

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Neutral
No		Neutral		Neutral		Yes		Yes
Yes		Neutral		No	I do agree to limiting the size to avoid giant homes being built to house multiple families	Yes		Yes
Yes		No	Storage of RV/boats on sp expensive at commercial places, why not let some air owners benefit from allowing storage of them. They could be an eyesore but so is farm stuff. Better than neighborhoods having massive RVs in front of their house which is currently allowed in	Yes		Yes		Neutral
Neutral		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral		Yes		No		Yes		Yes
Yes		No	I would only suggest vehicles are not seen from roadways directly adjacent to properties	Yes	Homes should not be 2000 square meters which will Only encourage multi family living. Possibly cap at 800 to 1000 square meters	No	500 square meters is quite acceptable. The value is is the land, if someone can afford a farm with a 4300 square foot home they can find a way to afford a 5300 square foot home	No
Yes		Yes	Sotring non farm vehicles etc are an environmental hazard. We need farms, not junk yards.	Neutral		Yes		No
No		No		Yes		Yes		Yes
No		No		No		Yes		No
No	People need to eat local. Utilization for crops other than blueberries	No		No	Use the farmland for farming as there's nothing wrong with the soil	Yes	Allows for multi generational living	Yes
Yes	It is always so disappointing to see Agricultural Land turned into estate properties instead. Increasing the minimum lot size to do so, should help discourage this practice.	Yes	I grew up on an ARL zoned property without strict rules about vehicle parking. Now, the neighboring property is housing up to 60 recreational vehicles and making a huge profit off of it. They cleared their entire land and put up a parking lot. It is a disgusting misuse of the intention for the land (*specific property not in Pitt Meadows).	Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes	I strongly suggest looking at Christina Gemino's Thesis "The silent death of agriculture in Metro Vancouver: when farmland protection isn't enough." ( <a href="https://summit.sfu.ca/item/39340">https://summit.sfu.ca/item/39340</a> ). She is now a Planner for the Township of Langley and her research supports these motions.	Neutral		Yes		Neutral
Yes	No	Yes	No	Neutral	No	No	Considering more than one generation may live in the same house it's not enough.	No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral		Yes		Yes		Yes		No
Neutral	I would like the agricultural land to be protected.	No	I do not support the storing of vehicle restrictions. I have been part of the fifty 567 Chevy club. There were a few people who stored their vehicles on their farmland in Pitt and Ridge. They are beautiful cars and bring lots of joy and work to the owners. I understand insurance can be an issue but add a caveat about needing insurance (storage, collector or everyday use). These cars are beautiful and most people who have collector cars care for them immensely.  I do agree junk vehicles and such being put on farmland and left to rot. Those ones should not be allowed to happen!	No	How would this work for long narrow properties like my own. Any barns or coops built would need to be further back from the road. Animals get spooked easily, especially horses. Then add in the fact that coyotes, bears and cougars roam the streets. Livestock need to be protected. Also thievery is on the rise. Farmland is an easy target. Also what happens if a farm animal escapes the barn. If it is close to the road it could get hurt.	Yes		Neutral
No		No	As a land owner you should be able to use your land for what is best for you as long as within normal guidelines. I think this is an overreach of power.	No	An overreach of government.	No		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes	i assume current 20 a parcels are grandfathered and the intent is to stop speculation and stop potential developers or current owners from reaping profits by subdividing their 40 a + parcels so this is a good thing.	Yes	addresses current violations..providing there is teeth in the zoning bylaws and its enforced.	Yes	I assume the drawing is example only and as long as house is not in the middle or back of parcel but is closest to the road it is allowable? or must it be in ONE corner only?	Don't Know	Can city have different rulings than ALC?	Don't Know

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
Yes		Yes	I don't see an issue with storing RVs or trailers for gain but within some type of maximum (e.g., no more than one non-personal RV or trailer to be stored on the property for financial gain).	Yes		Yes		No
Neutral		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral		No		Yes		Yes		No
Yes		No		Yes		Yes		Neutral
Yes		Neutral		Yes		Neutral		No
No	Where will all the water go if we don't have the Ag land to absorb it! The dykes were full a few years back with water no where to go, flooding in neighbors homes	Yes		No		Yes		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Don't Know		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Don't Know	I think it would make more sense to break out the house size on how many actual separate living quarters exist in the home. If its 3,600 with 1 living space that seems reasonable. But if you have a suite or two equal size living spaces under one roof, then a maximum of 5,300 would be fair. I think more detailed restrictions around multiple dwellings within the home are needed rather than the overall home size.	No
No		Yes		Yes		Yes		No
No	No you would be taking away farmers livelihoods	No		No		No		No
Yes		Yes	How will this be enforced? If it's only on a complaint basis, everyone will keep breaking the rules and hope no one complains. Meanwhile, more trailers and semi trucks move in for storage.	Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral		No	Real farmers should be allowed to have methods for supplemental income.	Neutral		Yes		No
No		No		No		No		No
No	Think it is time to start building more housing and mix use commercial and residential	Yes		No		No		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
No		No	Should be allowed to park what ever a farmer like on his own land	No		No		No
Don't Know		Neutral		Yes		Yes		Neutral
		Yes		Yes		Yes		No
Yes	Prioritize agriculture or estates	Yes		Yes	Similar to MR regulations	Yes		Don't Know
No		No		No	Some people don't want their homes right next to the road. They want privacy and quiet, which would be more suited to buildings away from the road.	Yes		No

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
No		Neutral	I think storage of recreational vehicles inside unused agricultural building such as unused barns space is okay but NOT using farmland as a big parking lot for unlimited recreational vehicles	Yes	I support limits on residential building on agricultural land if necessary, but I do NOT support rezoning of agricultural land for more residential housing.	Yes		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		No	People that live in condos need places to store there RV Cheaper than storage lots.	Yes		Yes		No
No	I don't want to see Pitt meadows farm land become subdivision galore for builders who want to purchase land. Everything should remain as is.	Yes		Yes	Again I do not want to see Pitt meadows become full of new builds because owners are selling land to developers. This seems to stop that.	Yes		Yes
No		No		No		No		No
No		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		No		Yes		Yes		Yes
No		No		No		No		No
Yes		Yes		Don't Know	What about larger families that farm a piece of land? What about adding additional dwellings for multi-generational farmers?  Very few people will be able to afford a career in farming by purchasing a farm in Pitt Meadows. If families cannot pass on their farm without expanding their living space are we actually protecting our farm land?  How many years would it take for multi-generational farms to apply for new zoning?	Yes		Don't Know
Yes		No		No		Yes		No
No		No		No		No		Yes
Yes	Make it easier ti regulate and combining all so it's used correctly	Yes		Yes		Yes	Make it farm land for farming	Yes
Yes	No there should be one code or agricultural land so it is used correctly	Yes		Yes	Yes to continue the correct use of agricultural land	Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Neutral	yes overall but concerns for the multi generational living. Which is a major pro of these large homes.	Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes	Not at this time	No		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral		No		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral	I agree with preserving ag land and keeping properties bigger to discourage non farming	Neutral	Having a couple for income doesn't bother me, but we all know this always gets out of control at some point.	Yes	Too much farm land has been damaged due to huge unnecessary houses and the bringing in of rocky, contaminated fill	Yes		Neutral
Neutral	Make the agricultural use permanent and property is continued to be used as intended ie a livestock farm is kept as livestock or thereby used. If desired the option to transition to a primarily livestock property should be encouraged whereas transitioning to a harvesting property should be discouraged unless the local need increases for product.	Yes	Livestock trailers and they should be well defined should be exempt.	Yes	Housing size should be limited as well. As well as a maximum of personal vehicles on the property insured or otherwise.	Yes	Should be half of the current size. There is zero need for housing to be 3500sq ft or more. It's a farm not a high rise.	Yes
Yes		Yes		No		Yes		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
Yes		Neutral	There needs to be a better approach to wording parking regulation changes. Unlicensed non-ag vehicle storage in an enclosed space is unpalatable and unrealistic. We have two machines on our property that could be considered construction machines, they are unlicensed but are necessary for snow clearing and for property restoration work. In order to enclose them we would need to construct a very large structure on our property which is both expensive and restricted due to property size. I understand and agree with restricting parking to eliminate problematic uses and there just needs to be more effort put into wording the changes.	Don't Know	This is exactly the issue I point out in response to the question about enclosing unlicensed non-ag vehicles. If there's no room to construct a building to contain large equipment within the allowable location and the vehicles are necessary how is this change going to work (with minimal or no investment of time in processes)? I agree that restricting construction on valuable farm land is critical but how to implement it without creating unworkable situations is important. Is a shed to store farming equipment considered a residential use? Who determines what is residential storage vs agricultural storage?	Yes	I believe floor area on larger parcels should also be restricted!	No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		No	I believe if an owner of 20+ acres would like to store rv's,boats, specialty vehicles for a fee, as long as strict regulations are followed it should be allowed.	Yes		No	If I have ALR property and want to build a home to house my large family, I believe I should have that right.	Yes
Yes		Neutral	I support a limit, but the number may be too low. How was the limit determined?	Neutral	I understand the reasoning behind keeping farmland useful, but what is the difference between having the house at the back of the property and using farmland in front vs behind?	No		No
Yes		No		Yes		No		No
Neutral		No		No		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral		Yes		No		Yes		Neutral
No		No		No	Why force a farmer to build their home close to the road. The footprint remains the same if multiple buildings are at different locations. This is someone's property, they should have the ability to build on their property where they want for best use, privacy, and personal needs/wants.	Neutral		Yes
Neutral		Yes		Neutral		Yes		Yes
Neutral		Yes		No		No		No
No	All of these designations can have very different uses, different types of ownership which likely won't be fully understood until after the change has been made and the residents/ farmers will then have to work around a bylaw that is being changed for What reason and what significant positive gain.	No	I do not understand the need for this bylaw change? How are the municipality and residents negatively affected by the parking of vehicles? People have purchased these properties under existing long standing guidelines and bylaws and should have the right to use their private property as they see fit. Additionally, in some cases, properties are affordable due to the ability to park vehicles there and owners have purchased them with that provision in mind. Housing has become unaffordable and it makes no sense for the municipality to put more restrictions/barriers on property owners.	No	What is the problem this bylaw is attempting to solve? More blanket restrictions prevent property owners from using their private property as they see fit. Different configurations may be advantageous for the landowners and the municipality would take that away. This seems like regulation for the sake of regulation.	No	This bylaw dictates how property owners can use their land. This is an infringement on their rights. What if they have a large family and need a larger home. The city has no right to determine the size of home property owners may need.	No
Yes	Keep Pitt Meadows green, no subdivisions on agricultural land.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral		No		No		No		No
No	Increase the minimum size for subdivision in all the zones.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Neutral	I am not a farm land owner, so don't want to step in where I shouldn't. I appreciate any steps to simplify the process on all sides. I grew up on a farm, in SK. And I talk a lot with farmers here. AND I am not a fan of HUGE glittery homes on farm land. I want farm land to be farmed.	Yes	Farm land is for farming, beyond family home(s) and supportive structures related to farming. The concept of storing all the campers and boats of the City folks, on farm land makes no sense.	Neutral	Here is an issue I know happens: Traditionally, on farms, the land is passed down to the oldest boy. Know some farms like this locally, grew up in a farm community. HOWEVER, locally, there are farms where the 2nd child, or 3rd, 4th, wants to stay on the homestead. In the cases I am aware of, they are either also working on that farm, or want to start farm related businesses, like micro greens... These are also the original settler homes, people here 100 years or more, farming that land. And finding ways to be viable with climate change and other things happening. In the cases of these Heritage Farm Lots, I would like to see some flexibility with home building, so that if the 3rd or 4th generation wants to live on the property, they can; and this might take some figuring out to place homes ideally. This would be a universal statement for the questions below as well. I would like to see such a designation, possibly only allow prefabricated homes so they can be moved off the land once the family sells, or no related family wants to live there any more.	Yes	Farm land is for farming. I grew up on farms, we lived in small farm houses. No monster homes should be allowed. What farmer can afford that anyway? I mentioned pre-fabricated homes above, that could work more in line with fitting a need at a period of time, then being moved off land, when no longer needed, like sale of land, change of requirements for workers, etc. HOWEVER, if there are children of long time Pitt Meadows farmers, or their grandchildren, where we are at now; there should be an ability for them to stay on the land, in a suitable dwelling. Farmers usually pass property to oldest sibling, which is inherently not fair for the other siblings. Often the oldest MALE. Again, not fair or just. So there must be options for the other siblings who are working on that farm in farming related ways.	Don't Know
No		No		No		No		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
No		Yes		Neutral		No	Have one max size.	No
No	I think there us no room gor anything other then agriculture	Yes		No	Leave this area agraculture	No		Yes
Yes		Yes		Neutral		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		No		No		No
Neutral		Yes		Yes		Yes		Neutral
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
No		Neutral		No		No		Neutral
No	It would eliminate my financial ability to continue my small farm practices	No	Property activity should not be governed by the city some people have farm operations and store rvs for others	No	A home can be located anywhere on the property to be able to run farm operations, and in some cases may be more preferable	Yes	I agree that these mega homes are driving up the price of affordable land	No
No		No		No	to many restrictions, we own the land and should be able to build where we would like too.	No	again, we own the land, we pay the taxes, to many restrictions	No
Yes	No easier the better but please don't use it as loophole for other purposes	Yes	Yeah I think it will be safer, coz people live in these rvs got no address and we don't know who they are. Some blueberry farms I saw people living there, no idea where they come come and who they are.	Yes		Yes		No
No		No		Yes		Yes		No
Yes		Yes		No		No		No
Yes	I hope to see more agricultural regulations that encourage people to engage in farming rather than commercial activities	Yes	Yes this has to be the first, stop those commercial operators who completely violating ALR regulations by dumping, storing, and constantly driving commercial vehicles on farmlands. This practice not only puts farmers at risk of health problems and psychological stress from ongoing noise, pollution and the sense of unfair violation of farmland, but also threatens the beauty and sustainability of Katzie's agricultural lands and water.	Neutral		Neutral		Yes
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes	Crack down on the rv's, dump trucks and semis that are taking up valuable farmland	Yes	Aligns with ALC mandates and prevents dissection of ALR land	Yes	Preserves value of farmland for farming and prevents speculation and use of farmland for mega mansions	Yes
Yes		Neutral	Hmmmm...are farmers having difficulty making ends meet trying to make a living from farming that some are augmenting their income by allowing others to store recreational or industrial vehicles on their property for a fee?	No	Farmers should be able to farm on the best growing areas of their land. What if there are land features such as wet areas, hills, rocky areas, etc. that dictate the best house and/or farming areas and this type of agricultural restriction causes more harm than good?	Yes	Yes, provided farmers can still have the necessary out buildings needed to store their agricultural products and equipment for farming.	Neutral
Yes		Yes		Yes		Neutral		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
No		No		No		No		No
No		Yes		Neutral		Neutral		No
Yes	Given what has happened in surrounding rural areas where agricultural land has been purchased and subsequently developed with obscenely large homes housing multiple generations and families, I am vehemently opposed to any rezoning that permits this. Ensure that parcels are a minimum of 16 ha and people who purchase them must agree to preserve the agricultural designation. I am fully aware of situations where people have intentionally ignored the designation, knowing that fines are pathetically small and do not serve as a deterrent.	Yes	I 100% support this. Again, we must protect our lands, particularly since more and more people are purchasing them who do not share the same values.	Yes	Excellent.	Yes		Yes
Yes		No		No		No		No
Yes		No		No		No		No
Yes		No		No		No		No
Neutral		No		Yes		Yes		No
Neutral		No	These sources of income help with farm affordability and financial stability	No	This may be a valid permitting point to review but there may be agricultural reasons that this isn't practical and should be addressed n a case by case basis	No		No

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
No		No		No		No		No
No	Farms that are made up of many smaller parcels (10 acre or less), should have the ability to build homes for family members. The restriction takes away this option. Family succession is very important for the longevity of farming. Farmers should have the ability to sub divide small parcels for family to build homes and build their own equity.	Neutral		Neutral	Regulations would have to include setbacks for water ways sloughs, streams. Setbacks further into property necessary road noise.	Yes		No
No	Wording is poor needs to be improved / 20 acres is adequate for smaller farms and needs to be maintained	Yes		No	The proposals need better wording , especially proposal 1 and would they even be enforceable, in the instance of regulating recreational vehicle storage? The plan of where building would have to be located at the road front only is one esthetically ugly and two not all farms can build to that configuration so a one fits all approach doesn't work for anything beyond berry farming. There's been a record number of farms already lost in this farming community to warehousing and housing development, the land needs to stay as sustainable farming in the ALR. I don't see these proposals helping that, other than residential dwelling size, that is the only positive proposal. Why would you remove a garden suite? One garden suite of limited size is a second home on the property to encourage families children or the elderly to stay within the family farm, and continue the tradition that has been done for a hundred years. That also is a potential benefit for those choosing to purchase a farm. Too many farms sold out and rezoned as families moved away from farming in the area. Rezone the existing residential for low rise multiple housing close to the city centre to increase your tax base - this will protect your financial targets and maintain ALR	Yes		No
No		No	It's our land back off on what and where we park! Who is anyone to say whether it's a vehicle used for work or not	No		No		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
No		No		No		Yes		No
Yes		Don't Know		Yes		No		Yes
Don't Know		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes	unregulated farm use. Keep farms for farm use.	Yes		Yes		No
Don't Know		No		Yes		No		No
Yes	Generally speaking, actions must be taken to stop the continual degradation of farmland via oversized homes, non-farm vehicle storage, etc.	Yes	Already a couple of properties on McNeil Road where all sorts of vehicles, containers, etc. are being placed on farmland. Besides a waste of farmland, it is unsightly.	Yes	Farmland should be preserved as much as possible, especially in this time with tariffs, climate change, etc.	Yes	A large home on a smaller parcel negates a large portion of its agricultural capacity.	Yes
Don't Know		Neutral		Yes		Yes		Neutral
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		No
Neutral		Yes		Yes		Yes		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		Yes		No		Yes		No

Survey Response

Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
No	<p>I do not support the proposal to consolidate Class 1, 2, and 3 ALR land classifications to impose further regulations on smaller parcels. This move is not only shortsighted, it's fundamentally unfair to small-scale landowners who are already facing mounting challenges.</p> <p>Smaller ALR parcels play a vital role in local food production, rural entrepreneurship, and land stewardship. These parcels are often home to hardworking families running orchards, market gardens, flower farms, agritourism ventures, or mixed-use farms — all of which are struggling to remain viable under the weight of increasing regulation and limited support.</p> <p>What's especially frustrating is that these same parcels are often prohibited from building additional homes for family members, which is ridiculous in the context of both a housing crisis and your own stated target of adding 750 new homes over the next five years. How can you justify blocking generational living and farm succession planning on land that's already owned and stewarded, while approving massive developments on former farmland for commercial and industrial use?</p> <p>Paving over pristine farmland for mega-warehouses and rail expansion, while clamping down on small family farms, shows a complete disconnect between policy and real-world impact. This proposal does not protect farmland — it threatens its future by making it even harder for those who live and work on it to survive.</p> <p>If the city genuinely wants to protect agriculture and improve housing access, it should support small landowners — not suffocate them with more red tape.</p>	No	<p>I am not in favor of these proposed revisions. They are an overreach that penalize rural landowners and completely ignore the lived realities of farming and life on agricultural land.</p> <p>This is Not the Problem That Needs Solving The City continues to push aggressive restrictions on individual landowners, while turning a blind eye to the large-scale destruction of farmland for industrial and commercial developments. It's hard to take these proposals seriously when acres of agricultural land are paved over for Amazon warehouses, CP Rail expansion, and business parks — yet somehow, the real threat to farmland is someone parking a few trailers or storing vehicles on their own property? Let's focus on real threats to agriculture, not manufactured ones.</p> <p>2. Rural Land is Not a Subdivision — It Needs Flexibility This proposal imposes arbitrary vehicle limits (4 or 6, depending on acreage) that don't reflect the reality of rural life or farming operations. Families often share land across generations. Farmers and landowners may have multiple work trucks, trailers, seasonal-use equipment, or utility vehicles. These are not eyesores or junkyards — they are tools of rural living. This kind of top-down micromanagement assumes everyone is misusing their land, when in fact, most rural property owners are proud stewards of it. This is Already Regulated — Why Add More? The City already prohibits landowners from profiting by renting out storage space for other people's RVs or vehicles. That rule exists. So why is more clarification or additional restriction needed? These proposals don't simplify enforcement — they just introduce more complexity, more bureaucracy, and more reasons to penalize people for normal, non-disruptive use of their own land.</p> <p>4. Garage-Only Storage Requirements Are Unrealistic Many farms and rural homes keep a few unlicensed vehicles — old trucks for parts, seasonal-use pickups, or future projects. Requiring these to be stored exclusively inside a garage is not only unrealistic but shows a complete disconnect from rural infrastructure. Some of us don't have massive garages — and we shouldn't be forced to build one just to keep a 20-year-old truck out of sight. This is rural land, not a gated subdivision.</p> <p>These revisions are not about protecting farmland — they're about controlling the people who live on it. They add unnecessary red tape, create enforcement headaches, and punish landowners for using their space in practical, reasonable ways. The City should be supporting the people who care for this land — not making it harder for them to stay on it.</p>	No	<p>I'm very much against this proposed change. While I understand the goal of preserving farmland, restricting where families can build on their own agricultural properties does more harm than good. Every piece of land is different — in shape, soil, drainage, and topography — and limiting development to one designated area, usually at the front of the property, is incredibly short-sighted. What might work on one parcel could be completely unworkable on another.</p> <p>This kind of blanket regulation strips away the flexibility that families need to live and work on their land. It makes it so much harder for those of us trying to build homes for aging parents, adult children, or farm staff — not to mention those planning gradual improvements or investing in long-term farming operations. These restrictions don't just inconvenience people — they chip away at the ability for farms to function as multigenerational and community-based spaces.</p> <p>It's especially frustrating to see constant development approved on actual farmland — massive industrial buildings, commercial sites, and paved-over acreage for logistics — and yet individual farmers are the ones being boxed in. It feels like we're being punished for simply trying to live and work on the land we already own and care for.</p> <p>A single home and a yard is not the problem. Overdevelopment of farmland for non-agricultural use is. This proposal doesn't protect farmland — it restricts the people who are still trying to preserve it.</p> <p>If the city truly values farmland, it needs to support the families on it — not regulate them into a corner.</p>	No	<p>I don't support this proposed change. Reducing the maximum home size on smaller agricultural parcels feels like yet another unnecessary restriction targeting rural landowners — and it won't actually solve the problem the City claims it will. The idea that reducing the size of a house will somehow make land more affordable for farmers is misleading. The cost of farmland is driven by many complex factors — speculation, development pressure, scarcity, and location — not just the square footage of a home. Limiting home size won't make farmland cheaper, but it will reduce flexibility for families who want to live together, age in place, or create multigenerational homes that support the farm.</p> <p>For many rural families, a larger home isn't about luxury — it's about practicality. These homes often accommodate extended family, farm workers, home-based businesses, or space to store gear and supplies in areas without basements. Farming is a lifestyle that often blends home and work, and that requires space. Trying to enforce arbitrary limits based on acreage alone, without understanding how the property is actually used, is shortsighted.</p> <p>It's also frustrating to see repeated efforts to restrict what individual landowners can build, while massive non-agricultural buildings are allowed to cover farmland with concrete. You can't approve industrial sprawl one day and then say you're limiting farmhouse sizes to protect agricultural land the next — that's a double standard.</p> <p>If the goal is to support farmers and preserve farmland, then empower those of us trying to live and work on it — don't chip away at our rights every few years.</p>	No
No	ALR is exactly that....for Agricultural purposes!	Yes		Yes		No		Yes
No		No		No		No		No
No	All of these designations can have very different uses, different types of ownership which likely won't be fully understood until after the change has been made and the residents/farmers will then have to work around a bylaw that is being changed what reason and what significant positive gain.	No	I do not understand the need for this bylaw change? How are the municipality and residents negatively affected by the parking of vehicles? People have these properties under existing long standing guidelines and bylaws and should have the right to use their private property as they see fit. Additionally, in some cases, properties are affordable due to the ability to park vehicles there and owners have purchased them with that provision in mind. Housing has become unaffordable and it makes no sense for the municipality to put more restrictions/barriers on property, owners.	No	What is the problem this bylaw is attempting to solve? More blanket restrictions prevent property owners from using their private property as they see fit. Different configurations may be advantageous for the landowners and the municipality would take that away. This seems like regulation for the sake of regulation.	No	This bylaw dictates how property owners use their land. This is an infringement on their rights. What if they had a large family and need a larger home. The City has no right to determine the size of home property owners may need.	No
Yes	If our land is under 16 hectare, would we no longer be under Zoning A? If so, which zoning will we be?	No	We are agreeable to first 2 changes. However, making enclosed residential garage mandatory adds significant financial burden on recreational vehicle owners (especially for large-sized RV). Farm owners should be able to enjoy their "off-season" time without needing to have these financial burden added.	Neutral		No		No
Yes		Yes	We are definitely not in support of large commercial vehicles being parked on agricultural land.	Yes		Yes		
Don't Know		Yes		Yes		Don't Know		Neutral
Neutral		No		Neutral		No	There are already provincial guidelines for this. I don't see why the city would feel the need to make their own changes. Richmond and Delta have implemented 4300 sqft and it has impacted the equity of current farmland owners	Neutral

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
Neutral	No	Neutral	No	Don't Know	Not enough information provided. In the event of a major event, such as a fire that destroys the residence, will an exception be made to rebuild within current footprint even if not compliant with the proposed regulation?? Having to move utilities, septic field and even the driveway would be a major inconvenience and expense that may not be covered by the homeowner's insurance.	No	Stated purpose of Change #1 is to provide consistency yet here you are proposing an inconsistency. City is already restricting buildings in Change #3 therefore the market will determine property cost/value, not building size.	No
No	I have a honeybee apiary on my property which is only 2 1/2 acres. I believe the small farms are more beneficial than the large parcels which are generally used for blueberries or hay production. Hay production to feed horses which are of no real value to feeding the population. And there are far more blueberries farms than we need. I believe the city should provide incentives for vertical farm Ming on smaller farms if people on smaller farms are interested. Old-fashioned large acre farms are a thing of the past. They consume far too much water. Large parcel of farmland are not needed for productive vertical farming which is far more sustainable and safe for the environment. And if the zoning byelaws were changed it would force small farmers like myself to potentially sell my property to a larger landowner. Pitt Meadows is and should remain a mix of exactly what it is. A beautiful community with small farms and large farms mixed into urban areas. Honestly I have no idea why anyone would want to change any of it. We have too many blueberry farms and hayfields. And I believe the Aqualini's enough of this city.	No	I do understand the frustration of seeing agricultural land gravelled over and having a bunch of non-farm vehicles stored on that property. And many times for profit however I don't think that making it illegal for anything over a certain number is the proper way of going about it. I do think allowing people with old barns or old farm buildings such as riding facilities, old dairy Barnes that are not used anymore should be able to rent space in those buildings. Many of these buildings are not used anymore but the farms are still being actively farmed. I believe the byelaws only allowed for agricultural buildings to be built on ALR land anyway. And I think it's good to remember that people in urban areas need places to keep their recreational vehicles. Without these types of old barn facilities storing vehicles etc.. there is no place to put them that is even vaguely cost-effective. I do believe that storage should only be allowed in and close buildings though. I don't think people should be able to store large amounts of vehicle vehicles etc. on open uncovered land.	No	I don't believe the city should have any control over how people can develop their property. Again ALR lands have certain building codes that people have to abide by and I believe that those are strong enough. Telling people where they can build a house on their property is very much a government overreach.	Neutral	I do believe that 5000 ft. <sup>2</sup> is more than enough for a single-family home. However again I believe it is government over each to try and tell someone that they cannot build a certain size home on their property. Personally I do not like the idea of seeing a massive 10,000 square-foot home built on a small farm lot. But I don't believe government should be able to dictate house size any differently than they have been in the past.	Yes
Yes	Save the farm land, keep parcels larger to discourage investors instead of farmers on the land.	Neutral	I agree farm land should not be used as storage units but how with this really be monitored.	Yes	Farms don't need big mansions on them. Also keep houses from being built in the middle of property or far back of property. Save the land.	Yes	Don't need these big mansions.	Yes
No	what's the reason? Many small ( 5 acres ) parcels are not being farmed.	Yes	Storing campers, boats, trailers for PAY has been going on for long time, a blind man can see it !	Yes		Yes	Monster homes is a relative new idea, mostly built by new comers (other cultures). They must have received building permits and were allowed to construct these.	Neutral
No		No		No	Cell phone towers are not healthy and should be nowhere near a neighbours property line if at all. A never ending lease is wrong.	No		No
Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
No		No		No		No		No
Neutral		Yes		Yes		Yes		No
No		No		No		No		No

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
No		No		No		No		No
No		No	The city cannot dictate how many recreational vehicle vehicles I own personally and wish to store on my property that I own and have paid for.	No	The city should not be able to dictate where I am able to build based on my personal preferences on the property that I have purchased. If I choose to build at the back of a property for privacy and conduct farming in the front portion that should not be up to the city to dictate.	No	The City Of Pitt Meadows should not be trying to steam me residential growth for families and generational longevity. With the current price of housing and land property owners are considering building homes, large enough to house, their children and their families. This should not be up to the city to dictate How many square feet or bedrooms I choose to put in.	No
No		No		No		No		No
Neutral		Yes		No	The city should not have the power to dictate where a homeowner builds their house. With our roads becoming increasingly busy, it is a huge risk to children, farm animals, and slow moving farm equipment if the house is located close to a roadway.	Yes		Yes
No		No		No		No		No
Yes		No		Neutral		Yes		Don't Know
Neutral		No		Yes		Yes		No
Neutral		Yes		Yes		Yes		Neutral
Yes		No	People are so over taxed and need other ways just to pay property taxes; Our economy is very stressed.	Yes		Yes		No
Yes		No	I think it is ok to allow people other ways to help pay their property taxes. We are getting squeezed by increasing taxes and increasing costs. These things keep going up but our incomes aren't.	Yes		Yes		No
No	The minimum lot size of 40 acres is too large for our area. 20 acres is acceptable	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Yes		No	I think if farmers or land owners want to park a bunch of trailers to help pay their bills let them. Seems super nit picky to go onto peoples land and say no you have to put that in a garage and that can't stay. And, all these trailers if they aren't hosted on a property then someone has to build an ugly storage facility. I'd rather see a few families make a little money than a big multinational. If this question is more about the look of neighbourhoods I'd be more concerned about cannabis farms that omit consistent undodgable stink. OR if land owners want to park a real load of things, make them a massive wall of shrubs around the parking area. 1) That will support our local nursery's 2) It will look nice 3) More tree's are always good.	Yes	I don't have any problem with a land owner building a long skinny road along the edge of the property if they want the house at the back corner. I agree yes, preserve the farm land but if they can do that and put it in the location they want, why not.	Yes	I completely support this. I live on a street where they have built these enormous monster homes. It looks awful now compared to what it used to be. The cute rural farm look is long gone. Tree's nuked etc.	No

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
No	More transparency is needed about the amount of lots that would fall within this new regulation in order to assess what the magnitude of this change is. It would also help to understand how many lots meet the minimum threshold that currently exists in the city of Pitt Meadows.	No	While we understand the City's intent to preserve agricultural land and prevent inappropriate vehicle storage, I would like to raise concerns about the fairness and practicality of a strict vehicle limit, particularly the proposed cap of four recreational vehicles or similar. This type of blanket restriction does not take into account the diversity of property owners' needs, especially in rural or semi-rural settings where vehicle ownership is not always for luxury or recreation. For example, a cart collector may own five or more carts or utility trailers as part of their legitimate livelihood. These are not recreational vehicles but necessary tools of the trade. A rigid limit could unintentionally harm small-scale operators or sole proprietors who rely on multiple vehicles to support their work. Additionally, many households today consist of multiple adults, including families with teenagers or extended relatives living together. It's not uncommon for such households to have five or more vehicles especially in areas lacking frequent public transit. Imposing an arbitrary limit without accounting for the number of residents or their transportation needs could unfairly penalize large or multigenerational households. If the goal is to target commercial misuse or visual clutter, perhaps a more tailored approach such as design guidelines, screening requirements, or case-by-case permitting would be more effective and equitable than a hard numerical cap. I strongly encourage the City to consider flexibility in this policy, accounting for the practical needs of working residents, rural property owners, and families who depend on multiple vehicles for daily life.	No	<p>I strongly oppose the City's proposal to implement restrictive residential footprint (farm home plate) regulations on agricultural properties. While the intention to preserve farmland is understandable, this approach imposes a rigid, one-size-fits-all constraint that fails to reflect the diverse realities of rural landowners and working farms. Forcing all residential buildings, accessory dwellings, and yards into a more confined area near the road is not only impractical, it is fundamentally unfair and in some cases, environmentally irresponsible.</p> <p>On our property, for example, an environmental engineer specializing in riparian areas has specifically advised that the most suitable location for future development is at the back of the property. This recommendation is based on responsible land use. The proposed regulation would directly conflict with that expert advice.</p> <p>Beyond environmental concerns, this policy ignores how many rural and agricultural properties actually function: It reduces operational flexibility by preventing landowners from placing homes or structures in locations that best support farm logistics, privacy, and safety. It disregards intergenerational farming needs, where families may need to build secondary homes or dwellings in other areas of the property to maintain their ability to farm together. It creates unnecessary bureaucratic red tape for landowners trying to make common-sense decisions about their own land. Most concerning is the broader principle: this regulation treats responsible landowners, many of whom have lived on and cared for these lands for decades as if they are the problem. This top-down approach punishes those of us who intend to balance agricultural use, conservation, and rural living without offering real agricultural support or flexibility in return. If the City wants to support farming and protect agricultural land, it should focus on incentives, support programs, and collaborative planning, not sweeping restrictions that remove autonomy and ignore environmental realities. This proposed regulation is unworkable, unnecessary, and, in some cases like ours, environmentally misguided. We strongly urge the City to</p>	No	<p>We respectfully disagree with the proposed reduction in maximum home size for parcels under eight hectares. As owners of a 15-acre (approximately 6-hectare) farm, we are in the process of planning a multigenerational farming operation that will require a home designed to accommodate extended family living and farm-related needs.</p> <p>The existing 500 m<sup>2</sup> (5,381 ft<sup>2</sup>) limit aligns with Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) guidelines and provides necessary flexibility for families like ours who are committed to building within the current rules. Reducing the maximum to 400 m<sup>2</sup> would significantly constrain our ability to create a functional living space that supports multiple generations under one roof, a traditional and practical model for small and medium-scale family farms.</p> <p>Multigenerational housing is often essential for long-term farm viability. It helps with the division of labor, knowledge transfer, and care of both the land and family members. Limiting the home size would work against this goal and could unintentionally discourage the very type of sustainable, family-based agriculture the City is aiming to support.</p> <p>We urge the City to consider exemptions or a more nuanced approach for bona fide farm operations planning multigenerational homes. Families who are investing in agriculture on smaller parcels should not be penalized for doing so responsibly under existing regulations.</p>	No
Neutral		Yes	These vehicles are generally for business ( trucking for instance) or rec vehicle paid storage. I think all non-agricultural uses should be taxed by square footage. Otherwise the city is encouraging the expansion of these uses. Why should they be exempted from taxation on agriculture land? By taxing them you do not discriminate one non-agriculture use from another.	Yes	in some cases the location of the residence would have less impact in a different location than what is proposed.	Yes	This will deter multiple family units in one house	Yes
No	Unfair for people who have smaller lot sizes .	No	There should be no change as it's for personal use .	No	City already has bylaws for this. If this requires change there should be environmental factors that requires this change . Please provide examples why this needs to be changed.	No	Again this is unfair for individuals who have small property sizes a 5300 square foot house is not that big to begin with and city wants to now reduce it even more .	Neutral
No		No	I support that there should be no storage of non agricultural vehicles for rent or sale	No	Regulations add large costs through taxes and compliance. To be viable, businesses need as few regulations as possible and those required should be as simple as possible	No	This discriminates against farmers - the ALC rule should be followed	No
Don't Know		No	Wealthy property owners will then build a "barn" to store their car collection or can afford to insure them year round. What exactly are you trying to achieve here? If this bylaw passes almost every rural property will be in violation or forced to spend money then can't afford. I support not allowing ag land to be used as a storage facility for business but this bylaw will only be enforced when a neighbor complains because they have a separate dispute.	No	I would not build my house in the middle of a field nor would anyone who wants to farm but I don't support another bylaw. We already have restrictions and extra expense to build near the road as most of that falls into the riparian area. I'm going through the permitting process to make an addition to my existing house which is near the road, and the riparian assessment has already cost me an additional 10,000. Most rural properties will have this challenge, or they will need to build on another corner which will add even more expense and wasted land to longer driveways. I see this as a bylaw that will not achieve its purpose and add more oversight challenges and expense.	No	Farmland is expensive and therefore we need to be able to house multiple generations or 2 families on one property to be able to farm, so square footage is needed. Most farmers have day jobs as well or other people on the property who have day jobs contributing to the mortgage. Restricting the housing size will hinder this. Also 4300 square feet is plenty big to build a luxury home anyways. Restricting the square footage will just make it less likely that young people can get creative with family or friends and actually purchase and farm OR for next generations to live on the farm and have a family and take over the operation.	No
Neutral		Yes	There is a lack of parking regulation enforcement on existing ALR properties. This needs to be addressed.	Yes		No		No
No	I own 5.3 acres blueberry farm and I don't want to be assessed a higher tax due to Agritourism, Agro-industrial and Agri-commercial all incorporated into one zone.	Yes		No		No	A 5381 ft <sup>2</sup> limit for all is acceptable.	No

Survey Response								
Do you support the combination of the A-1, A-2 and A-3 zones?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these parking regulation updates?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support introducing limits on where new residential uses can be located?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit the scale of homes of smaller farm lots?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support this change to limit further residential development on small lots?
Neutral		Neutral		No		No		No
No		No		No		No		No
Yes		No	Until current regulations can be enforced effectively, I am not in favour of adding additional rules.	No	This could create disagreement with the current ALC regulation of accessory residential housing having to be within 50 m of primary residential.	No	I do not see these proposed changes preserving more farmland. We have better utilized farmland now, than in the past and most homes being built are replacing end of life structures. Further the ALC restricts accessory residential to within 50 m of the existing primary residential which is an issue with this proposal.	No
No		No		No		Yes		No
Neutral		No	Enclosed garage is unnecessarily burdensome	No	Agriculture can be a noisy industry. Don't force me to live right next to a neighbour's noise and light at all hours.	Don't Know		Don't Know
Don't Know		Yes	Most definitely, and also because where vehicles are stored it is most unsightly and unkept looking and not in spirit of agriculture.	Yes		Yes		Yes
No		No		No		Yes		No
No		No		No		No		No
No		No		No		No		No
Yes		Yes	but enforce the regulations	Yes	finally	Yes		Yes
No		No		No		No		No

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
	Neutral	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
Pitt Meadows is essentially full. To increase the number of residents in the community we need to allow garden suites. Allow people	Yes	
To live and work closer to home. With all the industrial development in Pittsburgh Meadows we need to provide the ability to house more people in the community	Yes	
Regular the size but don't prohibit. Garden suites are important rental stock and also important for family dwellings. Eg inlaw suites.	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	
	Yes	The farm workers deserve not to live in sub standard living conditions
	Yes	
	Yes	
No	Yes	No
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	
	Yes	
	Yes	
Would depend on how much more land is being used. If main home is less than max SF and garden suite SF didn't add up to more than max SF, AND both fit in the home plate footprint, then I think it would be ok. NOT ok to have max main home SF in home plate AND garden suite (is there a max SF for garden suite?) located outside of home plate.	Yes	The max SF of 140 SF is good but there MUST be a MINIMUM SF for workers. If not then they will live in bunk beds four to a room smaller than a prison cell.

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
As long as there is a maximum footprint size for the garden suite and as long as plans are in place to demonstrate that farming activities can continue on the property with a garden suite in place, I think garden suites should be allowed. These provide housing for extended family (elderly parents, grown children) and can also provide entry into housing on agricultural land for non- landowners which increases engagement with farming activities and builds support for maintaining farmland.	Don't Know	How does this work on preventing oversize/large footprint housing on farmland? Might this result in more houses being built on farmland, this reducing area available for farming?
	Yes	
I think you should be allowed garden suites on large properties. Why is a small lot allowed but I'm on 5 acres and not allowed garden suites for my aging mother. Even though most house have bigger footprint than mine.	Yes	
	Neutral	
Detached garden suites should be allowed, but only one per certain acres. ie 1 per 10 acres.	Yes	
	No	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
All ALRs should have the ability to add a garden suite. This helps to house retiring farms or keeps the farming in the family. It also helps to house workers. There is no reason it would remove area that needs to be farmed since outbuilding so garden suite sizes are allowed anyway.	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Don't Know	
	Yes	Do NOT give up anymore land to huge warehouses that don't pay very much tax! Pitt Meadows "the Natural place" has become cement warehouse jungle! The wildlife, people and nature have all suffered. Pitt Meadows is not the beautiful natural place it used to be due to greed of past council. Just STOP! Make an over pass at Allen way for trucks that would align with Baynes rd and airport way

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
	Don't Know	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
What about multi generational farms needing a separate building for multiple families?	Yes	Thank you for preserving farm land in Pitt Meadows!
	Yes	
	No	
	No	
	Neutral	I am unaware of the current living conditions
	Neutral	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
Too many small acreages have multiple suites in shape of barns or shops	Neutral	Make sure it is used for only temporary workers
	No	Why are 130 workers staying on one farm? If temporary workers are needed they should require to determine length of stay to complete the job and require individual permits for each worker per site (farm) worked on. A contract both with the farm and local government. If numbers staying onsite are minimized this will also bolster local businesses as extra workers will need outside accommodation to assist in work.
	No	
	Yes	

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
Two acres is very small and has limited ability to grow sufficient ag product to support the property owner through sales, a secondary garden suite might be necessary as a bed and breakfast or as a temporary home for personal assistants for aging owners who need someone on site to support them (one example only).	Yes	
	Yes	
As long as the residential property includes off road/street parking, then "gardensuites" should be allowed.	Don't Know	Could be a this a loophole to allow people to live on your property as "workers" just to make a rent income? That I do not agree with.
With aging populations, these garden suites are often for family members or for additional income - housing is difficult as it is - why are you making it more difficult?	Yes	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	
With the lack of housing and affordability in the lower mainland, and most municipalities trying to promote more housing options, is PM really going to make it harder to provide housing. Its nonsensical.	Neutral	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
	Neutral	
I wouldn't want to live attached to my mother in law. Whatever square footage would be attached, I would feel would be acceptable, not attached. I grew up on a farm. We had two homes, fully separated by a garden and surrounded by fields. Nothing fancy. Nothing lavish. We were farmers. I would like to see some prefabricated options that would work for placement on farms for siblings who do not necessarily inherit the farm. I know of people like this locally, I grew in in SK, so no affiliation with those people, other than we live in Pitt Meadows and I am a chatty person who listens to peoples issues.	Neutral	I have lived/worked in various environments, like mountain resort, provincial park, and you live in a trailer with others. Never get your own room. communal kitchen and washroom, etc. However, in the advent of pre-fabricated homes, and tiny homes, there might be some options and these options can move off property when not being used, such as if the farm practice ended, or switched to another commodity. Definitely would like to see something more innovative, safe, with options for more privacy for longer term workers; BUT farm the farm land. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. Hoping the farmers are well aware of this survey. Sent to one, who had not seen it.
	Neutral	
	Yes	

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
With the cost of wages and property... farming anything under 10 acres is uneconomical... these parcels should be removed and developed... no further housing development allowed on other farm land which is larger.	Neutral	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
	No	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
I disagree, secondary detached suites can be all that is needed for additional help for farm operations	No	Farm workers have no difficulty with current available accommodations
again, we own the land, we pay the taxes, to many restrictions	No	
No residential use of any farm land	No	
	No	
	Yes	
	Neutral	Modern technologies and robotic systems significantly reduce or eliminate the need for human intervention. Relying on a smaller, well trained workforce can help ensure that workers respect their farmer neighbours' property and minimize harm to farmland, while also reducing environment pressures from transportation, emissions, congestion.
	Yes	
	Yes	
Not sure. I like the saving of farmland for farming but what about multigenerational families who farm? When mom and dad get older it is nice for them to have the younger generation live on site to help farm and eventually take over altogether. Or what about new young farmers who can never afford their own land being able to lease farm land and live on site in something other than a basement suite? So some of these potential changes could be problematic and hinder conservation of farmland for farming.	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
This again helps with affordability and multi. Generational living	Neutral	

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
	Yes	
	Yes	
Why would you remove a garden suite? One garden suite of limited size is a second home on the property to encourage families children or the elderly to stay within the family farm, and continue the tradition that has been done for a hundred years. That also is a potential benefit for those choosing to purchase a farm. Too many farms sold out and rezoned as families moved away from farming in the area. Rezone the existing residential for low rise multiple housing close to the city centre to increase your tax base - this will protect your financial targets and maintain ALR.	Neutral	
	No	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Don't Know	
I think if you have a small house on 2 acres you should be able to have a laneway house. Not subdivision feel.	Yes	
	Neutral	
	Yes	TFW are necessary and simplification of housing is important so long as the structure is not used for non-farm purposes in the future.
	No	Smaller family operated farms should be exposed to large numbers of workers living "next door"
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
	Don't Know	

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
<p>I'm completely against this proposed change. Taking away the ability to build a garden suite on parcels under two acres is not only unreasonable — it's completely out of touch with the housing crisis we're in.</p> <p>We keep being told that we need more affordable and diverse housing options. Garden suites are exactly that. They allow families to stay together, support aging parents, house adult children who can't afford to buy in this market, or simply add flexibility for real people trying to get by. Removing this option on smaller parcels — where space still exists and the impact is minimal — is a step in the wrong direction.</p> <p>What makes this even more frustrating is the hypocrisy. The City continues to push for densification in urban areas, encourages carriage homes and secondary suites elsewhere, but now wants to ban one of the few sensible options that exists for rural landowners. Why is it okay to add infill density in the city, but not allow a small, self-contained unit on a 1.5-acre property?</p> <p>Let's be honest — a single garden suite on a small parcel isn't threatening farmland. What's threatening farmland is large-scale industrial development, rising land costs, and policies that make it harder and harder for regular people to stay on the land.</p> <p>If the goal is to protect farmland and support housing, this does neither. It just removes options for the people who need them most.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>I'm not against this proposal — in fact, I think simplifying the rules for temporary farm worker housing is a step in the right direction. If we want to support local food production and keep farms operating, we need to make it easier for legitimate farm businesses to house the workers they rely on.</p> <p>Removing the minimum lot size requirement makes sense. There are many smaller or mid-sized farms that may not meet arbitrary acreage thresholds but still require seasonal or temporary help to operate effectively. This change allows for more flexibility, especially for those working with specialty crops, mixed farming, or agritourism.</p> <p>The proposed worker limits seem fair and consistent with ALC criteria, and increasing the floor area per worker is a humane and much-needed update. These workers are vital to our local food systems, and they deserve decent living conditions while they're here.</p> <p>That said, I hope the City also applies this same logic of flexibility and support to families who live and work on the land year-round, not just temporary workers. It's frustrating to see more and more options being given to accommodate workers (which I support).</p>
	<p>Yes</p>	
	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>With the lack of housing and affordability in the lower mainland, and most municipalities try to promote more housing options, is PM really going to make it harder to provide housing. It's nonsensical.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
	<p>Don't Know</p>	
	<p>Neutral</p>	
	<p>Neutral</p>	
	<p>No</p>	

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
This proposal does nothing to protect farm land as 2 acres has no economic value as a commercial farm! In addition this contradicts the Provincial Government's demands to provide more housing, I understand that the City is on the Housing Ministries BAD LIST!!!	Neutral	No
I believe that generational properties are what should be considered in Pitt Meadows just as they are in some of the Fraser Valley municipalities. The more we can densify the population and make more affordable housing I think is always a plus.	Yes	I think it is important to make it easier for farmers that need temporary housing for their employees to be able to provide that. Less people travelling on the roads is also a plus
Change this to six acres, because too many five acres parcels have more living quarters on them than legal.	Neutral	Farm workers are necessary and housing for them is necessary but don't let the size of these homes get out of hand as others will just apply for farm worker house when they want larger houses. If there are that many workers, rent off of farm property may be necessary
How many secondary homes ( Mobiles, small houses, converted barns ) are existing on farmland ? This also has been going on for long time. Strangely in the big cities Burnaby, Vancouver etc. garden suites are allowed on DINKY 33 x 120 foot lots. What a contradiction to solve the housing crisis.	No	This is a contradiction, how many workers do farmers on 5 acres need? to grow Blueberries or Hay?
	No	
	Yes	
	Yes	
This is unfriendly to farm succession where parents move to a smaller dwelling on their land and a child takes over the main house. This is desirable to maintain farm use of the land.	Neutral	
	Yes	

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
	Yes	
City Of Pitt Meadows should not be trying to limit the number of residential homes but instead should be supporting development of smaller parcels, including garden suites basement suites etc.	Neutral	
	No	
	Neutral	
	Yes	
	Don't Know	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
I think garden suites are totally ok. Helps with Grandparents or newly weds etc.	Yes	

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
<p>I do not support removing the allowance for garden suites on parcels smaller than 8,094 m<sup>2</sup> (two acres). Garden suites provide an important form of gentle, small-scale housing that supports both families and the broader community without significantly impacting farmland. Many smaller rural and agricultural properties are owned by multi-generational families or individuals who rely on secondary dwellings to: Support family succession and aging in place. This allows parents, adult children, or caregivers to live nearby without subdividing land.</p> <p>Increase rural housing flexibility. Garden suites provide affordable housing options in a market where prices continue to rise and rental options are extremely limited.</p> <p>Maintain viable farm operations. They offer space for farm help or family members who contribute to the property's upkeep and agricultural productivity.</p> <p>Restricting garden suites on smaller parcels will not meaningfully protect farmland, as these suites are typically modest in footprint and often use existing cleared or developed areas of the property. Instead, this change would limit the diversity and livability of rural communities and penalize responsible small landholders who wish to use their property efficiently and sustainably.</p> <p>A more balanced approach would be to retain garden suites on parcels under two acres, with design or siting guidelines to ensure the structures are compatible with agricultural use, rather than removing the option entirely.</p>	Yes	
	Neutral	
	Yes	Please have a townhall for these changes . Would love to have a conversation with someone about proposed changes
	Neutral	
<p>Most 2 acre parcels are not farmed right now anyways, not allowing a garden suite is just restricting housing when we are in a housing crisis.</p>	Don't Know	<p>In general I don't support more restrictions on ag land. Currently many bylaws are only enforced when neighbors complain about minor issues and it's become a tool for disputes rather than proper regulation. Meanwhile those who are truly abusing farmland aren't held accountable. With today's land prices if you make more restrictions you only narrow your target "farmer" and don't allow for people getting creative and pooling resources which is what any "average joe" would need to do today to afford and farm land in Pitt Meadows. Wealthy folks that want a weekend home will comply with these bylaws as they have the money to throw around to dance around them, and regular people will be more squeezed out. Where we need to start is fair enforcement on those who are grossly abusing the farmland instead of someone who has an extra trailer or car parked in their driveway. Adding these bylaws will only go after the low hanging fruit instead of the real issue. It will punish the more cooperative landowners that aren't creating an issue for anyone except their hard to please neighbor.</p>
<p>The garden suite restriction should not apply to properties greater than 2 acres and less than 20.</p>	Yes	
<p>There is not many 2 acre lots in the ALC, please leave as is.</p>	Yes	

Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?	Do you support these changes to better accommodate farm workers where required for farm operations?	Do you have any additional comments about this potential change?
	Yes	
	No	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Don't Know	
	No	
	Yes	
	Neutral	
enforce it	Yes	
	No	