

On Jun 17, 2015, at 4:19 PM, John Reilly <JReilly@victoria.ca> wrote:

Dear Heather,

Sorry for the delay in responding. The minutes of the Mayor's Task Force on Housing Affordability can be found at the following link: Minutes HATF <<https://victoria.civicweb.net/Documents/DocumentList.aspx?ID=82600>> . The blogger that spoke at the meeting was Jaclyn Casler and her blog can be found at Victorian Analysis <<http://victoriananalysis.ca/>> .

Regards,

John Reilly MSW RSW
Senior Planner – Social Issues
Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6
T 250.361.0351 F 250.361.0557

-----Original Message-----

From: Heather McArel [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, Jun 4, 2015 1:35 PM
To: Housing
Subject: Task Force on Affordable Housing

Good day members of the task force,

I attended the workshop held on Monday and have a few questions I was hoping you could answer:

- 1) When will the minutes be up, or will they be up? I checked and they were not online.
- 2) Would you happen to know the name of the blogger who spoke at the workshop, I am interested to read her blog on the workshop.

Thank you for your time,

Heather McArel

From: Alexander Kovalchuk [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, Jun 15, 2015 5:56 PM
To: Housing
Subject: housing affordability

Dear Task Force,

I commend the report for looking into ways to convert other properties more quickly into housing like motels and removing building height restrictions so developments could accommodate more. I was worried by suggestions to remove the minimum size requirements for rooms. I think we should not be tempted by "better than nothing" thinking and force upon others to accept any less than we would. That is an explicit double standard and unequal.

I heard that the council entertained a micro-housing proposal/presentation as a strategy to alleviate homelessness in the city. To be blunt, the problem of homelessness already has its solution in its word/term. Homelessness demands homes to be built. I hope the task force seriously considers that small confined spaces are an inappropriate response to the problem. Those units are literal after-thoughts to the fact that there are insufficient amounts of housing being built that can accommodate people with different abilities.

As a privileged individual attending post-secondary education I am aware that I cannot speak for others. Thus I feel that in these recommendations there is a lack of incorporating a feedback/consultative/outreach mechanism for those that would be using the services. They would know what they need and we are positions of power and comfort and thus responsibility to provide it to them.

Sincere regards,

sasha kovalchuk

From: jaclyn@v[REDACTED]
 Sent: Monday, Jun 15, 2015 5:38 PM
 To: Housing
 Subject: Feedback on draft recommendations

General comments

Lots of good ambition and intention. In absence of clear data however it is hard to recognize and or prioritize importance of any particular initiative. For instance, how many complaints have been received about poor quality dwellings that could potentially be enhanced by efforts to tighten up the property maintenance bylaw? Are there any clear numbers on how many affordable housing units are needed? Is there a clear definition of an "affordable unit"? I must admit I'm still confused about the difference between housing types (e.g., supported, affordable and subsidized). If more information was provided to justify each particular recommendation then I think you would also be more prepared to establish a logical sequence between efforts for the years 2016-18. As is, proposed sequencing is somewhat confusing.

Where I recognize that Mayor Helps is as record as saying "easy wins" are put forward for 2016 I think more time needs to be spent on bundling proposed recommendations into key topic areas within the two themes because then a more logical affordable housing business case could emerge. For instance, all parking related items should be considered and presented together - same goes for zoning related items, fees and charges related items, housing reserve related items, landlord and property maintenance issues, and land and real estate related items.

Once this information is clarified, maybe a professionally conducted telephone polls of residents and businesses may be an appropriate way of fully establishing City wide relevance of any particular issue.

Particular comments

1. Minimize & prorate fees for affordable housing...
 - * This should be considered together with DCC charges - similar to how there are charges for residential and commercial perhaps there could be a category of charges established for affordable housing? A tight affordable housing definition would be needed though.
2. Allow for higher density and greater heights in exchange for...
 - * A clear and supportable definition of affordable housing is needed as well as neighbourhood supported clarification on necessary services/provisions/accommodations associated with effective affordable housing.
3. Create an inventory of publicly & privately held land...
 - * This seems like a reasonable and easy thing to do. It should then be clearly tied into other land related items including the proposal for a real-estate function and the proposed recommendations for real-estate transactions. Only make land available for long term leases. Don't sell it.
4. Review the Victoria Housing reserve allocation of
 - * Again - need clear definition of affordable housing. I thought the reserve was only for supported housing? Please clarify.
5. Investigate options to expand the capacity of the Victoria Housing reserve....
 - * Again - need clear definition of affordable housing. I thought the reserve was only for supported housing? Please clarify.

6. Expedite conversion of motels and other transient accommodations....
 - * Before doing this, I would like to see a report on the efficiency and effectiveness of past city efforts in this area? What has been successful and what hasn't? Might there be other community partners who are better equipped for facilitating such a process?
7. Designate a City Housing Officer as a lead City Liaison....
 - * I did not know about this RESPOND program. Sounds interesting. Still not convinced though that the City should be the lead proponent? Might there be appropriate fee and penalty provisions within the terms of this program to allow the City to recoup related costs? If so, then I can support this.
1. Review and strengthen Property maintenance bylaw....
 - * Sounds like a good idea. I would like to see data though on the actual priority of this item from a resourcing of bylaw services perspective. Will this data be coming out of the bylaw services audit that I believe is scheduled for 2015? Related to my comments made on item 7 I would also like to see proof of the City's ability to recoup appropriate enforcement costs from negligent landlords.
2. Investigate opportunities for the City to support the development of affordable home ownership programs....
 - * I remember reading something about a similar program supported by the City of Victoria which seemed like a good idea. Suggestions and recommendations could then be tested in a telephone polls of city residents.
3. Expedite development approval and permitting process....
 - * This is not an appropriate topic for 2016. More research and agreement on what could be feasibly delegated or expedited first is needed. Also, with the city's new neighbourhoods team I imagine that some time will be needed as everyone gets used to new relationships and responsibilities. 1) I DO NOT support by-passing CALUC pre-meetings. 2) Delegating of approval authority may be appropriate once Zoning amendments specific to Conversions are clarified - clarity needed first. 3) With respect to giving "priority" clarity is needed both on what this means in terms of expediting and as well, clarity is needed on what affordable housing projects are and why they should be expedited. A clear definition is needed.
4. Waive development cost charges (DCCs) for affordable housing projects....
 - * Similar to my response to item #1 I think development cost charges should be considered with other development fees. I don't think they should be waived but perhaps a lesser fee requirement could be established. If fees are waived completely then the City is indirectly subsidizing affordable housing. Perhaps the issue of development related fees will come up in review of the Housing reserve and City fees could be seen as a secondary and or related way of supporting/facilitating affordable housing?
5. Remove the minimum unit size requirements for multi-unit zones....
 - * I think more research is needed on what this might look like. Parking could become a huge headache very quickly in areas where conversions occur. .
6. Amend Schedule G-House conversions....
 - * Within reason I think this is a good idea because some houses are more appropriate for conversions than others. I would like to see more research on this. Related to this, research will be needed on what appropriate cost categories and requirements will be from a City development and enforcement perspective because of the complexity of such projects.
7. Reduce parking requirements....
 - * These numbers seem arbitrary. Is it possible to provide some numbers on parking levels permitted at recent developments and to also look at what the traffic situation is in the neighbourhoods around these developments first? From a sequencing perspective, it seems more logical to explore item 18 (innovations in parking requirements) prior to reducing parking requirements. Proactive innovation makes more sense!
8. Remove rezoning requirement within Garden Suite Policy

* If I were a homeowner I would be really opposed to this item because what if I brought my property because I have young kids and I want them to play in our big backyard and my kids become unable to play in the backyard because my neighbour builds a garden suite that both wrecks the experience of my backyard and also makes it inappropriate for my kids to play in since the new tenants of this garden suite are dodgy? It wouldn't be unusual for my neighbour to also have a big backyard in this context. Garden suites are a big change and require neighbourhood consultation and approval. Clear yard size minimum requirements and garden suite size restrictions would also need to be retained.

9. Remove the restriction within garden suites policy that prohibits the development of garden suites on properties with secondary suites....

* I can support this one so long as clear specifications are established for yard and house size minimums (e.g., your house and yard has to be a certain size). I also have to wonder who would want both a garden suite and secondary suite? Would the owner live upstairs and rent the downstairs and garden? Or would all three suites be rentals? Idea sounds good but also sounds like the requirement could also be easily taken advantage of. Is data available on current existing rentals and city application made but rejected as a well of getting a sense of need for such a setup?

10. Amend schedule J - Secondary suite regulations by eliminating the minimum size requirements.....

* Does the city have any data on # of legal and illegal suites? Could this be associated with re-introduction of the secondary suite renovation grant program? If size requirements are removed, I would think some criteria for servicing and amenities would have to be introduced so as to ensure a minimum quality of liveability (for instance bachelor suites with only basic kitchens versus proper suites with full kitchens).

11. Consider a variety of innovations such as facility sharing, unbundled parking, increased density, and use mix, transit accessibility, car sharing options.....

* As per my response to # 14 I would like a report on possibilities related to this item to come to Council before the City contemplates reducing parking requirements full stop.

12. Direct City staff to report to Council with recommendations on implementing inclusionary zoning....

* I support feasibility reports. I don't quite understand though how this will be different from previous efforts and or the current situation. Related to this, can some Zone standards be established to move the city away from continuous spot-zoning?

1. Contribute land at no cost or at reduced market value for the development of affordable housing projects....

* I don't support this. Think its a bad idea. As per the advice given by the one fellow at the workshop, land should only be made available on long term leases in accordance with best practices.

2. Create a real estate function within the City's administration that can purchase and sell property for the purpose of creating affordable housing.

* I seem to recall that similar item related to the City Real-estate function will likely be a recommendation from the economic development task force. That said, I don't support this item because I don't see the need for it - very cart before the horse. If there is a need, a clear case should be made by the City. Related to this, what would the expectation be for public transparency of this new real-estate office because I know that the majority, if not all of the City's real-estate related transactions occur incamera meetings. Which is to say, a City real estate arm is only supportable if it is transparent.

1. Create incentives that support converting under-utilized or unused spaces above commercial properties into residential use.

* This could be good. Depends on landlord and owner support as well as the potential livability of certain places. What would associated rezoning requirements? If anything, I think this item would

actually be an “easier win” than garden suite rezoning because 1) fewer neighbours to worry about and 2) these buildings would likely be closer to necessary services the garden suite dweller in a residential neighbourhood would be. In sum, this item could be an effect 2016 item I think.

2. 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.

* I don't support this. Seems super dodgy and just an excellent opportunity to facilitate things like renovictions. This is too far out of City jurisdiction that it is just a bad idea.

3. Develop policies and procedures for establishing affordable housing agreements...

* I support this.

4. Review the Zoning regulation bylaw to ensure it accommodates a variety of housing types.....

* Don't know what this means - seems like it would come out of the other zoning related items and recommendations? Please make an effort to group recommendations by topic (zoning) so they make more sense. If they make more sense, you could get better public support and also have a better chance that these items would actually be implemented. Lastly, is it not false to say the city is “planning a review” when Council recently rejected a staff motion to fund a zoning bylaw review?

From: Douglas L. [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, Jun 15, 2015 11:29 AM
To: Housing
Subject: One more article on housing

Vancouver's Affordability Trap <http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/matt-toner/vancouver-housing-affordability-trap_b_7563602.html>

<http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/matt-toner/vancouver-housing-affordability-trap_b_7563602.html>
image

<http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/matt-toner/vancouver-housing-affordability-trap_b_7563602.html>
Vancouver's Affordability Trap

While the provincial government might want to wish this crisis away, the facts have a way of hanging around.

<http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/matt-toner/vancouver-housing-affordability-trap_b_7563602.html>
View on www.huffingtonpost.ca

Preview by Yahoo

From: Carolyn Knight [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, Jun 15, 2015 11:18 AM
To: Housing
Subject: Mayor's Task Force Draft Responses

Good morning,

I did attend the work shop and plenary session.

Fascinated to hear from UDI that density ought to be limited.

In response to density, please CONSIDER environmental impacts to densification; balance need for prudent, ecological implications of any new builds, and require water/ sewer/ stormwater/ transportation/ liveability issues for the present, but more so, for FUTURE implications. Put water/ stormwater/ sewerage issues first and foremost in considering development permit application.

Ensure that IF/ WHEN developers receive incentives to build affordable housing, that measures are enacted to ENSURE housing units CONTINUE to be affordable; ie, have robust rules so that developers DO NOT use incentives to get permissions, and then renege on commitments in the future. How?

Support residential property owners to tap into funding (via grants or other means), to ADD AFFORDABLE housing units in existing homes/ new builds of innovative secondary and garden suites, to MAINTAIN affordability of tax burdens that continually increase. It is promising and positive that The City recognizes that home owner affordability is ALSO a driver of increasing REALLY affordable housing that ADDS units that are transitional, does not require large tracks of pricey land acquisition, assists people across a spectrum of need/ value. Add this home owner supply as viable, sustainable and HELP owners maintain their properties, through incentives, grants, permissions to build with innovative green resources (ie, cob, rammed earth, earth bag, etc, building methods).

Recognize that pushing Parks as a Number One Solution for "temporary, mini-housing", pits users against one another. Parks bear the burden of EVERY stakeholder over-using a public amenity that risks the ecology of the very places we consider so valuable. I am tired of the "loved to death" quality that has hit ALL the special places that parks are throughout the CRD. Stop thinking Parks Are IT for housing! What about brown land? What about corporations leasing lands for temporary housing? How come the public sector lands have to take hits over and over again? How come City thinks Parks can be "re-branded" as housing allotments? WHERE is the private sector, with the cash, to become part of the solution, having gained incredible benefits from the overt over-building that constitutes " the economy", yet offers less than it gains in providing support, resources, leverage, to put in place the resources/ funds/ expertise to support ACTUALLY affordable housing?

I appreciate that the City recognizes that action is imperative, is seeking solutions, is developing updated policy drivers (ie, LID, permissions to transition to greener technologies, moving toward water capture/ mitigation on home owner properties), and is building consensus that SOMETHING has to shift.

While we are on this topic: encourage innovators to create green technology redevelopment of existing housing, ie, transition to off grid water mitigation solutions; solar power renovators, and other redux thinking - and permissions - to transition to low impact energy solutions. ENCOURAGE this transition at the regulatory level, in the post secondary education realm, in the tech sectors - EVERYwhere that we require NEW THINKING and ACTION.

Thank you for this leadership by CoV. I am hopeful.

Truly,

Carolyn Knight

Home Owner,

Artist in Residence, Fairfield Gonzales Community Association

From: Rachel O'Neill [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, Jun 15, 2015 10:49 AM
To: Housing
Cc: Burnside Gorge Community Association
Subject: Feedback - Draft Recommendations of Housing Task Force
Attachments: Letter to Council - Housing Task Force - June 2015.pdf

Good morning,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft recommendations put forward by the Mayor's Task Force on Housing Affordability. Please see the attached letter.

Warm regards,

Rachel O'Neill
Manager, Communications & Development
Burnside Gorge Community Association
Phone: [REDACTED]
www.burnsidegorge.ca

From: Neb Radojkovic [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, Jun 15, 2015 10:38 AM
To: Housing
Subject: Cob Housing

Hi,

I would try to include some regulations for Cob Housing as it is becoming a very popular way of building homes

with inexpensive earth materials.

Cheers!

Neb

From: Douglas L. [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, Jun 15, 2015 9:14 AM
To: Housing
Subject: Feedback to Housing report

Hello,

There is a Vox news story on the housing problems in San Francisco which I thought interesting. Basically, the low housing density is the cause of economic stagnation. However, it occurred to me that benefits from a housing boom could be lost if that boom was met with investment property buyers who see it as a safe place to put their money.

This may, to a certain extent, be true in Victoria. Noting that this has been recognized as a problem in Vancouver, it should be anticipated here too.

Douglas Laird

[REDACTED]

This woman has a plan to fix San Francisco's housing crisis — but homeowners won't like it
<<http://www.vox.com/2015/6/15/8782235/san-francisco-housing-crisis>>

<<http://www.vox.com/2015/6/15/8782235/san-francisco-housing-crisis>> image

<<http://www.vox.com/2015/6/15/8782235/san-francisco-housing-crisis>> This woman has a plan to fix San Francisco's housing cri...

A new generation of affordable housing activists argue that the way to get rents down is to build a lot more housing.

<<http://www.vox.com/2015/6/15/8782235/san-francisco-housing-crisis>> View on www.vox.com

Preview by Yahoo

From: Lee Herrin [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, Jun 12, 2015 12:02 PM
To: Housing
Cc: Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Subject: Policy idea for housing affordability

The policy recommendations do not include using permissive tax exemptions as a policy tool to support the development or ongoing supply of affordable housing.

Most affordable housing is provided by non-profit organizations and/or charities. One way to move money to these organizations is to provide permissive exemptions on their existing affordable housing projects (as well as on new developments). Obviously, an eligibility policy would need to be developed for this, but most affordable housing providers have received contributions from either the City and/or other levels of government. Projects receiving these funds usually make a commitment that is registered on title. This would be an easy way to screen applicants. If they could show proof on title that there is still an existing covenant to provide affordable housing (likely with either CMHC or BC Housing), they would be eligible for some level of permissive exemption. This would reduce ongoing operating costs for these providers. This reduced operating cost would most likely either be used to reduce rents (contributing directly to increased affordability), or to generate surpluses which would be used for the equity portion of a new affordable housing project (affordable housing providers have a purpose in their constitution to provide affordable housing—this could be another screening tool). Reducing ongoing operating costs would help the providers generate that equity sooner, leading to more rapid supply of new affordable units to market.

As an example, my organization provides 10 three bedroom units of affordable family housing on two sites. We currently receive no property tax forgiveness on these properties. The rents on these properties amount to roughly \$120,000 per year (market rents would be more like \$180,000 per year). Municipal property taxes, which are paid from the rents, amount to an estimated \$5,333 per year (I have to estimate because four of the units are in a mixed use building and calculating the residential only portion of the municipal tax bill is very complicated). Obviously, this is not a large amount, but it is ~\$45/mo per unit. An organization my size would likely use this contribution to keep rents affordable. However, a larger organization, with say, 100 units, could build \$4500 of equity per month with a full of exemption.

One other observation, which I have already shared with Councillor Thornton-Joe. The CRD and CoV housing trust funds currently pay “per-door” contributions to affordable housing projects. This incentivizes the construction of “workforce” housing (bachelors/one bedrooms) which is fine, in and of itself. However, as the population pyramid below shows, the City of Victoria has an unnaturally low population of children. I believe this is due to the lack of housing affordability for families. There is a significant cohort of people age 20 to 35 (known to demographers as the family formation stage of development). Providing “workforce” housing is great, as they need affordable places to live while in school or early career. But where do they go when they stabilize in employment, form couples and want to have children? Answer: Langford. We need a contribution policy that recognizes that affordable family housing is less advantageous economically for a housing provider to build (i.e. two- and three-

bedroom). A “per front door” policy is unfair to those who would build affordable family housing. Perhaps a “per bedroom door” policy? Yes, a three-bedroom apartment still has only one kitchen and bathroom, but a family complex might contain half as many units as a comparable sized complex of bachelor units and attract half as much subsidy, while being substantially similar in costs to build, and generating considerably less rent over its lifetime.

Lee

Lee Herrin
Executive Director
Fernwood NRG



www.fernwoodnrg.ca <<http://www.fernwoodnrg.ca/>>

From: Mike G [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, Jun 10, 2015 3:48 PM
To: Housing
Subject:[Feedback] Provide Feedback on Draft Recommendations of Mayor's Task Force on Housing Affordability

Hello,

As a resident of Victoria, I support most of these proposed changes in the draft. I like the idea of improving the efficiency of developer applications and reducing the high cost that's associated with these applications.

Please, however, for the love of god, do not do what the city of Victoria did in the old days and allow developers to build, crappy, unsightly, apartment blocks. Apartment blocks after apartment blocks it seems were allowed to be build along much of Cook st (towards the Village) and along Fort st and Pandora st. When a building needs a name like the "Shangri La", or "Emerald Greens" that really projects a much prettier mental picture of the building then it actually is, something is definitely wrong.

Thank you,

Mike Gazdag

725 Vancouver St.

From: Fairfield Community Assoc [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, Jun 8, 2015 4:26 PM
To: Housing
Cc: Fairfield Community Place
Subject: Mayors Task Force On Housing Affordability: Draft Recommendations

Attachments: 2015 06 03 FGCA Housing Affordability FINAL.pdf

Hello,

We are responding to your request for comment on the Mayors Task Force On Housing Affordability: Draft Recommendations Dated 27 May 2015. We appreciate the opportunity to provide the following commentary and feedback on several of the recommendations. Letter attached.

All the best,

Pippa Davis
Reception
Fairfield Gonzales Community Association
1330 Fairfield Road Victoria, BC V8S 5J1
[REDACTED]
place@fairfieldcommunity.ca
www.fairfieldcommunity.ca

Celebrating 40 years of community service - 1975-2015 <<http://fairfieldcommunity.ca/>>

From: sandra steilo [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, Jun 8, 2015 11:20 AM
To: Housing
Subject: Mayor's Task Force on Housing Affordability

I am writing to provide feedback on the recommendations, in particular this one:

Expedite development approval and permitting process by:

- a. Allowing rezoning applications for affordable housing projects to by-pass the pre-application meeting required with Community Association Land Use Committees.
- b. Delegating more approval authority within the development permit and heritage alteration permit processes.
- c. Continuing to give priority status to affordable housing applications within the development approval process.

I believe Victoria and B.C. have a challenge in creating affordable housing and housing for the homeless and I believe each community and municipality throughout the GVRD is responsible for addressing this challenge. I don't believe that bypassing meaningful consultation with communities is a way to solve or expedite this solution. We shouldn't bypass this consultation with communities on any decision.

Our neighbourhood parks and greenspaces are a part of where we live, raise families and pay taxes and this needs to be considered when making decisions that affect us.

I would be encouraged to see a greater emphasis on rent supplements as well.

thank you

Sandra Steilo

From: Anthony Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, Jun 7, 2015 1:57 PM
To: Housing
Subject: Comments on draft recommendations

Hello,

After reviewing the recommendations of the task force and attending the presentation last week, I have the following comments on the recommendations:

- 1) Late in the presentation, one of the task force members mentioned creating essentially passive buildings - it would be ideal to find a way to have the development of affordable units that are also green and use passive heating/cooling strategies to be dually incentiveized, as this creates both a win for the environment and also for long term affordability with lower energy costs
- 2) As was clear from the meeting, removing the CALUC should be reconsidered to ensure transparent community consultation throughout the development process and try to minimize NIMBYism. On this note - I agree with the height and density bonusing idea should be reconsidered, albeit for a different reason. It seems there is no better way to create community animosity/NIMBYism around affordable housing that already stigmatized and the target of disdain in some communities than to create it at a height/density scale that is outside that which is specified in the OCP. If people are already on the fence/against affordable units in their neighbourhood, they certainly won't want more dense/bigger ones. However height and density bonusing can still be a useful tool if there are provisions in place to transfer additional height and density to a different site/project. For example, in return for developing affordable housing at site x, the developer is rewarded with additional height/density at site y. This has been used effectively in other jurisdictions and I think it would be worth considering here.

Thank you for your work on this important issue,

Anthony Taylor

From: Judy Marston [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, Jun 5, 2015 5:19 PM
To: Housing
Cc: Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Subject: Another idea to possibly supplement the affordable housing shortfall at the same time as we address two other looming social issues

Hello,

I was not aware of this Committee otherwise I might have made an effort to get involved. I had a quick glance at your recommendations document and see the ideas presented below as fitting well into the "expanding into the details" aspects related to Year 2 (2017).

However, I heard Mayor Lisa on CFX today discussing your Committee and wanted to share an idea I "spawned" a couple of weeks ago when I heard Isobel MacKenzie discussing the recent Ombudsmen for Seniors 18 Recommendations <<https://www.seniorsadvocatebc.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/05/Seniors-Advocate-Housing-Report-News-Release.pdf>> report.

As it turns out, it may also marry well with the problems raised in Marcy Cohen's 2013 report: The Ombudsperson's Report on Seniors Care <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/ombudspersons-report-seniors-care> , which outlines the problems in getting enough of and high quality in-home care for seniors in order to allow them to stay in their own homes as they age.

My idea is a "kill THREE birds with one stone" kind of idea. I realize it won't suit everyone and may be too complex to be implemented (knowing how our governmental controls tend to work), but it still might be a potential solution for a number of those older Victorians (and any Canadians!) who have good-sized homes.

The benefits this concept could create are:

- 1) More affordable housing (for younger and/or underemployed people that are in demand to provide the support services we need but who can't afford local housing)
- 2) Increased disposable income for seniors who are house-poor but want to stay in their homes as they age
- 3) Better security for aging seniors who are continuing to live in their own homes but have limited access to home-health care support services (due to lack of funding).

And... here's the email content I sent to the Ombudsman's office (<http://www.seniorsadvocatebc.ca/>) a couple of weeks ago around the proposed concept:

How about this?

Seniors with a suitable home could access a tax-free (or subsidized) affordable housing income benefit so they can create a rental suite or "help/nanny" accommodations. Then they could collect disposable income from the rent and not be forced to get a reverse mortgage (although some or all of the renovations could be paid by that means because, obviously, there would be an outlay required to create the additional rental unit).

This would make for a win-win-win situation!

This way, seniors would be able to maintain their equity, as well as their independence and it would create more affordable housing for the younger/lower-incomed population who are also needed to fill the senior support jobs, especially with the grey tsunami and retirement population also increasing exponentially for the next 20 years or so. After all, who's going to serve these seniors when only wealthy people live in the expensive housing and the less-wealthy workers live too far away to hold the service jobs. (Such a crazy Catch-22 we're heading into here!)

Plus, it would help address the huge problem of an extreme -- and growing -- lack of affordable housing in Canada's urban centres (as CTV news covered a night or two ago:

<http://www.ctvnews.ca/business/municipal-study-warns-of-looming-housing-problem-1.2380064>).

ADDITIONAL BENEFITS:

- Part of the deal for reasonable rent would be that the renters could play a quasi-security role for the resident senior(s) and agree to keep an eye on them. Or have an alarm buzzer situation set up so they're not being bothered but would allow for the provision of an extra pair of eyes on a potentially isolated or house-bound senior. Then they could have a standard means of alerting some authority to come and check on them, if they don't see them for a day or two. (After all, now that we're losing mail delivery, this has been cited as a major issue for single seniors.
 - o Seniors could also potentially barter/trade for additional services from their "renters" such as gardening and other maintenance or general assistance in exchange for lower rents.
- Socially this also has the potential of enhancing the blending of generations which has been cited as being especially healthy for seniors, instead of plunking them into seniors' residential housing so that they only interact with people of their own generation. (Like they do in very inclusive "collaborative" housing developments in Denmark <<http://eliteseniorsolutions.com/cohousing-provides-community-and-independence/>> and other parts of Scandinavia.)

I have a number of other thoughts about this subject and, yes, I can also easily identify a few obvious "issues" related to it, but decided I would flash it off to you now, while it was fresh in my mind.

If you have any questions, I'd be happy to provide more details.

Hoping this might give your committee something to chew on!

Thanks very much...

Judy

Judy Marston
Career Transition Specialist
Military - Civilian Coach
Website: www.resumecoach.ca


From: Ben Isitt (Councillor)
Sent: Friday, Jun 5, 2015 10:34 AM
To: Housing
Subject: Fwd: Parks and Homeless

Please include with input for Housing Affordability Task Force.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Michael Sharpe [REDACTED]
Date: June 5, 2015 at 12:31:16 PM EDT
To: <mayor@victoria.ca>, <councillors@victoria.ca>
Cc: Michael Sharpe [REDACTED]
Subject: Parks and Homeless
June 6th 2015

All-

I have been spending a lot of time this season in the parks and playgrounds used by Beacon Hill Little League as well as the parks in Saanich that host our players as visitors.

The condition and quality of these playgrounds is noticeable without even looking hard – even their 'inner city' parks such as the ball diamond at Hampton Park are a step above many of Victoria's playing fields.

The recent talk of turning another one of Victoria's parks in to some form of assisted housing/homeless encampment is in my opinion shortsighted and inappropriate. The level of disrespect to those who frequent the selected parks and whose tax paying properties neighbor these locations is immeasurable.

There are other options and I feel the majority of council is not looking outside the box but is instead willing to accept the fact that a regional problem (such as homelessness) is something we are obligated as a municipality to shoulder entirely on our own.

There are no restrictions in the Local Government Act preventing Victoria from purchasing apartment buildings in Saanich, Esquimalt, View Royal, Langford etc.

You may say that the city is not in the business of 'landlording' however, in all actuality that is what you are entering in to with your talk of creating 'homeless parks'. You are also now owners of a number of properties in the downtown core that were purchased from the PCC.

Sell the downtown buildings.

Take the sales proceeds from them and start purchasing multi family buildings outside the City of Victoria. Lease the property for \$1 a year to one of the already established societies who are qualified and experienced in this industry (the city isn't). 47 suites for sale on Craigflower Road for \$3.1m, 39 suites for sale on Burnside Road \$2.3m, 30 units for sale on Regina Avenue \$3.5m.

Let Saanich Police and Saanich Bylaw deal with the additional costs that go with the territory of hard-to-house. Sure, you might not be making friends with your fellow local government leaders, but you don't work for them – you work for the residents of the City of Victoria.

Don't get me wrong, it's an admirable idea and something needs to be done (since the Province is passing the buck on to the local governments) but you need to put the pressure on the region – not more pressure on our already stretched local resources. Spending the \$350,000 on the present idea is wasteful as the spin-off expenses have not been considered such as policing, bylaw and the devaluation of neighboring properties tax assessment.

This isn't a case of NIMBY....it's been in our backyard for decades. It's more of a case of HAIEBY (how-about-in-everyone's-backyard).

It's time rate payers in Victoria get a break for once on this issue and time for others to be forced to the table.

Save our parks. Spend money on real housing instead.

Regards,

Michael Sharpe

From: Brian Scarfe [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, Jun 4, 2015 6:25 PM
To: Housing

Subject: Comments on the Program Proposals of the Affordable Housing Task Force

Attachments: Comments on the Program Proposals of the Affordable Housing Task Force.pdf

Please find attached some preliminary comments on the program proposals of the Affordable Housing Task Force.

Brian Scarfe
[REDACTED]

From: Heather McArel [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, Jun 4, 2015 1:35 PM
To: Housing
Subject: Task Force on Affordable Housing

Good day members of the task force,

I attended the workshop held on Monday and have a few questions I was hoping you could answer:

- 1) When will the minutes be up, or will they be up? I checked and they were not online.
- 2) Would you happen to know the name of the blogger who spoke at the workshop, I am interested to read her blog on the workshop.

Thank you for your time,

Heather McArel

From: Ana Simeon [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, Jun 3, 2015 7:21 PM
To: Housing
Subject: Feedback on proposal

Dear Task Force,

Great recommendations overall, and it looks like there is some legs to this proposal too - I like to see timelines! Many great ideas - thank you!

Two things that I would be wary of and would recommend be struck off the recommendations:

- yes to increased density in exchange for affordable housing, but not to height, or at least not before neighbourhood associations have had their say. Otherwise it becomes a developer-fest like in Vancouver in exchange for a few affordable units. Downtown is one thing, but height regulations in residential neighbourhoods should stand. Added density can compensate.
- no to by-passing meetings with neighbourhood associations in exchange for affordable housing. These checks and balances are there for a reason. The time gained is minimal compared to the loss of democratic input from nearby residents.

Many thanks,

Ana Simeon
1703B Fernwood Road
Victoria BC V8T2Y3
[REDACTED]

From: Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Sent: Wednesday, Jun 3, 2015 10:50 AM
To: Suzanne Bradbury
Cc: John Reilly; Jayne Bradbury
Subject: Re: Affordable Housing Task Force

Thanks! John, see below. Please incorporate these suggestions as part of the public input.

--

Lisa Helps, Victoria Mayor

www.lisahelpsvictoria.ca

[REDACTED]
@lisahelps

"Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody only because, and only when, they are created by everybody."

- Jane Jacobs

On Jun 2, 2015, at 10:51 AM, Suzanne Bradbury [REDACTED] wrote:

Good morning, Lisa!

I thought this "well-building" website and the downloadable guidelines therein might be a useful resource to facilitate the wellness discussion for your Affordable Housing Task Force.

<http://delos.com/about/well-building-standard/>

This website was recommended to us by the Gerding Edlen people (<http://www.gerdingedlen.com/>) who have done wonderful work in Portland and who show true thought leadership with regards to community based development.

Have a great day, and really great work on the task force.

Suzanne

Suzanne Bradbury
Fort Properties Ltd*
814 Broughton St | Victoria | BC | V8W 1E4
[REDACTED]

W: www.fortproperties.ca <<http://www.fortproperties.ca/>>

F: www.facebook.com/FortProp <<http://www.facebook.com/FortProp>>

I: instagram.com/fortprop <<http://instagram.com/fortprop>>

T: twitter.com/fortprop <<https://twitter.com/fortprop>>

Dear Richard,

Your submission to the Mayor's Task Force on Housing Affordability has been received and your recommendation will be presented to the Task Force for consideration. Thank you for taking the time to submit your suggestions.

Sincerely,

John Reilly MSW RSW
Senior Planner – Social Issues
Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6
T 250.361.0351 F 250.361.0557

From: Richard Brunt [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 9:17 AM
To: Housing; Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Subject: affordable housing idea

Hello,

I hope I am not too late to submit an idea for the affordable housing task force. If this is not the appropriate email please let me know. I have attached it as a PDF file.

Regards,

Richard Brunt

[REDACTED]

From: George & Jo-Ann Zador [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 3:38 PM
To: Housing
Cc: Lynn Beak; Fairfield Community Place
Subject: Mayor's task force on housing affordability, draft recommendations.

Please note my personal comments on the above subject:

Ref. Year 1, Theme: Remove barriers etc.....I

Item 1.a "bypass meeting with CALUCs"

Respectfully suggesting it to be a most retrograde idea when the pre-application meeting is the only avenue for neighbourhood and stakeholders' comments and input.

If anything, such projects should involve the community even more.

The scheduled meeting and comments relayed to the City should not delay the process.

Item 6. "Remove the rezoning requirement within the Garden Suite Policy"

It is the rezoning application that triggers the CALUC Community Meeting process and this would mean (as in the above) that such projects would proceed without community involvement.

Perhaps the the paperwork and process of rezoning can be eliminated but the Community Meeting maintained?

As a general comment: it would be necessary to define what is "affordable" as a term for accommodation and how it may vary depending on location

Sincerely

George Zador

Planning and Zoning Chair
Fairfield Gonzales Community Association
1330 Fairfield Rd. Victoria, BC V8S 5J1
planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
www.fairfieldcommunity.ca
Facebook



ROCKLAND NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION

Mayor and Council, Victoria

Dear Mayor and Council,

It is with real disappointment and alarm that we respond to the Draft Recommendations from the Task Force on Affordable Housing.

Neighbourhood associations are led by volunteers democratically elected to represent their residents. They spend countless hours on land use issues. That not a single N.A. is on the Task Force is completely unacceptable. The unrealistically short time line provided for our response to the recommendations that we had no share in creating adds to the insult.

Several of the Task Force's recommendations would have negative impacts on our neighbourhood that we would strongly oppose. Consider, for example, "allowing rezoning applications for affordable housing projects to bypass the pre-application meeting required with Community Association Land Use Committees," and "removing the rezoning requirement with the Garden Suite Policy." Disenfranchising those people most impacted by development from their full role in ensuring it is appropriate or desirable will serve only to frustrate and anger them. Is this the new face of civic engagement?

Two of the threats most likely to cause concern in a neighbourhood are increased density and building heights, yet one recommendation is to "allow for higher densities and greater heights than permitted within existing zones." To what purpose zoning?

The Task Force's mandate was to "engage the public and stakeholder groups as appropriate to develop recommendations." If the neighbourhood associations are not considered to be "stakeholders," the City has little notion of what community engagement really is.

Sincerely,

Janet Simpson, President

Christine Havelka

Subject: FW: Policy idea for housing affordability

On 2015-06-15, at 7:14 AM, Lee Herrin wrote:

I forgot to mention another possible screen. Serious housing providers apply for and obtain "municipal" tax status with respect to filing GST for providing services that in other parts of Canada are provided by municipalities (thereby providing them a 100% credit on GST paid for this activity). One of these is affordable housing, but in Cowichan Bay, a non-profit runs their "municipal" water supply (for instance). Providers have to prove to CRA that they are providing affordable housing in order to obtain the status. The permissive tax exemption could flow toward those who have municipal status.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lisa Helps (Mayor) [<mailto:mayor@victoria.ca>]

Sent: June-14-15 11:34 AM

To: Lee Herrin

Cc: Housing; Lisa Helps (Mayor)

Subject: Re: Policy idea for housing affordability

Thank you. We will ensure your feedback is added. A property tax exemption for non-profits that run affordable housing projects could be included as a concrete recommendation of the task force should the task force members agree to add it.

--

Lisa Helps, Victoria Mayor

www.lisahelpsvictoria.ca<<http://www.lisahelpsvictoria.ca>>

250-661-2708

@lisahelps

"Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody only because, and only when, they are created by everybody."

- Jane Jacobs

On Jun 12, 2015, at 12:02 PM, Lee Herrin <>> wrote:

The policy recommendations do not include using permissive tax exemptions as a policy tool to support the development or ongoing supply of affordable housing.

Most affordable housing is provided by non-profit organizations and/or charities. One way to move money to these organizations is to provide permissive exemptions on their existing affordable housing projects (as well as on new developments). Obviously, an eligibility policy would need to be developed for this, but most affordable housing providers have received

contributions from either the City and/or other levels of government. Projects receiving these funds usually make a commitment that is registered on title. This would be an easy way to screen applicants. If they could show proof on title that there is still an existing covenant to provide affordable housing (likely with either CMHC or BC Housing), they would be eligible for some level of permissive exemption. This would reduce ongoing operating costs for these providers. This reduced operating cost would most likely either be used to reduce rents (contributing directly to increased affordability), or to generate surpluses which would be used for the equity portion of a new affordable housing project (affordable housing providers have a purpose in their constitution to provide affordable housing—this could be another screening tool). Reducing ongoing operating costs would help the providers generate that equity sooner, leading to more rapid supply of new affordable units to market.

As an example, my organization provides 10 three bedroom units of affordable family housing on two sites. We currently receive no property tax forgiveness on these properties. The rents on these properties amount to roughly \$120,000 per year (market rents would be more like \$180,000 per year). Municipal property taxes, which are paid from the rents, amount to an estimated \$5,333 per year (I have to estimate because four of the units are in a mixed use building and calculating the residential only portion of the municipal tax bill is very complicated). Obviously, this is not a large amount, but it is ~\$45/mo per unit. An organization my size would likely use this contribution to keep rents affordable. However, a larger organization, with say, 100 units, could build \$4500 of equity per month with a full of exemption.

One other observation, which I have already shared with Councillor Thornton-Joe. The CRD and CoV housing trust funds currently pay “per-door” contributions to affordable housing projects. This incentivizes the construction of “workforce” housing (bachelors/one bedrooms) which is fine, in and of itself. However, as the population pyramid below shows, the City of Victoria has an unnaturally low population of children. I believe this is due to the lack of housing affordability for families. There is a significant cohort of people age 20 to 35 (known to demographers as the family formation stage of development). Providing “workforce” housing is great, as they need affordable places to live while in school or early career. But where do they go when they stabilize in employment, form couples and want to have children? Answer: Langford. We need a contribution policy that recognizes that affordable family housing is less advantageous economically for a housing provider to build (i.e. two- and three-bedroom). A “per front door” policy is unfair to those who would build affordable family housing. Perhaps a “per bedroom door” policy? Yes, a three-bedroom apartment still has only one kitchen and bathroom, but a family complex might contain half as many units as a comparable sized complex of bachelor units and attract half as much subsidy, while being substantially similar in costs to build, and generating considerably less rent over its lifetime.

<image002.jpg>

Lee

Lee Herrin
Executive Director
Fernwood NRG
(250) 381-1552 ext. 103
www.fernwoodnrg.ca<<http://www.fernwoodnrg.ca>>