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ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report provides a summary of the comments provided by stakeholders at the November 2015 workshops on the draft of the Regional Affordable Housing Strategy (RAHS) dated August 2015. The report includes a brief overview of the workshops themselves, and focuses on conveying the multiple perspectives we heard on how the Draft RAHS could be improved.

The workshops were an opportunity for participants to provide input on the strategy and also to benefit from the mix of ideas that comes from discussion among regional colleagues working on affordable housing and housing issues.

Metro Vancouver received feedback on the draft Strategy until the end of January 2016, and all stakeholder feedback was considered by Metro Vancouver in finalizing RAHS.

This report is organized as follows:
- Part A: Context and Description of Workshops
- Part B: What We Heard at the Workshops
- Part C: Appendices
PART A: CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHOPS

1. REGIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING STRATEGY CONSULTATION

The Draft Regional Affordable Housing Strategy (RAHS) provides a renewed vision, and shared goals, strategies and actions for tackling the housing affordability challenge. It draws on Metro Vancouver’s roles in housing delivery and housing policy, the role of local governments and other key actors including the private sector, provincial and federal governments, TransLink, health authorities, and non-profit housing sector.

Consultation with internal and external stakeholders has been an important aspect of the RAHS update process and has occurred at two key points: to respond to proposed goals and directions (September 2014) and to provide feedback on the draft strategy (November 2015). Further consultation occurred with Mayor and Councils of member municipalities and other stakeholders on the Draft Strategy.
Two workshops for invited stakeholders were held in November 2015. The first workshop was held in Vancouver on November 18, and the second workshop was held in Surrey on November 25. Those who had registered were encouraged to attend the Surrey workshop, meet with Metro Vancouver staff, or provide written feedback directly to Metro Vancouver staff.

Sixty-four participants attended the workshops: thirty-seven participants attended the Vancouver workshop and twenty-seven participants attended the Surrey workshop. Participants included staff from member municipalities and First Nations local government, non-profit housing providers, BC Housing, TransLink, representatives from private sector housing developers and organizations, community agencies, and housing advocates. The list of participants is attached in Appendix 1.

Each workshop was a half-day in duration, and included the following components:

- Welcome from Richard Stewart, Chair, Metro Vancouver Housing Committee
- Guest speakers: Michael Geller, The Geller Group from Vancouver BC at the November 18 workshop; and Melinda Pollack, Vice President of Enterprise Community Partners from Denver Colorado for the November 25 workshop. Presentation followed by a brief question period.
- Overview of the RAHS by Margaret Eberle, Metro Vancouver Senior Housing Planner
- Individual brainstorm activity about what works in the draft RAHS, what is missing and can be improved
- Facilitated small group discussions on key themes identified by participants around what is missing and can be improved in the draft RAHS. Participants each chose two small group discussion topics.
- Report back from small group discussions, and plenary discussion

Workshop agendas are included as Appendix 2.
3. WORKSHOP OPENING, OBJECTIVES, GUEST PRESENTATIONS

OPENING AND OBJECTIVES

Richard Stewart, Chair of the Metro Housing Committee welcomed participants and provided an overview of the workshop context, goals and objectives. He stated that regional governments and municipalities are responsible to provide a range of housing, and suggested that RAHS also needs to move discussion in the direction of advocating about housing to senior governments. In the coming years, the region must receive newcomers as well as enable our own children to remain here and afford to meet their housing requirements.

The objective of the stakeholder workshops was to seek feedback on the Draft Strategy, focusing the actions in the draft RAHS, and to provide ideas about improvements or what is missing in the draft strategy.

GUEST PRESENTATIONS

The guest presenters shared their thoughts about innovative and concrete approaches to affordable housing policies and practise.

November 18 Workshop Presentation by Michael Geller, The Geller Group:

Michael Geller is a Vancouver based architect, planner, real estate consultant and property developer. His presentation reviewed some trends and lessons about meeting housing needs that have been experienced over the last several decades in BC and Canada, highlighting various types of government involvement and partnerships. Geller noted the importance of replacing the aging supply of rental housing. A key message was that municipal incentives (including Development Cost Levy waivers, density bonus, expediting processing of application, and parking relaxations in particular) open up tremendous opportunities for building affordable housing. Mr. Geller also encouraged the audience to get more creative about tenure (e.g. shared equity ownership), form (e.g. modular units), and barriers (e.g. do some aspects of the building code need reconsideration?). Further, Geller suggested that the beneficiaries and supporters of new and innovative housing developments need to be mobilized speak out and show their support for them to proceed.

November 25 Workshop Presentation by Melinda Pollack, Vice President of Enterprise Community Partners:

Melinda Pollack oversees Enterprise Community Partners’ national initiatives dedicated to transit-oriented development, and is based in the Denver, Colorado office. Their work focuses on transit-oriented development (TOD) through partnerships, policy and financing solutions in Denver and elsewhere in the US. She profiled the Great Communities Collaborative and Mile High Connects, two examples of collaborations among advocacy organizations and non-profits dedicated to ensuring that all people benefit from transportation expansion, with an agenda focused on transportation, housing, jobs, education and health. Melinda also highlighted examples of policies linking transit and affordable housing in Los Angeles, Denver and Chicago and described the creation of the Denver TOD Fund, a $15 million tool for preservation and land acquisition for affordable housing near transit.
OVERVIEW OF THE REGIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING STRATEGY (RAHS)

Margaret Eberle of Metro Vancouver outlined the context and framework for the RAHS update, including:

- The modest role of Metro Vancouver in housing policy, direct provision of mixed income housing through Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation, and delivery of federal homelessness funding. There are many players including private sector, non-profits, municipalities and federal and provincial governments.

- Accomplishments since the 2007 Regional Affordable Housing Strategy include parking reductions, municipal Housing Action Plans, increased supply of infill housing and purpose-built market rental housing, and awareness of the connection between affordable housing and transit.

- The vision for the draft RAHS is a diverse and affordable housing supply that meets the needs of current and future residents. This vision reflects the Metro 2040 Regional Growth Strategy, Goal 4 Strategy 1.

- The draft RAHS has five goals: Goal 1: Expand the Supply and Diversity of Housing To Meet a Variety of Needs; Goal 2: Preserve and Expand the Rental Housing Supply; Goal 3: Meet Housing Demand Estimates for Low to Moderate Income Earners; Goal 4. Increase the Rental Housing Supply Along the Frequent Transit Network; and Goal 5. End Homelessness in the Region

- Additional information to support the draft RAHS was also available to participants at the workshops: updated draft housing demand estimates and performance measures.
4. FEEDBACK ABOUT WHAT WORKS

Workshop participants were invited to comment on what works in the draft RAHS through an individual brainstorming activity. Participants’ comments about what works were written on sticky notes and collected. In addition, a few participants commented about what works in the draft strategy on their evaluation forms. Participant’s positive comments were collected for information and displayed on a poster board throughout the workshop, but were not further discussed.

Overall, participants liked:

- The inclusion of housing demand estimates and performance measures as part of the strategy, and
- The comprehensive and regional nature of the strategy, and
- The fact that it contains a good breadth of policies.
Many of the comments about what works were in relation to specific goals, strategies and actions. Where possible, these are identified by the relevant RAHS strategy and action number. Goal 4: Increase the Rental Housing Supply Along the Frequent Transit Network received the most positive comments of the five goal areas in RAHS.

GOAL 1: EXPAND THE SUPPLY AND DIVERSITY OF HOUSING TO MEET A VARIETY OF NEEDS

Nine written comments pertaining to Goal 1 were offered. These included: support for the municipal level Housing Action Plans (Action C); acknowledgement in RAHS of the municipal role in housing supply; and support for the fact that RAHS includes municipal actions for a variety of affordable housing types and forms that work in various types of communities (i.e. Action L). Support for the development of an accessible and adaptable housing registry (Action I) was also noted.

GOAL 2: PRESERVE AND EXPAND THE RENTAL HOUSING SUPPLY

There were 10 comments about “what works” for this goal. Four comments were in support of the RAHS’s emphasis on incentives for purpose-built market rental housing (Action F), and several participants commented positively about the Metro Vancouver action to develop an implementation guideline on expanding and sustaining the purpose-built market rental supply (Action D).

GOAL 3: MEET HOUSING DEMAND ESTIMATES FOR LOW TO MODERATE INCOME EARNERS

Eight comments about what works were provided for this goal. About half of the comments identified municipal actions that ‘work’ in their experience such as: facilitating and supporting non-profit and cooperative housing providers, using municipal land, and allocating cash-in-lieu or amenity funds for low to moderate income housing. Other actions that work were measures that involve other levels of government, e.g. tax credit programs and portable housing allowances.

GOAL 4: INCREASE THE RENTAL HOUSING SUPPLY ALONG THE FREQUENT TRANSIT NETWORK

There were 13 comments about what works related to Goal 4. Several comments were supportive of the focus on linking transit and affordable housing overall and some specific actions were highlighted including:

- The regional role in convening a dialogue about how to achieve this goal (Action A);
- Facilitating multi-agency partnerships to generate funding (Action E);
- Establishing inclusionary housing targets (Action G); and
- Municipal incentives for new purpose built rental and mixed income housing in transit-oriented locations (Action J).

GOAL 5: END HOMELESSNESS IN THE REGION

Five comments were made about what works in relation to this goal. Four of the comments indicated support for specific actions. Two of these actions (Actions A and B) involve advocating to senior levels of government to meet homelessness and specific priority populations’ needs. The other two actions are to exploring homelessness prevention strategies (Action D), and delivering the Homelessness Partnership Strategy (HPS) (Action E). One of the comments supports the “Three Ways to Home” reference in the Draft RAHS.

Appendix 3 contains all of the What Works comments received, verbatim, grouped by RAHS goal.
5. FEEDBACK ABOUT WHAT HAS BEEN MISSED AND/OR NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

This section of the report first describes the process for gathering feedback and discussion about what has been missed and needs improvement in RAHS. It then provides a summary of key themes and an overview of each small group discussion.

A key focus of the agenda for the stakeholder workshops was to identify what, if anything, had been missed and/or needs revision in the RAHS. Workshop participants were invited to provide input through the following process:

1. Participants wrote multiple comments on multiple sticky notes to express their thoughts about what is missing and what needs revision in draft RAHS. Participants submitted all of their comments to be considered and selected a “priority” comment to guide development of small group topics at the workshop.

2. Multiple topics for small group discussion were created based on the priority comments received. Participants were invited to select and join two facilitated small group discussions about two topics of interest. The notes from the small group discussions were summarized and reported in plenary at the end of the workshop, and are summarized in this report. Table 1 shows the topics that were discussed at the small group discussion tables, and the alignment of topics with the RAHS goals. The focus of the discussion in the small groups, and the results, depended on each group’s collective experience, role, interests and priorities.

3. Participants also completed and submitted evaluation forms, which provided an opportunity for further feedback about the RAHS.
### TABLE 1. TOPICS AT SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Group Discussion Sessions</th>
<th>Workshop Date</th>
<th>Table Number</th>
<th>Session Number</th>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>Goal 2</th>
<th>Goal 3</th>
<th>Goal 4</th>
<th>Goal 5</th>
<th>Communication, Education &amp; Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of housing supply including homeownership</td>
<td>Nov 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing housing diversity and form</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strata redevelopment opportunities</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental housing supply, preserve and expand</td>
<td>Nov 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating new market rental housing</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment of existing market rental</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative financing options, and capacity of non-profit sector</td>
<td>Nov 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting low and moderate income housing demand</td>
<td>Nov 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for low and moderate income earners</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental housing along the Frequent Transit Network</td>
<td>Nov 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and transit connection</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending homelessness</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, awareness and NIMBY</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector and municipal roles in RAHS</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback from the workshops about what has been missed and needs to be revised in the draft RAHS is summarized here in six sections: according to the five goals that underpin RAHS, plus an additional theme that arose throughout the workshops: communication, education and engagement. Within each of the six sections, key themes, and a summary of each small group discussion during the workshops is provided. Detailed verbatim comments are in Appendix 4.
GOAL 1: EXPAND THE SUPPLY AND DIVERSITY OF HOUSING TO MEET A VARIETY OF NEEDS

GOAL 1: KEY THEMES

- Emphasize Metro Vancouver’s role as a resource for developing and providing practical information to support municipalities in creating diverse housing forms, e.g. inventory of examples, model and sample zoning bylaws.

- Communicate about the business case and benefits of housing diversity, affordability and density in the RAHS. Also, education about various aspects of non-market housing for various audiences is needed (Strategy 1.2)

- Give practical consideration to strategies related to inclusionary housing policies – how they can be implemented in different types of municipalities, and the challenges of managing a few units in a large project.

- Consider and plan for potential opportunities around redevelopment of strata buildings (resulting from Bill 40 changes).

- RAHS Strategy 1.2 needs municipal action items on addressing and managing community opposition to rental and affordable housing.

- A stronger Metro Vancouver role is needed to require municipalities to meet housing estimates and implement certain measures and policies.

- Emphasize alternative, creative funding and financing sources including federal and provincial tax measures and programs, and private sector financing participation.

- Incorporate examples of what is expected by different RAHS actions

- Give more attention to innovative and alternative entry- level home ownership options.
GOAL 1: SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

At the workshops there were three small group discussions on topics related to Goal 1.

Diversity of Housing Supply, Including Homeownership (Table 2 Session 2) discussion at the November 25 workshop in Surrey:

• Include a role for Metro Vancouver in messaging/communicating the business case for housing affordability and the benefits of density and housing diversity.

• Develop a list of examples from throughout the region (i.e. an inventory) of diverse housing forms (particularly entry-level home ownership).

• Include ideas in RAHS about how to make entry-level home ownership more feasible, including a review of the property transfer tax threshold and innovative home ownership models, as in Calgary.

Increasing Housing Diversity and Form (Table 5, Session 1) discussion at the November 18 workshop in Vancouver:

• Include real examples of diverse housing forms in the region and examples of the types of housing that are being promoted in the strategy, e.g. through case studies in RAHS, pilot projects in the region.

• Metro Vancouver should collect and make available to municipalities a catalogue of zones from zoning bylaws in the region that are resulting in innovative housing forms, and also provide assistance to municipalities with adapting existing housing forms such as single family housing to create a more diverse housing supply.

• Re-examine the inclusion of a small proportion of affordable units in condominium developments, as this often creates units that are not as affordable as intended and are a challenge to administer.

Strata Redevelopment Opportunities (Table 5 Session 1) discussion at the November 18 Workshop in Vancouver:

• Changes to legislation (Bill 40) will mean that 80% of strata owners must support any redevelopment requiring dissolution of the strata. The former requirement was for 100% support of the strata corporation. In addition to increasing the redevelopment potential of condominiums, it was felt that the effects could extend to redevelopment opportunities for different ownership models, e.g. coops, non-profits, etc. This legislation was introduced after the August 2015 draft of RAHS was issued and should be considered going forward. It will have implications for local area planning and may offer some new opportunities on sites previously considered to be ‘locked in’ for a longer timeframe.
GOAL 2: KEY THEMES

- New rental supply is paramount.

- The market requires incentives to redevelop or develop new rental housing, as well as a fast and clear development process.

- Density, incentives and requirements can be used in varying combinations to achieve new rental supply.

- Questions and ideas were raised about the capacities, roles and responsibilities of various players in delivering new rental housing supply including co-ops, private sector, non-profits, governments, landowners, etc. New opportunities can be leveraged, through collaborations and partnerships among non-profits and developers, and others.

- Metro Vancouver should lead by leveraging its Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation (MVHC) holdings to create additional mixed income housing.

- Federal tax incentives, lending and/or land are key to preserving the rental stock and building new rental housing.

- Strike a balance between preservation of existing rental supply, with rental housing replacement and building of new units.

- Tenant relocation in rental redevelopment situations is very important and needs to be done well.

- Non-profit housing providers tend to be risk averse and need support to build capacity to manage a redevelopment or new development project.
GOAL 2: SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS AT RAHS WORKSHOPS

There were three small group discussions related to Goal 2.

Creating New Market Rental Housing (Table 2 Session 1) discussion at the November 18 Workshop in Vancouver:

- To successfully realize and create new market rental housing, there need to be multiple winners (i.e. developer, landowner, municipality and community).
- Clear and consistent local government development processes and regulations contribute to landowners’ and developers’ motivation and decision to proceed with market rental housing in a community.
- Recommendations were made about types of municipal policy approaches to encourage rental housing, e.g. incentives, bonus density, fee waivers, etc.

Redevelopment of Existing Market Rental Housing (Table 2 Session 2) discussion at the November 18 workshop in Vancouver:

- The discussion focused on tenant displacement and renovictions. Helping displaced tenants to find new homes is a key issue, and many parties have a role to play: developers on a project by project basis, municipalities to set consistent policy (or requiring a plan for relocation), provincial regulations to protect and require compensation for tenants, and non-profit organizations / health agencies to assist tenants with moving.
- Additional new rental supply is needed. It was suggested that restrictions on re-development be eased and new market rental housing encouraged with policy, regulations, and clear development process.

Preserving and Expanding the Rental Housing Supply (Table 3 Session 1 and Table 1 Session 2) at the November 25 workshop in Surrey:

- Ideas were discussed about the need for local non-profit housing providers to participate more actively and skillfully in developing new housing by building their collective capacity. In addition, the roles of municipalities, tax reform and developers in creating additional housing were mentioned. MVHC holdings could be leveraged to create more affordable housing that meets regional objectives.
- Direct federal government funding to municipalities/housing projects (and not involving the province) would go a long way to preserve the existing rental housing supply and build new affordable units, including:
  - Refurbishing and redeveloping rental units that meet current objectives and criteria for affordable housing, including mix of housing types, transit, and environmental goals.
  - Reviving former CMHC lending/mortgage and bridge funding, MURB programs, and funding to assist the land assembly start-up process.
  - Development of federal land assets could be explored, as well as building partnership and dialogue regarding development of affordable and rental housing on First Nations lands.
GOAL 3: MEET HOUSING DEMAND ESTIMATES FOR LOW TO MODERATE INCOME EARNERS

GOAL 3: KEY THEMES

• Innovative funding models, partnerships and resources are needed to develop new non-profit housing. Partnerships can involve all levels of government, non-profit organizations, faith-based groups, developers, and others.

• Address the persistent equity funding gap and lack of predevelopment funds, which are significant hurdles for developing affordable forms of rental housing.

• Build capacity of the non-profit sector and form new partnerships to build housing for low to moderate income earners. Develop regional tools and supports to help non-profit and faith-based organizations.

• To make inclusionary housing approaches work, we need to find more efficient administrative models for managing the affordable units.

• Strategies and actions in RAHS should address special needs housing, including partnerships with health authorities and others.

• We need to better understand rental demand, and how the municipalities plan to meet their community-specific targets for social housing and rental housing.

• Municipalities’ initiatives such as land banking and cash in lieu funds to build affordable housing (which can include rental) accumulate over time. Even when these funds are available, there are challenges to actually get housing built, including: loss of relative value of the funds as land values rise; a shortage of pre-development funds; and limited senior government funding and commitment to construct the housing.
GOAL 3: SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

There were four small group discussions at the workshops on the topic of preserving, redeveloping, and expanding rental housing to meet the housing demand estimates for low to moderate income earners. Each discussion focused on the priorities and interests of the people in the particular group, resulting in a range of ideas and recommendations.

Innovative Financing Options and Capacity of the Non-Profit Sector (Table 1 Session 1) discussion at the November 18 workshop in Vancouver:

- Consider creative financing options, sources, and ideas to develop non-profit housing including the Vancouver Foundation, New Market Funds, community bonds, and creative arrangements to secure lands.

- Non-profit organizations need to build capacity about how to develop housing, the land development process, and municipal approvals process and costs. Regional collaboration and tools would be helpful to increase capacity.

- Strategies to minimize development costs need to be developed, and should involve multiple partners e.g. the non-profit sector, developers, municipalities.

Meeting Low and Moderate Income Housing Needs (Table 3 Session 2) discussion at the November 25 workshop in Surrey:

- Tools for preserving low to moderate income rental housing were discussed including the role of the Rental Assistance Program and rent supplements, using zoning to preserve rental housing, as well as partnerships between non-profit organizations and developers to create new units and manage them.

- The roles and expertise of BC Housing, non-profits and developers in developing and operating low to moderate income housing was discussed; i.e. developer role to create housing, BC Housing role for long-term maintenance, and non-profit role for operation.

- A suggested role for Metro Vancouver was to bring the various parties together for collaboration and possibly partnerships to build and operate housing.

Providing Housing for Low and Moderate Income Earners (Table 1 Session 1) discussion at the November 18 workshop in Vancouver:

- Some faith-based organizations are interested in developing affordable housing on sites that they own. A Metro Vancouver role could be to provide a regional directory of development/real estate support and expertise to assist these organizations. Regional guidance to municipalities about the use of faith based and non-profit land assets would be helpful.

- Municipalities are banking land and cash in lieu funds to develop affordable housing in the future. However, an equity gap and a lack of predevelopment funding are hurdles to realizing affordable housing projects. One of the group’s suggestions is to align BC Housing’s funding for affordable housing projects with RAHS priorities and housing demand estimates across Metro Vancouver municipalities.

- It was also acknowledged that municipalities are accumulating cash-in-lieu funds for affordable housing; however the funds take a long time to accumulate, and the funds are losing value as land values increase.

- It is not practical or efficient to manage a few affordable housing units created through inclusionary policies. Suggested roles for RAHS and Metro Vancouver include: identifying property management expertise and capacity for multiple units, providing regional policy guidance and support for management of units, and standardized reporting and operating of affordable units.
GOAL 4: INCREASE THE RENTAL HOUSING SUPPLY ALONG THE FREQUENT TRANSIT NETWORK (FTN)

GOAL 4: KEY THEMES

- Clarify that TransLink’s primary mandate is to deliver a regional transportation system to move people and goods, and in respect to transit, to provide an accessible and affordable regional transit system.

- Draw on multi-agency roles to create affordable and rental housing near transit, and recognize that TransLink’s focused role is in transit infrastructure and services (not housing).

- It is recognized that more rental housing production is desirable period, and that good transit locations are preferred.

- Transit infrastructure funds should be awarded to the municipalities that have local plans that incorporate provisions to develop affordable and rental housing that is close to transit.

- Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation should acquire sites near transit hubs.

- Use municipal levers to strategically incent affordable housing near transit. Local station and corridor plans need to explicitly include affordable and rental housing goals. Use a range of municipal tools (e.g. prezoning) to steer land use (including rental housing development) and eliminate speculation in transit-oriented locations. Create targets for inclusionary housing near transit.

- As warranted, development of transit-oriented rental housing should be made attractive to investors with provision of effective incentives.

- Develop new rental housing in air space parcels (Action H); this idea should be further explained and explored through RAHS.

- Consider the implications of this RAHS goal for municipalities and areas that are not on a Frequent Transit Network and/or which have different levels of transit service.
• Ensure that the policy links between Metro 2040, the Regional Transportation Strategy, Strategic Framework, and local plans are made clear in RAHS, i.e. the intent to accommodate growth in concentrated areas for effective transit infrastructure and service.

• Metro Vancouver should provide data and guidance regarding residential parking requirements near transit for both rental and non-rental sites.

GOAL 4: SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

There were four small group discussions about the housing and transit connection in general, and the more specific topic of rental housing along the Frequent Transit Network (FTN).

The Housing and Transit Connection (Table 3, Session 1) discussion at the November 18 workshop in Vancouver:

• RAHS should provide more policy context to show how the plan aligns with Metro 2040, the Regional Transportation Strategy Strategic Framework, and local plans.

• RAHS should acknowledge the current status and differences across the region as to transit service levels.

• RAHS should outline affordable housing opportunities in relation / association with future planned transit investments, and provide strategies and multi-agency direction to implement these opportunities.

• Transit infrastructure has the effect of reducing household spending on transportation); however, TransLink has a limited scope in affordable housing. Revisions to some RAHS actions in Goal 4 were suggested (see Appendix 4 for specifics).

A second discussion about The Housing and Transit Connection (Table 3 Session 2) at the November 18 workshop in Vancouver:

• There is a need for more residential parking data and guidance for market rental and non-rental sites, including in areas outside the City of Vancouver.

• New affordable housing should not be encouraged in areas without current or planned transit.

• RAHS should clarify the intent of Frequent Transit Network in relation to Urban Centres, and in relation to affordable housing), and emphasize the importance of accommodating growth in concentrated areas so that transit infrastructure and service can be effective.

Rental Housing along the Frequent Transit Network (Table 4 Session 1) discussion at the November 25 workshop in Surrey:

• Need to clarify the region’s need for ‘affordable rental’ versus ‘market rental’ housing.

• The public needs to be educated about housing needs and support needs to be generated for new housing development.

• Transit-oriented development locations have a positive effect on cap rates, which will encourage private investors.

• Innovative housing development projects can be only created if zoning is clear and consistent to eliminate real estate speculation in these areas.
A second discussion about *Rental Housing along the Frequent Transit Network* (Table 4 Session 2) at the November 25 workshop in Surrey:

- Tying federal infrastructure dollars to Housing Action Plans for the express purpose of land acquisition is of the highest priority. Transit investments could be tied to comprehensive planning for affordable housing, i.e. Housing Action Plans.

- Land use planning, land acquisition, and land succession plans play critical roles in creating clear expectations for affordable and rental housing development in Frequent Transit Development Areas (FTDAs) and other areas along the Frequent Transit Network. Local government housing strategies need to be implemented through prezoning to curb speculation and shift land value expectations.

- Some strategies for delivering market and non-market rental housing in good transit locations include: partnerships between private developers and non-profit organizations, as well as reductions and incentives related to parking, Community Amenity Contributions, Development Cost Levies/Development Cost Charges, provincial and federal taxes, and mobility strategies (e.g. transit passes, car shares, etc.).
GOAL 5: ENDING HOMELESSNESS

GOAL 5: KEY THEMES

- There is an absence of regional level coordination and political support for homelessness strategies and this is needed.

- RAHS should identify the need for coordinating the involved sectors and governments. A Metro Vancouver role could be to provide administrative infrastructure and operating funding to enable coordination.

- The role of BC Housing as the provincial agency with an interest in ending homelessness should be identified/clarified within RAHS. Some roles include:

- RAHS should specify Provincial government roles in ending homelessness to include review of the Residential Tenancy Act, particularly with respect to protecting people in affordable housing from renovictions, and with respect to transitional and affordable housing; funding models and standards for shelters; and health role in homelessness prevention and services.

- RAHS/Metro Vancouver could advocate for needed resources, coordination and funding for mental health care and facilities, which would be delivered through provincial and health resources.

- The Homelessness Partnering Strategy landlord engagement initiative (Action 5F) needs to be broadened, involve non-profits, and be implemented in a collaborative way.

- RAHS needs to recognize a continuum of approaches for ending homelessness, and define a role for BC Housing in achieving this goal.
GOAL 5: SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Two small group discussions at the workshops focused on what is missing and needs revision in the ‘End Homelessness’ goal, strategies and actions.

End Homelessness (Table 4 Session 1) discussion at the November 18 workshop:

- There is a real need for regional level coordination and leadership for homelessness. It was proposed that RAHS / Metro Vancouver should: include a strategy to identify a coordinator for the involved sectors and government; provide administrative infrastructure for coordinator/leadership; explore operating funding and options; and seek governance and direction for homelessness.

- There is also a need for a coalition of organizations working on homelessness.

- A continuum of approaches for housing homeless people needs to be recognized, in addition to the “Housing First” approach.

- The role of BC Housing as the provincial agency with an interest in ending homelessness should be identified/clarified within RAHS.

Ending Homelessness (Table 2 Session 1) discussion at the November 25 workshop:

- Suggestions were made about the landlord engagement initiative by the Metro Vancouver Homelessness Partnering Strategy (HPS) (Action F): include wording that also supports non-profit organizations in implementation, and specify that the initiative be a coordinated and collaborative effort to link homeless serving agencies with landlords offering rental units.

- The Residential Tenancy Act should be reviewed in terms of policies to protect people living in affordable housing and particularly in transitional housing.

- A need for additional resources, coordination and funding for mental health care and facilities was identified and Metro Vancouver could play an advocacy role to secure additional funding and partners for delivery.
RAHS COMMUNICATION, EDUCATION AND ENGAGEMENT

KEY THEMES

• Develop a coordinated multi-sector (private, non-profit and government) and multi-level (community level, regional, and broader) communication strategy with careful messaging about the intent and rationale of the RAHS – this is essential to build broad traction and support for endorsement as well as implementation.

• Many of the issues and topics in the RAHS are complex. Educating various audiences, including the general public, should be a top priority in order to gain support for new housing development and other measures to achieve RAHS goals.

• To ensure that RAHS gets support from municipal Councils across the region, it was suggested that a range / menu of options for municipal consideration and support of the RAHS be offered.

• The RAHS should more clearly acknowledge and define the role of the private sector in affordable housing, particularly their leadership in building housing.

• The RAHS needs to expand on the ‘business case’/cost-benefit rationale that solidifies the region’s commitment and involvement in affordable housing; i.e. what are the economic and other benefits of affordable housing, what is the societal cost of ‘doing nothing’, etc.

• Municipalities’ commitments for delivering affordable housing need to be made clear – this would help to create a more coordinated approach.

• Enhancing understanding in the region about the trade-offs involved in protecting existing purpose built rental housing. Preservation cannot be considered in isolation from new supply of affordable rental housing; new supply can be part of the solution, e.g. by leveraging density of housing in new developments.
RAHS COMMUNICATION, EDUCATION AND ENGAGEMENT: SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

EDUCATION, AWARENESS AND NIMBY (TABLE 1 SESSION 2) DISCUSSION AT THE NOVEMBER 18 WORKSHOP IN VANCOUVER:

- Public Education Region-Wide on Affordable Housing: RAHS should communicate to a broad audience through the media and other channels and partners about the housing challenges and needs of our region. This could include leading a collaborative effort (Metro Vancouver + municipalities + non-profits) to create communication strategy. Key information to communicate includes the definition of affordable housing, who gains, what are the trade-offs, etc. It was recommended to align affordable housing with quality of life messages and rationale, leveraging Health Authorities to help with these messages. The RAHS can also enlist voices from the private sector (linking affordable housing with a workforce and vibrant economy) and community groups to support RAHS communication efforts.

- Build Multi-Sector and Multi-Level Support for RAHS: It was suggested that Metro Vancouver could present the RAHS at a municipal level, and then community groups can be advocates and supporters for local government action. The recent transit referendum was cited as an example of multi-sector collaboration on a regional issue.

- Protecting Affordable Rental Housing from Demolition: There are some good examples of preserving rental housing stock; however further discussion needed to clarify / identify housing stock at end of its functional life, which is not feasible to repair. Preservation cannot be considered in isolation from new supply of affordable rental housing; new supply can be part of the solution, e.g. by leveraging density of housing in new developments. (This topic was discussed in the context of enhancing understanding in the region about what is involved in protecting affordable rental housing.)

PRIVATE SECTOR AND MUNICIPAL ROLES IN RAHS (TABLE 4 SESSION 2) AT THE NOVEMBER 18 WORKSHOP IN VANCOUVER:

- Municipal approvals: Metro Vancouver will ask municipalities to endorse the RAHS. Consensus and commitment for the RAHS is needed from municipalities across the region, and to achieve this it was suggested that thoughtful approaches and strategies to get support that is needed to get all municipal Councils’ support. Some options may be to request for endorsement of goals and strategies, while developing a menu of optional policies for municipal councils’ to formally adopt within the local context regarding the RAHS.

- Private Sector Role: It was recommended that the private sector’s role in affordable housing should be more specifically acknowledged in the RAHS (e.g. in context section).

- RAHS should be revised to include a more explicit explanation about why government is involved in delivering affordable housing, and state the consequences of not meeting residents’ housing needs in terms of social costs. As an overall comment, the RAHS needs a stronger economic argument of the cost benefit derived by taking action rather than ‘doing nothing’.

Appendix 4 contains verbatim comments and recommendations provided by participants (on sticky notes) and discussed in small group sessions.
6. PLENARY COMMENTS

During both of the workshops, a wrap-up plenary session provided an opportunity for questions and reflection.

At the November 18 workshop in Vancouver, Don Littleford (Metro Vancouver Director, Housing) offered some remarks to close the session and this was supplemented by other participants’ comments:

- Management and administration of inclusionary affordable housing units gained through inclusionary policies is an issue and these roles belong with an organization that has the capacity and confidence to carry them out and is perhaps not best handled by municipalities.

- Findings about parking utilization from a previous regional study were communicated regionally, but implementation is up to individual local governments.

- From a developer’s perspective, some rental projects are not viable because of the cost of the project and the timeframes for approval. There have been some incentives but not to the level that is required.

- The speed of approvals to develop housing needs to increase without compromising quality, in the interest of accommodating growth and housing needs. This is particularly true with development in town centre areas.

- We collectively need to agree on the critical things to do to meet housing needs and be bolder and more decisive in our steps to do them.

At the November 25 workshop in Surrey there were some comments in the plenary session that reflected on Melinda Pollack’s presentation, underscoring the importance of land banking near transit to get affordable housing in these key areas. It was also noted that limiting speculation around transit by pre-zoning (but not too much pre-zoning) is required.

In his summary remarks, Director Stewart reminded the participants that affordable housing is everyone’s responsibility. Over the decades many issues affecting affordable housing have remained the same (land costs, regulations) but the issue now is at a level no one would have anticipated 30 years ago. All ideas are needed to move forward.
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### APPENDIX 1 – WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

**RAHS Stakeholder Workshop – Vancouver Wosk Centre**  
**November 18, 2015 Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Mills</td>
<td>YWCA Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hutniak</td>
<td>Landlord BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Bond</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Marin</td>
<td>Bowen Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhtar Latif</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Chapman</td>
<td>District of North Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Peters</td>
<td>CHAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Wilson</td>
<td>Vancouver Coastal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Charlebois</td>
<td>District of Maple Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Santoro</td>
<td>Urban Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Fisher</td>
<td>Urban Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Tse</td>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Goodman</td>
<td>The Goodman Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Sundberg</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Mauboules</td>
<td>District of North Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilie Adin</td>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Freire</td>
<td>District of West Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noha Sedky</td>
<td>City Spaces Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougal Forteath</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hemmingson</td>
<td>BC Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McArthur</td>
<td>Polygon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ross</td>
<td>TransLink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Kiyooka</td>
<td>Disability Alliance BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan Murphy</td>
<td>City of Maple Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Bourke</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liza Jimenez</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lu</td>
<td>Vancouver Coastal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niki Antonopoulou</td>
<td>Vancouver Atira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Kitchen</td>
<td>CHFBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Jones</td>
<td>City of Port Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Guenter</td>
<td>Concert Properties Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Medcalf</td>
<td>Lookout Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirian Hodgins</td>
<td>VanCity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RAHS Stakeholder Workshop – Surrey City Hall
#### November 25, 2015 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letizia Romei</td>
<td>VanCity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Meggs</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Williams</td>
<td>Lookout Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Peterson</td>
<td>Surrey Board of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sakai</td>
<td>GVHBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Tennant</td>
<td>Semihamoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Akester</td>
<td>TransLink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Kaszonyi</td>
<td>Township of Langley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Beddow</td>
<td>City of Langley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Fedows</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurdeep Gill</td>
<td>Urban Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Greenwell</td>
<td>Transit Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Harvie</td>
<td>PCRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Holden</td>
<td>SFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira Gerwing</td>
<td>VanCity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherie Enns</td>
<td>FVRD/UFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee-Ann Garnett</td>
<td>City of Burnaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Harding</td>
<td>Metro Vancouver HPS CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Kitchen</td>
<td>CHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen O'Shannacery</td>
<td>Home Help 1/Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Lee</td>
<td>PCRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Manifold</td>
<td>City of Burnaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aileen Murphy</td>
<td>City of Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclay Pitkethly</td>
<td>FVRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Stewart</td>
<td>FVRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeep Sidhu</td>
<td>Vancity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Woodworth</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Everaars</td>
<td>Lookout Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Balbosa</td>
<td>SFU Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabna Ali</td>
<td>Tsawwassen First Nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AGENDA

November 18, 2015
8 am to 12:30 pm
Vancouver Wosk Centre,

Facilitator: Dagmar Timmer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Richard Stewart, Chair, Metro Vancouver Housing Committee</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>Opening, Workshop Goal and Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50</td>
<td>Guest Speaker and Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Michael Geller, The Geller Group</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>Regional Affordable Housing Strategy Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Margaret Eberle, Senior Housing Planner, Metro Vancouver</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Plenary – What Works? What Actions Can Be Improved? What is Missing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:55</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Small Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>Plenary – Report Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Next Steps and Concluding Remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AGENDA

November 25, 2015  
8 am to 12:30 pm  
Surrey City Hall

Facilitator: Dagmar Timmer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30  | Welcome  
*Richard Stewart, Chair, Metro Vancouver Housing Committee* |
| 8:35  | Opening, Workshop Goal and Introductions |
| 8:50  | Guest Speaker and Q&A  
*Melinda Pollack, VP, Enterprise Community Development, Denver, CO* |
| 9:15  | Regional Affordable Housing Strategy Overview  
*Margaret Eberle, Senior Housing Planner, Metro Vancouver* |
| 9:30  | Plenary – What Works?  
What Actions Can Be Improved? What is Missing? |
| 9:55  | Break |
| 10:15 | Small Group Discussions |
| 11:45 | Plenary – Report Back |
| 12:15 | Next Steps and Concluding Remarks |
APPENDIX 3 – VERBATIM COMMENTS ABOUT WHAT WORKS IN DRAFT RAHS

It is acknowledged that some of participants’ comments about what works also include suggestions for improvement, and these comments are included.

OVERALL COMMENTS ON DRAFT RAHS

- Inclusion of performance measures – very important to track progress.
- Plan is comprehensive and regional.
- Good breadth of policies and responses.

GOAL 1: EXPAND THE SUPPLY AND DIVERSITY OF HOUSING TO MEET A VARIETY OF NEEDS

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ABOUT STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS:

- Action B – Metro Vancouver action to undertake outreach to promote public awareness…
  Like outreach and public awareness to address opposition to increased density.
- Action N – Municipal action to promote family friendly housing… Identification of need for larger units for low/modest income households with kids.
- Action C – Metro Vancouver action to prepare an Implementation Guideline for Municipal Housing Action Plan to provide best practice guidance on the form and content of these plans; Action E Metro Vancouver action to advocate to the provincial and federal government for collection and reporting of reliable data about the sources and nature of regional housing demand…;
  Action N Municipal action to promote family friendly housing, as applicable…
- The point made on page 4 about the municipal role in supply: [[The municipalities] chief role lies in ensuring adequate supply of residential land to meet housing demand through the land use and regulatory process although there are other opportunities for municipal action…].
- Strategy 1.4 – Enhance understanding of the housing market to improve housing policy, and Action D (i) Work with partners to create an accessible an adaptable housing registry.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Identification of supply as important for responding to affordability challenge.
- Adaptable Housing Registry [Action I].
- Municipality expanding types of housing (laneway housing).
- I like the focus on ground oriented units. This should be a focus to manage the family housing issue. The province may be needed to help with political will at the local level.
- Housing Action Plans – more of a focused and strategic approach/look at housing issues at a municipal level. Need more monitoring and accountability/implementation.
GOAL 2: PRESERVE AND EXPAND THE RENTAL HOUSING SUPPLY

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ABOUT STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS:

- **Action C** – Municipal action to inform the provincial and federal governments of gaps in rental housing supply by income level and advocate for specific measures to address funding gaps for low to moderate income housing … - Use opportunity of government change to seek reinstatement and reactivation of past policies (MURB) and new policies (CCA recapture deferral) to encourage new rental housing development.

- **Like Action D** – Metro Vancouver action to develop implementation guideline on municipal measures to expand and sustain the purpose-built rental supply…

- **Action E** – Metro Vancouver role to research and identify best practices in tenant relocation policies and strategies. MVHC role in relocating tenants.

- **Action F** – Municipal action to offer incentives that will help make development of new purpose built market rental housing financially viable. Encourage municipalities to fast-track rental and lower income ownership projects (reduced holding/processing times will improve affordability).

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Kudos! The development of ‘implementation guideline on municipal measures to expand and sustain the purpose-built rental supply’.

- Offering tools and incentives to build more purpose built rental.

- Incentives for market rental housing.

- Encouraging municipalities to look at Rental 100 Type programs.

- Good to see municipalities working to support non-profits to secure real estate assets for rental housing. Building these assets will increase the NPOs’ capacity to leverage their assets and grow their portfolio of rental housing units.

- Focus on preservation, renovation, and replacement of older purpose built rental housing.
GOAL 3: MEET HOUSING DEMAND ESTIMATES FOR LOW TO MODERATE INCOME EARNERS

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ABOUT STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS:

- Strategy 3.3 Facilitate non-profit and cooperative housing providers to create new mixed income housing through redevelopment or other means - Like this strategy, but should recognize re-location [of tenants] here. It’s a big barrier.

- Action I – Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation action to explore with municipalities opportunities on municipal sites for expanding the supply of mixed income non-profit rental housing - This action works!

- Action N – Municipal action to ensure a portion of amenity contributions or payments in lieu are allocated for housing affordable to low and moderate income households - Most effective in my municipality.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Gaining municipal alignment is key.

- Great focus on meeting housing demand of low and moderate income earners.

- Good to see some discussion of federal tax credit program. This idea could be explored for the other goals in the strategy as well, and Metro Vancouver could do some research into the pros and cons of different tax credit systems. (e.g. US example, previous tax deferral for rental housing programs in Canada).

- Like “Support Nonprofits and coops to operate mixed income housing after agreements expire” [Strategy 3.2]

- [Actions to provide] tenant support – portable housing allowances, encouraging the provincial government.
GOAL 4: INCREASE THE RENTAL HOUSING SUPPLY ALONG THE FREQUENT TRANSIT NETWORK

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ABOUT STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS:

- Strategies 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 Expand Awareness …, Plan for transit station areas…, Implement incentives…
- Strategy 4.1: Expand awareness of affordable housing and transit connection.
- Incentives work. Clear and meaningful incentives help developers to act quickly and efficiently (re: Strategy 4.3 and Strategy 2.1).
- Like: Action – A Metro Vancouver role to convene regional dialogue, Action C Metro Vancouver role to conduct research to support affordable housing in transit oriented locations, Action D Metro Vancouver role to develop or cost share development of an online tool that will provide users with estimates of combined housing and transportation costs, Action E Metro Vancouver role to convene and facilitate negotiations among municipalities, TransLink and the Province…agreement to generate funding to achieve goals for low and moderate income housing near the FTN.
- Action A – Metro Vancouver role to convene regional dialogue to highlight the affordable housing and transit connection
- Action E – Metro Vancouver role to convene negotiations among municipalities, TransLink, Province with the objective of establishing an agreement to generate funding…
- Action E – Metro Vancouver role to convene negotiations among municipalities, TransLink, Province.
- Action G – Municipal role to establish transit-oriented inclusionary housing targets for purpose built rental and for housing affordable to low to moderate income households …
- Action J – Municipal role to consider providing incentives for purpose built rental housing and mixed income housing located in transit oriented locations to enable them to achieve economic viability - but need to flesh out airspace parcel process.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Focus on FTN
- Encouraging a diversity of housing forms close to FTN
- Increase the rental housing supply along the FTN
- Like emphasis/inclusion of FTN in Goal 4.
- Transit focus
- City development plans for housing policy: Access to information helpful in focusing procurement; include all vested parties to be as inclusive as possible.
GOAL 5: END HOMELESSNESS IN THE REGION

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ABOUT STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS:

• Action A – Metro Vancouver role to advocate to senior levels of government for 6,200 additional housing units for support as needed.

• Action B – Metro Vancouver role to advocate to senior levels of government and health authorities to provide housing and support throughout the region that meets the needs of specific priority populations - Acknowledges and promotes the need for specific priority populations and needs.

• Action D – Municipal role to with partners, explore the need for feasibility of homeless prevention strategies…

• Action E – Metro Vancouver role to continue to deliver HPS…- Continue to deliver HPS; this is a regional level role.

• Goal 5. Overall like that the Three Ways to Home Homeless Strategy is embedded in this plan. It needs a more legitimate home, and including it here achieves that.
APPENDIX 4.
VERBATIM COMMENTS ON WHAT IS MISSING AND NEEDS REVISION IN THE DRAFT RAHS

This appendix provides consolidated and verbatim comments by participants during the workshops. The comments come from three sources:

- Sticky notes written by individual participants about what is missing and needs revision in RAHS;
- Flip chart notes recorded during small group discussions on various topics that were set according to workshop participants’ priority issues; and
- Evaluation forms completed by individual participants

This appendix is organized into six sections:

- Goal 1: Expand the Supply and Diversity of Housing To Meet a Variety of Needs;
- Goal 2: Preserve and Expand the Rental Housing Supply;
- Goal 3: Meet Housing Demand Estimates for Low to Moderate Income Earners;
- Goal 4. Increase the Rental Housing Supply Along the Frequent Transit Network;
- Goal 5. End Homelessness in the Region
- Communication, Education and Engagement

Within each of these sections, the comments are provided on:

- Draft RAHS strategies (text reference to the relevant RAHS strategy number is provided in italics);
- Draft RAHS actions (text reference to the relevant RAHS action number is provided in italics);
- Missing and suggested additional RAHS strategies and actions (comments are grouped together in similar themes); and
- General comments related to the RAHS goal (comments are grouped together in similar themes)

The comments are categorized by the goal area that was identified by the participant, or if not identified by participant, then they are included in the most relevant section (i.e. goal). While some comments may be relevant to more than one goal or section they are listed only once in this appendix. Any repetition of comments results from duplicate comments that were received during the workshops.

Comments are written in verbatim, with some clarifications in square brackets i.e. “[_______]”. 
GOAL 1: EXPAND THE SUPPLY AND DIVERSITY OF HOUSING TO MEET A VARIETY OF NEEDS

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON STRATEGIES IN GOAL 1

• Strategy 1.1 Diversify the housing supply in terms of unit and lot size, number of bedrooms, built form and tenure. Comment: Missing - Need to define “family housing”. Is it a 2 bedroom unit in City of Vancouver but a 3 bedroom unit in suburbia? (and need to set minimum number of units needed – as a %).

• Strategy 1.2 Address community opposition to new residential development. Comment: Missing - Need to define “family housing”. Is it a 2 bedroom unit in City of Vancouver but a 3 bedroom unit in suburbia? (and need to set minimum number of units needed – as a %).

• Strategy 1.2 Address community opposition to new residential development. Comment: Would be nice to have 'political education' on non-market development.

• Strategy 1.3 Plan for the special housing needs of specific populations. Comment: Missing - Gap funding for people who have disabilities (need to promote inter-ministerial communication and between funders – Community Living BC and BC Housing).

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON ACTIONS IN GOAL 1

• Action B – Metro Vancouver action to undertake outreach to promote public awareness and understanding of accommodating population growth with increased density and housing diversity, and best practices for accommodating this growth using examples and strategies from here and elsewhere. Comment: Engage the school board in this action – this is possible in curriculum K-12.

• Action C – Metro Vancouver action to prepare an Implementation Guideline for Municipal Housing Action Plans to provide best practice guidance on the form and content of these plans. Comment: Metro Vancouver to develop a guideline for municipal action plans and this is great. It needs to include model bylaws etc. As an example Maple Ridge is developing triplex, fourplex, etc zone for midrange housing forms. They [Maple Ridge] started with sample bylaws from Langley and Coquitlam (Housing Choices Study).
• Action K – Municipal action to demonstrate how Housing Action Plan policies and initiatives are intended to work towards achievement of Metro 2040 housing demand estimates. Comment: Needs more to engage residents about the need to accommodate new housing to ensure long-term community sustainability / viability. [This comment also relates to section on Communication, Education, and Engagement in the RAHS.]

• Action R – Health Authority action to plan for and fund suitable housing and support services for frail seniors, persons with severe and persistent mental health issues and other vulnerable populations including the homeless. Comment: We need to be more specific about what housing is specific to health and what is not.

• Action M Municipal action to encourage a diversity of housing forms in proximity to FTN… Comment: Missing maps of FTN with buffers to show where high density should go and where medium density should go. And in general, RAHS needs maps!

COMMENDS ABOUT MISSING AND SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS FOR GOAL 1

Funding and Financial Considerations

• Include youth in funding for suitable housing and support services.

• Add: Metro Vancouver to explore alternate ways of funding/finding new funding resources for rental properties e.g. allow non-profits to take out loans on [capital] reserves (federal?).

• Missing: Integrate philanthropic funding into a larger funding source for non-profit access … Suggested strategies: 1. Leverage foundations to better understand objectives; 2. Integrate government funding sources through goal integration; 3. Involve non-profit housing providers; 4. Create better access to information.

• Proposed action: Advocate for property transfer tax. Create a new threshold to reduce pressure on the affordable housing sector. Metro Vancouver role is to research best practice. Limited equity/shared equity models (e.g. Calgary) not limited to first time home buyers (i.e. available to all owners).

Municipal Role

• Municipal responsibilities – add language that municipalities will be required to include specific tools such as inclusionary zoning, requiring community plans to include inclusionary statements as well as municipalities will have policies on prevention of loss affordable housing including specifically maintenance bylaws and 1-for-1 replacement policies on affordable housing.
Federal Role

- Missing: Need for federal government engagement in housing – federal housing strategy.

Business Case

- Missing or perhaps already in the strategy is the importance of business case … a strong economy requires a good and diverse stock of housing including affordable market rental – along transit lines. Business cannot attract employees because of Vancouver’s crazy housing market.
- Need to be able to demonstrate that there is a market for a diversity of housing.

Encouraging Housing Diversity

- Add a new strategy to consider the complementary need to redesign the built environment overall to support the diversity/density goals.
- Would like to add a strategy that connects housing diversity/density with climate change …. co-benefits or possible negative impacts from different mix and from different size (sq ft).
- It would be great if Metro Vancouver could cull and distill all of the bylaws enabling new and diverse housing forms, as a resource to share across municipalities. As an example Maple Ridge is developing triplex, fourplex, etc zone for midrange housing forms. They started with sample bylaws from Langley and Coquitlam (Housing Choices Study).
- Metro Vancouver could help many local governments in the region by looking at strata titling of larger homes, examples of how to use different tenures and uses but keep the same urban form and fabric.
- More talk about housing accessibility for people with disabilities living on very low incomes.
- Inventory of best practices and good design around entry level housing forms, e.g. Fort Langley, Arbutus Walk, Richmond.
- The whole RAHS document needs to add “for example:___________” after the strategies and actions to make it more real, or add an implementation piece. E.g. show examples of how diverse forms of housing have been created, e.g. a group home example, Bloomfield Gardens. This would add to the region’s collective experience.
- Metro Vancouver could work on regional pilots to demonstrate different forms and tenure of housing.
- Forms of tenure: expand and explore tenure forms to include life lease, shared equity, rent to own, options model (second mortgage), Calgary homeownership model, owned laneway houses.

Data

- Missing: Better access to data that is consistent across municipalities and regionally/provincially.
GENERAL COMMENTS ON GOAL 1

Business Case and Communication of Business Case

- Economic case for good and diverse stock of housing needs to be part of the why— we-need— housing strategy.
- Connect the housing industry to the economy of the region.
- Diversity = Density … this is a good thing, saves communities and builds economies.
- Metro Vancouver role in campaign and messaging around density and housing diversity.

Encouraging Housing Diversity

- Design challenge = not just towers or single family dwellings.
- Like having short, medium, and long term options.
- Need to identify what people can do and what they do best in this plan.
- Need to think about how this plan could make better things happen, i.e. what would not happen if this plan did not exist, and then focus on those things.
- Need to recognize differences in reality and suitability for the form and tenure ‘conditions’ that exist in urban and suburban municipalities.

Entry Level Home Ownership

- Affordable strategy – rental focus makes sense.
- Need for more around other ownership forms (e.g. cooperatives) … “continuum” language – does it limit movement.
- Increased support for entry-level ownership. Actionable items:
  1. Diversifying housing stock: small/mini houses, Britco homes, laneway homes, grow homes, etc;
  2. Increasing Property Transfer Tax threshold and subsidizing first time home buyers.
  3. Cost efficient building materials.

Public Education

- Public education and training (managing expectations). Introduction to pros/cons of alternative housing i.e. cohousing/laneway/ mixed income development. Cultural challenge and housing options.

Inclusionary Zoning for Affordable Units

- For affordable units, the discussion is that it’s better to take cash and build ‘proper’ housing than to include a few ‘affordable’ units here and there.
- Inclusionary zoning has some problems: devaluing all of the units, difficult to manage, can result in failure and then the developer ends up taking back the units, and the units are usually more expensive than intended because of add-on [costs] that are borne by the residents like strata fees and utilities.
GOAL 2: PRESERVE AND EXPAND THE RENTAL HOUSING SUPPLY

COMMENTS ON STRATEGIES IN GOAL 2

• Strategy 2.1 Expand the supply of rental housing, including new purpose-built market rental housing.
  Comment: Co-ops and Non-Profits can be part of this. Market rent units can cross-subsidize moderate income units.

• Strategy 2.2 Make retention and maintenance of existing purpose-built market rental housing more attractive.
  Comment: Metro [should] report out progress on rental replacement/loss.

• Strategy 2.3 Ensure that tenant relocations are responsive to tenant needs.
  Comment: How to “ensure” tenant relocations are responsive to tenant needs? Mechanisms?

• Strategies require density and expediting approval – transparency.

• Implementation plan needs to be consistently approved across municipalities.

• Perhaps less social housing focus and more focused on the “middle-class” and employed millennials.

• Much greater emphasis should be made on market and middle income housing – gets local political buy in.

• Recognize that nothing built unless development industry is able to earn a profit – must be a win-win-win.

• More attention to municipalities’ streamlining the development approval process.

• Balance between requiring new rental and preserving existing [rental].

COMMENTS ON ACTIONS IN GOAL 2

• Action K – Municipal action to support efforts to reduce rental operating costs by improving energy performance of purpose built market rental…
  Comment: Is this just a municipal action, or applies to province / non-profit housing providers?

• Action K – Municipal action to support efforts to reduce rental operating costs by improving energy performance of purpose built market rental…
  Comment: How ensure new rental supply is still affordable to low and moderate income earners? Should have strategy that requires consideration of this (e.g. inclusionary housing policy). [The participant associated this comment with Goal 2 Action, but the comment may also relate to actions in Goal 3.]

• Action J – Municipal action to enact standards of maintenance bylaws to preserve the stock in good condition and prevent further erosion of existing rental stock.
  Comment: Concern about enacting standard of maintenance bylaws to preserve the stock…

• Action I – Municipal action to require one for one replacement policies where existing rental supply is being redeveloped.
  Comment: Isn’t this duplicating efforts?

• Action L – Municipal action to establish bedroom mix objectives for new condominiums and purpose built rental housing.
  Comment: Are there Metro studies on bedroom mix objectives? (also relates to Goal 1).

• Inclusionary zoning does not work if there is no one to manage the below market units.
COMMENTS ABOUT MISSING AND SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS FOR GOAL 2

Rental Retention in Strata Titled Buildings

- Sometimes there is no housing agreement, so affordable housing is developed as a strata. Developer rents units even though they are all strata, and developer can sell units whenever they choose to sell them down the line – lack of rental security. Township of Langley is using covenants to avoid loss of rental strata. Proposed action is to investigate legal agreements limiting sale of strata units based on current vacancy rate, e.g. 20 year agreement after which the unit can be sold only if the vacancy rate is higher than x%.

- Preserving rental housing – Conversions from “rental” buildings that are in reality strata – not subject to strata conversation policies. These are hard to track – need mechanisms.

Protecting Affordable Market Rental from Demolition

- Rental preservation actions for municipalities are difficult: privately owned, redevelopment approved in area plans/OCPs, densities are low / regional directives call for density near transit.

- Municipalities can better leverage density.

- Can’t consider preservation in isolation from new supply. Some rental stock is not worth protection.

- Highlight some examples that have been done well to preserve rental stock.

- Missing: Building greater understanding among local politicians of their powers to protect affordable rental from demolition and replacement with condos.

Rental Replacement

- Missing: need to allow flex for 1 for 1 rental replacement as this does not provide affordable rental units. What about 1 affordable rental unit for 4 lost (old) rental units?

- Missing: Seek to replace affordability for low income tenants. Re RAHS Goal 2 Action i (Require 1 to 1 replacement of rental).

Incentives

- Suggested strategy: Offer incentives that will help maximize development of purpose-built market rental housing.

- Review federal taxes to identify best practices in stimulating new purpose built rental housing built and operated by non-profits (e.g. tax permission to borrow off existing properties).

- Missing: Federal Government actions to create and fund incentive programs for renovation of existing rental housing stock.

- Missing: Incentive for developers and owner/operators – move to incentives above

Participation and Engagement for Implementation

- Proposed Action: Bring municipalities, non-profits, lenders together to build capacity for enabling development. How to bring partners together to make this happen?

- Missing: Education of municipal staff and politicians re what the Local Government Act allows for affordable housing.

- Missing: Municipal strategic plans addressing the continuum of affordable rental housing.

- Missing: Leveraging the assets of Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation to increase supply of market and below market rental housing in its portfolio.

- Missing: Where are actions for development industry?
• Missing municipal actions – Reduce or eliminate parking requirements may simply shift resident parking to public domain which is a cost to society – must be considered.

• Rental Assistance Program (RAP) isn’t available for those in greatest core need – be more explicit.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON GOAL 2

Density, Incentives and Requirements

• Cities don’t issue enough density, which is their ‘currency’.

• Need to allow increased density to allow redevelopment to make financially viable.

• The need for density is noted in the RAHS, but you need to link density to specific actions like housing targets and inclusionary zoning, rental replacement, and tenant services.

• City of Vancouver is moving in the right direction with STIR and Rental 100 type programs, but not enough.

• You should not charge CACs on rental projects.

• Stick versus Carrot – for rental housing stock. It would be great if there were regulatory requirements for rental housing development/affordable housing stock versus incentive-based.

Making Development Happen

• Need to have solutions with multiple winners.

• Land does not come to market for development because difficult / delayed approval processes discourage landowners to sell.

• Pre-zone some land for rental only.

• Look to City of Burnaby in terms of re-zoning / bonus density process to support housing development, which works for developer, landowner, and city.

• Remove demolition moratorium (in City of Vancouver).

• Certain, clear approvals process and transparency.

• Recognize that new supply has trickle-down impact that benefits other down the chain.

• Have public speak up in support of new rental development projects.

• Not income tested units.

• More Developer/UDI and Landlord BC input

• We need more discussion on how we redevelop low density, rental, co-op, strata sites (especially near transit). How do we get the density to replace affordable units? There are opportunities at government and broader public sector sites for redevelopment.
Funding and Roles for Redeveloping Rental Housing

- Funding to refurbish older units.
- Funding directly from federal government to municipalities (skip the provinces).
- Federal incentive to help redevelop old, underutilized rental sites with affordable housing component – with retail, by transit, mix of housing unit types in a development.
- Recreate a modern version of the coop model.
- Avi Freedman’s new urban form, urban innovative redevelopment design.
- Capital gains tax issues, which prevents sales and redevelopment of lands.
- GHG/CO₂ reduction targets - relate to housing investments.

Funding and Land to Build New Affordable Units

- CMHC lending/mortgage, bridge funding – bring it back.
- Federal government deal directly with each project and municipality, rather than through the province.
- MURB program – bring it back.
- Use underutilized federal property / land assets.
- Provide space for administrative function.
- Assist with land assembly – funding to start process by developers.
- Canada Lands Corp process to develop federal lands.
- Development on First Nations lands – build partnerships and dialogue.
- Concept/idea vs. actual practice.
- ‘Middle men’ not adding value

Leveraging Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation Holdings

- Metro Vancouver preserve own stock.
- Leverage existing assets to deliver rental in region.
- Leverage collective equity in multiple buildings and use to buy other sites/assets to create new affordable housing. Does Metro Vancouver have development expertise to follow this path?
- Gap = Development know-how for leveraging multiple sites, assets. Look at Enterprise as a model. Metro Vancouver to lead by example. Investigate to see if Metro Vancouver faces regulatory barriers not applicable to non-profits. BC Housing has some development knowledge (via consultants).
- Metro Vancouver to lead the way – non-profit sector poised to evolve toward development capacity – need help getting there.
- Metro Vancouver challenge – need funding / cash to leverage MVHC sites. Need low cost access to loans.
- MVHC could make it work in mixed income projects.
- MVHC would like to explore selling density for some transit oriented development sites.
Non-Profits and Development

- Lack of local government capacity/knowledge to help non-profits in developing property.
- How to build skills for non-profits to engage with developers
- Need incentives for non-profits and developers to work together. Need to ensure public/community input into these partnerships (maybe via non-profit boards/activities).
- Non-profits have lost advocacy capacity over the last 10 years (Harper government).
- Non-profit board’s risk assessment can preclude advocacy for development. Developers to take a position of risk in a non-profit development project – developer takes over if project is in trouble, developer gains portion of return if it proceeds.
- Non-profits can participate in real estate development – risk seems too high-barrier.
- Financial gain opportunity via development for non-profits to support their other operations/portfolio. Use as incentive to learn about development.
- Investigate tax/regulatory issues associated with non-profits producing real estate income.
- Role for local government advocacy for tax reform to support non-profits in land development.

Tenant Relocation for Redevelopment

- [Renoviction] issue is not as large as it may appear, and landlords are generally responsible.
- There is a lack of new supply of housing due to restrictions/moratorium
- Tenants that are being forced out should have more housing options through new supply.
- Displacement for tenants from both their home and neighbourhoods.
- Landlords/developers need to help displaced tenants find new homes (possibly in the new buildings).
- Concerns about health and social impacts to displaced tenants, social safety net.
- Need a “Plan” [for relocation] (Recent new requirement at District of North Vancouver).
- Role of nonprofit organizations to help tenants with transition/move.
- Staging buildings for residents to stay temporarily during construction displacement.
- Provincial government – increase tenant termination notice and compensation payment.
- Suggestion: Developer pay fixed fee to city social department that would help tenants with moving/transition process.
- Dealing with existing tenants during redevelopment - reduce the time and risk process for tenants to move ... “renovictions”.

Regulation and development

- Difference between market housing and condo rentals – different issues.
- Economies of projects (municipalities are condo-centric) – financial viability of rental buildings.
- Zoning for rental housing (only).
- Role of private sector needs to be recognized.
- Bonus density for rental.
- Excessive regulations needs to be reduced.
- Rezoning process has too much uncertainty.
- Lack of supply of zoned properties/lands.
- Have higher densities at more locations.
- Allow more replacement of old apartment buildings.
- Different interpretations of affordable housing requirements.
- Land speculation issues.
GOAL 3: MEET HOUSING DEMAND ESTIMATES FOR LOW TO MODERATE INCOME EARNERS

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON STRATEGIES IN GOAL 3

- **Strategy 3.1** Facilitate new rental housing supply that is affordable for low to moderate income households. Comment: Missing - a public evaluation of success/failure of municipalities to meet rental demands.

- **Strategy 3.3** Facilitate non-profit and cooperative housing providers to create new mixed income housing through redevelopment or other means. Comment: Faith based organizations own significant underutilized lands and have a desire to help provide affordable housing. However, they require special attention and support to unlock this potential. Offering a road map and support to them would create more supply faster (than status quo). This is high impact for limited investment. (Michael Guenter, Here Housing Foundation)

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON ACTIONS IN GOAL 3

- General comment about Goal 3 municipal actions: Municipal actions are reasonable, but few resources and expertise to assist the non-profit sector (E.g. Do EOI/RFP process, review legal agreements, do proposals etc.). Does [this] sector have capacity and resources … how to help them?

INPUT ABOUT MISSING AND SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS FOR GOAL 3

**Delivery of Varied Housing Types**

- Missing in Strategies: There is an expectation that inclusionary zoning and density should be used to deliver social and market rental housing within municipal targets – this should be a more explicit strategy.

- Missing in Strategies: Add language to strategies to include recognition that at times it is an appropriate strategy to have rental housing built that is 100% core need / special needs income community. Current language excludes.

- Suggested action: Metro Vancouver should provide regional policy guidance for municipalities about how to manage a small number of units, or how to support municipalities in managing units, or support larger non-profits to manage several units. A regional role is to identify property managers with expertise and capacity to manage several units. Also, need a standardization process for reporting and operating requirements, which could be provided by Metro Vancouver or another organization.
Developing Partnerships and Capacity for Development

• Suggested action: Implementation idea: “Non-profit development school” for municipalities and non-profits.

• Suggested action: BC Housing could match their pre-development funding to what Metro Vancouver is saying about the amount of housing each municipality needs to deliver. Metro Vancouver opportunity is to advocate for BC Housing to align funding with RAHS.

• Missing: Actions to promote collaboration among municipalities, non-profits, developers. Suggested action is for Metro Vancouver to promote partnerships and produce resources similar to previous “what works” reports, focusing on “why it works”.

• Missing: Actions to promote collaboration among municipalities, non-profits, and developers. Suggested action is to create an inventory of non-profit providers. Work with BC Housing to make this information more accessible. Related suggested action is for Metro Vancouver to coordinate best practices for non-profit housing operation and maintenance, municipal regulations, create score for each municipality to see what is missing from the toolbox. (Non profits have strong ‘operating’ expertise, and BC Housing has capacity for long-term maintenance.)

• Suggested action: Regional / provincial database for matchmaking between developers and non-profits. This would be supported by municipal policy to encourage these partnerships. There is an opportunity to bring developer and non-profits into partnership: developer to construct housing, non-profit to operate housing. The challenge is to create incentive for developer to join partnership with non-profits. Need education for developers that it is not a bad choice to have mixed income tenants. Use of inclusionary zoning, and additional developer incentives beyond density bonus.

• Need a roadmap at regional scale with policy guidance for trading public assembly for affordable housing to discourage faith-based organizations from going for highest best use instead. Need a larger regional organization to help faith based organizations through the development process. Suggested action is for Metro Vancouver to create a database of regional organizations. The database would be a list of providers who can provide development / real estate support and expertise. (Could model database on Richmond’s.)

• Missing: Municipal actions should include development of municipal policy direction for use of faith based and non-profit land assets; need principles for managing community-based land assets to be considered in land use planning and OCP processes.

• Missing: Partnership opportunities with health authorities to expand access to supportive housing for specific sub-populations.

Targets

• Missing: Lack of specific targets for social and rental in each municipality.
GENERAL COMMENTS ON GOAL 3

Challenges with Land, Management, and Financing

- Cash in lieu funding [held by municipalities] takes a long time to accumulate. The challenge is keeping money lying around [while it accumulates] as it loses value in a market of rising land value.

- Management of affordable units can be a challenge. Managing a small number of rented units is not economical. There is a lack of expertise in managing housing. Perhaps some organizations can manage multiple units. Need to create units, also need funds to manage units.

- Challenge is getting new affordable units built, particularly there are challenges for smaller development.

- Land banking is occurring, but there is a money/equity gap. Money via density bonus, etc. Predevelopment funds are the gap, and not many municipalities have capacity to allocate funds to address funding gap. There is a balancing act of community amenity contribution funds. Municipalities do not want to pay for construction.

- There are capital gaps (where are the funding/financing options?)/pools of money and the potential collaboration also needed—collaboration between other stakeholders (potential other $$) that have an interest in access to affordable, accessible housing—like the health agencies.

Low Income Housing Challenges

- RAHS needs to better nuance/stratify degrees of low income <$30,000, e.g. seniors on guaranteed income supplement, currently living with family, rent supplements, etc.

- Challenges and opportunities with Rental Assistance Program (RAP). Can only access funding once. Maintaining rental stock is key – how possible to use zoning to preserve rental like in Vancouver? Could non-profits use rental assistance to create housing stock with lower rents? Need partnerships to incentivize developer but to not be on the hook for all aspects of managing affordable housing units/stock.

Barriers

- Barrier is non-profits hiring consultants to help with development. [These are funds that non-profits could spend on other development costs, if they had more internal development expertise].

- Barrier to partnership development – how to address challenge and risk aversion in non-profits for larger purchases.
GOAL 4: INCREASE THE RENTAL HOUSING SUPPLY ALONG THE FREQUENT TRANSIT NETWORK

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON STRATEGIES IN GOAL 4

• None specifically.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON ACTIONS IN GOAL 4

• Actions B, C, E, G – Comment: Where inclusionary targets/policies are referenced in RAHS, density numbers should also be included.

• Actions I, K, and P – Comment: With respect to its mandate, TransLink is unlikely to provide direct funding (subsidies) to the development of affordable housing (if indeed that is the intention of these actions).

• Actions F and K, re: agreements. – These actions could be combined or be made more consistent in language.

• Action F, etc. re: Project Partnership Agreements. – Comment: Project Partnership Agreements should also look at existing rapid transit lines, such as the Expo Line and opportunities for infill development (e.g. 22nd Avenue Station in Vancouver)

• Action H – Municipal action to purchase and hold sites/air space parcels for new non-profit housing to be made available as funding becomes available, focusing on the FTN. Comment: Action is problematic - municipalities are unlikely to actively purchase and hold sites (land banking). RAHS should explore other options or actors that could produce the same outcomes as land banking in terms of ensuring affordable housing is not squeezed out of frequent transit locations.

• Action K – MVHC action to establish an agreement with municipalities and the Province with the objective of generating funding to achieve goals for low and moderate income housing near the FTN. Comment: Clarity [is needed] on what is meant by this goal.

• Action M – Municipal action to establish an inclusionary housing target for joint development on TransLink/BC Transit properties. Comment: Add maps to the affordable housing strategy

• Action N – Municipal action to establish and inclusionary housing target for joint development on TransLink/BC Transit properties. Comment: RAHS should provide explain the role of air space parcels, which is a great idea, but not many people know what they are and how they can be leveraged to meet housing objectives.

• Action N – Municipal action to establish and inclusionary housing target for joint development on TransLink/BC Transit properties. Comment: TransLink does not own a lot of transit (FTN) oriented properties.
COMMENTS ABOUT MISSING AND SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS FOR GOAL 4

Provincial and Municipal Roles

- RAHS should include an action for the Province, TransLink, and affected municipality(ies) to commit to increasing densities and affordable housing supply in corridors prior to major transit investments (some uncertainty whether the federal government could feasibly be at the table).

- Missing: RAHS should include an action for the Province to provide municipalities with resources (i.e., transit funding for new investments) contingent on municipalities setting into policy commitments to achieve new housing supply and diversity objectives (market and non-market housing).

- Missing: Add a legend to Figure 3.

- Metro Vancouver/Province of BC to provide resources for municipalities who conduct neighbourhood plan updates that achieve new housing supply and diversity. Incentive could be related to new transportation investments.

- Missing: Municipal action for prezoning of sites to remove speculation from land acquisition. Do land use planning to establish clear expectations. Connect Plans with prezoning strategies (prezoning must be strategic) and connect with uplift capture (non-negotiated). Land acquisition (for non-market uses) attached to a prezoning strategy to work together to affect the “market”.

- Missing: policies to achieve affordable housing near transit.

Low Income and Affordability

- In referencing “Transportation and Transit Plan of Metro Vancouver” and “Regional Transportation Strategy” recommend those plans acknowledge and provide for low-income access to transit, when up for review/renewal.

- Add the “e”: Equitable Transit Development.

- TransLink could analyze opportunities of connecting fares at affordable TOD developments with income (affordable fares). Dollars from Province required to offset lost operating revenues to TransLink.

- Tie transit investment to planning and delivering affordable housing (housing action plans).

- Suggested action: Can RAHS include a recommendation to TransLink to explore affordable transit (e.g., sliding scale similar to Calgary/Seattle)?
Parking

- Encouraging reduced parking standards in areas served by frequent transit [Note: written on pink sticky – could be interpreted as saying the RAHS does a good job of recognizing the role of parking].
- Desire for more updated data on parking demand, with an increased emphasis on surveying market and non-market rental apartment sites, and in locations outside the City of Vancouver (Vancouver is already well advanced in their parking bylaws, whereas other municipalities need numbers that reflect their more suburban context). Potential collaboration between TransLink, Metro Vancouver, and municipalities. Must not forget about including visitor parking requirements to pre-empt spillover parking into neighbourhood. The parking study should also examine parking demand directly in the influence area of a transit station or stop, and further afield (shoulder areas).
- Municipal action needed: Specifically mention opportunity to reduce parking requirements.

Define/Clarify Frequent Transit Development Areas (FTDAs) and Growth Areas

- Include description/definition of FTN. FTDAs might be over-emphasized in relation to Urban Centres – the Urban Centres have highest level of transit.
- RAHS needs to clarify what FTDAs are and how FTDAs relate to Urban Centres, and their role in accommodating growth and the type of growth. FTDAs may be overplayed in RAHS in comparison to Urban Centres.
- RAHS should acknowledge that phasing in growth should be considered by municipalities; there may be a risk of having too many FTDAs or having new higher density housing sprinkled in too many locations; there needs to be critical mass both for transit to be effective and for creating more complete neighbourhoods/communities. RAHS should acknowledge that within each municipality, there exists a range of desirable locations for accommodating growth and housing.

Land Acquisition

- Land acquisition strategy to ensure long-term tenure/land use purpose.
- Generate comprehensive inventory of publicly-owned lands, existing municipal infrastructure is taken into account for densification (infrastructure costs decrease).
- Underutilized “land” succession plan, i.e. parking lots, public assembly lands (churches, etc.).
- Figure out where and how to use right of ways at rapid and frequent transit stops/stations… to build non-market affordable or market rental.
- Missing: Reposition Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation’s portfolio to acquire and develop sites at current or proposed transit hubs. This can include refinancing some of the existing properties that are mortgage free and/or selling less strategic properties to generate cash towards better located sites. Partner with TransLink on sites they own. (Kira)
GENERAL COMMENTS ON GOAL 4

Policy and Planning Context

- Context: 75 to 78% of all new development is happening through redevelopment. There is community opposition, and local government inability to overcome public perceptions. Is the concern “market rental” or “affordable rental”? No concerted/coordinated effort to educate the public on density.

- RAHS should expand on the regional policy context: connect the strategy to Metro 2040 and TransLink’s Regional Transportation Strategy Framework to illustrate how the different pieces (growth, urban containment, urban centres, FTDAs, affordable housing, transportation) fit together.

- RAHS should recognize/define the different levels of transit service in the region today (e.g. there are different varieties of frequent transit, and of non-frequent transit).

- RAHS should not forget about the role of Urban Centres (regional city centres, municipal town centres) to accommodate affordable housing.

Regional Differences in Transit Access

- RAHS should acknowledge that not all municipalities have a rich network of transit service (e.g. Maple Ridge).

- RAHS needs to be more inclusive of places in the region without frequent transit.

- Goal 4: How does it relate to municipalities not on frequent transit network?

- RAHS should be future-oriented and reflect plans for future transit investments and opportunities for affordable housing.

- RAHS should include an action for the Province to provide municipalities with resources (i.e., transit funding for new investments) contingent on municipalities setting into policy commitments to achieve new housing supply and diversity objectives (market and non-market housing).

- A “chicken and egg” problem: should we put affordable housing where it is viable, then introduce transit, or put the housing in good transit locations now?

- If the ultimate goal is “affordable living”, then we should not be advocating new affordable housing be located in transit poor areas. From a household perspective, housing costs may be lower, but transportation costs would be higher from dependence on personal automobile.

- Notwithstanding the notion that “all housing is good housing”, RAHS should be consistent with the Metro 2040 in terms of providing clear guidance on the importance of locating growth in the right locations – in this case, locating affordable housing in the right locations.

TransLink Role and Involvement

- TransLink could be more receptive and accepting of the requested actions in the RAHS if there was technical analysis demonstrating the transit ridership benefits of advancing mixed-income developments near transit – a potential task that Metro Vancouver and TransLink staff could collaborate on.

- The best transportation plan is a mixed-income housing plan.

- When planning new transit investments, TransLink and municipalities could bring in the housing element into the dialogue to ensure connections are being made.

- TransLink’s role is to first and foremost advance transportation options for residents in the region. In so doing, TransLink is helping residents spend less on transport and this will help with overall household affordability.
TransLink’s role and responsibility is providing a regional transit network that provides similar levels of service to Regional City Centres. The housing affordability and transportation costs should be reflected in the lack of transit services in suburban municipalities.

Funding from transportation authority – what existing or future services should be sacrificed?

Development Feasibility

CAP rates work. Cap = Operating / cost to build. Cost to build is influenced by: decoupling parking from a dwelling unit and instead providing a transit pass, building parking for rental development that can be shared during peak demand, reducing parking, and shared parking resources.

Long term returns.

Pension funds / real estate investment trusts (REITS) will invest if the return works.

Speculation needs to be removed through clear and unwavering zoning.

There are competing interests/visions for transit corridors: affordable housing vs. economic development with commercial employment. This plays through land value speculation. Question: How to bring competing visions (and financing models) together to create an innovative model combining both needs for corridors?

RAHS should acknowledge the competing demands for attractive sites near frequent transit and the challenge for fitting in affordable housing.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing

Market and non-market joint rental strategy in conjunction with municipal and regional frequent transit development areas (FTDAs) planning.

A non-profit service organization reflecting the voices of the eventual tenants.

Access to mobility services at TOD rental, provides comprehensive onsite or online travel planning, i.e. time of travel to work, access to services, multi-modal trip planning, etc.

Income-geared housing coordinated with transit.
GOAL 5: END HOMELESSNESS IN THE REGION

SPECIFIC INPUT ON STRATEGIES IN GOAL 5

• 5.3 Advocate to the provincial and federal government for support to meet the housing and support needs of the homeless. Comment: Federal government’s Housing First policy has an impact on front line / outreach capacity. Less funding for this not great. The units exist. Housing First does not work.

Specific Input on Actions in Goal 5

• Action B – Metro Vancouver action to advocate to senior levels of government and health authorities … needs of specific priority populations. Comment: Who will be included, i.e. shelters homeless. Engage the homeless population.

• Action F – Metro Vancouver Homelessness Partnering Strategy (HPS) Community Entity action to support the HPS Community Advisory Board in implementing a landlord engagement initiative. Comment: In RAHS, there needs to be some recognition of other approaches beyond Housing First. A continuum of housing approaches is required, and acknowledgement that Housing First is not the ‘be all and end all’.

• Action F – Metro Vancouver HPS Community Entity action to support the HPS Community Advisory Board in implementing a landlord engagement initiative. Comment: Repairs to units funding/security such as “replacement reserve” – regional or municipal.

• Action F – Metro Vancouver HPS Community Entity action to support the HPS Community Advisory Board in implementing a landlord engagement initiative… Comment: Use the terminology “non profit housing providers” and not restrict the action to “HPS” language. Shifts focus to support non-profits in implementation.

• Action F – Metro Vancouver HPS Community Entity action to support the HPS Community Advisory Board in implementing a landlord engagement initiative… Comment: State explicitly that the HPS community entity will lead a coordinative and collaborative implementation strategy.

• Action F – Metro Vancouver HPS Community Entity action to support the HPS Community Advisory Board in implementing a landlord engagement initiative… Comment: Add [to] “F”: Support non-profits in implementing a landlord engagement initiative.

• Action I – Municipal action to support agencies that serve the needs of the homeless population in the community. Comment: Recognize and acknowledge landlords around incentives and funding.

• Action N – Health Authority action to provide operating funding for transitional and supportive housing for persons who are homeless and at risk of homelessness. Comment: What would these operating dollars from health be used for and how is this different from BC Housing operating dollars?

• Action N – Health Authority action to provide operating funding for transitional and supportive housing for persons who are homeless and at risk of homelessness. Comment: Increased services and facilities – need for more access to facilities for mental health clients.
INPUT ABOUT MISSING AND SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS FOR GOAL 5

Regional Coordination and Collaboration for Ending Homelessness

- Currently there is a lack of coordination and leadership.
- Lack of implementation/coordination of how this will happen in the region.
- Proposed action for Metro Vancouver/RAHS is to identify a coordinator for all the involved entities that helps to set the goals for involved sectors and government. Action for Metro Vancouver/RAHS is to put the administrative infrastructure in place.
- Need for coalition of willing people organizations. The role does not belong within the Homelessness Partnering Strategy (HPS) entity.
- Use Metro Vancouver role to bring people together but not lead.
- Recommendation is that RAHS seek new governance and direction for homelessness. Collaboration is OK but need coordination.
- In an earlier discussion it was discussed that a more coordinated regional approach to solve homelessness is needed to be stated more emphatically.
- RAHS should add that a role of Metro Vancouver is to explore operating funding and options, and coordinate the dialogue and work to address homelessness.
- How would the housing be spread out in the region?
- Missing: Clarity of Housing First plan, especially given apparent layers of metro communities, action tables, complicated application process, etc. and with new federal government are “plans” likely to change?
- Missing: Region needs more coordination around solving homelessness

- Abigail Bond’s comments about having a group of expectations that all municipalities should meet would help/lead a region-wide group that could come together to have a coordinated approach to ending homelessness.

Proposed Provincial Roles and Actions

- Provincial action to review the Residential Tenancy Act (RTA) to review policies to protect people in affordable housing should be identified, perhaps with municipal advocacy. The RTA does not currently protect affordable housing stock and does not reflect affordable housing. Advocacy piece to be included with RTA review: Address the exclusion of those in transitional housing, i.e. private owners calling the building “supportive housing or program housing”
- Re Residential Tenancy Act: Preventative [action] to review policies of RTA to protect people in affordable housing such as renovictions. Include coverage of RTA on transitional and supportive housing.
- Proposed [RAHS] addition in Goal 5: Metro Vancouver role to advocate for: income assistance review (raise shelter component); health based income assistance/housing subsidies;, living wage actions for municipalities/Metro Vancouver; shelter standards (best practices exist, to be referenced/role model); review of shelter standards by the province and shelter providers (input from shelter users); bridging components within shelters to move along the continuum.
- Set standards for building shelters (recognize clients)
Federal and Provincial Agencies’ Funding Roles

- Provincial Government Actions – increase funding for mental health care and facilities
- Expanded health role in prevention and services to homeless. Example from Comox BC. Recognize the absolute homeless population … need Health Authority program/services (link to facilities and housing)
- Federal dollars flow - be ready to build upon current best practices. Think about sustainable funding.
- Provincial and federal alignment at the policy and funding levels including cross ministerial [alignment]. Enable philanthropic folks to access the tables early.
- Metro Vancouver role: To advocate federal/provincial alignment with the health authority and municipalities
- Provincial Action: Review of funding models for shelters. Range of shelter types needs to work within shelter standards.

GENERAL COMMENTS AND INPUT ON GOAL 5

Political Commitment

- Ending homelessness is not going to be solved just by expanding housing options, promoting measures and advocating to government. This is not realistically worded. Ending homelessness won’t be solved by 3 simple strategies. Need more social programs to help people.
- Need for regional political buy-in [re homelessness strategies]
- There is a lack of ownership for addressing homeless in the region. Plans and strategies for homelessness exist without support/buy-in.
- The Regional Homelessness Plan is only a draft, and need institutional buy-in

Roles

- Concern: experience with engaging landlords has been problematic.
- The Regional Steering Committee on Homelessness Strategic Plan is too high-level to be used to support this goal. Need a better planning process.

COMMUNICATION, EDUCATION AND ENGAGEMENT

‘Communication, education and engagement in RAHS’ is a key theme that emerged during the stakeholder workshops. Participants at the workshops submitted sticky notes with comments on this theme, and there were also two small group discussions on topics related to this theme.

This theme is not included as a standalone goal in the draft RAHS. A sixth section has been added to this report to capture comments related to this theme.

Emphasis in RAHS on Communication, Education, Engagement

- A new goal in RAHS is needed re public education and awareness, to increase public acceptance of the overall RAHS.
- A robust communications strategy is needed where a range of stakeholders have similar messaging/branding of the plan.
- The RAHS must establish Goal #6: Develop a broader education/communication plan, with strategies to assist local councils, media, and community advocacy groups.
- A new goal in RAHS is needed re public education and awareness, to increase public acceptance of the overall RAHS.
Communication Strategy and Collaboration among Multiple Sectors/Partners

• There [should be] a [defined and valued] role for community groups to be advocates for local government action on affordable housing.

• Look at the coalition that was formed for the transportation referendum, which included health authorities, NGOs, private sector, Port of Metro Vancouver, Chambers of Commerce, non-real estate private sector.

• Do more of these sessions [RAHS workshops for stakeholders].

• Need to address NIMBY.

• Work with media to communicating benefits of new affordable housing development, trade-offs, etc.

• More clarity [about] who gains, what is traded off [in affordable housing].

• Community groups as advocates.

• Municipalities are not clearly communicating housing goals.

• RAHS to take a lead in communicating housing challenges and needs.

• Coordinated communication strategy [needed] for (1) region and (2) municipalities [that includes]: what is affordable housing and how do we achieve it; leveraging the health authorities and other partners to connect housing with other quality of life messages; and a collaborative effort with the private sector as well.

• Municipalities can invite the region [Metro Vancouver] to present RAHS

• Address middle-income challenge.

• Enlist big private sector voices to say: “we need affordable housing for our workers”, e.g. Port of Metro Vancouver, Vancouver International Airport, etc.

• Define affordable housing clearly, as part of communication strategy for RAHS.

• Should also include advocacy to local governments. They are not all on board win thinking this is a priority or even their responsibility (re: RAHS Strategy 3.4).

• Lowering municipal fear in general. More information is needed on how RAHS regulates municipal plans. I support getting data on demand pressures – but be careful.
Communication/Education about Economic Rationale for RAHS

- Stronger emphasis on economic, environmental, and social justification for the strategy, especially economic.

- RAHS could be more explicit about why government needs to be involved in housing, i.e. not all people needing housing can/will pay a profitable amount.

- Make sure that the cost of externalities is part of the conversation. The cost of doing nothing is part of the conversation, i.e. Homelessness costs $\"x\" for police, hospital, other.

- RAHS needs a stronger economic argument, built upon the existing singular sentence [about this in RAHS]. Can use research from other sources such as Living Wage BC, Street-to-Home research.

- Overall comment on RAHS – The RAHS needs a stronger economic argument of the cost benefit of taking action versus doing nothing.

RAHS Endorsement and Implementation Process

- Question: Does Metro Vancouver intend to meet with the named agencies/organizations in RAHS with actions and roles identified … to discuss the actions, endorsement, and implementation?

- Getting private sector support/endorsement for the strategy will help municipalities endorse it.

- The challenge is going to be implementation – need implementation and monitoring plan.

- What is the plan post adoption? Implementation?

- Language for municipal actions - “will” vs. something else i.e. “facilitate, encourage”.

- All Goals: “Municipalities will”: The language suggests policy direction at the municipal level. This may be a significant concern to some Councils that would see Metro Vancouver setting OCP level policy.

- Discussion was to development of a menu of options for councils to consider local adoption … ‘will’ versus ‘consider’ balanced with a regionally consistent approach.

- Councils may receive for information, endorse or adopt. Metro Vancouver would ask municipalities to endorse RAHS.

- Concern that regional directives may lead to council rejections.

- A challenge is the regional status quo approach or stronger formal actions.

- There may be some key principles to allow RAHS to move forward.

- Need for teeth and consensus.

- Perhaps an approach is to endorse the goals and strategies, and the actions are more language-sensitive.

- Suggest: the RAHS goals moving into Metro 2040 solidify expectations.
Various Roles and Needs with RAHS
Communication, Education, Engagement

Municipalities:
• Great workshop … as a municipal employee a [valued] conversation about housing outside the confines of the local political environment.

Metro Vancouver:
• Metro’s role as an information coordinator needs to be developed (e.g. collecting and zoning bylaws by topic re zones to facilitate diverse housing types across municipalities).

Private Sector:
• More private sector involvement will come with implementation, however more acknowledgement of private sector in RAHS. Expand context statements parts of RAHS to capture involvement and engagement of the private sector.
• Why has it not been acknowledged that the private sector will build everything contemplated in this report?
• More language to include collaboration with the development community.

• Engage the development community often and early and keep engaging them in the edit and review process for RAHS
• Why does government need to get involved when the private sector has provided housing for thousands of years?
• Where is the private sector (UDI) involved in this process?
• Language for municipalities: “will” versus encourage
• Send invitation to more developers for next sessions.