation has implications on heritage protection. Generally, existing heritage designations and heritage revitalization agreements (HRAs) remain in place across the city, and are not overridden by the SSMUH legislation. Except for properties with a pre-existing heritage designation or HRA, the City must allow for the SSMUH requirements in regard to number of units allowed, based on proximity to transit and lot size, if the property owner so wishes. This includes protected and non-protected properties within the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area, except for those with existing heritage designation or an HRA.

Within the Conservation Area, applications for renovation or new construction would continue to require a Heritage Alteration Permit, which would be evaluated against the guidelines of the Conservation Area. Should Council support the Infill Housing Program Development Permit Area, applications would also be evaluated against these new guidelines. Consistent with current regulations, any applications to demolish unprotected buildings would still need to substantively demonstrate that the density allowable on the property is not possible without demolishing the building. The density allowable that would be considered in this evaluation would be the four or six units

established by the Province through the SSMUH legislation.

The existing zoning in the Queens Park Conservation Area provides benefits to protected properties in the form of a higher permitted density, and greater ability to build a larger laneway house. Through the application of the SSMUH legislation these benefits would be provided to all properties in the Infill Housing Program, not just the protected properties, essentially eliminating the incentive approach established through the Conservation Area. Consideration of additional incentives for protected properties is not included in the scope of this work, and there are limited opportunities outside of additional density, which will already be maximized by the SSMUH legislation.

New HRAs across the city remain possible, but it is anticipated that the reduction in ability to offer incentives such as greater density or reduced parking, will result in reduced uptake of the program. Owners of heritage assets could still consider an HRA and/or heritage designation as an option if they wanted to formally protect their heritage asset.

Engineering

The Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing legislation aims to allow more housing on properties currently restricted to up to three units. Allowing more housing on these properties has implications related to City infrastructure and services, including to solid waste service, curbside management, and stormwater and drainage volumes. Where possible, the OCP and zoning recommendations are structured to help manage these implications. Further details are provided in Attachment 2.

Childcare

Single detached dwellings are more likely to have larger room sizes and private outdoor space, which enable small daycare operations. These can be of particular benefit to children who function better in non-institutional settings, such as those with neurodiversity. These type of childcare operations make up about four percent of total licensed childcare spaces in the city. A reduction in the number of single detached dwellings as a result of four and six unit infill housing opportunities could result in a reduction in the number of new childcare facilities possible in New Westminster.

Consultation Summary

Community, Interagency and First Nations Consultation

Sections 475 and 476 of the *Local Government Act (LGA)* provide specific requirements for consultation that must occur prior to the consideration of an OCP amendment. The *LGA* requires local government to provide one or more opportunities it considers appropriate for consultation with the organizations and authorities it considers may be affected by the proposed amendment. These requirements are in addition to a public hearing. On November 4, 2024, Council endorsed the approach to early and ongoing consultation for OCP updates, including changes related to provincial SSMUH legislation (the report may be found here).

In addition, community wide consultation events have been held in Spring 2025 (the report may be found here) and Winter 2025 (see report in Attachment 9). An additional

round of community, industry, and agency consultation will take place in March 2026.

Winter 2025 consultation asked participants to select between four options for where up to six infill housing units should be considered (see Attachment 9). In summary:

- just over half of respondents would like to see up to six units only where required by the Province;
- a quarter of respondents would like to see some expansion beyond Provincial minimums (of which 15% would like to see a block “completed” if six units are allowed elsewhere on the block, and 10% would like to see these areas and more); and
- just under a quarter of respondents would like to see up to six units allowed on all eligible properties.

Advisory Planning Commission (APC)

Staff presented draft program materials to the APC at the December 2, 2025 meeting. Comments included preferences to: allow six units for all properties in a block if any of them must allow six units; de-emphasize car-focused infrastructure; and minimize the number of design guidelines. The minutes are shown in Attachment 10.

Typically, an OCP amendment bylaw or Zoning Bylaw amendment not consistent with the OCP would also be presented to the APC for formal consideration. At this meeting, which would be open to the public, APC would make a recommendation to Council about whether or not to support the proposed bylaw amendments. To meet the Provincial legislation deadline (June 30, 2026) and the Housing Accelerator Fund deadline (June 15, 2026), staff instead recommend referring the final bylaws to Commission members to provide an opportunity for members to give feedback directly to Council through the public hearing process.

Financial Implications

Expenses related to the Infill Housing Program, including the consultation, are accounted for in the 2025 and 2026 Capital Plan Budget. The costs are offset by the City’s $11.4 million grant from CMHC’s Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF).

Next Steps

Information Campaign and Targeted Outreach

An information campaign is planned for March 2026, to share the draft program direction and seek feedback for program refinement. The campaign will include pop-up booths in the community that will share key program information. In addition staff will host “ask a planner” appointments to help property owners understand program implications for their properties. The campaign would also include a builders’ breakfast to seek feedback from industry professionals who might construct infill housing projects.

Following these events, staff would update the program details and draft the required

Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments based on Council direction, final technical analysis, and community and agency feedback received.

Bylaw Adoption Process

The steps to amend the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw are:

1. Council Consideration of first and second readings of OCP and zoning amendment bylaws.
2. Notification of Public Hearing. *LGA* regulations do not require postcards to be mailed to owners and occupants, because of the number of properties affected. However, staff propose sending postcards, given the large scope of program changes.
3. Public Hearing and Council consideration of Third Reading of the bylaws. In accordance with the *LGA*, a Public Hearing must be held for the amendment to the OCP. As they are interconnected, the Public Hearing will also be held for the Zoning Bylaw amendment.
4. Referral of the Zoning Bylaw amendment to Ministry of Transportation and Transit; and
5. Council consideration of adoption of the Official Community Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment Bylaws.

The above steps are to align with the Provincial SSMUH deadline of June 30, 2026, and the HAF deadline for this action plan item of June 15, 2026.

Interdepartmental Liaison

The Planning and Development Department is working in close collaboration with several departments on the Infill Housing Program including Engineering & Public Works (including Transportation), Electrical, Building, Fire, Climate Action, Parks and Recreation, Bylaw Services, and Planning and Development Systems.

Attachments

Attachment 1 –	Infill Housing Program Background
Attachment 2 –	Engineering Implications
Attachment 3 –	Draft Infill Housing Land Use Designation Text
Attachment 4 –	Draft Infill Housing Land Use Designation Map
Attachment 5 –	Infill Housing DPA Guidelines Categories
Attachment 6 –	Draft Infill Housing Zoning District Recommendations and Consideration of Provincial Policy Manual and Site Standards
Attachment 7 –	Draft Maps of Proposed Pre-Zoned Infill Housing Properties
Attachment 8 –	Summary of Consultation
Attachment 9 –	What We Heard Report December 2025
Attachment 10 –	Advisory Planning Commission Minutes

Report Approval

Authored By
Sara Jellicoe, Senior Housing Planner

Agreed By
Linda Gillan, Supervisor, Housing
Lynn Roxburgh, Manager of Housing and Land Use Planning
Rupinder Basi, Deputy Director, Planning

Approved By
Jackie Teed, Director, Planning and Development
Donnie Rosa, Chief Administrative Officer

#2800692

Attachment *1*

Infill Housing Program Background

Council Strategic Priorities Plan

Council's 2023-2026 Strategic Priorities Plan, which serves as a guiding document, identifies Homes and Housing Options as a focus area, with a goal to clear the way for all types of homes needed by people today and tomorrow, prioritizing homes for those with the greatest need. Related outcomes identified in the Plan are:

- Infill Housing: Allow for diverse housing options in all neighbourhoods of New Westminster for different household demographics.
- Build More Homes Faster: Implement a simplified and streamlined development approvals process to get more homes built across the entire housing spectrum, from apartment buildings to laneway homes, while also facilitating amenities and infrastructure to support growth.

Less than 7% of the City's housing stock are units other than single detached dwellings and apartments, according to the most recent available Census data. Increasing housing choice is a high priority of the City and the community, as many members cannot find suitable housing as their needs change. Infill housing would provide more housing choice in the city, including: duplexes, triplexes, quadraplexes, multiplexes, secondary suites, laneway houses, side-by-side townhouses (strata)/rowhouses (fee simple).

Housing Accelerator Fund

In March 2023, with increasing pressure on supply across the housing spectrum, CMHC launched the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF), a $4 billion program that provides funding to local governments to fast track the development of more housing. To qualify for funding, local governments were required to create an action plan, to facilitate an increase in housing supply, beyond what would be achieved without the identified actions. Action plan initiatives should make changes to regulations, policy or approval processes, remove barriers to growth, speed up approvals, and drive long-term transformational change.

In February 2024, the City was awarded an $11.4 million grant from the HAF program. In receiving the grant, New Westminster has committed to implementing the seven initiatives in our HAF Action Plan, one of which is the Infill Housing Accelerator and the subject of this report. Associated with the HAF grant, the Infill Housing work has a deadline of June 15, 2026 for bylaw adoption.

Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing Legislation

<u>2023 Legislation Overview</u>

In November 2023, the Provincial Government introduced wide ranging changes to the housing legislation that governs how municipalities plan for and approve new development. While the Infill Housing Accelerator Program was identified as one of the City's key CMHC's Housing Accelerator Fund grant actions, in alignment with Council's 2023-2026 Strategic Priorities Plan, and was therefore initiated prior to

the enactment of provincial housing legislation, the Infill Program responds to the legislation.

Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) legislation requires municipalities to pre-zone identified properties to allow a minimum of three to six units, depending on lot size and proximity to transit. This includes pre-zoning to permit at least:

- Three units on lots that are 280 square metres or smaller,
- Four units on lots that are greater than 280 square metres,
- Six units on lots that are greater than 280 square metres and within 400 metres of bus stops prescribed as having frequent service by the legislation. Off-street vehicle parking minimum requirements must be removed for these lots.

If future bus service improvements meet the provincial threshold for frequent service, this could trigger a provincial requirement for allowing six units in additional areas of the city.

The 2023 legislation was written to require local governments to allow SSMUH on "restricted zone" properties, which are those otherwise zoned to allow:

- detached single family dwellings,
- detached single family dwellings with one additional housing unit (either a secondary suite or an accessory dwelling unit),
- duplexes, or
- duplexes with secondary suites or two accessory dwelling units.

The SSMUH legislation does not apply to any properties located within a Transit Oriented Development Area, where greater residential density has been enabled by the Province.

Following the new legislation, the Province issued a policy manual and site standards for SSMUH as an implementation resource. When adopting a zoning amendment bylaw to permit the use and density required by the SSMUH legislation, a local government must consider applicable guidelines in the manual. The manual also identifies recommended best practices and identifies common zoning bylaw provisions that are not aligned with SSMUH objectives. The guidelines encourage creating a favourable regulatory environment (e.g. by allowing sufficient height and density, and low parking requirements).

Bill 25

In November 2025, the Province passed Bill 25 (Housing and Municipal Affairs Statutes Amendment Act) which amended the original Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) legislation, including by:

- changing the definition of "restricted" properties to include sites where zoning regulations allow three units,

- requiring adoption of SSMUH-related zoning amendments by June 30, 2026, and
- expanding the Province's authority to make regulations for form, density, and off-street parking requirements for SSMUH developments.

These changes mean that the mainland properties that were previously exempt from SSMUH legislation (as they already allowed a house, suite and laneway house) must now be rezoned to comply with the legislation by June 30, 2026.

Summary of City's Implementation of Legislation

Mainland

Most residential neighbourhood properties in New Westminster permit a single detached dwelling unit (house) and two additional housing units – an accessory dwelling unit (laneway or carriage house) and a secondary suite. As such, the zoning was not considered "restricted" under the 2023 Provincial legislation and the City was not required to make wide-spread zoning changes at that time. Following 2025 SSMUH legislation updates, zoning changes to these properties is required by June 30, 2026. The majority of these properties are included in the scope of the Infill Housing Program, which, if approved, would meet the timeline and scale of change required by the Province. Other properties have instead been included in the Townhouse Program. Properties with higher density land use designations have also been excluded to maintain the opportunity for the higher density envisioned.

Queensborough

Queensborough has "restricted zone" properties that are required to be rezoned to comply with the provincial legislation. Further study is needed to understand the impact of the change on the area's infrastructure system(s) like water and sewer, which has been specifically constructed based on the previously planned density and in consideration of the area's geotechnical conditions. As a result, the City applied to the Province for and was granted an extension, with a new compliance date of May 4, 2029. The City will advance the work necessary to comply with the legislation for this neighbourhood following the completion of the scope of the current Infill Housing Program, which is the subject of this report.

Existing Duplexes

There were roughly 160 duplex properties in New Westminster whose zoning was required to be changed to be in compliance with the 2023 Small-scale Multi-unit Housing legislation. In July 2024, Council adopted an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw which rezoned "restricted zone" properties to a new (RD-1) zoning district, which permits duplex properties to add rental secondary suites and updated parking requirements for those additional units. These properties have been included in the Infill Housing Program, which is the subject of this report, which will provide these opportunities with additional infill housing opportunities.

Infill Housing Program Background

Phase One

The City adopted the first phase of the Infill Housing Program in 2017 alongside the new Official Community Plan. The intent of the program is to increase housing choice in the community. Through consultation, the community was asked which infill housing forms would be a good fit for New Westminster, and where they should be located. Based on community feedback, the first phase of the program focused on:

- laneway and carriage houses, and
- infill townhouses (strata) and rowhouses (fee-simple).

The program created zoning regulations and development permit guidelines for each housing form. For laneway and carriage houses, most single detached dwelling properties on the mainland were pre-zoned to allow these uses outright, in addition to a secondary suite.

The Infill Housing Program continued in 2020 with the launch of an interim multiplex policy to guide applications for development of duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes.

In 2022, the City conducted a comprehensive review of the 2017 program. Staff undertook a community survey, and a survey of past program applicants, developers and owners. Participants indicated general support for relaxing regulations, streamlining processes, and reducing costs for the Laneway and Carriage House Program, and some participants expressed concerns about overlook and traffic impacts. Based on these finding, the City launched a streamlined version of the laneway and carriage house guidelines in 2023.

Infill Housing Program Phase Two

This phase of infill housing work responds to Council's 2023-2026 Strategic Priorities Plan, provincial legislation, and federal housing goals through CMHC's Housing Accelerator Fund grant.

In May 2024, Council endorsed a work plan for the Infill Housing Accelerator Program, exploring pre-zoning (i.e. no rezoning required) to permit up to six residential units in single detached dwelling and duplex zones (outside of TOD Areas). The May 2024 Council report can be viewed here. Staff hired a consultant to advance this work with an interdepartmental staff team.

Attachment *2*

Engineering Implications

Engineering Implications

Overview

The Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing legislation aims to allow more housing on properties otherwise restricted to allow only one, two, or three units. Allowing more housing has implications for engineering services.

The Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing legislation, in combination with the Transit Oriented Development Area legislation, essentially mandates growth to occur everywhere in the city at any point in time. The biggest challenge with this mandate from an infrastructure and servicing standpoint will be managing the impacts associated with this dispersed growth. Without the ability to prioritize investment in targeted areas, it is anticipated that City resources, including financial and staff resources, will be overextended and challenged to adequately support this new growth pattern. Engineering implications of this provincially required, higher density growth occurring throughout the city include:

- Land use “spillover” impacts onto streets and lanes stemming from sites that will inevitably not be able to accommodate all site functions, including parking and space required to efficiently support solid waste service. More specifically, curbside management challenges resulting from increased on-street private vehicle parking demand that will compete with the increased need to prioritize finite curb space to better support sustainable transportation modes, including bus prioritization and implementation of the Active Transportation Network Plan, and solid waste cart staging for pick-up.
- Increased storm water and drainage volumes in City infrastructure as a result of increased impervious surfaces on more densely developed sites, and resulting potential for increased flooding in roadways during rainfall events.
- Increased water infrastructure to meet fire flow requirements to adequately support fire incidents on sites with greater numbers of dwelling units.
- Additional investigations and studies to address engineering service operational efficiencies, especially on the solid waste service, to enhance fleet, specialist technical and operations staff, and labour requirements.
- Uncertainty regarding waste management requirements and services provided for new (i.e. infill housing) and expanded (i.e. townhouse) housing types, including consideration of alternative collection vehicles to enable efficient waste collection in increasingly dense neighbourhoods.

Primarily as a result of the need to meet Housing Accelerator Fund deadlines, the Housing Program work done to date does not include a fulsome assessment of infrastructure asset needs and operational conditions, and the financial implications associated. Additional time and resources, including consultant and staff resources, will be required to complete this work in the coming months and years. Engineering staff will be providing Council further information on impacts and options for managing the implications.

Lanes

The large majority of properties that would be included in the Infill Housing Program do not back onto an accessible laneway. Accessible laneways are of 6 metres in width and provide access to a street. They facilitate garbage pick-up and fire department access, and are the safest access point for private vehicle site access, as vehicles can turn into properties while being less likely to encounter pedestrians, cyclists, or other vehicles. Many of the city's lanes are absent, undeveloped, or insufficiently wide. Undeveloped lanes have space allocated, but no proper surface treatment. Blocks with discontinuous lanes have a standard lane for a portion of a block, and absent lanes for other portions. The city's laneway system requires expansion to support safe and efficient transportation, including solid waste management.

To date, the expansion of the system has been negotiated through rezoning via required land dedications or statutory right of ways from property owners to City ownership. Dedications can be used to create a new lane where one did not exist, or to widen an existing laneway. The Province has clarified through Bill 16 that the establishment of a Servicing Officer can allow for dedications of roads or lanes through Works and Servicing Agreements linked to Building Permit, regardless of whether a site is being subdivided or rezoned. Council has endorsed the establishment of the Servicing Officer role as of December 15, 2025, allowing dedications to be secured for infill housing projects, without rezoning negotiations. The program will not require developments to build out the lane, when there is no accessible lane.

Attachment *3*

Draft Infill Housing Land Use Designation

Text

Draft Official Community Plan Residential Ground Oriented Land Use Designation

The land use designation included below would be amended by adding the proposed green text.

(RGO) RESIDENTIAL – GROUND ORIENTED INFILL HOUSING

Purpose: To provide a mix of ground oriented infill housing forms where each unit has a separate exterior entrance directly from a street or open space. Units can be attached, detached or a combination of the two.

Principal Forms and Uses: Single detached dwellings (houses), detached accessory dwelling units (laneway or carriage houses), multiplexes (e.g. duplex or quadraplex), cluster houses, rowhouses, side-by-side townhouses, and other equivalent ground oriented housing forms. Principal units may also include a secondary suite.

Complementary Uses: Small scale local commercial uses (e.g. corner stores), small scale child care, small scale places of worship, public schools, utilities, transportation corridors, parks, open space and community facilities. Home based businesses as an ancillary use.

Maximum Density: Low density residential of up to six units per site (including all principal units, secondary suites, and detached accessory dwelling units).

Heritage Assets: Through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement, or similar tool, a site may be eligible for incentives such as a smaller minimum lot size, an increase in density, an increase in the number of permitted units, or reduced parking requirements, which would make it viable to conserve assets with heritage merit. A Heritage Revitalization Agreement may also be used to formalize an existing land use such as a low rise or a place of worship.

Attachment *4*

Draft Infill Housing Land Use Designation


Map

Proposed Update to the OCP Land Use Designation Map

Map 1 on the following page identifies the proprieties proposed to be designated (RGO) Residential - Ground Oriented Development in the OCP. For additional context, Map 2 shows the recent update to the OCP to implement the Transit Oriented Areas, and Map 3 shows the recent update to implement the Townhouse Program.

DRAFT


Map 1: (RGO) Residential - Ground Oriented Infill Housing Land Use Designation



Map 2. Updated OCP Land Use Designation Map

September 25, 2025


* *This map represents updates under consideration by New Westminster City Council and is for reference purposes only.*



Legend:

- **(RD)** Residential - Detached and Semi-Detached Housing
- **(RGO)** Residential - Ground Oriented Infill Housing
- **(RT)** Residential - Townhouse
- **(RLR)** Residential - Low Rise
- **(RLM)** Residential - Limited Mid Rise
- **(RMR)** Residential - Mid Rise
- **(RHR)** Residential - High Rise
- **(ML)** Mixed Use - Low Rise
- **(MLM)** Mixed Use - Limited Mid Rise
- **(MM)** Mixed Use - Mid Rise
- **(MH)** Mixed Use - High Rise
- **(BDMU)** Brewery District Mixed Use and Health Care
- **(SGTMC)** Sapperton Green Transit-Oriented Mixed-Use Community
- **(RHC)** Residential - High Density/ Community Facility
- **(CHC)** Commercial and Health Care
- **(C)** Commercial
- **(ME)** Mixed Employment
- **(P)** Major Institutional
- **(I)** Industrial
- **(U)** Utilities and Transportation Infrastructure
- **(IN)** Intertidal
- **(H/N)** Habitat/Natural Areas
- **(CEM)** Cemeteries
- Parks, Open Space and Community Facilities
- **(BC)** Bent Court Study Area
- **(LTS)** Lower Twelfth and Sharpe Street Study Area
- **(CD)** Comprehensive - Development
- Frequent Transit Development Area
- Local Centre

Map 3. Townhouse (RT) Land Use Designation Map



Attachment *5*

Infill Housing Development Permit Area

Categories

Development Permit Area Guideline Categories

The Development Permit Area would have guidelines for each of these categories, along with these intent statements that outline the intent of the category. Each category would include a set of guidelines that outlines how an application can meet the intent statement. The proposed categories and intent statements are summarized below.

Building Siting and Massing

Guidelines would require developments that respond to site and neighbourhood context, support a pedestrian scale environment, support energy efficiency, and prioritize livability.

Streetscape Expression

Guidelines would require developments that create active, walkable, and human-scale streetscapes.

Building Design

Guidelines would require developments that achieve a high quality of design, architectural expression, and material finish, such that neighbourhoods are activated and made vibrant by a range of architectural styles, from contemporary to traditional expressions.

Privacy

Guidelines would require developments that balance the desire for privacy within the development and between adjacent properties with creating livable units and opportunities for socializing.

Open Space

Guidelines would require developments that provide quality private and shared outdoor amenity spaces that contribute to livability, sustainability, and social connectedness.

Trees and Tree Canopy

Guidelines would require developments that prioritize, accommodate, and support the long-term preservation of existing high-value trees and the growth and establishment of new tree canopy.

Stormwater Management

Guidelines would require developments that support the City's Integrated Stormwater Management objectives.

Hard and Soft Landscaping

Guidelines would require developments that use high quality landscaping that prioritizes permeability and biodiversity.

Screens, Fences, and Retaining Walls

Guidelines would require developments that thoughtfully transition to the public realm and adjacent properties and incorporate landscape elements to mitigate views of service and parking areas.

Circulation, Access, and Parking

Guidelines would require developments that prioritize walking and cycling circulation, use, and access above vehicle circulation.

Solid Waste, Recycling, and Utility Servicing

Guidelines would require developments that conveniently accommodate functional site servicing needs, in balance with other site uses.

Attachment *6*

Draft Infill Housing Zoning District Recommendations and Consideration of Provincial Policy Manual and Site Standards

Infill Housing Zoning District Recommendations

The proposed zoning district recommendations are for up to four-unit and up to six-unit development. Distinct regulations are proposed for four-unit and six-unit projects regarding density and site coverage, and all other regulations are consistent regardless of number of units.

The key goals of the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendments are as follows:

- Align with Council's Strategic Priorities Plan.
- Align with Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) legislation.
- Consider the Province's *Policy Manual and Site Standards*.
- Consider Council's Seven Bold Steps for Climate Action.

Draft zoning regulations are summarized below. Full details are provided in *Table 2.*

- *Unit Type:* Single detached dwellings (houses), detached accessory dwelling units (laneway or carriage houses), secondary suites, multiplexes (e.g. duplex or quadraplex), side-by-side townhouses, and other equivalent ground oriented housing forms would be permitted. A maximum of one unit can stack on top of another unit. Typical accessory uses would be permitted such as childcare and home based business.
- *Density* (regulated through Floor Space Ratio (FSR)): The density permitted is greater the more units that are proposed, starting with one unit at between 0.50 and 0.60 FSR depending on existing base entitlements, and increasing to 1.00 FSR for six units. This would allow livable sized units, without encouraging larger single detached houses. Enclosed vehicle parking (garages) would be included in floor space calculations, as the intent of FSR is to control the overall size of buildings, including all uses.
- *Site Coverage*: Regulations would balance goals for stormwater retention, tree retention, biodiversity, and open space, with retaining sufficient building space for projects with more units. Impervious coverage maximums would include buildings, impervious driveways and walkways. Pervious materials could include lawn, live landscaping, rocks, and wood chips.
- *Setbacks* (the distance of the building from the property lines): Regulations would be a reduction from current single detached and duplex zones, but not always as modest as proposed by the Province to improve the transition between public and private space, and to retain space for tree planting.
- *Height:* Maximums would aim to allow three storeys above grade, to help provide flexibility for design of units, and allow for greater likelihood of above-ground, livable three-bedroom units with adequate light. This could also increase the possibility of accessible units for people with mobility challenges and disabilities. This differs from current single detached residential regulations, which only allow three storeys when a house includes a basement.
- *Stepback* (an additional setback for an upper storey of a building from a

property line): Regulations would aim to minimize building bulk at the rear of properties by introducing a stepback for a third storey from the rear property line for buildings constructed within five metres of the rear property line, which would be permitted on properties with a lane.

- *Vehicle Parking*: Parking requirements are not permitted by provincial legislation for properties in proximity to prescribed bus stops with frequent bus service. Outside of these areas, the following parking rates are proposed:
    - 1.0 parking space per principal dwelling unit,
    - 1.0 parking space for the first secondary dwelling unit on the property, 0 for the second, and 0.5 for any additional (total required spaces rounded up to nearest whole number).

  The recommended parking minimums are similar to existing regulations. The approach aims to balance observed vehicle ownership rates with the need to maximize space for other elements such as tree retention and planting, open space, garbage storage, and electrical infrastructure.
- *Bicycle Parking:* Requirements of 1.5 spaces per unit are included with the aim to support active transportation options and help reduce vehicle dependency.
- *Access Requirements*: Site access must be taken from a lane wherever possible. Through an update to the Subdivision and Development Control Bylaw, as allowed through provincial housing legislation, a dedication would be taken to complete lanes. Applicants would not be required to construct the lane at the time of development when there is no accessible lane. Where dedication is not possible for a future lane, then an on-site vehicle turnaround would be required.
- *Tenure:* Different tenures (i.e. rental housing, ownership or a combination) and ownership models (i.e. free hold, strata, co-op) would not be restricted.

Consideration of the Provincial Policy Manual and Site Standards

Tables on the following pages compare proposed zoning district recommendations to Provincial recommendations.

Table 1 presents the proposed zoning regulations, and shows how they have been developed in consideration of Provincial site standards packages. Program development work also considered lessons learned from past projects, best practices in other local municipalities, and analysis of the local context. The proposed amendments would help facilitate the feasibility and uptake of infill housing while also meeting other City policies and regulations.

Table 2 provides details on the rationale for the City's response, showing how the proposed regulations seek to address potential regulatory barriers to infill housing development, as recommended in the Province's SSMUH policy manual.

Table 1: Infill Housing Zoning District Recommendations Compared with Provincial site standards

Zoning Regulation	Provincial site standards		Proposed Infill Housing Zoning
District	**Recommended 4 Unit Zoning**	**Recommended 6 Unit Zoning**	**Recommended 4 and 6 Unit Zoning*** *Regulations apply to both districts, except for select regulations varying by number of units where noted.
Setbacks	• Front Lot Line: Minimum of 4-6 m • Rear Lot Line: Minimum of 6 m for main buildings • ADUs: Minimum of 1.5 m • Side Lot Line: Combined minimum setback for side-yards of 3 m • No stepbacks	• Front Lot Line: Minimum of 2 m • Rear Lot Line: Minimum of 1.5 m • Side Lot Line: Minimum of 0-1.2 m • No stepbacks	• Front: 3.5 m (11.5 ft.) • Rear: if no lane: 3.0 m (9.8 ft.); if lane: 1.2 m (4 ft.) • Side (interior): 1.22 m (4 ft.) • Side (exterior): 3.0 m (9.84 ft.) • Building Separation (front/rear): 6.1 m (20 ft.) • Building Separation (side/accessory): 2.4 m (7.9 ft.) • Front and Side Stepback: none • Rear Stepback: if no lane: none; if lane: 5.0 m (16.4 ft.) stepback third storey from property line.
Height	• Maximum building height of 11 m to the mid-point of a pitched roof or highest point of a flat roof • Maximum 3 storeys	• Maximum building height of 11 m to the mid-point of a pitched roof or to the highest point of a flat roof • Maximum 3 storeys	• Sloped roof: maximum 12 m (39.4 ft.) • Flat roof: maximum 11 m (36.1 ft.) • Maximum 3 storeys

Zoning Regulation	Provincial site standards		Proposed Infill Housing Zoning
District	**Recommended 4 Unit Zoning**	**Recommended 6 Unit Zoning**	**Recommended 4 and 6 Unit Zoning*** *Regulations apply to both districts, except for select regulations varying by number of units where noted.
Lot Coverage	Maximum 40%	Maximum 60%	Building Coverage o 1 unit: maximum 35-40% depending on base zone o 2 units: maximum 40% o 3-4 units: maximum 45% o 5-6 units: maximum 50% Pervious Lot Coverage: o 2 units: minimum 45% o 3-6 units: minimum 40% Planted Site Space o 2 units: minimum 30% of lot o 3-4 units: minimum 20% of lot o 5-6 units: minimum 15% of lot o minimum 15 m^2 (161.46 $ft.^2$) o minimum 2.1 m (6.9 ft.)
Off-Street Parking	• Maximum 0.5 space/unit if lot is within 800 m of transit stop with a bus at a minimum frequency of every 15 minutes (measured between 7am – 7pm) • 0 parking if within 400 m • Maximum 1 space/unit otherwise	0	• within 400 m of prescribed bus stop: 0 spaces • outside 400 m: o 1.0 parking space per principal dwelling unit o 1.0 parking space for the first secondary dwelling unit on the property, 0 for the second, and 0.5 for any additional.
Density	None		• 1 unit: 0.50-0.60 FSR depending on base zone • 2 units: 0.60 FSR • 3 units: 0.70 FSR • 4 units: 0.80 FSR • 5 units: 0.90 FSR • 6 units: 1.00 FSR

Zoning Regulation	Provincial site standards		Proposed Infill Housing Zoning
District	**Recommended 4 Unit Zoning**	**Recommended 6 Unit Zoning**	**Recommended 4 and 6 Unit Zoning*** *Regulations apply to both districts, except for select regulations varying by number of units where noted.
Bicycle Parking	None		• 1.5 bicycle spaces per dwelling unit

Table 2: Response to Provincial Guidance

Provincial Guidance [1]	City of New Westminster Response
Setbacks Adopt modest lot line setbacks	• Front setback reduced from existing single detached and duplex standards. The proposed setbacks are higher than recommended for four units, but lower than recommended for six units. A middle value is recommended for consistency across properties, and to help support space for tree planting in front yard. • Interior side setback set consistent with Manual. • Minimum exterior side setback higher than Manual to support public/private transition. • Rear setback reduced from existing single detached and duplex standards. The proposed setbacks are higher than recommended for 4 units, but lower than recommended for 6 units. A middle value for consistency across properties, and to support public/private transition at back of lot. • The stepback proposed at rear of property does not align with the Manual, but supports urban design goals to prevent shadowing along the narrower passage widths found in laneways, and to ensure privacy given the typically high amount of glazing found on the rear/front facades of livable building designs.
Height Insufficient height allowances	• Maximum building height increased to support three storeys, regardless of site gradient or roof style, to ensure overall building envelope is sufficient to allow for infill housing.
Lot coverage Protect pervious surfaces while enabling functional building footprints	• Site coverage restriction simplified to include all on-site structures. • Allowable site coverage increased for projects with more units, up to 60%, which aligns with Manual recommendations. • Planted site space minimums included, as part of pervious space, to emphasize stormwater management and biodiversity goals.

Off-Street Parking
On-site parking requirements that are too high
	• Within 400 metres of prescribed bus stop:
	  ○ None, as required.
	• Within 401 and 800 metres of prescribed bus stop:
	  ○ Proposed rates for principal units and first secondary suite higher than Manual because of vehicle ownership rates in New Westminster.
	  ○ Proposed rates for any additional secondary suites aligns with the Manual.
	• Outside 800 metres of prescribed bus stop:
	  ○ Proposed rates align for principal dwelling units and the first secondary suite.
	  ○ Proposed rates lower than required for additional secondary suites.
	• Projects may be eligible for parking variances when a rationale for a lower rate is provided.

Provincial Guidance [1]	City of New Westminster Response
Density Permit minimum of three or four units, depending on lot size. Remove maximum FSR requirements	• Proposal allows six units within 400 metres of prescribed transit, as required. • Proposal allows four units where the Province requires allowing only three. • Retention of FSR as a tool does not align with Manual. Use of FSR is recommended, as strategic exemptions would be used as incentives for features that support SSMUH goals, such as bicycle parking. The proposed approach maintains consistency with existing zones. • Greater FSR permitted for projects with more units, compared to single detached dwellings, would incentivize infill housing rather than allow larger single detached dwellings. This approach aligns with the Manual advice to grant greater allowances based on the number of units to promote higher-density development and discourage large single family dwellings.
Servicing requirements triggered by additional units	• The City made updates to the services requirements included in the Subdivision and Development Control Bylaw, including to runoff coefficients, fireflow requirements, infrastructure standards, and climate action requirements, to reflect regional standards and accommodate new infill housing forms.
Limitations on the visibility or positioning of entrances for non-principal dwellings	• Zoning Bylaw requirement regarding position of secondary suite entrances was removed as part of 2024 SSMUH implementation, and is instead proposed to be encouraged through infill housing development permit guidelines, to help support access by emergency responders.
Owner occupation requirements for secondary suites	• Not required, in alignment with Manual.

[1] As noted in *Provincial Policy Manual and Site Standards*, pages 37-45.

Attachment 7

Draft Maps of Proposed Pre-Zoned Infill Housing Properties

DRAFT

Infill Housing Zoning Districts

Up to 4 Housing Units
Up to 6 Housing Units, when 4 required to be allowed
Up to 6 Housing Units

Burnaby
Richmond
North Delta
Surrey
Coquitlam
North Fraser River
Annacis Channel
South Fraser River
Fraser River
Sapperton Channel
Tenth Ave
Ninth Ave
Eighth Ave
Seventh Ave
Sixth Ave
Fifth Ave
Fourth Ave
Third Ave
Queens Ave
Royal Ave
Front St
Columbia St
Columbia Street
Twelfth St
Tenth St
Eighth St
Sixth St
Fourth St
McBride Blvd
Queensborough Bridge
Patullo Bridge
Stewardson Way
Quayside Dr
E Columbia St
E Eighth Ave
E Sixth Ave
Brunette Ave
Edworthy Way
Cumberland St
Richmond St
Braid St
Marine Way
River Dr
Trapp Rd
Mead St
Blackberry Dr
Memorial Dr
Sapperton Landing

Attachment *8*

Summary of Consultation

Summary of Community Consultation

Summary of 2024 Consultation

In Summer 2024, community engagement was held for the Infill Housing Accelerator program. Engagement was completed online through the project's Be Heard New West page. There were 977 page visitors, and 40 participants submitting forum contributions and questions, between June and August 2024.

Key themes heard include:

- Interest in designs that consider sustainability, biodiversity and tree retention;
- Concerns about infrastructure and amenities (roads, schools, sewer, water) supporting increased density;
- Considerations of parking and traffic demands on neighbourhoods with increased density;
- Interest in more diverse missing middle housing forms that accommodate families and aging in place and provide greater affordability.

Summary of Spring 2025 Consultation

In Spring 2025, the Our City Our Homes initiative was held to coordinate engagement on a number of housing programs, including the Infill Housing Program, Townhouse Program, Affordable Housing Accelerator Initiative, and other changes required to implementation of provincial housing legislation.

Key infill housing takeaways heard during this engagement period included:

- general support for streamlining approvals and permitting processes (70% support), and
- allowing a sliding scale of building floor area based on the number of homes provided, to incentivize projects providing more homes (66% support).

See the full Engagement Summary Report (click here) which includes a summary of the approach taken and the feedback received, including regarding the Infill Housing Program.

Summary of Winter 2025 Consultation

In Winter 2025, another phase of public engagement was help regarding the Infill Housing Program. This phase included three in-person open houses, and an online survey with similar questions to the open houses. The full result details are in a What We Heard Report in Attachment 9.

- *Allowing Up To Six Infill Housing Units:* Just over half of respondents would like to see six units only where required by the Province. A quarter would like to see some expansion (of which 15% would like to see a block "completed" if six units are allowed elsewhere on the block and 10% would like to see this and more). Just under a quarter would like to see up to six units allowed within the whole study area.
- *Off-street Parking:* Taking into consideration proposed transportation demand management measures and bicycle parking spaces, almost half of respondents

felt that the proposed off-street parking was “not enough” (48%), 30% felt it was “just right”, and 14% felt it was “too much”.

- *Transportation Demand Management Measures:* Feedback was mixed, with a similar proportion of respondents feeling the proposed transportation demand management measures felt “just right” (26%) or “too much” (26%) and a slightly higher proportion responding that the proposal was “not enough” (29%).
- *Housing Variety:* Most respondents (61%) agreed or somewhat agreed with the proposal to allow a variety of infill housing types.
- *Design Guidelines:* General support for the proposed design guideline categories, especially regarding circulation, access, and parking (ranked highest) and building siting and massing (ranked second highest).
- *Building Floor Area:* General support for the proposed sliding scale of allowable building floor area (52% agreed or somewhat agreed), with about a fifth (20%) noting they were unsure / didn’t know, and just over a quarter disagreeing or somewhat disagreeing (27%).
- *Proposed Height and Setbacks*: Most respondents support the proposed approach (61% agreed or somewhat agreed). Some respondents felt the proposal for three storeys is too high (34% disagreed or somewhat disagreed).
- *Open Space Requirements*: Feedback was mixed, with a slight preference for requiring more (41% responded require more, 35% maintain proposed, 23% require less).
- *Private Open Space:* Feedback was mixed, with a moderate preference for requiring open space (24% responded allow shared space, 39% require all units to have private open space, 15% allow shared open space only in specific conditions, 21% require a smaller amount of open space that is private).
- *Parking Type:* Preference for encouraging carports or surface parking over enclosed garages (41% responded agree, 20% somewhat agree, 7% not sure / I don’t know, 9% somewhat disagree, 22% disagree).

Advisory Planning Commission

The draft program materials were presented to APC at the December 2, 2025 meeting. The minutes are in Attachment 10. In summary, Commission comments included:

- supporting clear City communication when infrastructure constraints exist as these may affect development feasibility and costs for property owners;
- noting increased costs placed on developers to fund amenities and infrastructure are ultimately passed on to buyers, which can undermine affordability;
- preferring including the entire block for areas that allow six units, not cutting off in the middle of the block;
- noting a broader societal shift away from car ownership and emphasizing the importance of prioritizing public transit over car-focused infrastructure;

- expressing concerns some streets are too narrow to support traffic associated with higher-density housing, which may also affect emergency vehicle access;
- encouraging less prescriptive design guidelines to help support infill housing;
- supporting considering sustainability goals when setting setback requirements, including solar orientation to support passive building design;
- allowing floor space ratios that maximize the livable building space;
- establishing consistent maximum height across a lot rather than an average; and
- suggesting that the Province should contribute to funding community amenities, as high development cost charges may limit the effectiveness of the program.

Summary of Interagency and First Nations Consultation

Agencies and First Nations received a letter in January 2025 informing them of the various projects underway, including the infill housing program. City staff met with agency staff who expressed interest in learning more about the work. A summary of the feedback received from each agency is identified below. Another letter will be sent to all agencies and First Nations in early 2026 with an update specific to the Infill Housing Program.

Summary of Agency and First Nation Feedback Received

Metro Vancouver Regional District

- Metro Vancouver expressed a desire to standardize land use designations across municipalities, but recognizes this is not be possible at this time.
- Metro Vancouver was pleased to know that the City is working to strengthen tenant protections by updating the Tenant Relocation Policy.
- Staff shared a draft of the Regional Context Statement with Metro Vancouver for their review. Metro Vancouver was generally supportive of the draft. City staff have made minor edits based on Metro Vancouver's feedback.

Translink

- City staff had a meeting regarding regional planning with TransLink and Metro Vancouver staff, which resulted in TransLink the Frequent Transit Development Areas overlay in the Regional Growth Strategy.
- Staff received no other feedback from Translink on the rest of the Official Community Plan update work.

New Westminster School District

- The School District supports the City's approach of allowing schools in most residential and some mixed-use land use designations across the city as this helps streamline the approval of new school sites.
- The School District will reflect the growth mandated by the Province in the upcoming update to their Long Range Facilities Plan.

- The School District continues to explore new opportunities for delivering schools in the urban context of New Westminster, including through integration in a residential or mix-used development project.
- The School District continues to welcome the City to join them in advocacy efforts to the Province.

Vancouver Fraser Port Authority

- The Port Authority continues to encourage noise mitigation in new residential buildings.
- The Port Authority is pleased to see that industrial designated land continues to be separated from residential areas by roadways.

Fraser Health, Healthy Built Environment Program

- This group works on long-range physical planning with municipalities within their health authority. They were encouraged by the updates related to climate action, recognizing its importance in community health and longevity.
- They were encouraged by the current active transportation work that the City is undertaking or planning (not proposed to change in this update), and by the principles of transit oriented development now reflected in the City's land uses.
- Further focus on community well-being and social connectedness was encouraged, especially related to future design guidelines or other similar policies for Transit Oriented Development Areas.

Kwikwetlem First Nation

- The Nation has asked to be kept up to date on changes to the OCP for information purposes at this time as they have limited staff capacity to undertake detailed analysis.
- The Nation has requested that when the City updates design guidelines that consideration is made for indigenous principles and design elements.
- The Nation is concerned with protecting their traditional territory, especially through an environmental lens, by being stewards to the land. It was highlighted that the Fraser River is home to the last wild population of White Sturgeon, whose numbers are in a state of decline. As such, disturbance (such as through development applications) at the edge of the Fraser River should be carefully considered and ideally referred to the Nation for comment.
- The Nation wants cultural heritage within the territory protected and artifacts identified as belonging to the Nation returned to them. The Nation does not see previous ground disturbance as a sufficient reason not to do archaeology and noted that New Westminster has high archeological potential due to its proximity to water and trade routes.

Musqueam Nation

- Consultation on the OCP with Musqueam Nation built from existing and ongoing conversations that were already underway regarding the 22nd Street Station

Vision. Musqueam recognized the need for the City to proceed with work that reflects Provincial Government requirements, though requested that conversations continue with the City on the approach to consultation with Nations generally, including processes, capacity funding and other items.

- Musqueam remains particularly interested in 22nd Street Station Area implementation work.

Squamish Nation

- In response to the City's online referral through Squamish Connect, Squamish Nation identified preliminary comments that speak to their community's priorities which the City will work to address in future areas of work. These comments include considerations such as protection of the natural environment, improved economic opportunities for Squamish members, better housing options for members living off-reserve, enhanced access to healthcare, and greater representation of Squamish culture in the public realm.

Ts'uubaa-asatx Nation

- In response to the City's referral letter, Ts'uubaa-asatx Nation provided a letter acknowledging that New Westminster is outside of their core title area. As a result, the Nation communicated that they would defer to the comments of any other Nations whose title and governing authority were directly affected, though they retain the right to revise their assessment in the future. City staff will continue to consult with Ts'uubaa-asatx Nation for future work.

<u>Consultation Referral List</u>

First Nations

- Cowichan Tribes
- Halalt First Nation
- Katzie First Nation
- Kwantlen First Nation
- Kwikwetlem First Nation
- Lyackson First Nation
- Ts'uubaa-asatx First Nation
- Musqueam First Nation
- Penelakut Tribe
- Qayqayt First Nation
- Seabird Island Band
- Semiahmoo First Nation
- Shxw'ōwhámél First Nation
- Skawahlook First Nation
- Soowahlie First Nation
- Squamish First Nation
- Sto:lo Nation
- Sto:lo Tribal Council
- Stz'uminus First Nation
- Tsawwassen First Nation
- Tsleil-Waututh Nation

External Agencies

- Board of Education of New Westminster Schools
- Fraser Health Authority

- Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District
- Greater Vancouver Water District
- Metro Vancouver Regional District
- Ministry of Infrastructure
- Ministry of Transportation and Transit
- TransLink
- Vancouver Fraser Port Authority.

Attachment *9*

What We

Heard

Report

New Westminster

Infill Housing Program

What We Heard Report
January 2026



beheardnewwest.ca/infill-accelerator

Infill Housing Program

What We Heard Report

January 2026

511 Royal Avenue
New Westminster BC V3L 1H9
604 521 3711 | info@newwestcity.ca

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Engagement Process 3
3. What We Heard 5
- Section 1: Program Principles 5
- Section 2: Where Would There Be Infill Housing? 7
- Section 3: Transportation and Solid Waste 12
- Section 4: Transportation Options and Parking Requirements 15
- Section 5: Proposal: Housing Variety – What Could Infill Housing Look Like? 23
- Section 6: Proposal: Design Guidelines 28
- Section 7: Proposal: Building Floor Area 30
- Section 8: Proposal: Building Height and Size 34
- Section 9: Proposal: Open Space and the Size of Homes 37
- Section 10: Proposal: Private or Shared Open Space 39
- Section 11: Proposal: Parking Type 41
- Section 12: Tell Us About Yourself 44
- Section 13: Tell Us About Yourself: Why Are You Interested? 45

4. Who We Heard From 49
- Be Heard New West 49
  - Postal Code 49
  - Age Groups 50
  - Connections to New Westminster 51
  - Additional Demographic Information 52
  - Demographic Analysis 52
- In-Person Open Houses 53
  - Connections to New Westminster 53
  - Neighbourhoods 54

5. Next Steps 54

1. Introduction

The Infill Housing Program is exploring pre-zoning to permit up to six units of infill housing (such as secondary suites, laneway and carriage houses, triplex, quadplex, and multiplex forms of housing) on single family and duplex properties across most of the city. Pre-zoning would mean that a rezoning application would no longer be required to build these forms. However, other City approvals would still be required. The program builds on the Phase 1 Infill Housing program, considers lessons learned from past projects, and input gathered from previous rounds of public engagement, including the 'Our City Our Homes' initiative.

The City is now planning to update its design guidelines and zoning regulations for infill housing. These updates are intended to help the City achieve its housing goals.

Housing Goals	How Infill Housing Can Achieve Our Housing Goals
Provide for Housing Choice	Expanding housing options for different age groups and household sizes.
Build More Homes, Faster via a streamlined process.	Eliminating rezoning applications for infill housing can help speed up the development approval process, allowing more homes to be built, faster. This is called pre-zoning.
Growth with Livable and Financial Sustainability	We are creating a new Financing Growth Strategy so that new development helps pay for the services and amenities needed for a livable city.
In the Right Place	Allowing infill housing in lower density neighbourhoods is part of the City goal to allow housing in the right places, with the highest density forms allowed closest to frequent transit.

Between November 18 and December 9, the City sought out public feedback to help shape more detailed decisions, such as design features, numbers of units allowable, and more. The feedback collected through this engagement, along with the 'Our City Our Homes' Spring 2025 engagement, technical analysis, provincial legislation, and Council direction will inform program regulation and guidelines for infill housing in New Westminster.


View the Infill Housing Program Be Heard Project page for more information.

The purpose of this summary report is to share the results of this infill housing engagement with engagement participants, the broader New Westminster community, and City Council.

2. Engagement Process

Community engagement to gather feedback on the Infill Housing Program ran from November 18 through December 9, 2025, with an online survey on Be Heard New West and a series of three open houses.





A total of 122 individuals shared their input through the online survey and 89 attended the open houses.

Opportunities to engage:

- **Be Heard New West project webpage**
  - Launched November 18, 2025
  - 805 unique visitors (individuals) as of December 9, 2025
- **Online survey**
  - November 18, 2025 through December 9, 2025
  - 122 responses
- **Open Houses:** 89 participants
  - Century House (34 participants), November 20, 2025
  - City Hall (23 participants), November 26, 2025
  - təməsewtxʷ Aquatic and Community Centre (32 participants), November 29, 2025

The opportunities to engage were communicated through the following methods:

- Email notification to various City email databases:
  - Be Heard New West subscribers
  - Citypage newsletter subscribers
  - Email to residents' associations
- Social media posts (Facebook, Instagram)
- City events calendar

Important Note: this summary of engagement input does not reflect a representative sample of the New Westminster community. The input captured here reflects the views of those who self-selected to participate, and may not be representative of the views of other community members and interest groups. Please see section 4 – Who We Heard From, starting on page 49 – for some demographic information and representation analysis about people who participated in the online activities.

3. What We Heard

An online survey was available on Be Heard New West from November 18 to December 9, 2025. A total of 122 people completed the survey. Three open houses were also held on November 20, November 26, and November 29, 2025 with a total of 89 people attending. Questions in the online survey and the open house engagement events sought feedback and input on Infill Housing Program guidelines, how many units could be allowed, and what infill housing could look like in New Westminster. The results below reflect a combination of feedback gathered through the online survey and open houses, and include the questions asked of participants both online and in-person.

The following sections outline the questions that were asked in the engagements, along with context that was provided to participants, and then share the results for each respectively.

Section 1: Program Principles

What We Heard: In our spring 2025 engagement, we heard strong interest in allowing diverse housing choices across the city.

What That Could Look Like For The Program: To encourage diverse housing choices while still providing the required services and infrastructure for safe and sustainable neighbourhoods, we have drafted Infill Housing Program principles. With single family property sizes, it may be challenging to meet all of the principles equally on each lot. As we consider how to best achieve each principle, we're looking to understand what principles are most important to you.

Question 1: How important are each of the following principles to you?

- **Parking:** Set appropriate on-site parking requirements such that public curb space better supports sustainable transportation including walking, rolling, cycling, and buses, and other public uses, and to manage the demand for parking on our streets. (As noted on the Transportation and Parking Requirements board, in frequent transit areas, the City cannot require parking.)
- **Site Access:** Ensure pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicle drivers can get around safely by having clear sightlines, safe road crossings, and well-designed driveways. For any properties that do not have accessible laneways, require that land be dedicated for that purpose, but do not require that they be developed.
- **Stormwater and Open Space:** Manage water from storms onsite to prevent off site flooding and disruptions. This can include green spaces that also provide natural spaces for residents to enjoy.

- **Solid Waste:** Provide space for efficient storage and convenient access to solid waste carts to enable collection by the City's solid waste services.
- **Design:** Prioritize housing choice, livability, social connections, and accessibility, to meet people's needs, and allow them to enjoy their homes and outdoor spaces.
- **Incentives for Built Form and Housing:** Explore opportunities for incentives and remove disincentives for City priorities for heritage preservation, accessible units, bicycle parking, and rental units.
- **Sustainability:** Explore opportunities for incentives for sustainable design, including tree protection and planting, that integrate Council's Seven Bold Steps for Climate Action, one of which is Robust Urban Forest, and explore incentives to exceed the bold steps.


Question 1 Results

Note: *The table combines the results from the three open houses and the online survey.*

Program Principle	Rank	Weighted Average Score From survey and open house (5 = important, 1 = unimportant)
Stormwater and Open Space	1	4.07
Site Access	2	4.05
Design	3	4.01
Solid Waste	4	3.84
Parking	5	3.67
Sustainability	6	3.60
Incentives for Built Form and Housing	7	3.43

Total responses: 209 *(**Survey:** 122 responses; **Open Houses:** 87 responses)*

Section 2: Where Would There Be Infill Housing?



(Click here to view a full size version of the map).

The Infill Housing Program is exploring pre-zoning to permit up to six units of infill housing (such as secondary suites, laneway houses, triplex, quadplex, and multiplex forms of housing) on single family and duplex properties across most of the city. As part of the Program, we are exploring how many units should be permitted and where.

To make this decision we will follow provincial legislation which sets minimums of 3, 4, or 6 homes per lot, depending on the lot's size, and its distance to bus stops with frequent service. These requirements are shown on the map above. Properties shown in yellow would be pre-zoned to allow 4 homes on a property, and properties shown in blue would be pre-zoned to allow 6 homes per property.

Today, we are looking for your feedback on how we should refine the base map established by the provincial legislation. We will also consider technical analysis and Council direction.

In addition to meeting the minimum requirements of the Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing legislation, there are two small changes we think are easy to make:

- Allowing up to 4 units on small sites instead of the 3 units required by the Province. This would impact approximately 50 sites across the city (shown in red on the map).
- Allowing up to 6 units in areas where the City utilities, such as sewer and stormwater pipes, are already the right size for more units because there are apartment buildings nearby. This would impact approximately 50 properties.

Question 2: Our proposal is to go beyond the provincial requirements. Which option do you prefer?

Options, How They Relate to Provincial Requirements, and Rationale
OPTION: I would like to see the **MINIMUM AREAS** allow up to 6 units. **How it relates to the Provincial requirements:** Follows the minimum requirement by the Province as shown in the map on the previous board. **Rationale:** The Province has already set requirements for how many units should be allowed and where.
OPTION: I would like to see **SOME ADDITIONAL AREAS** allow up to 6 units. **How it relates to the Provincial requirements:** Expands on the provincial requirements by allowing up to 6 units on a property if other properties on the same block are allowed up to 6 units. See properties in blue on previous map. **Rationale:** • Allows fairness within the block by giving similar properties the same opportunities. • Does not include properties which are in areas with infrequent transit because of traffic and parking pressures.
OPTION: I would like to see **MORE AREAS** allow up to 6 units. **How it relates to the Provincial requirements:** This includes the above option and also looks at additional areas for expansion. **Rationale:** A combination of the above and below rationales.
OPTION: I would like to see **ALL AREAS** allow up to 6 units. **How it relates to the Provincial requirements:** Allow 6 units everywhere in the residential ground oriented housing area (all of the red, yellow and blue properties on the previous map). **Rationale:** • Supports Council's Strategic Priorities Plan infill housing priority by allowing more areas to have more housing choice. • Provides all properties the same opportunity. • Proactively prepares for potential future transit service upgrades that may expand the Provincial mandate of 6 units to more areas. • Responds to interest from the public for infill housing.

Considerations:

- Property owners would be responsible for major utility (sewer, water, electrical) upgrades. For 6 unit projects the upgrades may be more expensive than is financially feasible since much of the infrastructure in these areas was designed for 4 units.
- Includes properties which are in not in areas with infrequent transit.


Your input will be considered along with further technical analysis. The final direction would be implemented through changes to the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw.

Question 2 Results

Note: *The chart combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*

I would like to see "____" areas allow up to 6 units	Online # (%)	In-person # (%)	Total # (%)
Minimum	53 (47%)	18 (82%)	71 (53%)
Some additional	19 (17%)	1 (5%)	20 (15%)
More	14 (12%)	0 (0%)	14 (10%)
All	27 (24%)	3 (14%)	30 (22%)

Total responses: 135 *(**Survey:** 113 responses; **Open Houses:** 22 responses)*



Question 3 (Optional): Tell us why below.

A total of 98 comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question. Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of the responses provided. In some cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes are listed below.

Question 3 Results - Survey

Of the participants who selected *"I would like to see MINIMUM AREAS allow up to 6 units"*, the following themes and general comments emerged (43 comments):

- **Neighbourhoods are at capacity:** Several participants shared that the city already suffers from traffic congestion, and lack of school capacity and emergency services. Some expressed concern that infill housing beyond provincial mandates would worsen pollution and traffic, without providing local jobs or the transit needed to reduce vehicle dependency. Respondents also shared concerns that too much density would negatively impact infrastructure and amenities like water services and recreation facilities (12 comments).
- **Meet mandated density, and not more:** Several participants felt that the City should adhere to the minimum provincial mandates. Three noted that they could expand the infill housing program later if needed, with further engagement (8 comments).
- **Impact to neighbourhood character:** Several participants felt that too much housing density would affect the city's heritage, established character, local streetscapes, green spaces, privacy, beauty and aesthetics (7 comments).
- **Impact on livability:** Some participants shared that increasing densification would decrease livability by sacrificing private yards, green space and room for outdoor activities. People expressed concerns that overcrowding would overwhelm existing infrastructure and lead to a lower standard of living and increased community conflict. Some participants wanted the City to prioritize recreation facilities and park space (6 comments).
- **Other (10):** Topics with fewer than five comments included:
    - **general disagreement** with the proposal (4 comments),
    - suggestions to focus on **development process changes** and assess neighborhood impacts (2 comments),
    - concerns about **affordability and costs** of infill housing (2 comments), and
    - critiques of the **survey format**, including requests for neutral options or alternatives supporting lower densities (2 comments).

Of the participants who selected *"I would like to see SOME AREAS allow up to 6 units"*, participants raised a variety of less frequently mentioned comments (13 comments):

- **Other:** Topics with fewer than five comments included:
    - the **pace of change**, with some preferring slower or more gradual adjustments and others questioning the need for additional infill in an already dense city (3 comments);
    - potential **neighbourhood impacts**, including strain on infrastructure and congestion (2 comments);
    - the need for more **infrastructure and amenities**, particularly green and open spaces, to avoid overburdening services (3 comments);
    - the need for more **housing choice** beyond small condos and large houses (1 comment);
    - concerns about **affordability** as landowners will choose most profitable options (1 comment);
    - support for locating infill housing near existing **active transportation routes** (1 comment);
    - concerns that increased density would outnumber First Nations communities by **attracting more settlers** to the area (1 comment); and
    - wanting to see **more multiplexes** in the Braid Station area to better utilize transit while **preserving local tree canopies** (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected *"I would like to see MORE AREAS allow up to 6 units"*, participants raised a range of less frequently mentioned comments (10 comments):

- **Other (10):** Topics with fewer than five comments were:
    - support for **housing choice** and flexibility, to offer more areas for family housing, and with it being important to offer in strong transit connection areas (4 comments);
    - **infrastructure and amenities** regarding caution about maintaining existing stormwater systems and potential impacts on community centres and schools, and that increased density could benefit local businesses by expanding their customer base (3 comments);
    - **increased housing density and massing** emphasizing the importance of livability and comfortable living spaces, with one adding that development should be guided by controls on lot coverage, height, and massing rather than floor space ratio (2 comments); and
    - a need for more Step 4 and Step 5 **energy-efficient** green buildings (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected *"I would like to see ALL Areas allow up to 6 units"* the following themes and general comments emerged (25 comments):

- **Housing Need and Efficient Land Use:** Several participants noted the need for substantially more housing amidst the housing shortage, especially for families and ground-oriented units. Some participants felt that single-detached zoning is not an efficient use of land, and that increased density should be allowed everywhere, even in transit-inaccessible areas, as long as there are plans to improve active transportation (10 comments).
- **Housing Choice:** Some participants noted that the proposal supports greater housing choice and that the missing middle housing can help transition densities between high-rise towers and sign detached homes (5 comments).
- **Other:** Topics with fewer than five comments focused on:
    - **fairness**, emphasizing that all neighbourhoods should accommodate their fair share density (4 comments);
    - **affordability** and need for more housing options for lower-income residents (3 comments);
    - the importance of supporting population and density increases with adequate **infrastructure** such as transportation, utilities, sewage systems, and measures to address congestion (2 comments); and
    - increased housing could help fund shared services through a **larger tax base** (1 comment).

Question 3 Results - Open House

At the open houses, ten comments were provided in response to the optional question. Most focused on infrastructure and amenities, including concerns about street and parking capacity, school and park capacity, construction impacts, and the need for improved transit service (6 comments). Other comments addressed preferences for infill or townhouse development in specific locations (2 comments). Individual responses commented on the **survey questions**, noting that they are not clear (1 comment), while another commented on the **pace of change**, noting that they are frustrated with how long it is taking the City to introduce the program (1 comment).

Section 3: Transportation and Solid Waste

The City is exploring how to add new infill housing, while balancing demand for parking space. Reducing off-street parking (parking space provided on private property) can mean that people will try to find space to park their vehicles on the street. This increases overall demand for curbside space (public property), which is already used for a variety of activities (space for

garbage bins for pickup, bus stops, delivery services, etc.). Many of our streets are already heavily used for parking.

Below is a summary of the issues and challenges we're considering, followed by our proposed parking requirements for infill housing, and some questions for you. Your input, along with technical analysis, will help inform our recommended parking regulations.

Lanes and Road Widths

- Lanes are service roads that provide access to the rear of properties.
- New Westminster has a significant number of lanes which, for various reasons, have not been fully developed since most of the City's road network was created in 1912.
- Given the age of the road network, many of the City's lanes (paved or unpaved) are too narrow for service vehicle access. In some areas, lane widths are between 3.66 metres (12 feet) and 4.8 metres (16 feet), whereas City standards and best practice guidelines specify lanes should be 6.0 metres (20 feet) wide.
- Narrower streets and lanes that are heavily used for parking can make travel more challenging and less safe for people who are walking or riding bikes and for larger vehicles, like fire trucks and solid waste collection trucks.




Image Source: City of New Westminster Subdivision Plan (NWP2620), Registered Dec.23, 1912

Solid Waste and Recycling Services

- To minimize potential vehicle, pedestrian, and cycling conflicts, solid waste pickup operations typically happen along lanes as much as possible. However, the city has many dead-end lanes, or areas with no lanes, and this makes solid waste collection challenging.
- Solid waste (recycling, compost, and garbage) volumes and the time required to complete pick-up routes will increase as more infill housing is introduced to neighbourhoods. To meet this increased demand, likely impacts to service could include:
    a. A potential slowdown in pick-up service due to increased traffic from a growing population, and to more solid waste, recycling and organics carts required for pickup, lengthening the time required to service an individual lot.
    b. Additional curbside space required to accommodate an increased number of carts, or larger shared carts, where lanes are not available.

c. Potential disruptions in service to inaccessible lanes from illegal parking in the lanes.

- Likely changes to operations could include:
  a. a reduction in the frequency of solid waste and recycling collection;
  b. the need to consolidate solid waste and recycling from multiple properties into fewer, larger, shared carts;
  c. stricter parking regulations to ensure sufficient space is available in lanes or on street for placement of collection carts, and;
  d. stricter enforcement of parking regulations to ensure collection vehicles can access lanes and other collection points.

Road Safety Considerations

- Road safety best practice is to remove obstructions, such as street parking, close to intersections to improve visibility and help avoid potential collisions.
- Addressing these safety considerations means that there is less space for parking on the street.
- If infill housing increases the amount of vehicle parking that cannot fit on-site, this could increase the demand for curb space, which could make it harder to achieve these safety upgrades.






Image Source: bikescape.org

Vehicle Ownership in the City

- **Vehicle ownership rates are not declining**. Despite the City's efforts to support and promote sustainable transportation, population growth will likely result in an increased number of vehicles that need to be stored somewhere.
- Vehicle ownership is also typically higher for people living in single-detached houses, duplexes, and townhouses, compared to apartment and condo buildings, both low-rise and high-rise. We do not have statistics for vehicle ownership for people living in triplexes or multiplexes.



Source: ICBC Passenger Vehicle Data, 2024



Source: ICBC Passenger Vehicle Data, 2024 and City Building Permit Records

Section 4: Transportation Options and Parking Requirements

With smaller lot sizes and narrow or incomplete laneways, we know that not every infill housing site can safely provide one off-street parking space per unit. We're exploring how transportation demand management (definition below) can help encourage the use of other methods of transportation and reduce the demand for parking space.

The City's Zoning Bylaw includes parking requirements for new housing. Below is a summary of existing parking requirements for single-detached houses and duplexes, followed by proposed parking requirements for infill housing.

Definitions

Accessible vehicle parking is a parking space designated and designed for use by and for people with disabilities.

Off-street vehicle parking is a parking space on private property, accessed from either the lane or a driveway, for the use of people living on that same property

Prescribed bus stop is a bus stop served by at least one bus route scheduled to stop at least every 15 minutes, on average, between the hours of:

- 7 am and 7 pm, Monday to Friday, and
- 10 am and 6 pm on Saturdays and Sundays.

Secondary Suite is a self-contained dwelling unit located within a building containing a larger, primary dwelling unit.

Transportation Demand Management Measures are (services or facilities) that reduce travel demand by privately owned single occupant vehicles and may include bus passes, car sharing, bike sharing and secure and convenient bike storage.

Current Requirements: Single-Detached Dwellings, Duplex		
		Existing Requirement
P	Primary dwelling unit – Off-street vehicle Parking (on private property)	1 space per unit
S	Secondary suite – Off-street vehicle Parking (on private property)	1 space for the first unit, 0 spaces for additional units on the lot
A	Accessible vehicle parking	Not required
T	Bicycle parking	Not required
T	Transportation demand management measures	Not required

Proposed Requirements: Infill Housing	
	Proposed Requirement
Primary dwelling unit – Off-street vehicle parking (on private property)	

B	Infill housing located within 400 metres of a "prescribed bus stop"	Not required, per the new provincial legislation
P	All other areas	1 space per unit
Secondary suite – Off-street vehicle parking (on private property)		
B	Secondary suites located within 400 metres of a "prescribed bus stop"	Not required, per the new provincial legislation
P	"All other areas"	1 space for first unit, 0 spaces for additional units on the lot
A	**Accessible vehicle parking**	Not required
T	**Secure dedicated bicycle parking**	2 spaces per unit
Transportation Demand Management Measures		
B T	Infill housing located within 400 metres of a "prescribed bus stop"	Property developer provides three-year, two-zone, TransLink Compass Card for each dwelling unit
T	All other areas	Property developer provides car-share service membership and $500 use credits for each dwelling unit

Your input would help inform which direction we explore with further technical analysis.


Question 4: What is your impression of the proposed number of off-street vehicle parking spaces per unit, considering the provision of Transportation Demand Management measures and bicycle parking spaces being proposed?

Question 4 Results

Off-street Vehicle Parking Spaces	Online # (%)	In-person # (%)	Total # (%)
Just Right	34 (28%)	8 (44%)	42 (30%)
Too Much	18 (15%)	1 (6%)	19 (14%)
Not Enough	57 (48%)	9 (50%)	66 (48%)
Not Sure	11 (9%)	0 (0%)	11 (8%)

Total responses: 138 *(**Survey:** 120 responses; **Open Houses:** 18 responses)*

Note: The chart combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.



Question 5 (Optional) Tell us why below.

A total of 68 comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question. Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of the responses provided. In some cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes are listed below.

Question 5 Results - Survey

Of the participants who selected "*Just Right*", participants raised a range of less frequently mentioned comments (7 comments).

- Topics with fewer than five comments focused on:
  - limiting residential parking to **promote active transportation** and to shift to single vehicle per household (4 comments);
  - the need for better parking **enforcement** in lane right-of-ways (1 comment);
  - ensuring adequate **accessible parking** while allowing one side-street spot per unit (1 comment); and
  - **general agreement** that providing parking for all infill housing is not reasonable (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "*Too Much*", participants raised a range of less frequently mentioned comments (11 comments).

- Topics with fewer than five comments focused on:

- reducing parking availability could **promote active transportation** and discourage car dependency, while allowing land currently used for vehicles to be repurposed for housing, supporting more car-free or car-lite neighbourhoods where needs can be met locally (4 comments);
- **transit incentives**, with some supporting them, along with a decrease in parking, while another felt that incentives would not be used, with costs being passed on to home buyers (3 comments);
- suggestions that the City prioritize housing and not infrastructure for cars, perhaps through eliminating parking minimums and **requiring less parking** (2 comments);
- eliminating parking minimums can reduce **development costs** (1 comment); and
- a need for more **adequate parking** for streets and malls (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "*Not enough*", the following themes emerged (48 comments):

- **Adequate Parking and Vehicle Dependency:** Several participants shared that the usefulness of active transportation is limited by the City's hilled terrain and there is a need by some to have a car to transport children, groceries and equipment. Others felt that since vehicle ownership is not declining, mandated parking is needed to prevent congestion. Further, some participants mentioned that lack of parking, enforcement of existing rules and the inclusion of visitor and contractor parking stalls would impact the city's livability. Several participants questioned the feasibility of reducing parking and expressed concern that high-density housing overwhelms street capacity. Some participants mentioned that some households need at least one car and are concerned that a lack of mandated on-site parking will worsen congestion as the population grows. Other respondents suggested that off-site parking should be 1.5 spaces per unit, while others felt that 1 spot per unit should be the minimum (22 comments).
- **Accessibility:** Several participants emphasized the importance of considering accessibility while planning for parking, as many residents, including tradespeople, families and seniors cannot rely on transit for multi-stop commutes and managing tight schedules. It was also heard that factors such as hills, seasonal weather and unreliable bus service make car ownership a necessity and that a lack of parking would impact those with mobility issues and specialized labour requirements (11 comments).
- **Traffic Congestion:** We heard several concerns that inadequate parking can lead to traffic congestion and safety hazards (e.g. drop off occurring in active lanes). Concerns that increased density would increase the number of vehicles and impact essential services like garbage collection were expressed (7 comments).

- **General Disagreement:** Four comments expressed general disagreement with the city's approach, noting that it was out of touch with the reality of family needs for critical storage and workspace. The need for garages was noted as increasingly necessary for storing bicycles and work trucks, and that current bicycle parking mandates are an insufficient substitute for a cohesive, regional transportation plan. One participant disagreed with the proposed policy, as they felt that current efforts to discourage car usage is not working (5 comments).
- Topics with fewer than five comments called for:
    - **active transportation improvements**, including better coordination with TransLink to address service gaps beyond SkyTrain corridors and more appropriate bike storage requirements based on unit size (2 comments); and
    - concerns about lack of **enforcement** on residents that repurpose parking for storage and its impact on streets (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "*Not Sure*", participants raised a range of less frequently mentioned comments (2 comments).

- Topics with fewer than five comments focused on:
    - incentives in favor of bike parking and robust transportation demand management (TDM) strategies. They suggested that while car-share services like Evo or Modo could help people transition away from private vehicles, significant shifts require a transit system that rivals driving times (2 comments).

Question 5 Results - Open House

At the open houses, two comments were provided in response to the optional question. One comment was that parking should be further relaxed to 0.5 spaces at most, when the property was located within 250m of transport route; and another that non-infill housing sites should require more parking.

Question 6: What is your impression of the proposed Transportation Demand Management Measures?

Proposed Transportation Demand Management Measures


- **Infill housing located within 400 metres of a "prescribed bus stop"**: Property developer provides three-year, two zone, TransLink Compass Card for each dwelling unit
- **All other areas:** Property developer provides car-share service membership and $500 use credits for each dwelling unit.

Question 6 Results

What is your impression of the proposed **Transportation Demand Management measures**?	**Online # (%)**	**In-person # (%)**	**Total # (%)**
Just Right	32 (27%)	2 (20%)	34 (26%)
Too Much	32 (27%)	1 (10%)	33 (26%)
Not Enough	33 (28%)	4 (40%)	37 (29%)
Not Sure	22 (18%)	3 (30%)	25 (19%)

Total responses: 129 *(**Survey:** 119 responses; **Open Houses:** 10 responses)*

Note: *The chart below combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



Question 7 (Optional) Tell us why below.

A total of 71 comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question. Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of the responses provided. In some cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes are listed below.

Question 7 Results - Survey

Of the participants who selected "*Just Right*", the following theme emerged (8 comments):

- **Promote a shift towards sustainable transportation (8):** Several participants shared that the measures promote alternatives to private vehicles as the main form of transportation, instead encouraging active transportation, car share and transit. One person noted that this shift makes the city safer for everyone. Another person noted that car-free households are able to save money on transportation.

Of the participants who selected "*Too Much*", the following themes and general comments emerged (23 comments):

- **Impact to the cost of housing:** Several participants commented that subsidizing transit would result in an increase in the cost of developments/housing (9 comments).
- **General disagreement:** Several participants did not like the idea in general (6 comments).
- **Other:** Topics with fewer than five comments included:
  - concerns about **vehicle dependence** and transit not being sufficient to meet needs, while another noted more parking is needed (4 comments);
  - questioning the **implementation and effectiveness** of the incentives, with one commenting on the limited interest in some programs, such as the Compass card (3 comments); and
  - concern about potential negative impacts on neighbourhoods and infrastructure (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "*Not enough*", the following themes and general comments emerged (23 comments):

- **Inadequate Transit and Alternative Transportation Options**: Several people noted that there is inadequate transit infrastructure and that private cars will still be needed (9 comments).
- **Implementation**: Several participants question the 3-year timeframe being sufficient to have a meaningful impact. Some question enforceability. (7 comments)
- **Other:** Topics with fewer than five comments indicated:
  - that the program can go further to **promote a shift in transportation** modes, with one also adding the need for flexibility to choose what works best for the development (4 comments); and

- concerns on **street congestion**, while also highlighting the importance of having daily amenities within walking distance (3 comments).

Of the participants who selected "*Not Sure*", the following themes emerged (11 comments):

- **Vehicle Dependence:** Several participants questioned uptake and likelihood of a shift in transportation methods. One person noted systemic change that makes people want to use transit is needed. (5 comments)
- **Other (6):** Topics with fewer than five comments indicated:
  - **general disagreement** (4 comments); and
  - questioning the **implementation** and enforceability of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures (2 comments).

Question 7 Results - Open Houses

Three comments were received at the open house: one that **bike spaces** should be incorporated into storage (per unit, not separate); one emphasizing the need to confirm **infrastructure availability,** and one noting that **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) costs** tend to get passed onto residents.

Optional: Are there other transportation demand management measures that may better support reduced dependency on private vehicles for transportation?

Note: *This question was only asked during the open houses and was optional.*

A total of four comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question:

- **increasing transit amenities**, frequency and reliability (2 comments);
- that **Evo Car Share** is needed in the West End (1 comment); and
- that the City could consider running its own **shuttle service** between SkyTrain stations and major points not covered by BC Transit Bus network (1 comment).


Section 5: Proposal: Housing Variety – What Could Infill Housing Look Like?

Definitions

- **Zoning** allows municipalities to set requirements for things like building size, use, and location, including how far building(s) must be set back from property lines.
- **Development Permit Guidelines** allow municipalities to set expectations for things like building appearance from the outside, site layout, and sustainability.

- **Development Permits** would be required for Infill Housing Projects, and would be issued when development permit guidelines are met.
- **Building size** is set through zoning rules about height (including the maximum number of floors) and floor area (measured using Floor Space Ratio).
- **Floor area** is measured by Floor Space Ratio. This is a percentage representing the total floor area of a building in relation to the size of the lot.

All three lots in the diagram below, show the same Floor Space Ratio, split across a different number of storeys (i.e. if height goes down, the footprint gets bigger).



What: A variety of housing would be permitted including: single family homes, laneway homes, duplexes, quadraplexes, multiplexes, rowhouses, and side-by-side townhouses. Units may also include a secondary suite. (To a maximum of 4 or 6 units).

Why: This would enable a variety of housing choice for residents of all ages and needs, such as families, older adults, and people with accessibility needs, so everyone can find a home that works for them.

What We Heard: During Spring 2025 engagement, we heard that participants were interested in seeing a range of housing options, including multiple units in one building, and multiple smaller buildings on one lot.



Question 8: Do you agree with this proposal?


Question 8 Results

As shown in the chart below, on average most participants agreed with the proposed housing variety. A higher proportion of participants who disagreed with the proposal participated in-person compared to those who participated online.

Do you agree with this proposal? **(Housing Variety)**	**Online # (%)**	**In-person # (%)**	**Total # (%)**
Agree	56 (46%)	4 (17%)	60 (42%)
Somewhat Agree	24 (20%)	3 (13%)	27 (19%)
Not sure / I don't know	8 (7%)	0 (0%)	8 (5%)
Somewhat Disagree	11 (9%)	2 (9%)	13 (9%)
Disagree	22 (18%)	14 (61%)	36 (25%)

Total responses: 144 *(**Survey:** 121 responses; **Open Houses:** 23 responses)*

Note: *The chart below combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



Question 9 (Optional): Tell us why below.

A total of 77 comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question. Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of the responses provided. In some cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes are listed below.

Question 9 Results - Survey

Of the participants who selected "*Agree or Somewhat Agree*", the following themes and general comments emerged (34 comments):

- **Support housing choice:** Several participants expressed support for variety and housing choice. Some noted that more townhouses are needed. (14 comments)
- **Prioritize Neighbourhood Character:** On character, participants noted that their priority is quality design and height that fits the neighbourhood. Low lot coverage and prioritizing open space was also noted, several noting a preference for going higher if it meant smaller building footprint. Aesthetics and character, specifically aligned with existing architecture and not appearing as high rises or apartments, was also noted. (6 comments)
- **Other (14):** Topics with fewer than five comments indicated:
    - concerns on the **impacts on livability,** specifically on how housing that shadows or overlooks neighbouring properties may reduce privacy (3 comments);

- expressing **preference for higher density**, including one sharing single detached dwellings may not be needed anymore, and another that density when done thoughtfully is better than sprawl (3 comments);
- expressing optimism that infill housing can support **affordability** (3 comments);
- **general agreement** of the proposal (2 comments);
- uncertainty on the implementation and infrastructure (2 comments); and
- allowing different uses in residential areas is desired (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "Disagree or *Somewhat Disagree*", the following themes and general comments emerged (27 comments):

- **Preference for Lower Density Housing:** Several participants expressed their preference to keep lower density housing. Infrastructure, overcrowding and lack of amenities were common reasons. (16 comments)
- **Other:** Topics with fewer than five comments indicated:
  - a **lack of information** being presented (2 comments);
  - preference for certain **regulatory tools,** such as lot coverage and building height rather than floor space ratio (FSR) (2 comments);
  - preference for infill only in areas where services are available, while they are ok with lower density infill (e.g. duplex, laneway house) on larger properties (2 comments);
  - the city's ability to **enforce** good design (1 comment);
  - **support for higher minimum density,** such as duplexes rather than single detached homes (1 comment);
  - concerns on **neighbourhood character** not being appropriate for the neighbourhood (1 comment);
  - whether engagement efforts were reaching those that can **afford infill housing** (1 comment); and
  - that **protecting heritage buildings** should be a priority (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "*Not Sure / I Don't Know*", participants raised a range of less frequently mentioned comments (4 comments).

- **Other:** Topics with fewer than five comments focused on:
  - **neighbourhood character**, sharing that building heights should be limited to match the existing neighbourhood, while another encouraged variety in design (2 comments);
  - **process** and encouragement to pursue a cautious and balanced approach (1 comment); and

- **affordability,** with the concern that infill housing will help homeowners become wealthier (1 comment).

Question 9 Results - Open House

At the open houses, eight comments were provided in response to the optional question:


- **density**, including concerns about some areas that allowed for townhouses when infill housing may be more appropriate (4 comments);
- **FSR range** and questions asking whether 0.6 FSR differs from typical single-family zoning, and noting that existing infill zoning already allows up to 0.85 FSR or suggesting that larger lots should be permitted higher FSR (1 comment);
- **design** (1 comment);
- support for **variety and choice** (1 comment); and
- looking to the **City of Vancouver** RM-7 zoning (1 comment).



Section 6: Proposal: Design Guidelines

What: Design guidelines would give direction on what the building and site could look like from the outside, including guidelines about roof type, building materials, open spaces and more. New projects would apply for a Development Permit, so that the project can be reviewed for alignment with the design guidelines.

Why: The design guidelines focus on ensuring high quality housing and site designs that fit well within our neighbourhoods.

What We Heard: During Spring 2025 engagement, we heard that participants were supportive of buildings of matching or varied designs.

Design Guideline	
	**Building Siting and Massing (the size of buildings)** Infill housing can respond to site and neighbourhood context, support a pedestrian scale environment (buildings that prioritize the experience of people walking), support energy efficiency, and prioritize liveability.
	**Streetscape Expression (the way that buildings look along a stretch of street)** Infill housing can create active, walkable and human-scale streetscapes.
	**Building Design** Infill housing can achieve a high quality of design, architectural expression, and material finish, such that neighbourhoods are activated and made vibrant by a range of architectural styles, from contemporary to traditional expressions.

	**Privacy** Infill housing can balance the desire for privacy within the development and between adjacent properties with creating livable units and opportunities for socializing.
	**Open Space** Infill housing can provide quality private and shared outdoor amenity spaces that contribute to livability, sustainability, and social connectedness.
	**Trees and Tree Canopy** Infill housing can prioritize, accommodate, and support the long-term preservation of existing high-value trees and the growth and establishment of new tree canopy.
	**Stormwater Management** Infill housing can support the City's Integrated Stormwater Management objectives.
	**Landscaping** Infill housing can use high quality landscaping including trees, plants, and pavers that prioritize permeability (allowing water from storms to flow through and absorb into the ground) and biodiversity.
	**Screens, Fences, and Retaining Walls** Infill housing can thoughtfully transition to the public realm and adjacent properties and incorporate landscape elements to mitigate views of service and parking areas.
	**Circulation, Access, and Parking** Infill housing can prioritize walking and cycling circulation (pathways for travel by different transportation modes), use, and access above vehicle circulation.

Question 10: How important are each of the following categories of guidelines to you?

Question 10 Results

As shown in the chart below, on average the highest ranking guideline was circulation, access, parking, and the lowest ranked was screens, fences and retaining walls.

Note: *The table combines the results from the three open houses and the online survey.*

Design Guideline	Rank	Weighted Average Score From survey and open house (5 = important, 1 = unimportant)
Circulation, Access, Parking	1	4.37
Building Siting and Massing	2	4.36
Streetscape Expression	3	4.27
Stormwater Management	4	4.25
Privacy	5	4.19
Building Design	6	4.12
Trees and Tree Canopy	7	4.12
Open Space	8	4.10
Landscaping	9	3.89
Screens, Fences and Retaining Walls	10	3.88

Total responses *240 responses* ***Survey:*** *122 responses;* ***Open Houses:*** *118 responses*

Optional: Tell us why.

Note: *This question was only asked during the three open houses.*

A total of 12 comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question:


- **open space**, emphasizing tree protection, thoughtful planting, inclusion of private decks in open space calculations, considerations of landscaping costs, and overall preservation of green space (5 comments);
- **neighbourhood character**, particularly the need for sensitive height transitions between uses (2 comments);
- that **market forces** should guide design considerations instead of guidelines (2 comments);
- **sustainability** and climate adaptation (1 comment);
- **flexibility in material** choices (1 comment); and
- **livability** concerns including privacy, circulation, access, and parking (1 comment).

Section 7: Proposal: Building Floor Area

What: The amount of floor area that can be built on a property would be increased for infill housing projects, to a maximum of 1.0 Floor Space Ratio. The floor area allowed for a single family house would stay the same.

Why: This would provide flexibility to add more livable sized units, without allowing larger single family homes.

What We Heard: During Spring 2025 engagement, we heard participants were interested in a sliding scale of building floor area (66% support).




Question 11: Do you agree with this proposal?

Question 11 Results

Do you agree with this proposal? **(Building Floor Area)**	**Online # (%)**	**In-person # (%)**	**Total # (%)**
Agree	42 (34%)	5 (42%)	47 (35%)
Somewhat Agree	23 (19%)	0 (0%)	23 (17%)
Not sure / I don't know	26 (21%)	1 (8%)	27 (20%)
Somewhat Disagree	9 (74%)	1 (8%)	10 (8%)
Disagree	22 (18%)	5 (42%)	27 (20%)

Total responses: 134 *(**Survey:** 122 responses; **Open Houses:** 12 responses)*

Note: The chart below combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.



Question 12 (Optional) Tell use why below.

A total of 53 comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question. Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of responses provided. In some cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes are listed below.

Question 12 Results - Survey

Of the participants who selected "*Agree or Somewhat Agree*", the following themes and general comments emerged (21 comments):

- **A need for increased floor space ratio (FSR):** Participants noted that a higher FSR is desired or may be needed to support the financial feasibility of infill housing, and one added that higher FSR would allow for more family friendly units (7 comments).
- Topics with fewer than five comments indicated:
    - that **preserving open space and tree canopy**, with a smaller building footprint, is a priority (4 comments);
    - that the proposal is good (2 comments);
    - that there are **better tools than FSR to control for massing** (1 comment);
    - that there should **be height restrictions,** adding that it should be related to the neighbourhood context (2 comments);
    - preference for **lower density** (1 comment);
    - preference for **higher minimum density** than single detached homes (1 comment);

- **more flexibility** with allowing more FSR, but acknowledging that single detached homes are acceptable (1 comment);
- a **context responsive** program that considers the number of units relevant to the lot, size, neighbourhood and proximity to transit (1 comment); and
- that there is **lack of information** on the current FSR and impacts to flooding risk to adequately compare and respond to the question (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "Disagree or *Somewhat Disagree*", the following themes and general comments emerged (20 comments):

- **Livability:** Several people commented on livability considerations, such as space for living, outdoor area, privacy, light, and character (6 comments).
- Topics with fewer than five comments noted:
  - that the FSR should allow for multiple units to **incentivize higher density** (3 comments),
  - that the **FSR is too high** (3 comments);
  - preference for a **single FSR** regardless of number of units (2 comments);
  - **housing choice** to allow for single detached homes with intergenerational living and for the market to determine the number and size of each unit (2 comments);
  - that the program needs to be **context specific**, noting that infill housing can work but not everywhere (1 comment);
  - that the program proposes **too many units** and would like to see three units as maximum (1 comment);
  - expressing a **preference for the minimum requirements** (1 comment); and
  - **general disagreement,** not wanting to see an infill housing program (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "*Not Sure / I Don't Know*", the following themes emerged (6 comments):

- **Lack of information:** Several people expressed that they were unable to comment as they did not have enough information on how the program would work or had difficulty visualizing the impacts (5 comments).
- One comment noted a need to **protect green space** and yards (1 comment).

Question 12 Results - Open House

At the open houses, two comments were provided in response to the optional question. Both noted that density must accommodate **market feasibility** to make them affordable, with specific reference to a need for sufficient FSR.

Section 8: Proposal: Building Height and Size

What: Buildings could have the following limits to their size, as illustrated in the diagram to the right:

- **Height**: maximum of three storeys above the ground. This differs from our current regulations which only allow three storeys when a house includes a basement.
- **Front Yards**: minimum of 3.5 metres (11.5 feet) from the front property line.
- **Rear Yards**: minimum of 2.44 metres (8 feet) from the back property line.
- **Building Separation**: minimum of 6.1 metres (20 feet) when a second building is built in the read yard (such as a laneway house).

Why:

- **Height**: This will give flexibility for the number and design of new units, including allowing for more livable three-bedroom units.
- **Front Yards**: Our neighbourhoods have large front yards because historically, houses are required to be set back 7.62 metres (25 feet) from the front property line. Since front yards are often underutilized, we have started allowing smaller front yards in order to increase the open space in centre or back of a property. Infill housing projects would also see more front yards used as open space.
- **Rear Yards**: To provide flexibility in the types of infill housing forms, buildings could be built in the space currently used for rear yards. The rear yard may also be used for parking, landscaping or as open space for units.
- **Building Separation**: This would allow for livable open spaces that have access to natural light to be included between buildings.

What We Heard: During Spring 2025 engagement, we heard that more housing variety was an important priority.


Question 13: Do you agree with this proposal?

Question 13 Results

Do you agree with this proposal? **(Building Height and Size)**	**Online # (%)**	**In-person # (%)**	**Total # (%)**
Agree	45 (38%)	7 (39%)	52 (38%)
Somewhat Agree	29 (24%)	3 (17%)	32 (23%)
Not sure / I don't know	7 (6%)	0 (0%)	7 (5%)
Somewhat Disagree	14 (12%)	0 (0%)	14 (10%)
Disagree	25 (21%)	8 (44%)	33 (24%)

Total responses: 138 *(**Survey:** 120 responses; **Open Houses:** 18 responses)*

Note: *The chart below combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



Question 14 (Optional) Tell us why below.

A total of 63 comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question. Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of the responses provided. In some

cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes and general comments are listed below.

Question 14 Results - Survey

Of the participants who selected "*Agree or Somewhat Agree*", the following themes and general comments emerged (27 comments):

- **Building Height Impacts:** Participants noted potential impacts of building height and greater density associated with height. (5 comments).
- **Setback Balanced with Yard Provision:** Participants noted that the setbacks are well balanced with space for buildings and yards. One person suggested regulating buildings differently if there are existing solar panels in a neighboring property. One person added that sloped roofs and dormers support character (6 comments).
- Topics with fewer than five comments noted:
  - that there should be **land use efficiency** through reduced setbacks (4 comments);
  - **general agreement** overall (4 comments);
  - **lack of greenspace** concerns related to outdoor and backyard space (2 comments);
  - **survey content** and the need for more granular questions to get a better sense of the space between houses (2 comments);
  - **implementation** and the belief that reality will be different than theory (1 comment);
  - **general disagreement** that alternatives to houses and high rises are needed (1 comment);
  - support for a **four storey building height** (1 comment); and
  - belief that **profit motivation** will influence developers to maximize development space (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "Disagree or *Somewhat Disagree*", the following themes and general comments emerged (31 comments):

- **Too High:** Several participants commented that three stories is too much. (9 comments).
- **Livability:** Several participants commented on impacts to livability, citing issues such as lack of outdoor space, feeling of being crowded, shadow impact, and lack of accessible units (6 comments).
- Topics with fewer than five comments noted:
  - **density concerns** (4 comments),
  - **impact on privacy** (3 comments);

- need for **flexibility to support implementation,** cautioning that building separation limits what's possible on a site, and that the City should not set limits on size, and should allow developers to build what they need (2 comments);
- **need for a nuanced approach** that takes into consideration the context of each neighbourhood and consider creativity in design (2 comments).
- proposed regulations are **not high enough** and suggested allowing a fourth floor (1 comment);
- that the regulations should **restrict single family homes,** in favour of multi-unit dwellings instead (1 comment)**;**
- concerns on **preservation of existing buildings** and that regulations will result in existing character homes being torn down (1 comment);
- that they would like one building to allow three stories, but not both (1 comment); and
- **political commentary** that presenting to Council rather than homeowners have been made a priority (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "*Not Sure / I Don't Know*", participants raised less frequently mentioned comments (2 comments).

- Two participants commented on **livability** and liability impacts from shadow, reduction of open space, and fire risk.

Question 14 Results - Open House

At the open houses, nine comments were provided in response to the optional question:


- **setbacks,** with some expressing that the proposed approach goes too far, others suggesting a reduction in front yard setbacks, calling for greater flexibility, or noting that setbacks should generally reflect existing conditions (4 comments);
- concerns about **building height,** with some respondents noting that permitted heights should be less than those allowed in Burnaby (2 comments);
- potential **impacts to sunlight, greenspace, and trees** (1 comment);
- accommodating different **building orientations** (1 comment); and
- that the **FSR** should support functional and adequately sized dwelling units (1 comment).

Section 9: Proposal: Open Space and the Size of Homes


What: Each new unit would be provided with a private outdoor space. The space would be at least 14.8 square metres (160 square feet), with a minimum dimension of 1.83 metres (6 feet), per unit. This requirement could impact the size of homes or number of units, so we are exploring options for how much green space is required.

Why: We want all units to have usable open space for things like patio furniture and a barbeque.

What We Heard: During Spring 2025 engagement, we heard that allowing more housing is a top priority. While open space is also a priority, it ranked slightly less important than creating new housing.



Less open space with larger unit sizes.



Larger open space with smaller unit sizes.

Question 15: When considering a new home you might want to live in, which option would be more appealing to you?


Question 15 Results

As shown in the below chart, the most common response was to require more open space, and the second most common was to maintain the proposed open space requirement.

When considering a new home you might want to live in, which option would be more appealing to you? (**Open Space**)	**Online # (%)**	**In-person # (%)**	**Total # (%)**
Require more open space	46 (39%)	12 (52%)	58 (41%)
Maintain the proposed open space requirement	44 (37%)	6 (26%)	50 (36%)
Require less open space	28 (24%)	5 (22%)	33 (23%)

***Total responses: 141** (**Survey:** 118 responses; **Open Houses:** 23 responses)*

Note: *The chart below combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



Section 10: Proposal: Private or Shared Open Space

What: Open space could be designed so that every unit has private open space. We are also exploring the option of allowing shared open space instead.

Why: Allowing space to be combined and shared could mean that all the residents have access to a larger open space. For example, a larger shared courtyard between buildings.


Private Porch


Shared Porch and Yard


Private Porches and Yards

Question 16: When considering a new home you might want to live in, which option would be more appealing to you?


Question 16 Results

As shown in the below chart, the most common response was to require all units to have private open space, and the second most common was to allow shared open space.

When considering a new home you might want to live in, which option would be more appealing to you? **(Private Open Space)**	**Online # (%)**	**In-person # (%)**	**Total # (%)**
Option 1: Allow shared open space	30 (25%)	4 (18%)	34 (24%)
Option 2: Require all units to have private open space	40 (34%)	15 (68%)	55 (39%)
Option 3: Allow shared open space only in specific conditions	21 (18%)	0 (0%)	21 (15%)
Option 4: Require a smaller amount of open space that is private	27 (23%)	3 (14%)	30 (22%)

Total responses: 140 *(**Survey:** 118 responses; **Open Houses:** 22 responses)*


Note: *The chart below combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



Section 11: Proposal: Parking Type

What: Parking pads (neither covered nor enclosed) and carports (covered parking) would be encouraged over garages (enclosed parking).

Why: Parking pads are preferred because enclosed garages add building bulk and risk being converted to living or storage space.



Parking Pad



Parking Pad and Garage



Carport and Garage


Question 17: Do you agree with this proposal?

Question 17 Results

Do you agree with this proposal? **(Parking Type)**	**Online # (%)**	**In-person # (%)**	**Total # (%)**
Agree	49 (40%)	11 (42%)	60 (41%)
Somewhat Agree	28 (23%)	2 (8%)	30 (20%)
Not sure / I don't know	10 (8%)	1 (4%)	11 (8%)
Somewhat Disagree	10 (8%)	3 (12%)	13 (9%)
Disagree	24 (20%)	9 (35%)	33 (22%)

***Total responses: 147** (**Survey:** 121 responses; **Open Houses:** 26 responses)*

Note: *The chart below combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



Question 18 (Optional): Tell us why below.

A total of 64 comments were provided by those who chose to answer this optional question. Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of responses provided. In some cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes are listed below.

Question 18 Results - Survey

Of the participants who selected "*Agree or Somewhat Agree*", the following themes and general comments emerged (31 comments):

- **Opposition of use of garages as storage and flex place:** Several comments were received opposing the use of garages for productive space, storage, and conversion to living space, especially with people choosing to park on the street or in the lane instead. (7 comments)
- **Support for non-garage parking types:** Several comments supported parking in areas other than garages, including: one mention that open pads are preferred, one idea for partial covering rather than full carport, one for permeable surfaces, and two that parking should be underground (5 comments).
- **General agreement:** Several comments expressed general agreement, one because it may reduce demand for on street parking, one that it helps to reduce housing cost, and two that it helps reduce building mass (5 comments).
- Topics with fewer than five comments were:
    - **support for garages**, including two speaking to productive space, security, and storage, one comment preferring garages in combination with either parking pad

or carport, to provide separate space for visitor vehicles, and one expressing both carports and garages each have a purpose (4 comments);
    - preference for **garages in select conditions,** including one noting should be site specific, one that they should be encouraged only if they are used for intended purpose, and the other that some areas of the City should allow garages because of security (3 comments);
    - support for **alternative transportation** (3 comments);
    - one person supporting EV charging infrastructure (1 comment),
    - one person generally **supporting off-street parking** as opposed to street parking (1 comment);
    - one person expressing interest in the flexibility of garages but ultimately discouraging garages to **preserve open space** (1 comment); and
    - one person noting that tenants are unlikely to be provided access to garage space, meaning garage provision wouldn't reduce street parking from renters (1 comment).

Of the participants who selected "Disagree or *Somewhat Disagree*", the following themes emerged (21 comments):

- **Flexibility and choice:** Many participants commented about the value of a garage's flexibility for different uses, such as storage, workspace, bike storage, weather protection, or to secure parking (from theft and crime). Some comments related to allowing individual developers and purchasers to decide, based on their preference. Others suggested that garages are essential, that no enclosed garages should be allowed, or that underground parking may be an option. (20 comments).
- One comment was received from a participant who noted **general disagreement with infill housing** overall.

Of the participants who selected "*Not Sure / I Don't Know*", participants raised less frequently mentioned comments (3 comments):

- **need for more information** (2 comments); and
- **flexibility and choice,** noting garages should be allowed (1 comment).

Question 18 Results - Open House

At the open houses, five comments were provided in response to the optional question. A couple respondents suggested garages are important for **security** (2 comments). Individual comments were heard that some garages are used for **storage** and that parking pads are more **affordable.**

Section 12: Tell Us About Yourself

Question 19: What type of home do you live in?
(Please choose the option that best describes your home).


As shown in the chart below, the majority of participants live in houses. Online participants had much higher proportions of people living in apartment buildings and townhouses than did in-person participants.

Question 19 Results

What type of home do you live in?	Online # (%)	In-person # (%)	Total # (%)
House	74 (62%)	24 (92%)	98 (68%)
Apartment (less than 6 storeys)	17 (14%)	0 (0%)	17 (12%)
Apartment (greater than 6 storeys)	17 (14%)	0 (0%)	17 (12%)
Townhouse	8 (7%)	0 (0%)	8 (5%)
Infill Housing	2 (2%)	1 (4%)	3 (2%)
Other	1 (1%)	1 (4%)	2 (1%)

***Total responses: 145** (**Survey:** 119 responses; **Open Houses:** 26 responses)*

Note: *The chart below combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



Section 13: Tell Us About Yourself: Why Are You Interested?

In our Spring 2025 engagement we asked the community to share their hopes and concerns about the future of all types of housing throughout the City. We heard that the participants would like to see:

- More variety in housing types
- More affordable housing
- More family friendly housing

We also heard concerns that:

- There aren't enough community amenities or infrastructure to support our growing community.
- People feel they won't be able to stay in New Westminster because of the cost of housing.

Building on these themes, we would like to hear how you feel they apply to the specific context of the Infill Housing Program.

Question 20: Why are you interested in this program? Select all that apply.

More Affordable Options: This includes the ability to add more units to generate rental income from secondary suites, which can be mortgage helpers.

More Rental Housing: This includes accessible housing to support aging in place and multi-generational living.

More Livable Units: This includes accessible housing to support aging in place and multi-generational living.

More Variety of Housing Types: This includes housing for a variety of household types and sizes.


More Family-Friendly Housing: This includes ground oriented homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms.

Question 20 Results

As shown in the chart below, participants selected a wide variety of reasons for interest, and the most common responses were more affordable options, more livable units, more variety in housing types, and more family-friendly housing.

Participants were able to select multiple responses.

Note: *The chart combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



A total of 14 comments were provided by those who chose "Other." Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of responses provided. In some cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes and general comments are listed below:

- **Livability and sustainability:** noting that infill housing supports a livable city, including a couple of comments on the potential for increased walkability (5 comments).

- Topics with fewer than five comments related to:
    - **non-support** for infill housing and provincial legislation (3 comments),
    - impact on **land values** (1 comment),
    - a desire for **other levels of government** to support infrastructure upgrades (1 comment),
    - potential increased **tax base** (1 comment);
    - p**ersonal housing need** (1 comment);
    - impact on **heritage preservation** (1 comment); and
    - opportunities for passive **solar heating and natural ventilation** (1 comment).

Two general comments were received at the open houses, relating to

- the need for **family housing** (three- and four-bedroom units) (1 comment); and
- the importance of flexibility to **permit retention of existing houses** (1 comment).

Question 21: What are your concerns for this program? Select all that apply.

Won't Be Affordable: Adding more infill housing rental options won't make it more affordable in New Westminster.

Impacts to Local Services: Not enough community amenities (parks, community centres, etc.)

Parking: Not enough parking to support more housing will make it hard to park on city streets to support more people in these neighbourhoods.

Strain on Infrastructure: Not enough infrastructure (roads, sewers etc.) to support more housing.

Neighbourhood Appearances: I don't want my neighbourhood to look different.

Loss of Green Space: More housing could result in loss of landscaping or trees.


Construction Impacts: More construction means more noise and traffic disruptions.

Question 21 Results

As shown in the chart below, participants gave a wide range of responses on concerns for the program, and the most common responses were strain on infrastructure, loss of green space, impacts to local services, and parking.

Participants were able to select multiple responses.

Note: *The chart combines the results from the open houses and the online survey.*



A total of 16 comments were provided by survey respondents who chose "Other." Below are the key themes, general comments and examples of responses provided. In some cases, one person's response may have included multiple themes. Themes are listed below.

- **Infrastructure and amenities:** comments suggested a need to allow for mixed uses and services in neighbourhoods; a lack of existing local services (community services, schools, transit) and one comment related to vehicle congestion (5 comments).

- Topics with fewer than five comments related to:
  - **livability**, including the **quality of housing** being delivered (1 comment).;
  - **affordability** and the need for **family housing** (1 comment).;
  - character retention, including **heritage** and the need for **neighbourhood-specific regulations** (1 comment).;
  - concerns that infill housing is **not enough** (1 comment); and
  - **midrise and mixed-use apartments** are needed (1 comment).

Twenty-one general comments were received at the open house, including:

- comments about **infrastructure, services, and amenities** being over capacity (8 comments);
- general concerns about the proposed **density being too high** (4 comments);
- the desire to make the infill housing program more flexible with less restrictive regulations (4 comments);

- questioning the **provincial mandate** (3 comments);
- the need to reflect neighbourhood **character and scale** (1 comment); and
- the need to **take time** and get the infill housing program right (1 comment).


4. Who We Heard From

Be Heard New West

Be Heard New West users provide demographic information when they register on the site, including postal code, year of birth, connections to New Westminster, and other optional details such as Indigenous identity, if they have a disability, if they were born outside of Canada, and other lived experiences. Below includes the demographics information of 122 participants who completed the online survey on Be Heard New West.

The same information was not collected for all questions from participants of the in-person open houses.

Postal Code




Neighbourhood	Count	Percentage
Connaught Heights	3	3%
West End	11	9%
Moody Park	7	6%
Glenbrooke North	17	14%
Massey Victory Heights	14	11%
Sapperton	15	12%
Victoria Hill/ Ginger Drive	2	2%
Queen's Park	9	7%
Downtown	16	13%
Brow of the Hill	18	15%
Quayside	3	2%
Queensborough	5	4%
Outside New Westminster	2	2%
Total	**122**	**100%**


Age Groups

Age Group	Online # (%)
19 and under	0 (0%)
20-34	13 (11%)
35-49	41 (34%)
50-64	42 (34%)
65 and older	26 (21%)


***Total responses: 122** (**Survey:** 122 responses)*



Connections to New Westminster



Additional Demographic Information



Demographic Analysis

A demographic analysis was conducted for 122 participants who provided input through Be Heard New West, an online survey. Participant characteristics were compared with the demographic profile of New Westminster residents using data from the 2021 Census.

Compared to the Census population, residential property owners were highly over-represented among survey participants, accounting for 78.9% of respondents compared to 54.7% of the city's population. In contrast, residential tenants (renters) were highly under-represented, making up for 22.1% of participants despite representing 45.3% of the city's residents. No Be Heard participants for this survey identified as under-housed or unhoused members of the New Westminster community.


The age distribution of online survey respondents also differed from Census figures, with younger residents substantially under-represented. No respondents were aged 19 or younger, compared to 16.4% of the population. Participants aged 20–34 accounted for 11% of respondents, lower than their census proportion of 23.9%. Conversely, participants aged 50–64 for 34% and 65 and older for 21%, which resulted in over-representation relative to Census figures of 20.8% and 16.1%, respectively. Participants aged 35-49 accounted for 24%, only slightly higher than 22.9% in the Census.

Participants were also asked to self-identify across additional demographic categories comparable to census data. Participants identifying as people of colour and/or as part of a racialized group were highly under-represented, making up 11.5% of respondents compared to 46.8% of New Westminster residents. Those born outside of Canada were similarly highly under-represented, comprising 20.5% of participants compared to 37.5% city-wide. Recent immigrants (those who arrived in Canada within the past five years) accounted for 4.9% of respondents, which is comparable to the census proportion of 6.5%. Parents or guardians with children under the age of 18 represented 24.6% of participants, closely aligning with the Census figure of 20.2%.

In-Person Open Houses

Participants at the in-person open houses were encouraged to respond to the optional demographic questions below. Responses may not represent the demographics of all in-person participants, due to the opt-in nature of these questions.

Connections to New Westminster



Neighbourhoods

Neighbourhood	Count	Percentage
Connaught Heights	1	3%
West End	2	6%
Moody Park	1	3%
Glenbrooke North	15	46%
Massey Victory Heights	6	18%
Sapperton	4	12%
Victoria Hill/ Ginger Drive	0	0%
Queen's Park	2	6%
Downtown	0	0%
Brow of the Hill	2	6%
Quayside	0	0%
Queensborough	0	0%
Outside New Westminster	0	0%
Total	**33**	**100%**

5. Next Steps

Thank you for sharing your feedback for the Infill Housing Program! Verbatim comments received from the survey and open houses can be found here. City staff are now reviewing the input received from this community engagement process to help shape changes to the Zoning Bylaw and Design Guidelines for infill housing in New Westminster. The updates will also reflect the requirements of the Provincial Small Scale Multi-Unit Housing legislation and support the City's participation in the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's Housing Accelerator Fund.

A draft of these proposed changes will be presented to Council early 2026. Stay tuned for updates. Updates will be posted on the Infill Housing Program Be Heard New West project page.

Attachment *10*

Advisory Planning Commission Minutes

City of
New Westminster

Minutes

Advisory Planning Commission

Tuesday, December 2, 2025
6:00 p.m.

Council Chamber, Second Floor & Zoom
New Westminster City Hall, 511 Royal Avenue

Present:	Andrew Hull, Chair Anna Cuyegkeng* Ginny Foo* Krista Macaulay* Anne Peterson Gwendolyn Reischman Joseph Van Vliet*
Absent:	Jassy Braich Paolo Paragas

**Attendance by electronic means*

1. CALL TO ORDER & LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and recognized with respect that New Westminster is on the unceded and unsurrendered land of the Halkomelem speaking peoples. It was acknowledged that colonialism has made invisible their histories and connections to the land. It was recognized that, as a City, we are learning and building relationships with the people whose lands we are on.

2. AGENDA ADDITIONS & DELETIONS

MOVED and SECONDED
THAT the Agenda of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held on December 2, 2025 be approved.

CARRIED

3. MINUTES

MOVED and SECONDED
THAT the Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held on November 19, 2024 be adopted.

CARRIED

4. PRESENTATION & REPORT

4.1 Infill Housing Accelerator Program

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Sara Jellicoe, Senior Housing Planner, provided an overview of the Infill Housing Accelerator Program, outlining the context, including definitions, intent, associated planning tools, provincial legislation, proposed changes to regulations, and next steps. S. Jellicoe advised that the Program is intended to encourage the development of a broader range of infill housing forms—including duplexes, triplexes, quadraplexes, multiplexes, secondary suites, and laneway homes—as well as opportunities for multiple buildings on a single property and buildings up to three storeys.

S. Jellicoe provided the following information:

- Council completed Phase 1 of the infill housing initiative in 2017 through the Official Community Plan (OCP) update, establishing zoning regulations and development permit guidelines for laneway carriage houses and townhouses;
- in May 2024, Council endorsed the Infill Housing Work Plan as part of the City's successful application to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Housing Accelerator Fund, enabling implementation of Phase 2 of the initiative, including OCP amendments and pre-zoning to be completed by June 2026;
- the Program's goals are to: (i) create housing choices for residents of all ages, needs, and household types, (ii) provide opportunities for family members to live on the same property, (iii) meet the City's overall housing supply targets, and (iv) increase rental supply through secondary suites and accessory dwelling units;
- the program would establish new zoning districts to expedite infill housing projects, permitting up to four units per property in pre-zoned areas, and up to six units per property in pre-zoned areas in proximity to frequent bus stops;
- the regulations would apply to single detached dwelling and duplex properties, as well as properties currently permitted to contain three units;
- the Program would not apply to provincially defined transit-oriented development areas (TOD) areas around Skytrain stations, which are being addressed through a separate work stream;
- provincial site standards must be incorporated into forthcoming OCP and zoning changes related to the Program;

- not all properties within the new zoning districts will be capable of achieving the maximum allowable density due to site constraints, including lot size and width;
- development cost charges and infrastructure costs may be higher in certain neighbourhoods;
- Provincial legislation prohibits municipalities from requiring on-site parking for developments located near frequent transit stops; and
- Queensborough is currently excluded from the Program due to potential existing infrastructure capacity limitations.

Staff requested feedback from the Commission on several elements of the proposed Infill Housing Accelerator Program that are not required by the Province. Staff noted a number of policy options for consideration, including:

- Infill housing locations: whether to pre-zone for six units additional areas beyond the provincial minimum, including whether to include the entire block instead of only a portion, and whether to include more properties on blocks where multiple-unit housing would already be permitted;
- Infill housing types: potential inclusion of a broader mix such as quadraplexes, multiplexes, rowhouses, side-by-side townhouses, secondary suites, and configurations where more than one building is located on the same lot;
- Unit size and density: determining the floor space ratio to enable additional units on a property; and
- Building height and sitting: options such as permitting up to three storeys even without a basement, reducing minimum front and rear setbacks, and requiring at least 6.1 metres of separation between two buildings on the same lot.

Discussion ensued, and the Commission provided the following comments:

- the City should clearly communicate upfront when infrastructure constraints exist in certain areas, as these may affect development feasibility and costs for property owners;
- increased costs placed on developers to fund amenities and infrastructure are ultimately passed on to buyers, which can undermine affordability;
- the areas that allow six units should include the entire block, not cut off in the middle of the block;
- members noted a broader societal shift away from car ownership and emphasized the importance of prioritizing public transit over car-focused infrastructure;
- concerns were raised that some streets are too narrow to support the traffic associated with higher-density housing, which may also affect emergency vehicle access;

- less prescriptive design guidelines were encouraged to help support more infill housing development;
- setback requirements should consider sustainability goals, including solar orientation to support passive building design;
- floor space ratio should allow the livable space to be maximized within the building footprint;
- height regulations should establish a consistent maximum height across the lot rather than relying on an average building height; and
- members suggested the Province should contribute to funding community amenities, as high development cost charges may limit the effectiveness of the program.

In response to questions from the Commission, staff provided the following information:

- updating the City's asset management plans may identify required upgrades to amenities and infrastructure in growth areas;
- property owners considering infill development will be encouraged to contact the City early to understand any potential infrastructure-related costs at their sites;
- minimum unit sizes in the Zoning Bylaw are tied to the number of bedrooms; however, program flexibility would allow developers to choose the bedroom mix—for example, could choose to provide four studio suites on a site;
- property consolidation would require rezoning and an OCP amendment;
- in transit-oriented development areas, the City cannot require parking; however, it can still encourage developers to provide it and can require parking outside those areas;
- the City will continue developing mobility options and will work with TransLink to support reduced dependence on driving;
- depending on how provincial legislation is interpreted, increased transit frequency could create additional provincial requirements for allowing six-unit developments;
- program flexibility may allow for separate legal ownership of detached structures, including laneway units;
- design guidelines will be developed based on future entitlements as well as current ones, and will apply city-wide except in the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area, where existing guidelines must also be considered;
- applicants will be encouraged to plan for adequate storage during the design stage, as adding storage later is challenging;
- staff emphasized the importance of partnering with the Province—and advocating for the school district—to ensure amenities and infrastructure such as schools, transit, and bridges keep pace with higher-density growth; and

- a public hearing on the program is anticipated for spring 2026, along with an information campaign encouraging interested property owners to speak with Planning and Development staff.

5. NEW BUSINESS

None.

6. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED and SECONDED
THAT the meeting adjourn (7:35 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held on December 2, 2025.

ANDREW HULL	MAUREEN LATTA
CHAIR	COMMITTEE CLERK