

**From:** Madhur Motwani [REDACTED] S.22(1)Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 5:09 PM  
**To:** External-Legislative Services  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Bylaw No. 8494 - EV Ready Requirements for New Non-Residential Buildings

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of New Westminster's network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,  
This is one of the [REDACTED] S.22(1)Personal and Confidential. I don't reside there nowadays.

It is really heartening to see the city working on these EV Ready Requirements translate roughly into a bylaw which would be similar or at least identical to the requirements. [REDACTED] S.22(1)Personal and Confidential  
[REDACTED] I was wondering whether the following queries could be clarified based on the documents I have examined so far?

1)  
**"Electric Vehicle Ready Requirements for New, NonResidential Buildings"** - does the phrasing imply that this bylaw would be triggered in the case of both residential as well as non-residential buildings. Is this correct? Or is the bylaw only applicable to non-residential buildings. As far as I remember there already exists a bylaw which has a provision for both residential as well as car share vehicles.

2)  
Potential Section 140.17.2 c) ..... **a minimum of 20% of the off-street provided parking spaces shall provide Energized Level 2 outlet or higher, without an Electric Vehicle Energy Management System and.....** Has this requirement been added to allow proportional consistency to match the 40% of Level 2 + EVEMS and 10% Level 2 requirement? How would compliance be checked and how much parking is that supposed to generate? Has the city looked at compliance checking via their buildings team.

3)  
**All provided off-street parking spaces for car share vehicles shall provide an Energized Level 2 outlet, or higher, without an Electric Vehicle Energy Management System.** ... This does not include the provision of an EV charger. If this plays out in the real world then car share companies like evo would not be obligated to put EV chargers to service their own fleet of EV's. Is that what was intended? This doesn't seem consistent with the provisions by a number of other municipalities (**if I remember correctly this would be CoV where demand for EV charging is much higher**). It is understandable if this is the intention. However if not then car share companies might interpret it as putting an EV charger being optional.

4)  
**council report Item # 2024-602 - Zoning Amendment Bylaw: Electric Vehicle Ready Requirements for New, Non-Residential Buildings – Bylaw for First, Second, and Third Readings.**

The comment on the proportion of residents living in MURB's in the city is pegged at 50%. [REDACTED] S.22(1)Personal and Confidential  
[REDACTED] the proportion is much higher. Although this does not materially impact the recommendations

since the recommendations are decoupled, qualitatively from these figures, It is important to note that a much accurate dwelling data picture is available within the city which has not been utilized. I can personally remember a much higher figure(in excess of 75%). It would be great if instead of quoting census data, we have a more accurate picture of dwelling data available which could be used.

Thank you.

Regards,

Madhur Motwani

M.Eng(Hons) Mechanical Engineering, Masters of Engineering Leadership in Advanced Materials  
Manufacturing