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Executive Summary

Regulating the use of land through zoning has produced both intended and unintended impacts on equity in the City of New Westminster. To address these impacts, a critical examination and rethinking of how zoning operates in the city is necessary to become a more inclusive and equitable place.

This rethinking applied an approach to evaluation through an institutional analysis that was based in equity planning. This approach was established by first reviewing research and best practices of planning at the intersection of equity and zoning, then conducting demographic spatial analyses to examine how equity relates to zoning in the city. We further contextualized our findings through interviews with City staff.

To adequately address the inequities that are entrenched in zoning practices and to move toward the City of New Westminster’s equity goals, the City should engage in a comprehensive rezoning process to rewrite their Zoning Bylaw regulations. This process should strive to make the Zoning Bylaw’s regulations more flexible and adaptable to changing conditions through a balanced approach of regulations based on intensity, form, and use. At the same time, the document’s layout, format, and language should be made more accessible for all residents to engage in zoning and planning related activities.

The comprehensive rezoning process is an essential step for the City to reorient its practice of zoning toward equity.
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Equity in Zoning: Three Directions Forward

Project Overview

On its path to becoming “a healthy, inclusive, and thriving community where people feel connected with each other,” the City of New Westminster is considering how its use of regulatory tools like zoning can help achieve this vision. To support the City in these efforts, this project:

• Critically examines how existing zoning and land use regulations have, and continue to, impact equity.

• Explores how zoning can be leveraged as a tool to respond to and counter exclusionary practices and promote social inclusion.

• Provides recommendations for reviewing and updating the Zoning Bylaw so it can serve as an equitable foundation for future city building.

Zoning as Exclusionary

Zoning, as the primary regulatory tool for land use planning in North America, has significant and wide-reaching impacts on urban equity. These impacts have been both intended and unintended. Cities began using comprehensive zoning in the early twentieth century to address growing public health concerns resulting from the proximity of incompatible land uses. This zoning approach of separating land uses and housing types, which became known as Euclidean zoning, remains the most predominant form of zoning. While this form of zoning is inherently restrictive, as it prohibits specific uses in certain areas, it has been historically used alongside tactics of exclusionary zoning.

Exclusionary zoning sought to preserve the social and economic values of communities by segregating people based on income, ethnicity, and race. While early exclusionary tactics such as zoning ordinances and restrictive covenants that explicitly segregated people based on race were not legally upheld, the legal mechanism of separating residential zones by housing types (i.e., single-family and multi-family housing) achieved many of the same exclusionary effects. Additional requirements like minimum lot sizes, floor areas, setbacks and the restriction of multi-unit dwellings limited the types of buildings and number of units permitted on a parcel of land. Overall, these efforts limited density and preserved high land and dwelling values, making certain areas inaccessible for low- and middle-income households.

Many tactics of exclusionary zoning have been entrenched into the practice and regulations of zoning, even if achieving exclusion is no longer the intent. While many zoning codes were adopted in the first half of the twentieth century, few cities have undertaken a comprehensive review of their zoning codes. Instead, cities have relied on piecemeal revisions that change the zoning for one or a few parcels, modify the rules of zoning districts, or create new ones. The lack of comprehensive review and update to zoning codes means that any of the prior motivations for zoning could still be seeping into its application today, producing inequities.

In order to provide for the conservation of property values, it shall be lawful for the Director of Engineering to refuse to grant a permit for the construction of a dwelling in any residential area unless the value of such proposed dwelling shall be at least equal to the average value of all dwellings erected within 500 feet (152.40 metres) of such proposed dwelling.

Zoning Bylaw 6680, 2001, City of New Westminster

This regulation was originally included in the City of New Westminster’s 1940 Zoning Bylaw. While not being used in practice, due to a lack of a comprehensive review of the Bylaw, it still appears in the current version.
Project Approach

This project is based in the field of equity planning, “a reorientation of physical planning that places equity at the heart.” Equity planning considers how equity issues are defined and articulated and the tools and governance strategies used to address them. From this understanding, we apply a nuanced definition of equity throughout the project that encompasses the four equity categories outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributional Equity</td>
<td>Equitable distribution of goods, services, and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional Equity</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of and respect for diverse intersecting identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Equity</td>
<td>Decision-making processes that encapsulate distributional, recognitional, or regulatory equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Equity</td>
<td>Zoning and other regulations crafted in such a way that they do not lead to differential treatment, hardship, or disadvantage to some people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the recommendations within this report focus on changes to the Zoning Bylaw, we recognize that inequities expressed and reinforced by zoning have not been the result of zoning bylaws alone. Exclusionary zoning tactics relied on how zoning regulations were procedurally applied, selectively enforced, and widely accepted. These practices ensured the exclusionary intent of the regulations could be achieved. Thus, the use of these practices to achieve inclusion, or more equitable outcomes, should be considered.

To understand how the operation of the Zoning Bylaw is affected by these practices present in the larger context of zoning, we employed an institutional analysis framework. An institutional analysis elevates the importance of context by examining the role institutions play in defining processes and influencing decisions. More than organizations, institutions are embedded aspects of social life that are being actively made and remade through social relations. There are four main elements, or groups of conditions, that influence the operation and outcomes produced by zoning.
City Context

To determine the equity impacts of zoning, an institutional analysis framework led us to consider the broader setting of zoning in the City of New Westminster. To aid our understanding of this context, we reviewed the history of the city before and since the first Zoning Bylaw was adopted to understand how its development patterns shifted over time. We then conducted an analysis to explore the socioeconomic and demographic makeup of the city in the lens of equity and compared those findings with an analysis of the current distribution of zoning districts. These findings were confirmed and reinforced through the interviews with City staff familiar with the development and history of New Westminster. This provided us with an understanding of how the zoning and development, both past and present, may be impacting equity outcomes.
City Context

Regional Context

The City of New Westminster is a small, compact city of 80,000 residents located at the heart of Metro Vancouver on the north bank of the Fraser River. Metro 2050, Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy, indicates the City is composed mostly of urban land, encompassing residential neighbourhoods and centres, and industrial and employment lands supporting heavy and light industrial, commercial, and other employment-related uses. Downtown New Westminster is a regional city centre where the location of employment, services, amenities, affordable housing options, commercial, cultural, entertainment, institutional, and mixed uses are prioritized to accommodate growth. Additional regional growth is directed to the Frequent Transit Development Areas, which includes areas surrounding the Braid, Sapperton, and 22nd Street SkyTrain stations.

Residential Areas

Zoning, whether intentionally or not, has long-impacted who can live where by shaping housing and development markets that may spatially segregate people according to social group. To make connections between zoning and the residential patterns in New Westminster, we used a two-step process to:

1) analyze the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of residents; and
2) examine how these characteristics intersect with zoning.

To understand the zoning framework that most impacts different social groups in the City of New Westminster, we conducted a data cluster analysis to examine the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of residents. A cluster analysis identifies data trends that are grouped together across a set of variables. For our analysis, we selected 16 variables from the 2016 Census that represented nine themes: education, wealth, income, employment, age, households, equity-denied groups, mobility, and land use.

The analysis resulted in three clusters representing residential areas of similar demographic and housing characteristics. For each area, we conducted further analysis to determine if the variables were significantly different compared to the City (see Appendix A for a detailed description of the analysis and findings). To explore the ways that zoning intersects with these residential areas, we looked at the prevalence of land use, zones, and housing types (see Appendix B for a detailed description of the findings). An overview of the three areas is provided on the following pages.
City Context

The Outer Edge is composed primarily of low-density areas on the periphery of the city. These areas make up most of the city’s land area (56.8 percent) and residential land (65.3 percent). Compared to the other areas, residents of the Outer Edge, on the whole, are more likely to have lived in the area for at least five years, have households with kids, have higher incomes, live in a single-detached house and own their home.

The Outer Edge is home to 35.6 percent of New Westminster residents. Relative to the City of New Westminster, residents of the Outer Edge are characterized by:

- Higher median incomes
- Higher rates of homeownership
- Higher percentage of youth
- Lower percentage of single-parent families
- Fewer recent immigrants and internal migrants

The Outer Edge is a low-density area (3,546 persons/sq km) that comprises 56.7 percent of the City’s zoned land. Key characteristics include:

- Predominantly residential
- Low on commercial land uses
- Lacking a variety of housing types
- Predominantly single-detached dwellings (82% of all single-detached dwelling across the city)
- Higher prevalence of higher-value dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data obtained from Statistics Canada.\(^8\)

Note: Data obtained from City of New Westminster.\(^9\)

Table 2: Percent of Land Area by Land Uses in the Outer Edge

Figure 1: Outer Edge Dissemination Areas in the City of New Westminster

[Image of Outer Edge Dissemination Areas]
City Context

Central Core

The Central Core is home to 22.9 percent of New Westminster residents. Relative to the City of New Westminster, residents of the Central Core are characterized by:

- Lower median incomes
- Lower rates of homeownership
- Lower percentage of youth
- Lower education levels
- Higher percentage of one-person households
- Higher numbers of recent immigrants and internal migrants

The Central Core is a high-density area (15,326 persons/sq km) that comprises 6.6 percent of the City’s zoned land. Key characteristics include:

- Predominantly residential
- Relatively high on commercial land uses compared to other areas
- A mix of single detached (35% of residential area) and apartment (63% of residential area) zoning districts
- Highly concentrated with apartment dwellings (56% of city land zoned for apartments)
- Higher prevalence of lower-value dwellings

The Central Core contains highly dense areas in the central part of the city. These areas make up a small part of the city’s land area (6.6 percent) and residential land (9.2 percent). In comparison to the other areas, the residents here are more likely to have recently moved to the area, be of relatively lower economic status, and have lower levels of education. Residents are more likely to rent and live alone in a multi-unit dwelling.

Table 3: Percent of Land Area by Land Uses in the Central Core

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data obtained from Statistics Canada.16

Note: Data obtained from City of New Westminster.17

Figure 2: Central Core Dissemination Areas in the City of New Westminster

Figure 2: Central Core Dissemination Areas in the City of New Westminster

Note: Data obtained from Statistics Canada.16

Table 3: Percent of Land Area by Land Uses in the Central Core

Note: Data obtained from City of New Westminster.17
Riverside contains moderately dense areas located adjacent to the Fraser River. These areas make up a moderate portion of the city’s land area (36.7 percent) and residential land (25.5 percent). There is a high diversity of land uses where, unlike the other areas, residential is not the most common use. Residents in these areas are more likely to live alone, have higher education levels, and have moderate incomes. There is a great diversity of housing types and moderate homeownership levels.

Riverside is home to 41.5 percent of New Westminster residents. Relative to the City of New Westminster, residents of the Outer Edge are characterized by:

- Moderate median incomes
- Moderate rates of homeownership
- Higher education levels
- Higher percentage of one-person households
- Higher numbers of internal migrants

Riverside is a moderately dense area (8,121 persons/sq km) that comprises 36.7 percent of the City’s zoned land. Key characteristics include:

- Relatively lower residential uses
- More variety of land uses
- Greatest mix of housing, including low- and high-rise apartments (47% of residential area), single detached (36% of residential area), and duplexes and townhouses (13% of residential area)
- Higher prevalence of lower-value dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Context

Opportunities and Challenges

In building our institutional analysis framework, we conducted interviews with City of New Westminster staff to gain insight on how zoning operates in the city (see Appendix C for detailed interview process and findings). With guidance from our project partners at the City, six interview participants were selected based on their knowledge of planning, policy, development, regulation, and the Zoning Bylaw. Interview participants interacted with zoning in diverse ways, providing us with varied perspectives. These interviews aided us in framing questions on how zoning can promote or impede equity and identifying key challenges and opportunities for the City in answering these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributional Equity</th>
<th>Recogntional Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does zoning and land use impact access to housing, services, and amenities across the city?</td>
<td>How do zoning regulations acknowledge and celebrate the diverse identities of New Westminster residents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity:</strong> The City is moving toward an expanded understanding of community benefits that includes housing choice, community diversity and inclusion, and energy reductions and environmental sustainability.</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity:</strong> In community consultation processes, City staff seek out and consider diverse voices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> The City has a limited amount of land it can use to provide individuals with access to housing, employment opportunities, and amenities and services to meet daily needs.</td>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Through ensuring the Zoning Bylaw is regulating for use, not the user, the drafting and enforcement of zoning regulations may overlook the diverse needs of residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural Equity</th>
<th>Regulatory Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can individuals participate in decision-making processes around zoning?</td>
<td>What regulatory changes need to occur within zoning to support equity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity:</strong> Networks, or groups of people or organizations, already exist in the city.</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity:</strong> As a small municipality, the City of New Westminster can be more nimble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Well-resourced networks of resident groups and organizations have capacity to organize and advocate for their interests.</td>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> The Zoning Bylaw can be slow to change and adapt to new and emerging industries or policy priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three Directions

To increase equity within the Zoning Bylaw and its application, it should be more accessible, flexible, and adaptable. These three directions were identified based on findings from the analyses conducted, including the residential area analysis and interviews, and a literature review. The initial literature review focused on the intersection between zoning and equity, which provided the basis for our understanding of the complex relationships between zoning as an institution (incorporating the elements of formal rules, working rules, social norms, and networks) and equity outcomes. As the findings from our analyses began to take shape, additional targeted reviews of literature were conducted, including a review of planning practices and case studies of different zoning approaches and their impact on increasing equitable outcomes through zoning.

Accessibility  The Zoning Bylaw should be written, formatted, and presented in a way that allows residents to access, navigate, interpret, and meaningfully understand it.

Flexibility  The Zoning Bylaw should be less prescriptive as it regulates use, intensity, and form, allowing for innovation and creativity in meeting equity goals.

Adaptability  The Zoning Bylaw should accommodate and adapt to changing circumstances and contexts over time.
Accessing the City of New Westminster Zoning Bylaw

While the Zoning Bylaw can be accessed by obtaining paper copies from City Hall, the majority of residents will access the online consolidation of the document on the City’s website. The web page for accessing New Westminster’s Zoning Bylaw provides example requirements included in the Bylaw and a brief explanation of the document’s purpose as “an important tool for implementing City policies and objectives.” A hyperlink provides access to CityViews, an interactive map, which residents can use to look up a parcel’s zoning designation.

Three Directions

Accessibility

As a regulatory tool, the Zoning Bylaw is filled with legalese to ensure its regulations are enforceable. While technical language is often difficult to understand, City staff are readily available to assist residents, organizations, and developers in interpreting zoning regulations. However, there are opportunities to make the Zoning Bylaw more accessible while maintaining clear and enforceable language. These approaches require rethinking the document’s structure, design, availability, and incorporation of plain language where possible. A clear and understandable Bylaw contributes to procedural equity by allowing residents to readily participate in City planning and development processes. As one of the interview participants reflected,

As soon as I came into city government, I looked at [the Zoning Bylaw] as a tool and asked myself who’s it for? How can it be communicated better? And is it a citizen tool? Or is it [for] those that already hold certain degrees of power?

Through an analysis of interviews with City staff and the Zoning Bylaw text, several aspects related to navigation, legibility, and education were identified as opportunities to increase the Zoning Bylaw’s accessibility.

Availability

The Bylaw itself is accessed through a series of hyperlinks to individual sections of the document or to a version of the Bylaw as a single document. Providing the option to access the different sections individually helps to increase accessibility by providing quicker and more straightforward navigation. An additional section of “Zoning Information Guides” links to documents that provide further information on the regulations of commonly referenced sections of the Bylaw. These guides are not regulatory documents and are not enforceable, but provide a more plain language interpretation when complex, legal language is unavoidable. There is an opportunity to expand these resident guides to be more comprehensive, as there are currently only two guides, for fences and retaining walls. Creating a more comprehensive collection of these guides for different regulations and zoning districts would significantly increase the accessibility of the Zoning Bylaw.
Three Directions

Format and Layout

Zoning bylaws or other zoning regulatory documents follow a fairly similar legal structure. However, there is space for some variation in the layout and design that can make the document more accessible and easier to understand. Because New Westminster’s Zoning Bylaw is an old document, it incorporates new amendments and sections into the previously established structure. This has created a document with several different formats for zoning districts with variations in their layouts. These formats range in their structure from plain text to highly formatted sections with tables, figures, and graphics. Having different format styles can make understanding different sections or zoning districts difficult as information is not presented in a standard and consistent way. This can make the document difficult to navigate and lead to readers’ confusion. Through a review of the Zoning Bylaw, three format styles were identified.

While all of these layouts and format styles specify the same set of regulations, the way they are presented impacts the navigation of the document and its legibility. Some basic formatting that is beneficial includes the use of larger text and grouping similar regulations under subheadings. The addition of colour, as seen in Format 2, while not necessarily increasing accessibility, does improve the attractiveness of the document. Also, the use of icons to indicate a zone’s land use, such as for residential and commercial districts in Format 3, could aid in navigation. Perhaps the most important format approach is the inclusion of graphics, illustrations, and tables, which is further discussed in the following section.

The City’s Bylaw has a few unique approaches that increase the document’s accessibility. These approaches should be incorporated as the Bylaw is updated.

- **Information Sheets**
  While not regulatory documents, these elements provide an easily understandable summary of the most relevant and important regulations allowing readers to find them quickly.

- **“Anchor and Chain” Zoning Districts**
  Chain districts rely on the regulations provided in Anchor districts, only providing additional regulations where the zoning districts differ, creating a shorter, simpler document to navigate.
312. Residential Commercial Dwelling Districts (RS-3)

The intent of this district is to allow for neighborhood commercial and associated residential uses in the Rivers of the HRR neighbourhood.

Permitted Uses

The following uses and uses shall be permitted in the RS-3 district:

1. Single detached dwellings
2. Grocery stores provided that:
   a. the grocery store is located only at grade level;
   b. the grocery store is located between the residential unit and the exterior side property line;
3. Accessory buildings and uses provided that all accessory buildings and uses:
   a. shall be used as part of the grocery store;
   b. shall not exceed one story and
      i. in the case of a pitched roof, no portion of the roof shall exceed 4.57 metres (15 feet); or
      ii. in the case of a flat roof, having a pitch of 4.13 or less, no part of the roof shall exceed 3.8 metres (12 feet);
   c. in the case measured from the finished floor of the detached accessory building, (BYLAWS 7407, 2010)

Example Zoning Districts:
RS-3, RS-6, RQ-5, RT-2, RM-1

- Simple, conventional format.
- Minimal use of tables or maps.
- No graphics or illustrations.
- Permitted uses, whether primary or accessory, are grouped together in a long list.

RS-5

Single Detached Residential Districts (RS-1)

310 Single Detached Residential Districts (RS-1)

310.1 The intent of this district is to allow single detached dwellings, secondary, and carriage house homes in residential neighborhoods.

Permitted Uses

310.2 The following principal and accessory uses are permitted in the RS-1 zoning district. For use accompanied by a checklist, there are other Use Specific Regulations in the Conditions of Use within the zoning district or within the General Regulations or Special Conditions Sections of this Bylaw.

Example Zoning Districts:
RQ-1, RT-1, C-1, C-2

- Highly formatted with text boxes.
- Column formatting.
- Inclusion of tables.
- Inclusion of graphics and illustrations.
- Provision of Information Sheets.

Example Zoning Districts: RS-3, RS-6, RQ-5, RT-2, RM-1

- Single, conventional format.
- Minimal use of tables or maps.
- No graphics or illustrations.
- Permitted uses, whether primary or accessory, are grouped together in a long list.

Example Zoning Districts: RS-1, NR-1

- Highly formatted with text boxes.
- Column formatting.
- Inclusion of tables.
- Inclusion of graphics and illustrations.
- Provision of Information Sheets.

Example Zoning Districts: RS-2, RS-4, RS-5, NR-2, NR-5

- Use of “Anchor and Chain” zoning districts.
- Consolidation of similar subheadings into composite subheading sections.
- Moderate use of tables.
- Incorporation of color into design.
Three Directions

Improving Accessibility

The Zoning Bylaw should seek to incorporate tables, graphics, and illustrations where appropriate to further explain and increase understanding of regulations.

- **Tables**
  Tables are a relatively simple format tool for organizing information in an easily understandable manner. Particularly for regulations that vary depending on certain circumstances, tables can make it much easier to understand which regulation applies to the current situation.

- **Graphics or Illustrations**
  The City first introduced illustrations into the Zoning Bylaw in 2002, but only in a few select districts. They act as a visual representation of regulations such as height, yard setbacks, and others related to the size and location of structures.

Format Features

Tables and graphics or illustrations were mentioned by interview participants and identified in literature as features that significantly increase the legibility of bylaw regulations. The New Westminster Zoning Bylaw contains some of these features, but they are not used consistently, appearing in some sections and not at all in others. Tables and graphics serve two different purposes that increase the accessibility of the Zoning Bylaw.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown Community Plan Designation</th>
<th>Maximum Bonus Height</th>
<th>Maximum Bonus Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Mid Rise Apartment</td>
<td>100 feet (30.48 metres)</td>
<td>3.0 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Tower Apartment</td>
<td>240 feet (73.15 metres)</td>
<td>4.0 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use High Density</td>
<td>240 feet (73.15 metres)</td>
<td>5.2 FSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The table above for Bonus Density and Height regulations is included in the RM-6 district.

Zoning regulations lend themselves well to visual representations as they are applied to physical space. They provide a real world understanding of how the regulations are applied. They can also be used to clarify definitions and distinguish between similar terms. For example, there are illustrations which show a house on a lot and demonstrate the difference between the terms front yard, rear yard, and side yard.
There are a few ways in which the language and terms used throughout the Zoning Bylaw impact its legibility. First, is the use of plain language. The Zoning Bylaw is a legal document that requires the use of legalese and complex language which often requires a certain amount of expertise and knowledge to interpret. It is also an old document which has become responsible for helping to achieve more and more City priorities and has received many additions over the years adding to its complexity. As one of the interview participants said,

I think given that through so many years, through legal amendments, through additions, it has become this really complex legal tool, which is only interpreted by a few people with specific training. So it’s a document that’s publicly available on the website. I think it isn’t actually publicly available in the way it’s written, in the way it’s presented.

This complex legal language creates a barrier as many residents lack the technical expertise that is required to interpret and understand the regulations. They must often rely on others who have this expertise and understanding which can result in a significant burden of time and expense. Using plain language where possible, while maintaining the legal enforcement of the Bylaw, will do much to increase equity through accessibility.

The second way that language can affect accessibility and equity is through the use of appropriate and inclusive language. The Zoning Bylaw is intended to be a document that is applicable to all residents within the city and needs to reflect their diverse lived experiences. Because much of the Zoning Bylaw text has been carried over from earlier versions and has not been updated frequently, it may contain terms, definitions, and language that are exclusionary to certain lived experiences. The language should be neutral and inclusive so that no resident feels that the regulations overlook them.

Lastly, the Bylaw is only available in English. The City of New Westminster is a diverse community with many speakers of other languages who may not have enough knowledge of the English language to understand the complex legal document. While it is necessary to provide the official Zoning Bylaw in the official language of the Province, there are still opportunities to provide non-official versions of the Bylaw document in a variety of other languages so that more residents are able to access and understand the regulations.
Education

Education is less related to the Zoning Bylaw text itself and more about increasing residents’ understanding of how zoning regulations and processes function. Increasing residents’ knowledge of zoning can overcome barriers to being able to meaningfully understand the regulations the document is presenting.

While striving to increase the ease of access, navigation, and legibility of the Zoning Bylaw will increase the document’s accessibility, this approach can only accomplish so much. This is because the Bylaw is a legal regulatory document and must retain a certain amount of legal structure and language. To further increase accessibility when nothing more can be done in these other areas, the City should look toward educating residents on how to read, use, and interpret the Zoning Bylaw. This education will not only benefit residents that are seeking to engage in a development process directly, but will increase the knowledge and understanding of all residents whose lives are also governed and impacted by the regulations the Bylaw sets out.

Equity Impacts of Improving Accessibility

**Regulatory Equity**

By increasing the accessibility of the Zoning Bylaw, the City will decrease the amount of hardship or disadvantage that some residents may face in understanding zoning regulations.

**Procedural Equity**

An accessible Zoning Bylaw allows for residents to be more knowledgeable about the Bylaw, its regulations, and impacts, and more able to participate in community conversations during planning and development processes.

**Recognitional Equity**

By using language that is inclusive, the Bylaw will acknowledge and show respect for New Westminster’s diverse population.
Flexibility

As a regulatory tool, the Zoning Bylaw has long included prohibitive requirements that limit what can be built, where it can be built, and the parameters around how it can be built. These requirements derive from the use of Euclidean zoning, which separates land uses and housing types, and long-held zoning practices that regulate aspects of built form including minimum lot sizes, floor areas, and setbacks. This approach positions the Zoning Bylaw as an inherently prohibitive and restrictive tool.

As one interview participant observed, the Zoning Bylaw is a “tool that has hindered a lot of progress in many ways as it’s been historically applied.” The Zoning Bylaw, however, can also be leveraged as a tool to respond to and counter these exclusionary practices and promote social inclusion. Specifically, interview participants noted increasing flexibility within the Bylaw could provide support for equity-seeking groups and assist the City in achieving key policy objectives. Based on our analyses and best practices, three themes for increasing flexibility within the Zoning Bylaw emerged: promoting mixed use zones, diversifying housing types, and relaxing requirements.

“If you allow creativity, you would get some solutions that nobody writing the Zoning Bylaw had thought about.”

- Interview participant
Incorporating Flexibility

Mixed use zones offer the following benefits:\textsuperscript{27}

- Promotes walkability and active transit
- Lessens reliance on vehicles
- Creates compact cities
- Promotes the efficient use of urban services and land
- Generates urban vitality and social cohesion

Assuming the Brewery District, Sapperton Green, and 22nd Street Station developments bring in the right mix of amenities needed, neighbourhoods that may still be facing low-amenity-density values include West End, Victory Heights, and southeast McBride Sapperton.

While West End and Victory Heights consist primarily of one- and two-unit residential zones, McBride Sapperton is a mix of residential (both one- and two-unit and multi-unit) and institutional uses. Enabling the possibility of corner markets and other local services in these residential areas promotes distributional equity through increasing access to these amenities.

Promoting Mixed Use Zoning

Since the City of New Westminster first adopted its Zoning Bylaw, it has segregated uses into zones based on broad land use categories including residential, commercial, and industrial (see figure 7). This separation of uses was counterintuitive to long-used settlement patterns that allowed for places like markets and shops that serviced daily needs to be accessed by foot.\textsuperscript{23} The use of mixed use zones through zoning allows for homes, workplaces, and services to be located within the same building, neighbourhood, or district.\textsuperscript{24}

While nearly all of the zoned commercial land in the City of New Westminster permits residential uses, this only accounts for 8.7 percent of zoned land. Residential zones are largely maintained for their singular use, with only one zone allowing for the conditional use of a grocery store. Recent development trends in the city, however, are prioritizing mixed use. Primarily this is occurring through master-planned sites that incorporate mixed uses into its land use designations like the Brewery District Mixed Use and Health Care, Sapperton Green Transit-Oriented Mixed-Use Community, and 22nd Street Station Frequent Transit Development Area. These developments align with a goal of the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy to direct growth to mixed use areas well-served by transit. In the Official Community Plan, the City of New Westminster indicates residential growth will be located within Frequent Transit Development Areas surrounding SkyTrain stations.\textsuperscript{25} These developments will increase the amenities accessible to the surrounding residential areas which are currently in low-amenity-dense neighbourhoods.\textsuperscript{26}
Diversifying Housing Types

In addition to segregating uses, the City of New Westminster also relies on residential zoning designations based on housing type, including one- and two-unit dwelling districts and multi-unit dwelling districts. From the early years of the Bylaw, the separation of these housing types was evident (see figure 7). The desire to preserve property values and preserve the quality of life for those living in single-family areas was idealized from the belief that multi-unit dwellings would wreak havoc upon single detached districts. In the 1940 Zoning Bylaw, one family, duplex, and semi-detached dwellings were approved outright, while multiple-unit dwellings required approval from the City Council and Town Planning Commission.

Zoning has long sought to protect the lowest density and most expensive housing forms from change. In our cluster analysis on demographic and socioeconomic variables, we found the Outer Edge to be predominately zoned for single detached dwelling units, representing 59 percent of zones in that area. The Outer Edge was also a high economic status area characterized by high median incomes, a low percentage of low-income earners, high dwelling values, and a high prevalence of owner-occupied households (see Appendix A). Unlike the other residential areas, the Outer Edge has not experienced a neighbourhood transition. With low levels of both new immigrants and internal migrants moving to these areas, the Outer Edge is characterized by exclusive neighbourhoods. The exclusive nature of these areas prevents residents and the generations proceeding them from obtaining improved life outcomes, including educational attainment, income, and health, that these high opportunity areas afford.

Currently, most single detached zones permit secondary and accessory dwelling units like laneway and carriage houses. The City also revised its requirements for secondary suites, removing unnecessary requirements and focusing on safety requirements that “theoretically,” a participant said, made “secondary suites much easier to implement.” Permitting secondary and accessory dwelling units aligns with the OCP’s intent to accommodate housing choice in single detached neighbourhoods.

To further increase housing supply in single detached districts, several interview participants identified the need for additional density. One participant stated the City needed “to look at bold steps” like permitting duplexes and triplexes in single detached zones outright. Another supported multi-unit residential uses, referencing the amount of land in the city that was locked up in single detached districts. Across the city, single detached zones make up 37 percent of all zoned land, setting aside the most predominant land use for the most expensive housing type.
Incorporating Flexibility

More than accommodating growth, diversifying housing types enables differences in living arrangements and ownership models. Addressing the housing needs of specific populations is crucial in promoting equity.

In Queensborough, this could include allowing housing forms that accommodate more than one household or simplifying the process for converting to a multi-unit dwelling. To reflect the high percentages of one-person households in Downtown and other areas of the city, alternative ownership models like cohousing, community land trusts, or shared equity should be explored.

Diversifying Housing Types

While increasing density does not ensure affordability or increased access to housing, it can generate more possibilities to achieve these goals. Further, it allows for more choice along the housing continuum, including more housing types like multiplexes, townhouses, and low-rise apartment buildings. These “missing middle” housing types fall in between single detached dwellings and mid-rise and high-rise buildings. While these housing types are not new to the City of New Westminster, their use across the city varies. Only 12.3 percent of zoned land in the city permits either duplexes, townhouses, or low-rise apartments.

Areas of the city that permit these uses are more accommodating to growth. In our cluster analysis, the Central Core had the highest prevalence of low-rise apartment buildings, at 41 percent of zoned residential land in the area. This area also saw the most transition in the years preceding the census, welcoming high levels of both new immigrants and internal migrants to these areas. Riverside also saw high levels of internal migrants and had 44 percent of its residential land zoned for either low-rise apartments, duplexes, or townhouses.

Our City 2041 indicates that a significant share of residential development will occur in Downtown and Queensborough, absorbing 43 percent and 19 percent of the population growth, respectively. Downtown is predominantly within the Riverside area, characterized by one-person households, middle-income earners, and medium homeownership levels. To accommodate the large share of growth, new housing units will largely be high-rise apartment buildings. A smaller share of new housing units will be low-rise apartments and townhouses, both stand-alone and those located at the base of high-rise towers.

Queensborough is a part of the Outer Edge area, defined by its high prevalence of families with young children, higher than average median incomes, high homeownership rates, and high dwelling values. Unlike other areas of the city though, Queensborough is more culturally diverse with a large immigrant population. There are also larger household sizes and a higher prevalence of multi-family households in Queensborough. Housing growth is projected to take the form of multi-family developments, including townhouses and apartments, but will also see an increase in single detached dwellings.

“If your community does have a large population of folks that want this sort of extended family household, then...we should be accommodating in our zoning.”

- Interview participant
Relaxing Requirements

Through requirements like setbacks, lot size, and lot coverage, zoning attempts to regulate for area and bulk. Historically, these requirements were used as a tool of exclusionary zoning to impact the price of dwellings in an area, and thus who could afford it. To address these embedded practices, and facilitate the diversity of housing types and tenures needed to accommodate growth, meet the needs of diverse populations, and respond to challenges of housing affordability, a review of regulatory requirements needs to be conducted.

In responding to housing affordability challenges, one participant observed that various construction considerations like dealing with setbacks and parking requirements adds to the cost of homes and lots, thereby impacting affordability. Further, this participant thought that the “Zoning Bylaw probably requires more parking than needed, particularly in a time when we are trying to move away from car dominated forms of transportation.”

Several policies in the City point to relaxation of parking requirements as an approach to achieve their goals. These policies seek to remove parking as a barrier to providing needed housing stock in the city. In considering relaxing parking requirements for residential uses, locality is a major factor that should be taken into account. The findings of Metro Vancouver’s Regional Parking Study reveal that apartment buildings located close to frequent transit have lower parking utilization. The lower rates of parking utilization can be attributed to the higher transit use by residents in areas close to transit; the study also suggested a stronger relationship between the rate of transit use and parking utilization for rental apartment sites.

Equity Impacts of Incorporating Flexibility

**Distributional Equity**

Through mixed use zoning and increasing housing supply, opportunities for residents to secure equitable access to housing and amenities is enhanced.

**Recognitional Equity**

Diversifying housing types and tenures expands housing choice and acknowledges the diverse needs of residents in accessing suitable and culturally appropriate housing.
Equity in Zoning: Three Directions Forward

Changing Zoning in the City of New Westminster

Property owners, developers, and organizations can achieve compliance with zoning regulations by obtaining a:

- **Development Variance Permit**
  A DVP permits variations to zoning district requirements like building height, building setbacks, number of parking or loading spaces, and site coverage.

- **Zoning Bylaw Amendment**
  Zoning Bylaw Amendments, or rezonings, can permit changes in requirements as well as changes in designated use or density.

Adaptability

As cities evolve, zoning and how the land is used needs to evolve alongside them. Municipalities in British Columbia manage these changes, while factoring in their own sustainability, social, economic and land use interests, through the development of an Official Community Plan (OCP). While adopting an OCP doesn’t instantly change land use or zoning as it currently exists, it does set expectations for where and how growth and development will occur. Residents, property owners, community groups, and developers can use the OCP and land use designations to aid them in making decisions about potential developments or changes to a property.

In the City of New Westminster, if a proposed development or changes do not comply with the current zoning regulations, property owners and developers have two mechanisms for achieving compliance: a development variance permit (DVP) or a Zoning Bylaw amendment. As one interview participant observed, rezonings are a key mechanism for triggering City policies, such as the Inclusionary Housing Policy. Another participant noted that the City has attempted to make the typically lengthy rezoning process to be “as quick and painless as possible,” particularly for rezonings that achieve City policy objectives. However, these changes are indicative of piecemeal rezonings, where changes are made to one or a small number of parcels, new zoning districts are created, or the rules of a zoning district are modified. Changing the Zoning Bylaw in this way can lead to inconsistencies within the Bylaw, the presence of outdated uses or language, and misalignment with City priorities. Alternative approaches to zoning that are more adaptable and account for the changing needs and context of a city include comprehensive rezoning, performance zoning, and dynamic zoning. Consideration of these approaches and examples of their use in practice are discussed on the following pages.
Performance Zoning

Performance zoning is an alternative approach to traditional Euclidean zoning that uses performance standards to regulate and control land use. These performance standards are used to quantifiably measure the effect or impact of different uses and buildings to inform land use decisions. Rather than focusing on the type of use or design specifications, these standards focus on outcomes and effects such as environmental pollution, traffic generation, and social and economic impacts. Performance standards aim to regulate if community goals are met rather than how they are met.⁸

The focus of performance zoning on regulating impacts and outcomes connects the regulations more directly with their intent. If the Intent of a regulation is to prevent some negative outcome, then it is more effective to regulate that outcome directly rather than regulating the built-form or permitted uses, which may or may not produce the negative outcome. Additionally, by not restricting the built-form and uses, performance zoning allows for more flexibility in accomplishing a community’s goals through innovation and unique approaches instead of a strict one-size-fits-all approach. In this way, performance zoning provides the space for developers, businesses, and residents to adapt to changing contexts, markets, and situations.

Performance zoning was first introduced as a means to control the impacts of industrial uses. While performance zoning standards can be used as the primary land use control, they are often incorporated into conventional zoning structures creating hybrid approaches utilizing tools such as policy or regulation overlays.

---

Project Name: Land Development Guidance System (LDGS)
Location: City of Fort Collins, CO
Date: 1981

**Purpose**
In 1981, Fort Collins implemented a new system for controlling land use known as the Land Development Guidance System (LDGS).⁹ This land use control system has been touted as the closest to true performance zoning. This system only applied to planned unit developments (PUDs), which the City relied on for the majority of their new development activity.

**Process**
Planning staff review a development plan under sets of absolute and variable criteria. Absolute criteria apply to all new development and include performance standards such as neighbourhood compatibility, engineering and services standards, environmental impact, conformance with planning documents, and site design. Variable criteria are specific to the intended land use. Developers explain how their project fulfills these different criteria and are assessed a score to which they must meet a minimum requirement for the development to be approved. This system encouraged mixed use development by allowing commercial or industrial uses to coincide with residential without the negative outcomes that a separation of uses seeks to prevent. Fort Collins has since shifted back to a more conventional zoning approach but has incorporated performance standards from the LDGS into the zoning ordinance creating a hybrid zoning system.

**Outcome**
- Connects regulation of development with the vision and goals of the community.
- Created more efficient use of the city’s land by encouraging mixed-use development.
- Allowed for adaptation to changing land use needs as use was not restricted so long as developments met performance standards.
- Ensures that adverse impacts are mitigated while not restricting potential uses or built forms.
- Performance standards were incorporated into conventional Euclidean zoning to provide more predictability.
Dynamic Zoning in Practice

Example regulations for dynamic zoning include:

- Maximum building height shall be equal to no more than X feet greater than the greatest height of existing buildings on the same block.

- If unit density for a given area reaches 80% of the maximum buildout, then the maximum allowed density of all parcels within that area must be increased or a review process is triggered.

- If a given area reaches a certain population density, certain corner parcels within the area are automatically rezoned to allow commercial uses such as neighbourhood grocery, restaurants, or retail shops.

Dynamic Zoning

Dynamic zoning is a framework for land use regulations that increases their adaptability to a variety of potential future contexts. It calls for zoning to be more responsive to demographic and market changes through tools such as context dependent regulations, automatic rezoning, threshold-based decision-making, and mandatory periodic reviews. It proposes that community members predetermine the thresholds or indicators that trigger the decisions for zoning changes to occur rather than relying on the case-by-case basis of spot rezoning.

The general concept is that land parcels or zones should be able to incrementally change in density or intensity according to their context. This can be through small increases or decreases of specific regulations such as height, setbacks, or site coverage. It can also be a more comprehensive process involving automatic rezonings without lengthy review and approval processes. The community decides upon set thresholds or indicators that determine when and if a zone or parcel should increase or decrease in intensity.

Dynamic zoning is already incorporated into many zoning ordinances in the form of regulations such as contextual height limits, where limits are set by the height of surrounding buildings. This allows for areas to organically increase in intensity when there is a willingness to do so. Another application of dynamic zoning would be threshold-based zoning changes determined by specific indicators that automatically upzone an area or trigger a process to discuss the possibility of upzoning with the community.

Dynamic zoning may not be an appropriate approach for all areas of the city. Dynamic zoning regulations can be incorporated directly into a zoning bylaw or through a policy overlay which applies to certain areas where increased density and intensity are already being focused such as mixed use corridors.
Comprehensive Rezoning

Comprehensive rezoning is the process of replacing the existing zoning code with an entirely new one. The use of this approach is rare in practice, but as zoning codes continue to show their age with outdated requirements, become clunky with piecemeal revisions or amendments, or are no longer reflective of City priorities, more and more municipalities in North America are exploring the use of comprehensive rezoning to update their zoning bylaws.

Comprehensive rezonings are particularly useful in cities with stagnant growth or those looking to reinvigorate their economies. If occurring alongside or as the result of a comprehensive community planning process, it can strengthen zoning’s connection to planning, and thus enhance alignment with current City goals. To ensure continued alignment, however, a regular review and evaluation process for updating the Zoning Bylaw would need to occur following a comprehensive rezoning.

“I think it’s a great idea to reevaluate the Zoning Bylaw every few years. [As] things get added in as a problem arises... there’s always going to be some little anomalies.”

- Interview participant

| Project Name: Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative  
Location: City of Edmonton  
Date: 2018 - Current |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Purpose**  
In 2018, the City of Edmonton initiated the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative (ZBRI) to update its Zoning Bylaw. Edmonton consolidated its Bylaw in 2001, using the same bylaw structure and approach as previous iterations. The ZBRI seeks to address the increasing complexity of the Bylaw and ensure current City policies and initiatives are codified within the Bylaw. |
| **Process**  
The ZBRI is taking place over four phases. During phase one, background research, technical studies, and community engagement processes were conducted. The findings of these activities led to the development of the Zoning Bylaw philosophy, the creation of a decision-making framework, and the development of a Gender-Based Analysis Plus and Equity Toolkit to guide planners in considering concepts of equity and diversity when drafting the new Zoning Bylaw. During phase two, multiple iterations of the new Zoning Bylaw and zoning map will be drafted and additional engagement conducted. Internal processes and workflows will be updated to reflect use of the new Bylaw and an interactive zoning map and development applications map will be developed. Phase three will consist of final updates to processes and workflows, public hearing notifications, and final review and refinement. In phase four, the new Zoning Bylaw will go before Council and if approved, will be implemented. |
| **Outcome**  
The approach for drafting the new Zoning Bylaw includes the following components:  
- New layout and interface to enhance user experience and understanding.  
- Hybrid bylaw that incorporates elements of use-based, performance-based, and incentive-based zoning.  
- Fewer, more enabling and inclusive zones to eliminate redundancy across zones and allow for flexibility in building types and combination of uses.  
- Broader uses to allow for a greater range of activities to occur in spaces.  
- Purposeful and enforceable regulations to reduce regulatory complexity and clearly communicate the intent and intended outcomes of regulations. |
## Three Directions

### Equity Impacts of Embracing Adaptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural Equity</th>
<th>Adaptive Zoning is responsive to changes in City priorities, ensuring the policies set out in new plans are incorporated into the land use regulations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributional Equity</td>
<td>Adaptive zoning allows for amenities and services to be located in more areas of the city while mitigating any potential negative impacts they may have on the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional Equity</td>
<td>By accounting for potential changes in context, City priorities, and residents’ needs, an adaptable bylaw can provide the opportunity for land use and development to accommodate those changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

We recommend the City of New Westminster undertake a comprehensive rezoning process in which the Zoning Bylaw regulations are reviewed and rewritten to advance toward the three directions of increasing accessibility, flexibility, and adaptability. This recommendation is based on the findings from the analyses of the City’s current equity context, the Zoning Bylaw’s regulatory approach and structure, and interviews with City staff. It is from these analyses that the three directions were established and while the City could move forward in an individual, step-by-step manner, a comprehensive rezoning process provides an opportunity to move toward all three directions simultaneously. This approach is warranted as the Bylaw regulations are intertwined with intents that may no longer reflect City priorities and should be reevaluated as a whole system rather than through incremental changes.
Rebalancing Use, Intensity, and Form in the Bylaw

The current Zoning Bylaw foundationally relies on separating zones by uses. Over time, attempts to manage intensity and form within and across those uses have created narrowly defined uses that have added to the Bylaw’s complexity and inflexibility. These narrowly defined uses and how they’ve been applied selectively across zoning districts have embedded regulatory inequity within the Bylaw. A new Zoning Bylaw should seek to rebalance how managing use, intensity, and form is prioritized.

A rewrite of the Zoning Bylaw should reconsider how its regulations manage:

- **Use**
  The type of buildings and activities permitted.

- **Intensity**
  The impacts associated with the buildings or activities permitted.

- **Form**
  How buildings should be situated and designed.

Comprehensive Rezoning

The City of New Westminster should undertake a comprehensive rezoning process that relies on a framework of accessibility, flexibility, and adaptability. An overview of the phases involved in this process is provided below. At each phase, the City should provide opportunities for public engagement and conduct targeted engagement activities with equity-seeking groups.

1. **Review the Current Zoning Bylaw**
   - Review regulations to determine their underlying intent, purpose, and connection with City priorities. A review completed by City staff utilizes the institutional knowledge of the City to best understand the context and purpose of specific regulations.
   - Evaluate regulations to determine if the intent and purpose is being accomplished effectively. Effective regulations should be incorporated into the drafting of the new Zoning Bylaw, while those that are ineffective should be reassessed.

2. **Draft a New Zoning Bylaw**
   - Adopt an approach to drafting a new Bylaw that seeks to advance equity through increasing accessibility, flexibility, and adaptability.
   - Seek to balance regulations based on use, intensity, and form by using alternative zoning approaches.
   - Apply best practices of accessibility to the drafting of the new Bylaw document
   - Develop additional informational documents when appropriate to increase legibility and ease of navigation within the Bylaw.
   - Document the purpose and intent of each regulation for future reference.

3. **Monitor and Evaluate the Zoning Bylaw**
   - Review and reevaluate the new Bylaw periodically to ensure the regulations are effective and are reflective and responsive to changing city priorities.
   - Document the purpose and intent of any new or changes in regulation for future reference.
Use

Use refers to the type of buildings and activities permitted on a site.

Create Broader Land Uses

The City of New Westminster has 93 land uses defined in its Zoning Bylaw. Many of these land uses overlap partially or significantly in terms of their intended use and should be consolidated into broader land use classifications.

Related to commercial uses, the Bylaw has separate definitions for antique stores, charity thrift stores, clothing consignment stores, and second hand specialty stores, each with specific regulations on the type of items sold and the amount of floor space that must be used for resale items. Despite the differences between these definitions, zoning districts group and permit these uses together. However, while these stores are of a similar use to a retail store, these uses are not permitted in all zones that permit retail stores. Other uses with similar impacts, including pawn shops, used music stores, and used tool stores are severely restricted in where they can operate in the city, only permitted in one institutional zoning district (P-8).

Different residential land uses have similar impacts, but are narrowly defined in the Zoning Bylaw by dwelling type, such as single-detached dwellings, duplexes, townhouses, row houses, and apartment buildings and activity, including supportive and transitional housing. A broader residential land use would allow for more diversity of housing to occur in all areas of the city and address the exclusionary impacts of regulating housing type or activity. Intensity and form regulations within the Zoning Bylaw can be maintained to inform the dwelling’s scale and compatibility.

Broader land use classifications will simplify the Bylaw, make it more understandable, and decrease the discretion applied to specific uses. The zones themselves will allow for more variety of uses, reduce the need for Zoning Bylaw Amendments, and be able to adapt more quickly to new and emerging industries and housing needs.
Recommendaations

Intensity

Intensity refers to the impacts created by the building or activities taking place on a site.

Develop Performance-Based Regulations

The Zoning Bylaw uses prescriptive policies to regulate the impacts of buildings and activities that occur within a zone. Zoning districts rely on narrowly-defined uses to regulate the intensity of activity and requirements like density, building height, site coverage, and setbacks to regulate a building’s intensity. These regulations may be ineffective in achieving their intended purpose. To address this discrepancy, the Zoning Bylaw should shift toward performance-based regulation.

In the Zoning Bylaw, industrial uses are classified into light and heavy industrial zoning districts. In place of these use-based classifications, performance standards should be used to measure the impacts of these uses to determine their compatibility for use in a certain area. Effects of industrial activities can be measured through the use of standards that monitor noise, smoke, odour, dust and dirt, noxious gases, glare and heat, fire hazards, and industrial wastes.

Similarly, regulations that monitor a development’s site impacts should be evaluated for their effectiveness in meeting their intent. Performance-based site regulations can include standards such as minimum open space, maximum density, and maximum impervious surface to meet traditional zoning requirements while allowing for flexibility in design.

Use Overlays

Currently, residents, developers, and organizations can receive a relaxation of requirements that regulate intensity through a development variance permit or rezoning. These relaxations are an important tool for furthering City priorities. The City of New Westminster’s Inclusionary Housing Policy requires strata and mixed-use development applicants seeking additional density to provide affordable housing units. Exceptions are permitted for projects that provide only townhouse units or projects with fewer than ten units. Further, the policy relies on the developer to seek a rezoning and additional density to take effect.

A more widely-applied approach for securing affordable housing could be achieved through the use of an Affordable Housing Overlay. An Affordable Housing Overlay would provide incremental increases in density, limited increases in height, and relaxation of other zoning limitations in exchange for the provision of permanently affordable housing. In contrast to the Inclusionary Housing Policy, these relaxations would be permitted outright and would not require a rezoning application. The overlay would be applied in areas of the city where there are currently fewer affordable housing opportunities. This overlay would contribute to the equitable distribution of affordable housing city-wide.
Recommendations

Form

Form determines how buildings should be situated on a site and designed.

Consolidate Development Permit Area Guidelines

Form is currently controlled in the Zoning Bylaw through regulations that address measures of intensity such as density, building height, or lot coverage. However, the City primarily relies on the use of Development Permit Areas (DPAs) as tools to control the form and character of new developments. Almost all new development within the city is subject to DPAs with the exception of the construction of single detached dwellings in accordance with the authority set out in the Local Government Act.

The DPAs are currently designated in accordance with the existing use-based Zoning Bylaw, with separate DPAs that apply to residential, commercial, mixed use, and employment lands. If the City adopts the above recommendations for regulating use and intensity as a part of the new Zoning Bylaw, their application may become ineffective.

The City should create a new set of DPAs based on the existing form and character of areas and neighbourhoods. The existing guidelines should be consolidated to align with these new form and character areas. The DPAs should include general guidelines that apply across all developments in the area. Additional specific guidelines for developments can be provided within the DPAs for different types of residential housing or land use categories. Structuring the DPAs in this way can allow for more inherent mixing of uses. DPAs that address natural features and natural hazards should continue to be used.
Considerations

Honour Relational Commitments

This study does not fully represent the rights and interests of First Nations and Indigenous communities as it pertains to using and regulating land. Engagement with First Nations and Indigenous communities whose territory the City of New Westminster is situated on requires the development of an ongoing, respectful relationship, rather than a singular study. The City of New Westminster should continue its work toward building long-term relationships with these communities. The findings of this report in representing ideals of equity within zoning should complement, but not replace, that work.

Conduct Engagement with Equity-Denied Groups

Engagement efforts of this study have been limited to interviews with a small number of City staff. While some staff members engage more directly with equity-denied groups as part of their work and could draw on their experiences during the interview, it does not replace engagement with these groups. In engaging with individuals with lived and living experiences, care and consideration should be given to the capacity of equity-denied groups to participate.

Understand Data Limitations

The quantitative analysis used in this study relied primarily on spatial analysis to understand and interpret equity implications. This method was beneficial to the study and findings, particularly due to zoning districts existing spatially. However, there are limits to this method of analysis. Not all causes of inequities can be represented spatially or have a spatial component to them. For example, the analysis considered being in an amenity-dense neighbourhood as representing distributional equity, but it can not consider the time of day those amenities may need to be accessed by nearby residents depending on their schedules. Further, this study relies on aggregated data and by creating larger resident typologies, the hyper-local context and needs of groups may be overshadowed.

Consider Role of Institutional Elements

While this report and recommendations were primarily concerned with assessing and providing recommendations to the Zoning Bylaw, we recognize that inequities produced result from more than the Zoning Bylaw alone. Through analysis and interviews, we attempted to understand the broader context influencing the Zoning Bylaw and its application in the City of New Westminster, and use these insights to inform our ultimate findings and recommendations. However, due to time and scope constraints, a full institutional analysis could not be conducted. In undertaking a comprehensive rezoning process, we implore the City of New Westminster to consider the various ways zoning is operationalized, including the formal and informal rules that affect it, the networks that influence it, and the social norms that shape it.
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Appendix A

Demographic Analysis of Residential Areas

Methodology

Geographical Scale of Analysis

Census dissemination areas (DA) were used as a proxy for residential areas. Dissemination areas are the smallest area at which all census data is disseminated and are relatively stable geographical units. For the 2016 Census, the City of New Westminster was comprised of 90 dissemination areas.

Variable Selection

Through a review of equity indicators used by municipalities and previous studies attempting to define area-level socioeconomic status, broad categories of socioeconomic and demographic characteristics were identified: education, wealth, income, employment, age, households, equity-denied groups, mobility, and land-use. Variables from the 2016 Census of Canada were reviewed for their usefulness as measures of socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, reliability, and availability at the DA level. Two identified variables were ultimately excluded from the analysis due to missing data (households spending 30% or more of income on shelter costs) or misrepresentation of data (average monthly shelter costs for rented dwellings) in one or more DAs. A total of 16 variables were included in the analysis (see Figure A1 for a complete list of variables). Except for population density, average value of dwellings, and median total income, variables were expressed as a percentage to account for variability in the population size of each DA.

Statistical Analysis

Cluster Analysis

The multivariate clustering tool on ArcGIS was used to analyze the 16 variables across the 90 DAs in the City of New Westminster. Using clustering, DAs were sorted into three clusters, or groups, based on the patterns in the data. These residential clusters group areas of the city that are similar in terms of their demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, but distinct from the other clusters.

Cluster analysis is a statistical tool used to organize a set of data into natural groups, or clusters, based on the data values. The clusters are formed so that there is a high degree of similarity within each cluster, while maximizing the differences between clusters. The analysis used a non-hierarchical clustering method, k-means clustering, to identify the clusters. This method relies on an iterative process whereby once observations are initially assigned to different clusters, a cluster mean, or the average of the variable across all DAs assigned to that cluster, is calculated for each cluster and each observation is re-assigned based on which new cluster mean it is closest to. This process continues until no observations change clusters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Persons with no certificate, diploma, degree</td>
<td>Percentage of the population 15 years and over with no certificate, diploma, or degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Owner households</td>
<td>Percentage of dwellings in which the owner also lives. A household is considered to own their dwelling if some member of the household owns the dwelling even if it is not fully paid for, for example if there is a mortgage or some other claim on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average dwelling value</td>
<td>Average expected value of an owner-occupied, non-farm, non-reserve dwelling (including the value of the land the dwelling is on) at the time of the census.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Median total income</td>
<td>Median personal income for persons aged 15 and over, from all sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of low-income</td>
<td>Percentage of persons in economic families or a person not in an economic family with 2015 incomes below the Statistics Canada low-income cut-offs, after-tax (LICO-AT), based on the threshold applicable to that person or family. The cut-offs represent income levels at which people spend disproportionate amounts of their after-tax income to the necessities of food, shelter, and clothing. The LICO-AT has 35 cut-offs varying by seven family sizes and five different sizes of areas of resident to account for economies of scale and potential differences in cost of living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>Total number of unemployed individuals 15 and older divided by the total number of individuals 15 and older participating in the labour force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Youth population</td>
<td>Percentage of the population aged 0 -14 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior population</td>
<td>Percentage of the population aged 65 years or older.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Single-parent families</td>
<td>Percentage of single-parent families among all census families living in private households. A census family refers to a married or common-law couple or lone parent with at least one child living in the same dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live alone</td>
<td>Percentage of persons living alone in private households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity-denied</td>
<td>Non-official language speakers</td>
<td>Percentage of the population who cannot conduct a conversation in either official language (English or French).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>New immigrants</td>
<td>The percentage of immigrants who came to Canada from 2011 to 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visible minority</td>
<td>Percentage of the population belonging to a visible minority group. As defined by the Employment Equity Act, visible minorities are persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal identity</td>
<td>Percentage of the population who identifies with the Aboriginal peoples of Canada, including those who are First Nations (North American Indian), Métis, or Inuk (Inuit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Internal migrants</td>
<td>Percentage of the population who lived in a different Canadian municipality at the time of the previous census.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-Use</td>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>Total population divided by land area, reported in km².</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A1: Variables included in the cluster analysis. Definitions adapted from Statistics Canada.
To characterize the three residential areas relative to the socioeconomic and demographic makeup of the city, statistical significance tests were performed for each residential area using an independent t-test in SPSS. An independent t-test compares the means between two groups. For residential area one, the cluster mean of each variable was compared to the mean of that variable across all DAs in the other two residential areas. The results of the t-test indicate if the difference between the cluster mean of a variable in residential area one and the remaining areas of the city is statistically significant. T-tests that produced a p-value less than 0.05 indicated a statistically significant result. For statistically significant results, the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval were used to determine if the variable was comparatively higher (upper and lower bounds were positive integers) or lower (upper and lower bounds were negative integers). This process was repeated for the other two residential areas.

**Findings**

Using clustering, the 90 DAs in the City of New Westminster were clustered together based on having similar demographic and socioeconomic information. Each cluster is characterized by the attributes within that cluster as being more (high) or less (low) prevalent compared to the other clusters. Attributes that did not significantly differ from the other clusters are described as medium.

**Cluster 1: Outer Edge**

The Outer Edge (39 DAs) represents a high economic status area within a lower density environment compared to the other areas. It has the highest median income, lowest percentage of low-income earners, highest dwelling values, and the highest percentage of owner-occupied households. This area is also characterized by a high prevalence of young families, featuring the highest percentage of youth, lowest percentage of seniors, and lowest percentage of one-person households. The Outer Edge has remained relatively stable with low levels of both internal migrants and new immigrants moving to these areas. Approximately 35.6% of New Westminster residents live in these areas.

**Cluster 2: Central Core**

The Central Core (21 DAs) in many ways stands in contrast to the Outer Edge. The Central Core is comparatively a low economic status area in a highly dense environment. There is a relatively high percentage of low-income earners, low median income values, and low dwelling values in the Central Core. This area also had the highest percentage of individuals without a certificate, diploma, or degree. The Central Core features smaller households and not as many young families, with a high percentage of one-person households and low percentage of youth. It also has a high percentage of single-parent families. In addition, this area boasts higher levels of ethnocultural diversity and Indigeneity with a high percentage of new immigrants and persons of Aboriginal identity. The Central Core shows indications of transition and neighbourhood turnover occurring with high levels of new immigrants and internal migrants moving to these areas. There is also a low percentage of owner-occupied households in this area. The Central Core is home to approximately 22.9% of the city’s population.
Cluster 3: Riverside

Riverside (30 DAs) is more dense than the Outer Edge, but not as dense as the Central Core. Similar to the Central Core, Riverside has a high percentage of one-person households and low percentage of youth, indicating smaller household sizes. There is some indication of transition occurring in Riverside with a high percentage of internal migrants. There is a higher percentage of middle-income earners in Riverside with medium levels of both median income and percentage of low-income earners. Riverside had the lowest percentage of individuals who cannot speak English or French and low numbers of persons without a degree. In addition, Riverside has medium homeownership levels and the dwelling values are relatively low. Approximately 41.5% of the population lives in Riverside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>Outer Edge</th>
<th>Central Core</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons with no certificate, diploma, degree (%)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner households (%)</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average dwelling value ($)</td>
<td>698,285</td>
<td>1,046,585</td>
<td>358,006</td>
<td>483,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median total income ($)</td>
<td>36,441</td>
<td>39,730</td>
<td>28,813</td>
<td>37,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of low-income (%)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (%)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth population (%)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior population (%)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent families (%)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live alone (%)</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-official language speakers (%)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New immigrants (%)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minority (%)</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal identity (%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal migrants (%)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density (no. of persons per km2)</td>
<td>7,820</td>
<td>3,546.7</td>
<td>15,326.1</td>
<td>8,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (count)</td>
<td>70,996</td>
<td>25,270</td>
<td>16,259</td>
<td>29,467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A2: Variable means for the City of New Westminster and three residential areas identified through the cluster analysis.
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Zoning Analysis of Residential Areas

Citywide

Residential zoning districts are the most prevalent land use across the city accounting for 53% of the city’s total zoned land area. The remaining land uses are industrial (20%), commercial (9%), park space (9%), institutional (7%), and agricultural (1%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Category</th>
<th>Area (Sq M)</th>
<th>% of City Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>4,267,510.10</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2,381,031.79</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,008,914.54</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Space</td>
<td>1,004,956.46</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (low-rise)</td>
<td>956,205.26</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>853,268.53</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (high-rise)</td>
<td>406,837.04</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>286,482.85</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>190,227.78</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>168,479.62</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>108,531</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unzoned</td>
<td>8,343.56</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B1: Zone categories by land area (sq. m) and percentage of total city land area (%).
For land that is zoned for residential uses, single detached zoning districts are the most prevalent accounting for nearly 69% of residential zoned land and 37% of the city's total zoned land area. In fact, single detached zoning districts alone occupy nearly double the area of land for the next most common use, industrial. The other residential districts in descending order of land area are low-rise apartments, high-rise apartments, townhouse, duplex, and mixed use zones.

For residential uses there are 1,241 total zoning districts and of these 958 (77%) are one- and two-unit residential zoning districts and 283 (23%) are multi-unit residential districts. Among these residential zoning districts there are 72 unique zoning district types. One- and two-unit zoning districts account for 31 (43%) of these different zone types while 41 (57%) of them are multi-unit zoning districts. This shows that while there is a far higher quantity of one- and two-unit residential districts there are more types of multi-family zoning districts.

Notably, of the most common residential zoning districts across the city only one of the top ten zones is a multi-unit zone (RM-2). The RS-1, Single detached zoning district is overwhelmingly the most prevalent residential zone across the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Residential Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR-1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ-1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR-2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-2D</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B2: The most common residential zoning districts count and percentage of total residential districts.
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Outer Edge

Zoning Districts

The Outer Edge has the vast majority of residential zoning districts across the city (60%) and has a relatively high diversity of zone types (38%). Of these residential zoning districts 89% of them are one- and two-unit zones which also account for 52% of the different residential zone types within the area.

Land Use by Area

The Outer Edge is the largest area encompassing 57% of all the zoned land area across the city. This area is primarily designated for residential zoning categories which account for 61% of the area’s zoned land which is followed by industrial (17%), park spaces (8%), institutional (7%), and commercial (5%).

The vast majority of residential zoned land area in this area is designated for single detached dwellings at 86%. This is an even higher proportion of land dedicated to single detached homes than the city-wide average. The next most common residential zone categories are low-rise apartments and townhouses at 6% and 5% of the residential land, respectively.
Central Core

Zoning Districts

The Central Core has the lowest number of residential zones and the least diversity of zone types among the three areas. This area has only 12% of all residential zones within the city and only 18% of the different types of residential zones. 71% of the zone types in the Central Core are either RS-1 (Single Detached) or RM-2 (Multiple Dwelling Low-rise). 46% of the residential zoning districts in the Central Core are multi-unit zones, which is the highest proportion of multi-unit zones among the three areas.

Land Use by Area

The Central Core is the smallest area by size at just 7% of the city’s zoned land. This area is even more residential than the Outer Edge with 74% of the area’s zoned land area being designated as residential use. This is followed by commercial (22%), institutional (2%), and park space and unzoned areas (less than 1% each).

Although the Central Core has more of its land area devoted to residential uses, it is the opposite of the Outer Edge in that most of the residential zoned land is for multi-unit dwellings. Low-rise and high-rise apartment zone categories are 41% and 35% of the residential zoned land respectively, while single detached zone categories are only 22%. When making this comparison between the areas it is important to note that Central Core has a total zoned land area of approximately 771,000 square meters while in Outer Edge just the single detached land area is 3.4 million square meters.
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Riverside

Zoning Districts

Riverside has the highest diversity of zone types compared to the other areas with 44% of all residential zone types. It also has the highest number of multi-unit zones across the city at 11% of all residential zones. These outcomes seem likely to coincide as there are more types of multi-unit zones.

Land Use by Area

Riverside’s zoned land area makes up 37% of the city’s total zoned land area. Coincidentally, 37% of Riverside’s zoned land area is designated for residential uses which makes it the only of the three areas to not have the majority of its land area designated for residential uses. There is a more even spread of different zoning categories with the other uses being industrial (28%), commercial (12%), park space (11%), institutional (8%), and agricultural (4%).

For the residential zoning categories, single detached zones (36%) still account for the highest proportion of zoned land area but are closely followed by low-rise apartments (31%). These are then followed by high-rise apartments (16%), duplexes (7%), townhouses (6%), and mixed-use (4%).
Interview Process and Analysis

Introduction

To obtain an understanding of the context that shapes zoning regulation and the way zoning regulation has contributed to inequities in the City of New Westminster, a qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews was utilized. The qualitative data was collected through six semi-structured interviews conducted with City Staff over four months. These interviews were held virtually on Zoom and averaged 56 minutes in length. All interview participants were asked to provide consent to be recorded digitally for a transcript to be produced to support analysis. Consent was obtained before all interviews began.

A standard set of interview questions were developed prior to the interviews. Additional questions tailored to each interview participant’s background were prepared for each interview.

1. Can you describe a little bit about your role at the City of New Westminster?

2. What aspects of zoning do you deal with in your current role at the City?

3. Can you elaborate on what specific parts of the Zoning Bylaw and other land use regulations of the City of New West create inequities (e.g., access to housing, transit, employment; impact on equity-seeking groups)?

4. How can we promote equity and inclusion in drafting a Zoning Bylaw?

5. What specific human rights and equity issues should be considered when drafting land use regulations?

6. What are the key challenges we should expect when addressing equity and inclusion in the City of New West?

7. Have there been any zoning amendments done that you think brought more equity in the Bylaw?
Results

Three major themes, accessibility, flexibility, and adaptability, emerged as directions towards which the Zoning Bylaw can be improved to increase equity in the City of New Westminster. These three directions are mentioned repeatedly by interview participants; each of them address the gaps in the Zoning Bylaw in improving the equity outcomes of zoning regulations. Accessibility refers to how the Zoning Bylaw can be written, formatted, and published in a way that is more understandable to different individuals and groups that interact with the document and the process of zoning. Flexibility highlights how the Zoning Bylaw regulations and processes can be more flexible to accommodate the different needs and experiences of the diverse population of the City. Finally, the direction of adaptability focuses on how the Zoning Bylaw can adapt to the city’s current and/or changing priorities, policies, such as, social benefit zoning policies and inclusionary housing policies, and emerging needs from growing population and new industries.

Accessibility

The first theme identified in the six interviews is accessibility. Several interview participants noted how the current Zoning Bylaw is not accessible and approachable to the general public in the way it is written and presented. As one interview participant reflected,

As soon as I came into city government, I looked at [the Zoning Bylaw] as a tool and asked myself who’s it for? How can it be communicated better? And is it a citizen tool? Or is it [for] those that already hold certain degrees of power?

Another interview participant noted the importance of reflecting on the Zoning Bylaw’s legibility and its intended audience when moving toward a more accessible Zoning Bylaw. The Zoning Bylaw’s complexity as a legal document made it not only a tool to help the City forward social equity projects for equity seeking groups, but also sometimes a barrier that might have hindered a lot of progress in many ways as it’s been historically applied. The “clunky and old” Bylaw is also not accessible enough for staff to interpret and leaves a lot of space for interpretation, as one interview participant noted.

It is commonly mentioned that the Zoning Bylaw should use more inclusive and plain language to increase accessibility. One interview participant recommended using language that is more understandable to the vast majority of the residents and the people that the Zoning Bylaw is for. Given the Zoning Bylaw being viewed by different groups in the city, the language of the Bylaw should be more inclusive to avoid generalizations and stereotyping based on race or ethnicity.

Other recommendations from interview participants for improving accessibility of the Zoning Bylaw refer to its format and structure. It is recommended that in future Zoning Bylaw updates, to look at the structure of the Bylaw and consider inserting tables and graphics to increase the legibility of the Bylaw. One participant further suggested that resident guides be provided in the future to give a clearer explanation of the Bylaw for situations where language cannot be plain for legal application of text.
Adaptability

All interview participants addressed the gaps in the Zoning Bylaw to support City priorities and emerging needs from new industries and businesses. As the current Bylaw was consolidated in 2001, the old text of the Bylaw is rigid and may not align with the updated Official Community Plan (OCP) and other policies. Even though the City is nimble and fast to provide support to residents, interview participants expressed that capacity should be built in the Zoning Bylaw to change over time to conform with emerging challenges such as housing affordability and climate action.

Agreement existed among interview participants that the Bylaw should respond to the City’s changing priorities as reflected in the OCP and policies, such as the Inclusionary Housing Policy. Some of the current policies are not well implemented due to the lack of corresponding changes to the Zoning Bylaw. One interview participant provided an example of the inefficacy of the Zoning Bylaw to support strategic priorities:

If you were to develop in your existing zoning, you don’t have to provide inclusionary housing. But if you’re rezoning your property, that’s the sign of... okay, if you want your rezoning, you have to apply these inclusionary components from the inclusionary policy. So it’s just a matter of where you have those requirements and when they get triggered.

Moving the recommended changes from existing policies to the Bylaw is one way to align the Zoning Bylaw with current policies and strategic goals. Another measure brought up by the interview participants is to expand the Crisis Zoning Bylaw Amendment to social benefits land use.

Social benefit zoning policy is frequently mentioned by interview participants as an area of opportunity. It is noted by one interview participant that the current Bylaw has been restricted when it comes to supportive housing and social services types of uses. Another interview participant suggested that “the next step is to look at expanding bylaw amendments, to look at a wider scale of social benefit land uses, and maybe those social benefits land uses we identified in our strategic priorities,” which include affordable housing and affordable childcare. It is suggested that with careful considerations of operators, these social benefits land use should be permitted outright.

The interview participants pointed out that the Zoning Bylaw should be fluid enough to adapt to the changing markets, industries, and emergencies such as the COVID-19 pandemic. One example of emerging needs from new industries is cryptocurrency mining. It is mentioned by one interview participant that there is a gap in the Bylaw to define where such use could be permitted. Changes in the electric vehicle market also brought new conditions to zoning regulation. One example provided in the interviews is the lack of EV charging requirements in previous heritage revitalization agreements in residential zones.

Regarding other future actions toward a more adaptable Zoning Bylaw, one interview participant suggested regularly reevaluating the Zoning Bylaw every few years. It is stated by the participants that a revaluation could look at the requirements or relaxations that were created for anomalies and remove those that are not applicable across the city. Two interview participants noted the role the Zoning Bylaw plays in streamlining the investment process for upper levels of government to contribute their funds towards local projects.
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Flexibility

The direction of flexibility addresses the rigidity of the current Bylaw and points out various areas where it can be flexible so that more diverse uses are allowed to accommodate the needs of different interest groups. By allowing things outright rather than prohibiting things outright in the Zoning Bylaw, the City can have more locations used for the purpose of strategic priorities and encourage creative solutions for issues such as affordability.

In terms of practical ways to improve flexibility of the Zoning Bylaw, the interview participants suggested a focus on single detached dwelling districts and provided ideas such as diversifying housing options, allowing mixed use, and relaxation of requirements in some zones. There already exist mechanisms that increase flexibility and create discretion to current development in the city. Development Permit Guidelines were frequently mentioned in the interviews as one tool to provide flexibility. It is stated by one interview participant that the staff tend to move as many requirements and guidelines outside of the specific number in the black and white Zoning Bylaw to avoid putting development applicants and homeowners through the time-consuming rezoning process. The Development Permit guidelines ensure a development conforms to the City’s expectation regarding future development and growth. The Heritage Revitalization Agreements (HRA) Policy also plays a key role in contributing to flexibility of land use regulation. As described by one interview participant, an HRA acts like rezoning, but allows for flexibility to meet the needs of a specific site. The HRA process is not codified and considers only what is appropriate for the site for the intent of heritage preservation. This made it very site-specific and flexible towards requirements that are listed in the Zoning Bylaw. Another example of previous works that bring more flexibility in the Zoning Bylaw to support social benefits use is the expansion of outright permitted use with some conditions for youth in foster care in all one- and two-unit dwelling districts.

Among all the potential areas of improvement, single-detached dwelling districts are one of the areas brought up most frequently by the interviewees. Flexibility in the currently restrictive Zoning Bylaw can provide opportunity for greater density in these districts to combat the affordability crisis. One interview participant stated:

How density can be increased in single family districts is a very important part of making the Zoning Bylaw...having a greater impact in equity seeking groups, which are impacted by the affordability crisis.

It is noted by this interview participant that land is locked up in the single-family zoning districts. With a limited land base for development, a large part of the City is zoned for one- and two-unit lots where there could be more flexibility. Another interview participant observed that single-detached dwelling districts have a greater number of requirements than compared to other zones.

In the previous review of the Zoning Bylaw, one interviewee stated, the city removed some requirements in single-detached dwelling districts to create flexibility to building secondary suites. All unnecessary requirements were removed, leaving only key life safety requirements to make it easier for additional suites to be put into existing houses.

Flexibility for diverse housing types and ownership is another theme identified in the interview. A couple of interviewees suggested that single-detached dwelling districts should be more flexible to accommodate cultural differences. It is argued that the current Zoning Bylaw is biased towards single family uses and there is a gap in providing diverse types and ownerships of housing to address the needs of a diverse and expanding population. Multi-family housing and co-housing One interview participant proposed a more standard development for infill townhouses in single-detached dwelling districts and existing neighbourhoods.
As one solution to create flexibility in one- and two-unit zoning districts, expansion of permitted uses are frequently mentioned by interview participants. The benefits of such changes to the current restrictive zoning scheme are beyond promoting affordability. In terms of permitted land use, broadening land use categories, permitting social benefits uses throughout the city and relaxation of certain requirements such as minimum parking requirements were also brought up by several interview participants as important next steps for a future Zoning Bylaw update. Transformation of industrial districts in Queensborough was referred to as an example of why expanded uses are needed. It is acknowledged by one interview participant that the impact of online commerce has shifted land use demand from industrial to “extra light industrial.” The current permitted uses for areas that used to be power centres in the 1990s are no longer in demand. The current Bylaw is restricting some of the potential of these lands, as one interview participant asked:

Those power centers of the 90s are bygones, and everyone is kind of starting to relook at them and what can they be? Can they be a mix, kind of service and extra light industrial?

It is argued by one interview participant that, for industrial uses, a broader land use category would streamline the process of regulation. This interview participant put forward this example:

If they’re talking about broom manufacturing or widget manufacturing. It’s both manufacturing uses in general and that allows us to be... If it’s a manufacturer of any type, regardless of the goods, then it’s a permitted use and so you’ll have to apply that same sort of discretion lens.

Broadening the land use category would allow the staff to apply less discretion in terms of what specific uses could be allowed, and make the Zoning Bylaw less restrictive to all kinds of business and industries that the City can support and bring in.

To better utilize the scarce land in the City and increase inclusivity, it is suggested that the City could further support the use of land for social benefits, from allowing them through comprehensive development zones to allowing them as permitted use with conditions throughout one- and two-unit dwelling districts, which take up a large portion of the city's land. These social benefits uses can be any uses that address the City’s strategic priorities areas, such as affordability and childcare, and uses that better address the needs of various equity-seeking groups in the City.

Among all kinds of relaxation of requirements that can be considered for promoting flexibility, parking requirements were highlighted by two interview participants as one big area of relaxation. One interview participant referred to a Metro Vancouver report that points out lower demand of parking from renters and low-income housing near transit, arguing that the current Zoning Bylaw may require more parking than needed, especially in a time when the City thrives to move forward to less automobile-dominated forms of transportation. The reduced requirement on parking can also leave space for affordable housing and child care, which are the current priorities in the City.

There are issues to consider when applying the above flexibility approaches to zoning regulation, as addressed in the interviews. First of all, while the HRAs policy provide a channel to encourage creativity and introduce flexibility in the process of heritage preservation, there exists some non-conforming uses that was allowed in history and not align with current regulation today. A zoning bylaw update will provide an opportunity to address the issue. For social benefits uses to be allowed citywide, one interview participant is concerned about the selection of operators for those service providers. It is suggested that the City should continue to carefully examine the qualification of operators to bring appropriate services, even though this is not required by the current Bylaw.
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Tools

The following tools can aid the City of New Westminster as it undertakes a comprehensive rezoning process.

Decision-Making Framework

To determine the regulations that will be included in its new Zoning Bylaw, the City of Edmonton developed a decision-making framework. This framework seeks to answer two fundamental questions about the regulations:

1. Should the Zoning Bylaw regulate this?
2. If yes, then to what degree should it be regulated?

To answer each of these questions, a set of guiding principles for decision-making were established (see Figure D1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should we regulate it?</th>
<th>If yes, then to what degree?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Legal obligation: Do we have a legal requirement to regulate this topic?</td>
<td>• Health &amp; Safety: What level of regulation is required to protect the health and safety of residents and the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy alignment: Does regulating this topic align with the City Plan and other strategic policies and directions on land use and development?</td>
<td>• Risks &amp; Trade-offs: What are the risks &amp; trade-offs associated with different degrees of regulation for the topic and what is acceptable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scope is clearly definable: Can the scope of the topic be clearly defined and understood?</td>
<td>• Consequences: What is the most cost-effective way to regulate the topic to achieve the desired outcome - for the public, businesses and government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good planning practices/principles: Is it best practice to pursue regulating this topic with available data and literature?</td>
<td>• Consistency and timeliness of approval processes: Would the degree of regulation affect permitting and approval processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholder and public input: Do city residents support regulating this topic?</td>
<td>• Predictability: Are the regulations and associated permitting requirements understandable and predictable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land use impact: Will not regulating this topic create land use impacts, either locally or city-wide?</td>
<td>• Land use impact: The degree of regulation should be proportional to the potential impact of not regulating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measuring land use impact: Is it possible to objectively measure the impact of the topic or will subjective measures be relied upon?</td>
<td>• City impact on local scale and city-wide scale: The degree and method of regulation must consider whether the impact of the topic applies locally or city-wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weighing up the risks involved: What are the risks and trade-offs of regulating/not regulating and how much risk should be taken on this topic?</td>
<td>• Monitoring: Can the regulations be monitored for effectiveness and continued relevance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enforceability: Can compliance with the regulation be easily determined, and can it be enforced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alternative means of regulation: Is the Zoning Bylaw the only feasible way for this topic to be regulated, or are there alternative means such as other bylaws or standards that would be more appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As previously discussed, the formatting of the Zoning Bylaw can greatly enhance its legibility. Several examples of formatting features from different municipalities are provided to offer inspiration for the City of New Westminster.

The City of Hartford, Connecticut use a common format throughout its zoning regulations. In addition to the use of tables and illustrations, the zoning regulations also provide key information on how to interpret the zoning code by including a “How to Use this Code” section.
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The Town of Pelham in Ontario is in the process of preparing a new Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw that uses a hybrid model to permit more flexibility and better represent current development trends and diversity of uses in the Town. The draft of the new Bylaw makes use of photos and diagrams, including the use of letter symbols, to visually represent the regulations.

Figure D3: Draft Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw from the Town of Pelham, 2022.
# Best Practices

The following list of best practices were compiled based on the literature review and case studies conducted by the project team. The practices are organized by which direction the practice most reflects. In updating its Zoning Bylaw, the City of New Westminster should review the list of best practices and determine the applicability of their use based on the zoning approach selected.

## Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Increase the amount of density permitted in various zoning districts with an intended goal of promoting infill development and providing a diversity of housing options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot sizes</td>
<td>Reduce the minimum lot size of selected zoning districts to promote infill development and allow for a variety of housing types and form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Dwellings</td>
<td>Permit or conditionally allow attached dwellings in all residential zoning districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Permit or conditionally allow accessory dwelling units in all residential zoning districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Requirements</td>
<td>Remove parking minimums for new developments and, based on the area of the city, use open option parking, where property owners and businesses can determine the amount of parking provided, or parking maximums, where a restricted number of parking spaces can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Patterns</td>
<td>Create typologies that blend use, dimensional, and development standards into a unified whole. These typologies are used to create forms of development that are authorized in the various zoning districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Zoning</td>
<td>Create multiple districts for aspects such as use, height, and density. These different districts come together to create a composite zoning district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Neighbour Guidelines</td>
<td>Guide intensification and densification of single detached dwelling districts to be accommodating to neighbourhood preferences in built form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Accessibility

#### Enhance Understanding of the Zoning Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident’s Guide to the Bylaw</td>
<td>Create a resident’s guide for the Zoning Bylaw that provides a more clear language explanation of bylaw regulations for instances where language cannot be plain for legal application of the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning 101 Workshop</td>
<td>Host workshops that are open to the public to attend that will explain the zoning bylaw, how to read it, and how many of the processes involved in zoning occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning 101 Video</td>
<td>Provide a “Zoning 101” video explaining the basics of zoning and how to use the Zoning Bylaw on the web page for the Zoning Bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Flow Charts</td>
<td>Provide flow charts explaining different permitting and approval processes and their associated timelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation Services</td>
<td>Provide access to non-English readers through the providing the Bylaw or Resident’s Guide in other languages or providing translation services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Intents</td>
<td>Provide an explanation of the purpose and intent of zoning districts and regulations and an explanation of their relationship to city policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use</td>
<td>Use plain language to the greatest extent possible an ensuring language used in the Bylaw is inclusive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Improve Formatting of the Zoning Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Principles</td>
<td>Utilize good design principles when formatting the Bylaw, including the use of blank space, use of large type faces, use of subheadings, and use of short lines of text. Avoid clutter pages and bold important headings within the Bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables and Illustrations</td>
<td>Use tables and illustrations when appropriate to provide clarity and make the document more understandable. Tables and illustrations can be used to clarify definitions, distinguish between related terms, and demonstrate application of regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop-ups and Hyperlinks</td>
<td>Throughout the Bylaw, create pop-ups or hyperlink to any referenced definition or other zoning district to enhance navigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Uses</td>
<td>Create an index list of uses that can be used to find the specific zone in which that use is permitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Historical Context and Development

Brow of the Hill

Brow of the Hill was developed during the city’s boom years around 1912 as a suburban area. It was and still is a primarily working-class neighbourhood with affordable housing of diverse building forms and sizes. The neighbourhood is located adjacent to industrial areas along the Fraser River with pockets of light industry in the southwest area of the neighbourhood itself. There have also been commercial land uses, particularly along Twelfth Street, and corner stores scattered throughout, some of which still exist. The neighbourhood has a well-defined street grid with access to the riverfront. The streets vary with some short streets, dead ends, courtyards, and back lanes (some of which are named and act as streets).

Residential Neighbourhoods

1. Queensborough
2. Connaught Heights
3. West End
4. Moody Park
5. Brow of the Hill
6. Glenbrooke North
7. Queen’s Park
8. Massey Victory Heights
9. McBride Sapperton

D. Downtown (including Quayside)

Twelfth Street and Eighth Street are major roads in the neighbourhood and Stewardson Way is a major thoroughfare separating the neighbourhood from the riverfront industrial lands. There are many street trees, treed courtyards, front yards, and gardens as well as Simcoe and Riverside parks. Post World War II the neighbourhood saw the conversion of existing houses into multi-family residences as well as the construction of many apartment buildings.
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Connaught Heights

This neighbourhood is located at the far western reaches of New Westminster and was the most recent to be incorporated into the city in 1965. Its location away from downtown with a history of provincial jurisdiction led to a slightly later development. Housing began being developed here around 1910, but much came later in the 1930s. It wasn’t until 1938 that the province passed administration onto New Westminster. In 1948, the establishment of the Connaught Heights Regulated Area brought about stricter building regulations, a zoning plan, and streetlights. In 1959, the residents petitioned to join the City of New Westminster, but nothing came of it. In 1961, a plebiscite garnered 56% in favor of joining New Westminster but was just shy of the required 60%. In 1964 a petition passed with 90% in favor of amalgamation, and it was annexed in 1965. Although it has no major through traffic, it is and has been a transportation corridor. The Interurban Railway ran through the neighbourhood and now the 22nd Street Skytrain station is located here. It is also surrounded by some major thoroughfares of Marine Drive, Stewardson Way, Southridge Drive, and Twelfth Street. The Annacis Highway interchange is also nearby leading to lots of traffic around the neighbourhood. Its location near the Riverfront industrial area led to the development of working-class houses, mostly bungalows. Because of its rural roots and late coming to the city it wasn’t until 1972 that it received a large capital works program to upgrade its substandard infrastructure. In 2000, the neighbourhood had a homeownership rate of 60% (48% city-wide) and the highest portion of immigrants in the city except for Queensborough.

Glenbrooke North

Glenbrooke North became part of the city in 1888 but it was not until after the turn of the century that construction of buildings began south of Eighth Avenue along Fifth Street. The neighbourhood contains or abuts both Terry Hughes Park and Queen’s Park. The neighbourhood’s original development was shaped by the Glenbrooke Creek and ravine which had not been considered by the Royal Engineers when they laid the street grid over the topography. This terrain produced varied lot sizes throughout the neighbourhood. In 1914 the ravine was filled in for the creation of a city combined sewer. The City also located their public works yard and substation on Ovens Avenue in 1948. Also, in this post-war time period a swath of land that had been acquired by the federal government for wartime purposes became a large 133-unit apartment complex for returning veterans. The neighbourhood’s close proximity to Queen’s Park neighbourhood brought some of the housing styles of that area further north, while also containing a mix of more houses from various styles over time. Commercial growth occurred along Sixth Street including the Royal Square Shopping Centre.
Downtown

Downtown is the heart and initial residential settlement in New Westminster. It is and was a hub of industry, transportation by both land and sea, and a commercial center. The neighbourhood contains a small-scale street grid that was originally planned by the Royal Engineers. There is now a diverse mix of land uses including administrative, government, education, commercial, industrial, residential, and greenspace and tourist destinations. The area has always had a strong focus on the riverfront port and the commercial buildings that were constructed on Columbia and Front Streets. There is also lots of transportation in the area including the port and railways as well as Royal Avenue and two Skytrain stations. The neighbourhood developed around the riverfront industry with many working-class households. This included a large population of immigrants and was the site of the city’s first Chinatown. In 1898, early in the city’s history, there was a great fire that destroyed almost all of the downtown and left nearly half of the city’s residents without homes. Thanks to the strong industry, the city was quickly able to begin reconstructing. Many larger homes were located in the city’s first suburban development of Albert Crescent while smaller, modest homes were more centrally located. On the eastern side of downtown some three story apartment buildings were built and highrise apartments would follow mostly in the western part. Many multi-story brick buildings were built for commercial use along Columbia Street, which following World War II, became a major commercial destination in the region gaining itself the name of the Golden Mile. The commercial area expanded north changing the land use from residential to retail, but hit a road bump when the Woodward’s department store opened in Uptown in 1954. That same year the New Westminster Downtown Business and Property Owners Association formed to reverse the trend of shoppers going Uptown. Then in 1958, the Front Street Parkade opened thinking more parking would attract more shoppers and effectively blocking off the waterfront from downtown. The continuing shift in retail to shopping malls and the Uptown neighbourhood presented challenges to the Downtown’s vitality. Along with this shift in shopping came a shift in living to the newer, further out neighbourhoods as well. The First Capital City Development Company was founded in 1977 with the objective to redevelop the downtown core and waterfront in accordance with the Downtown Community Plan and the City’s first Official Community Plan from 1978. As industry has declined in the city many more people are moving into the downtown neighbourhood with a 22% increase between 2001 and 2006 (NHCS). The neighbourhood has a higher share of residents living in apartments than the city-wide average and still has a large share of immigrants at 32%. Much of the riverfront area has been redeveloped and revitalized through projects such as the Westminster Quay Public Market, Plaza 88 development, Waterfront Esplanade Park, and the Westminster Pier Park as part of the City’s vision for a continuous waterfront experience.

Massey-Victory Heights

This neighbourhood was originally laid out as a subdivision with smaller suburban lots and larger country lots that acted as a rural, agricultural area. Established in 1946, much of the original development and streetscapes are intact. There are areas within the neighbourhood that break from the street grid reflecting the new residential development ideas of the period. Until World War II the primary land use in this area was the city’s reservoir and agriculture but after the war it became highly sought after for residential development. The houses reflect this as most of them were built in the post-war period and represent multiple styles. Much of the land was opened up for land exclusively to returning veterans for prices at 60% of the assessed land value. This complemented the nearby Glenbrooke Apartments at Sixth Avenue and McBride Ave which were constructed by the Federal government for returning veterans. In the 1950s the McBride Apartments (now Massey Apartments) and the Royal City Shopping Plaza were constructed on McBride Avenue between Eighth and Tenth Avenues. The last vacant land in the neighbourhood was subdivided in the 1970s. In the 1990s the Massey-Victory Heights Residents Association was established.
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McBride-Sapperton

McBride-Sapperton was developed as a separate community outside of New Westminster on the site of the camp for the Royal Engineers. They laid out a gridded street pattern that persists today and contains small residential lots. Columbia Street acts as a central corridor where much of the commercial land use is centered. The edges of the community are determined by the Glenbrooke ravine and the Brunette River. The development of St. Mary the Virgin Anglican Church established Sapperton as a permanent community in 1865. It was not until 1889 that New Westminster expanded their boundaries to incorporate Sapperton. There was much important industry in the neighbourhood including sawmills, the Royal Columbian Hospital, and the New Westminster Brewery which were some of the city’s largest employers for decades. It was also the location of the BC Penitentiary which closed in 1980. Much of the neighbourhood remains single-family homes with some apartments along Columbia Avenue, but it did not see as much intensification as other neighbourhoods. Households living in apartments was 25% lower than the city-wide average in 2006. The neighbourhood has short walkable streets within but is still connected to the region with Brunette Avenue leading to the Trans-Canada Highway. There is also the Sapperton Skytrain station on Brunette Avenue and the Braid station on the edge of the neighbourhood. The old age of the neighbourhood gives it historical significance with working-class roots and many in the neighbourhood refer to it as a “layman’s Queens Park.” In 2002 the New Westminster City Council voted to rezone both sides of Columbia Street along the Sapperton commercial corridor to allow four story buildings.

Moody Park

Moody Park was surveyed by the Royal Engineers in 1859 and was incorporated into the city in 1888. It is diverse ethnically, economically, and in the age of its residents. The streets adhere to the grid pattern with the 25-acre Moody Park, which hosts sporting activities and other events, as its cornerstone. The neighbourhood is walkable with many commercial amenities located on Sixth Avenue and Sixth Street, including the site of the Woodward’s department store. Subdivision of the area began west of Tenth Street prior to 1890 in anticipation of the interurban railway. The park itself was created by the City at this same time and residential development, mostly bungalows, began to occur along Sixth Avenue near the park. The lots in this neighbourhood are more uniform than others with most set at a depth of 132-feet and a width of 50-feet. In the post-war period the southeast quadrant of the neighbourhood saw many apartment buildings constructed along Twelfth Street south of Eighth Avenue.

Quayside

Quayside, while having been part of the city since its beginning, is a relatively new residential neighbourhood. It was the location of early waterfront industry including the site of the Pacific Coast Terminals deep sea port. It did not undergo a post-war transformation and remained heavily industrial until its revitalization in the 1980s. This revitalization was part of the City’s connected waterfront vision and was marked by a shift to residential development, notably the Plaza 88 development. The housing that existed prior to revitalization was considered some of the poorest quality and most overcrowded in the city. It had mostly catered to working-class households with its proximity to warehouse and transportation industries as well as to the early Chinatown and Downtown. Additionally, it has been the site of a waterfront market since the 1960s which was also revitalized in 1985 and reopened as the Waterfront Quay Public Market. The new housing has developed as towers with low-rise buildings near the river followed by the high-rise towers behind them. The development includes pedestrian only areas, shopping centers, parks, and green spaces along the waterfront creating a livable waterfront community. This development also included two housing co-ops, Westminster Landing Housing Co-operative and Riverbend Housing Co-op.
Queen’s Park

Queen’s Park is one of the older and more stately neighbourhoods in the city. It was an early site of agricultural activity as well as some larger estate lots. Much of the residential and commercial construction occurred during the boom years prior to 1913. The Royal Engineers marked out the streets to include both small streets as well as wide, landscaped boulevards, land reserves, and squares. This also included the 75.5 acre Queen’s Park on the neighbourhood’s eastern edge and planning for legislative buildings before the provincial capital was moved to Victoria. The first house was constructed in 1862 and the neighbourhood acquired services earlier than most other areas. While Albert Crescent was intended to be the esteemed neighbourhood in the city, Queen’s Park quickly took over that role. There are many large single-family homes on large lots including many of historic architectural significance and heritage. Throughout the years the neighbourhood has received lots of planning and building attention being regionally recognized for its character and aesthetics. However, there were some periods of challenging times. During the great depression some homes reverted back to the City for an inability to pay taxes and many of these were torn down. During World War II, the federal government overruled the zoning bylaws in the city to allow residences to be converted into suites to meet housing shortages. This change was only repealed a decade after the war ended. In 1955, the local zoning board permitted older multi-story houses considered “obsolete” to be replaced by more fashionable one-story houses adding to the mix of housing types in the neighbourhood. Then in 1963, City policies began allowing the construction of apartment buildings in part of the neighbourhood. Many of the houses that had been converted into suites began to be returned to single-family residences in the 1970s and a residents’ association was formed. Queen’s Park residents played a central role in the foundation of citywide heritage preservation societies. In 1987, parts of the area that allowed apartment construction were returned to single-family zoning and in 1993 engagement was conducted for a heritage management plan which determined that smaller lot development and infill housing were perceived as negatively impacting the neighbourhood.

Queensborough

Queensborough has a history of early industry and agriculture and was surveyed into large lots to accommodate these purposes. This resulted in few original land owners in the area with only about 200 residents. It remained primarily an agricultural and industrial settlement since it was incorporated into the City of New Westminster until the 1920s. In 1907 Alexander Ewan, a large land owner, died and his land was subdivided into smaller, affordable lots creating a first small jump in residential development. A second bout of residential construction occurred during the interwar period when the population jumped up to 1500-2000 people. An immensely diverse population was attracted to Queensborough for job opportunities and cheap land. It has one of the oldest Sikh communities, a large Italian community, Japanese and Scandinavian fishing settlements, and many Chinese people who moved from Chinatown for work. In 2001, 46% of the population were immigrants and while the average income was relatively low ($23,791), there was a homeownership rate of 61%, which was the highest in the city at the time. Due to the neighbourhood’s remote location in relation to the rest of the city and its unique geographic characteristics, like its high water table, it has a range of rural, industrial, and suburban landscapes with relatively little urban infrastructure. In 1966 a lack of sewer and septic systems halted residential construction in the neighbourhood with an official moratorium taking place in 1969. The Queensborough Plan was adopted in 1971 and sewer construction began in 1979. In 1990 Queensborough OCP amendments are the first new subdivision opens. Because of the unique soil characteristics and other limitation on building much of the new housing constructed is in the form of townhouses. There may be concerns about how this form of housing impacts the vulnerable sewer system in the neighbourhood. There had not been much commercial development until the Queensborough Landing development received approval in 2001 which brought many large box stores to the area.
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Uptown

The Uptown neighbourhood began as another area of residential development with houses ranging in era from 1890s to the 1980s. There is still a mix of building types including pre-WWII cottages, modest post-war homes, apartment buildings, and early modernist institutions striking a balance between a small town and modern city. Early development was mostly of larger homes moving their way up the hill from the affluent Queen’s Park but following World War II the area developed into a major commercial hub and alternative to the commercial corridor downtown on Columbia Street. This was due in large part to the opening of the Woodward’s department store and brought about an increase in affordable and worker’s housing as well as the construction of apartment buildings. The neighbourhood now boasts high and low-rise apartments, mixed housing types, and varied retail buildings for both individual, small businesses as well as malls. The first high-rise apartment in New Westminster opened here in 1957 which was followed by several more in the 1960s. In 2006, 94.3% of housing in the neighbourhood was apartments and 56% of the population lived alone. The Westminster Mall, now Royal City Mall, was constructed in 1978. Now dealing with its own competition with regional shopping areas the Uptown Business Improvement District was established in 2014.

West End

West End was surveyed by the Royal Engineers but was long used as an agricultural area and was incorporated into the city in 1888. Several farmhouses sprang up along Sixth Avenue in the 1890s but it was not until the interwar years that the neighbourhood experienced the “bungalow boom.” This began to establish the West End as a modest counterpart to Queen’s Park with working-class roots. The streets follow the grid pattern laid out by the Engineers and contain relatively uniform lots throughout with a mix of housing types, styles, and sizes. The neighbourhood is relatively walkable with commercial development established along its eastern edge on Twelfth Street although it used to have many corner stores throughout. In 1984 a residents association was formed and today it has a high number of homeowners (71%) when compared to the city-wide average (48%). Notably, the neighbourhood has a lack of green space with Grimston Park in the neighbourhood’s southwest accounting for nearly all of it.