

Analysis of Housing Affordability Task Force Recommendations

Year 1 Actions (2016):

Task Force Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
<p>1. Minimize and pro-rate fees for affordable housing projects</p> <p><i>*This includes a reduction in costs associated with development application supporting information (studies) and costly design features. The recommendation is aimed at small to mid-sized infill projects (not large projects).</i></p>	Yes, requires bylaw amendments e.g. Land Use Procedures Bylaw, Building Bylaw, Sanitary Sewer and Stormwater Utilities Bylaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low and moderate income households People with special housing needs Older populations Households with children, particularly lone parent households Service workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing fees and eliminating need for studies may help to reduce a small portion of overall project costs. Not requiring studies may help streamline development application processes. Actions #9 and #22 may assist with achieving this objective if parking requirements are reduced for affordable housing projects, thereby lessening the need for traffic studies or the provision of underground parkade structures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit fees provide cost recovery related to staff time spent processing applications. Staff time would still need to be expended. Not requiring studies in some circumstances may impact approval process if full information is not provided (i.e. public's ability to comment, staff's ability to provide recommendations, Council's ability to make a decision). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing projects by non-profit organizations are currently fast-tracked which provides cost savings to applicant. Does Council wish to expand to for-profit applicants? Unclear if this would result in more affordable housing projects. More consultation may be needed to determine if this is currently a significant barrier. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
<p>2. Review the Victoria Housing Reserve to determine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether there is a need to increase the \$10,000 per unit amount limit allocated to affordable housing developments; Consider the option of introducing a per-bedroom allocation to encourage the development of larger units; Investigate options to expand the capacity of the fund through alternative financing mechanisms. 	Yes, requires policy amendment to revise program guidelines – does not require a bylaw amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low and moderate income households People with special housing needs Older populations Households with children, particularly lone parent households Service workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per bedroom allocation may help to achieve more dwelling units including family-oriented housing. Expanding capacity and overall balance of Housing Fund may encourage more affordable housing projects within the region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in funding will reduce the overall fund more rapidly without necessarily resulting in any more housing than what would have occurred with current funding limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does Council wish to consider criteria to allocate more funding for projects that deliver family-oriented housing or units of a certain size? In addition to City of Victoria funding mechanisms, Council could consider requesting other surrounding municipalities to consider co-funding options. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct staff to review the Victoria Housing Fund Reserve Guidelines to encourage the further development of family-oriented units.
<p>3. Provide permissive tax exemptions to charitable, philanthropic and/or non-profit corporations that currently own or that build affordable housing in the city.</p>	Yes, exemption allowed through Community Charter however would require amendment to the City of Victoria Permissive Tax Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low and moderate income households People with special housing needs Older populations Households with children, particularly lone parent households Service workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily indirect social benefits. City can control and administer level of exemption or grant amount. Exemptions can be provided for a period of up to 10 years and can be renewed for another term. Tax exemptions provide greater financial relief than grants because 40% goes to other levels of government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exempted taxes still need to be made up by other taxpayers. Permissive tax exemptions are not as clear or transparent as a grant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider changes to the permissive tax exemption policy. Willingness to pass on cost of exemption to other tax payers. Council may wish to consider criteria for determining eligible forms of affordable housing based on location, target demographic and built form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.

	Action can be absorbed within current projects or operationalized in 2016
	Action requires further consideration and reporting back

Task Force Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
4. Waive development cost charges (DCCs) for affordable housing projects where applicants are willing to enter into a housing agreement.	LGA, Section 933.1 (for not-for-profit rental housing including supportive living housing and for-profit affordable rental housing) Requires amendment to DCC Bylaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low and moderate income households• People with special housing needs• Older populations• Households with children, particularly lone parent households• Service workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides an initial cost saving to the developer/land owner of an affordable housing project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although DCCs could be waived for a project, they still are required to be paid by the City therefore this may have a negative impact on City Finances.• Waiving or reducing DCCs would require the City to establish a dedicated budget to offset the cost of all DCCs that are waived or reduced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DCC are the only dedicated source of revenue for system-wide improvements.• Results in unequal benefit among system users.• Does the City have the capacity and willingness to offset the cost of all DCCs that are waived as this will require additional finances?• How would the DCC reserve be funded?• Council can be provided with a study prepared by Urban Systems (2009) which the previous Council considered on this matter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
5. Direct City staff to report to Council with recommendations on implementing inclusionary zoning as a way to support the development of more affordable housing.	LGA, Section 904: city can encourage affordable housing through a formal density bonus system. Council also has discretionary power to request contributions at rezoning. Requires an amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw in conjunction with a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low and moderate income households• Potential to request unit types targeted to specific populations (e.g. larger units suitable for families; accessible units) as part of developer's housing contribution.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Density Bonus System and rezoning process can be used to generate affordable housing units as development occurs, contributing to target of 19% of new units being affordable.• Supports a mixed-income community	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Likely limited potential outside of downtown core area due to lower densities• Reduce the potential for new development to contribute to the provision of other public amenities• Homeownership (strata) units in particular may require significant investment of resources to make housing units affordable for the target market	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider different ways of achieving “inclusionary zoning” objectives and its impact on community amenity contributions.• Given the potential number of affordable units which can be provided by development, how/what does Council want to focus Inclusionary Zoning (e.g. income, unit type or household target)?• What balance does Council want to strike between affordable housing and amenity contributions?• What is the threshold at which on-site affordable units would be requested (as opposed to funding contributions)?• Is Council willing to consider additional incentives for on-site affordable units? (e.g. housing fund contribution, tax abatement, and additional density above OCP max, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report back to Council with potential options for a Density Bonus System outside of the Downtown – anticipated for November 2015.• Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
6. Update the Zoning Regulation Bylaw to reflect the densities envisioned within the OCP to facilitate additional housing capacity.	Yes, LGA, Section 903 Requires amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw including a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All demographic groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updated <i>Zoning Regulation Bylaw</i> provides more certainty to developers, land owners and communities• Avoids need for a rezoning process if City rezones existing parcels with new zones – provides greater certainty, cost and time savings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No guarantee that new housing would be affordable• Removing need for rezoning may reduce ability to negotiate amenities• OCP densities are high-level, and need to be confirmed through local area planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff are currently developing new Zoning Bylaw for the Downtown Core Area only. Is Council willing to update existing Zoning regulations in advance of a local area planning process for other areas of the city?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue to develop new Downtown Core Area Zoning Regulation Bylaw.• Confirm appropriate densities and update Zoning Regulation Bylaw as part of local area plans.
	Action can be absorbed within current projects or operationalized in 2016					
	Action requires further consideration and reporting back					

Task Force Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
7. Remove the minimum unit size requirements for multi-unit residential zones within the <i>Zoning Regulation Bylaw</i> and within the <i>Conversion Guidelines – Transient to Residential Accommodation</i> .	Yes, LGA, Section 903 Requires amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw including a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">All demographic groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Would be consistent with current practice Downtown where no minimum residential unit sizes are specified.More units may be achieved in development projects if this regulation is removed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Parking will be required for all new additional units which may increase construction costs.Reduction in parking requires a parking variance (does not remove the regulatory requirement). Removal will need to be combined with reduction in required parking (actions 9 and 22) in order to be effective. <i>*See pros and cons associated with those actions.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Public consultation would be recommended with any policy and bylaw changes.The Building Code does not require minimum unit sizes for dwellings units, however, livability matters are provided for in the Building Code through minimum ceiling heights.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Direct staff to remove the minimum unit size requirements for multi-unit residential zones within the <i>Zoning Regulation Bylaw</i> concurrent with the update to <i>Schedule “C” – Off-Street Parking Regulations</i>.
8. Amend Schedule G – House Conversion Regulations of the Zoning Regulation Bylaw to better facilitate conversion of single detached housing units to multi-unit residential buildings <i>*Note: These regulations enable larger pre-1930’s homes to be converted into multiple units (either strata or rental). Indications from the development industry is that most or all of the eligible pre-1930’s homes have been converted, leaving few opportunities for additional units.</i>	Yes, LGA, Section 903 Requires amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw including a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">All demographic groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Increasing the eligible age of the houses would add more housing stock that could be eligible for conversion.An alternative would be to consider introducing additional eligibility based on distance from an urban village to support the OCP growth principles.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">If the house age, number of units and minimum unit sizes were eliminated, the potential growth directed to Traditional Residential areas may exceed what is envisioned in the OCP, which directs the majority of growth in the core and in/around urban villages.Increasing the number of units within eligible houses or broadening eligibility will have parking implications in the neighbourhoods that would need to be considered. Potential solutions could be waiving parking requirements if the units are rental vs strata ownership (which would also encourage more rental units).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The City’s House Conversion regulations have been a very successful initiative.Consider implications of removing/reducing some or all of the eligibility regulations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Direct staff to review <i>Schedule G – House Conversion Regulations</i> to determine amendments that would best accommodate additional conversion opportunities that are consistent with the <i>Official Community Plan</i>.
9. Reduce parking requirements within Schedule C – Off-Street Parking of the <i>Zoning Regulation Bylaw</i> as per the table provided in the Action Plan.	Yes, LGA, Section 906 Requires amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw including a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">All demographic groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Consideration for this can be absorbed into the planned Schedule “C” update (RFP currently under development).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Considering this ahead of the Schedule “C” update as an immediate fix would not have the benefit of a thorough analysis by the transportation consultant team.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Is Council willing to wait until the Schedule “C” update is complete?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Continue developing RFP for Schedule C review including analysis of parking requirements for affordable housing.
10. Amend the Zoning Regulation Bylaw to permit garden suites in single-family zones and amend the Garden Suite Policy as necessary.	Yes, LGA, Section 903 Requires amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw including a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Aging populationsModerate income households seeking mortgage helperStudents and lower wage workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Allowing garden suites outright in zoning would allow new homeowners to qualify for CMHC insured mortgage that accounts for income from garden suites. Currently, not eligible due to uncertainty.Reduces regulatory and financial barriers; will likely increase uptakeMaintains current DP review processCurrently, garden suites provide affordable home ownership but not affordable rental due to higher rent levels. Lack of rezoning may reduce costs of building garden suites, and savings may be passed onto tenant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Impact on adjacent properties (privacy, siting, parking). Visual impact is greater than secondary suites, since not invisible.Victoria does not have many lanes or consistent subdivision patterns therefore servicing must be done from front yard.Concern that Victoria does not have enough experience yet to draw conclusions on how this would be received.Related issue: current size restriction on garden suites limits suitability to one resident, which limits the tenant affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Should garden suites be allowed outright on all R1-B properties, or just plus size lots?Should garden suites be allowed outright at a citywide level or only within certain neighbourhoods?Consider need for public engagement Citywide or neighbourhood focused.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
	Action can be absorbed within current projects or operationalized in 2016					
	Action requires further consideration and reporting back					

Task Force Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
11. Amend the Zoning Regulation Bylaw to permit garden suites on properties with secondary suites and amend the Garden Suite Policy as necessary.	LGA, Section 903 Requires amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw including a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aging populations• Moderate income households seeking mortgage helper• Students and lower wage workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dramatically increases mortgage helper options for homeowners. This may result in lower rental rates for the tenants (additional analysis needed).• If done right, density is still fairly invisible.• Due to declining populations in some neighbourhoods, does not necessarily increase density of people per property, but does increase the number of households on a property• See notes in Action 10 regarding CMHC mortgage eligibility for garden suites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Makes density/increase in housing more visible• Cumulative impact of more households and parking could impact adjacent properties.• Does this create a de facto triplex, where all three units could be rented?• May be better suited to big lots only.• May want to look at imposing requirement that owner lives on site (in one of the three units) – currently, no requirement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should there be a requirement that the owner lives in one of the units on the property?• Should garden suites on properties with secondary suites be allowed outright at a citywide level or only within certain neighbourhoods?• Consider need for public engagement Citywide or neighbourhood focused	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
12. Amend Schedule J – Secondary Suite Regulations of the <i>Zoning Regulation Bylaw</i> by eliminating the minimum size requirement and the restriction on dwellings that have been renovated in the past five years.	LGA, Section 903 Requires amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw including a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aging populations• Moderate income households seeking mortgage helper• Students and lower wage workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Could significantly increase the stock of housing eligible for a new suite (e.g. small houses, houses that need external/internal renovations).• Increases ability of households to make physical changes to house in order to age in place. Current regulations regarding post-secondary suite renovations reduce the size of any addition to a maximum of 20m².	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Restrictions put in place to maintain the invisibility of density• Concern that poor quality additions would degrade the character• Additional analysis needed to determine how many small houses would be eligible for a suite if size limits eliminated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How important is it that changes to existing dwellings to accommodate secondary suites be minimal or “invisible”?• Should amendments be considered at a citywide level or only within certain neighbourhoods?• Consider need for public engagement Citywide or neighbourhood focused	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
13. Reconsider policies, guidelines, regulations and application/permit procedures for motel properties in the T-1 Zone, Limited Transient Accommodation District to reduce barriers for residential conversions.	LGA, Section 903 Requires amendment to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw including a Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low income households• Small households• Persons with special needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Makes use of property for which land use (motel) is becoming outdated• In some cases, would upgrade existing buildings which are already used as housing by some low-income households	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Few residential amenities in neighbourhood, since typically in commercial or industrial areas/zones• Conversion of motels does not guaranteed affordability to tenants• Some motels are currently used as temporary housing by low income households which could be displaced as a result of this initiative.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should T-1 amendments be considered at a citywide level where T-1 exists or only within certain neighbourhoods e.g. Burnside.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Direct staff to reconsider policies and guidelines for potential conversion of motel properties in the Burnside neighbourhood as part of the local area planning process (phase II public engagement).
14. Review and strengthen the Property Maintenance Bylaw and the resources to administer the Bylaw in order to better protect quality of life and promote safe housing conditions for all residents of Victoria. a. Add conditions of tenant/resident quality of life (mold, pests, etc.) to the City's Property Maintenance Bylaw; b. Coordinate actions to	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tenant households	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existing property maintenance/standards bylaw is too vague to be enforced• Enhances ability of the City to directly improve tenants' quality of life without having to rely on the Tenancy Board as sole regulator• New maintenance bylaw will be more specific, easier to interpret and enforce• Reduce reliance on electrical/plumbing/building inspectors, provide more power directly to bylaw enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enhanced bylaw will result in more service calls for bylaw officers• Increased cost of employing more officers• Existing bylaw enforcement officers not currently trained to enter premises	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What specific quality of life issues should the new Maintenance bylaw address, bylaw will require very specific language to be enforceable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Direct staff to update the <i>Property Maintenance Bylaw</i> to improve tenant housing quality.
	Action can be absorbed within current projects or operationalized in 2016					
	Action requires further consideration and reporting back					

Task Force Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
address housing conditions through the City Housing Officer and through reviewing and, where possible, re-prioritized bylaw enforcement resources towards addressing housing quality of life and safety issues.			officers, thus improving cost and administration efficiencies			
15. Streamline development application and permit processes by considering the following: a. Refine the CALUC process by shifting the timing of the “pre-application” CALUC meeting, and instead, allowing it to occur once the application is submitted to the City. This would permit all reviews to happen concurrently so applicants can receive all feedback at once and amend plans once. b. Delegate approval authority to staff for development permit and heritage alteration permit applications that propose affordable housing projects. c. Continue to give priority status to affordable housing applications within the development approval process.	Community Charter, Section 154 (delegation of council authority)	a. All demographic groups b. Low to moderate income households and persons with special needs c. Low to moderate income households and persons with special needs	a. May lead to time savings for applicants, as applicants can receive feedback concurrently. This suggestion was also made at the Development Summit. b. May lead to significant time savings for applicant (estimated 3-4 months reduced to 2-4 weeks). c. Existing practice can continue and process improvements may expedite processing time even further.	a. Change may be most effective as part of a larger review of CALUC process. The purpose of the pre-application meeting was to encourage applicants to respond to community suggestions and concerns, before a formal application is submitted to City. Would need to still encourage meaningful community input before proposal is too far developed. For small projects, limited time savings to applicant. b. Council may wish to be involved in decision-making for design of new housing in complex, sensitive or prominent locations. Staff have proposed that all new buildings and building additions in DPA 16 be delegated to staff. This would include many potential affordable housing development sites. Many affordable housing projects involve rezonings and legal agreements approved by Council, so Council may need to review project anyway. c. N/A.	• Development Summit Action Plan recommends an upcoming review of the CALUC process.	• Direct staff to consider additional delegation authority initiatives for development applications in future years following monitoring and evaluation of the delegation options currently under consideration by Council.
16. Create an inventory of publicly and privately-held lots suitable for affordable infill.	Yes	• Low to moderate income households	• Supports City’s consideration of its own assets and potential for infill housing on underused land (e.g. parking lots, low-density buildings) • Supports conversation and possible partnerships to create affordable and/or mixed income communities on underutilized land. • Potential for innovative forms of	• Limited land base even considering land owned by other government entities.	• N/A	• Examine whether the Strategic Real Estate function for the City could support municipal objectives related to affordable housing.

	Action can be absorbed within current projects or operationalized in 2016
	Action requires further consideration and reporting back

Task Force Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
			homeownership (e.g. land trust, equity co-op) where government or a non-profit entity maintains land ownership.			
17. Designate a City Housing Officer as a lead City liaison for landlords and tenants on housing issues that are within the City's jurisdiction.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tenant households	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assists in addressing quality of life issues for affordable housing and the enforcement of property maintenance bylaw.• Could provide a “one-stop-shop” for Victoria tenants dealing with landlord complaints.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Position may infringe on issues already handled by the BC Residential Tenancy Office.• New position is likely to create increase service calls to the City, would require additional staff resources and funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What service offerings would the Housing Officer provide that differentiates itself from the Residential Tenancy Branch?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Examine if Housing Officer function can be absorbed within existing staff resources and departmental functions or does this require an additional dedicated staff resource FTE.
18. Investigate opportunities for the City to support the development of affordable ownership programs (e.g. shared equity, non-profit) by hosting a workshop for City staff, housing providers, developers and builders.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moderate income households	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are many models of entry-level homeownership programs currently being implemented in other cities, from down-payment assistance and shared equity loans, to resale restricted units, land trusts, and equity coops. The City could learn from what works and what doesn't in different contexts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• While not necessarily a “con”, Victoria's built-out land base, location within the region, and development patterns will provide primarily opportunities for ownership within multi-family buildings with limited opportunities for ground-oriented infill (e.g. townhomes). These options will match only some households' preferences for ownership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Direct staff to undertake related research and organize a workshop to explore findings.

Year 2 Actions (2017)

Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
19. Contribute land at no cost or at reduced market value for the development of affordable housing projects.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low to moderate income households• May create mixed-income communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allows the City to direct location/distribution and types of affordable housing within the city• Allows the City to bank land for the future development of affordable housing• Potential for innovative forms of affordable housing including ownership (e.g. land trust, equity co-op)• Can maintain long-term control of land and its use as affordable housing• There may be potential to add density while retaining (through redevelopment) current uses at some sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If public land is developed, this could disrupt current uses of land (e.g. parking, city offices or facilities)• If land is currently leased for other uses (e.g. commercial) may result in loss of rental revenue.• May also result in loss of property taxes if Council approves permissive tax exemptions (see item #3)• Locations for development are limited by City's current land inventory and ability to acquire further land or partner with existing public or non-profit entities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Examine whether the Strategic Real Estate function for the City could support municipal objectives related to affordable housing.

	Action can be absorbed within current projects or operationalized in 2016
	Action requires further consideration and reporting back

Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
20. Create incentives that support converting underutilized or unused spaces above commercial properties into residential use.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All demographic groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide long-term solution to intermittent above-grade vacancies throughout downtown including additional incentives for downtown heritage buildings• Provision of affordable housing within close proximity to the amenities and services of downtown.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Market value of unused commercial floor area in downtown is high, City incentives/subsidies would be substantial• Potential loss of strategically located space for business incubators (high tech)• Requires City funding (grant) or tax exemption	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does Council want to ensure that converted space remains housing over the long term and does not revert to commercial/office uses?• Would incentive be tied to affordable housing or market housing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
21. Investigate and implement appropriate incentives (e.g. grants, tax credits, loans and/or loan guarantees, lowered development fees for adding units to existing rental stock) that can assist landlords in maintaining and/or improving affordable market and non-market housing.	Limited ability - Section 25 of the Community Charter prohibits Council from providing any form of grant, benefit, advantage or other form of assistance to a business (e.g. loans, loan guarantee, and tax exemptions).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low to moderate income households• Persons with special needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increases the likelihood of affordable housing units included within redevelopment.• Increases the likelihood of higher quality affordable housing and a diversity of affordable housing options within the city.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential loss of revenue (e.g. lowered development fees, tax exemptions) and/or excessive redistribution of tax burden to other ratepayers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does Council want to explore further financial incentives in consideration of the cumulative impact that other potential financial incentives may have on the City's financial capacity or potential impact on tax payers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
22. Consider a variety of innovations such as facility sharing, unbundled parking, land use mix, transit proximity, car-sharing options, and demographic needs and incomes within the scheduled review of Schedule C – Off-Street Parking of the <i>Zoning Regulation Bylaw</i> .	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All demographic groups	These are all forms of TDM that can be explored through different tools such as policy and zoning. RFP for Schedule C review is currently being prepared.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If issues arise through review of Schedule C, staff will report back to Council with summary and options.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Issues may arise following the recommendations of the Schedule C review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
23. Develop policies and procedures for establishing affordable housing agreements that include: a. Consistent and transparent processes; b. Guarantees or protections for the long-term security of tenure and affordability of units; and/or c. Supports for other housing affordability measures (e.g. inclusionary zoning requirements, revitalization tax credits, etc.).	LGA, Section 905	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low to moderate income households• Persons with special needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Housing agreements are currently utilized to secure housing related amenities as part of rezoning applications and considered at public hearings.• The content of housing agreements are not consistent because they are tailored to each particular development proposal (i.e. securing rental for different time periods, like 10 years or in-perpetuity, etc.).• Developing a policy for consistent housing agreement standards may provide proponents with more clear guidance and expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Widespread use of housing agreements required by the City to secure tenure and affordability of rental units may result in lower assessed values, and in turn, may affect mill rates for other areas to make up for the lost revenue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Further analysis may be needed to determine if there are any financial implications to the City.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore options at Council Housing Workshop for further direction.
	Action can be absorbed within current projects or operationalized in 2016					
	Action requires further consideration and reporting back					

Recommendations	Confirm City Authority	Population Served	Pros	Cons	Key Considerations to Explore at Workshop	Recommended Next Steps
24. Review the Zoning Regulation Bylaw to ensure it accommodates a variety of housing types (e.g. fee-simple row housing, co-housing, minimum parcel sizes for infill subdivision, etc.) that can be used to achieve greater owner affordability in the housing market.	LGA, Section 903	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Moderate to higher income households	<ul style="list-style-type: none">There may be some existing regulatory barriers that could be addressed related to building siting for fee simple row housing and co-housing typologies (as many common zones were designed to accommodate placement of more traditional housing typologies like single-family dwellings, duplexes and apartment buildings).New zoning categories could be created for fee simple row housing and co-housing to reduce the need for zoning variances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">It may be challenging to identify specific sites across the city that would be most conducive to fee-simple row housing or co-housing developments given lot reconfiguration (subdivision) or land assembly may be needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Is Council interested in exploring development of a new policy that would encourage favorable consideration of siting variances for fee-simple row housing or co-housing projects if certain criteria were met?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Update the Zoning Regulation Bylaw to facilitate additional housing capacity and types following local area planning within each neighbourhood.
25. Create a real estate function within the City's administration that can purchase and sell or lease property for the purpose of creating affordable housing.	Yes – direction to establish a real estate function for the City was approved by Council on August 27, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Low to moderate income households	<ul style="list-style-type: none">City has recently approved a Strategic Real Estate functionPotential to provide land to support affordable housingSee Item #19 regarding provision of land for affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">See Item #19 regarding provision of land for affordable housing	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Examine whether the Strategic Real Estate function for the City could support municipal objectives related to affordable housing.

	Action can be absorbed within current projects or operationalized in 2016
	Action requires further consideration and reporting back