

# City of Vancouver

## Talk Housing With Us

### Stakeholder Workshop Report

DRAFT

# Table of Contents

Report Summary.....	iii
Session I: Current Actions.....	iv
<i>Theme 1: Ending Street Homelessness by 2015</i> .....	iv
<i>Theme 2: Increasing housing choice for low &amp; modest income households</i> .....	vii
Session 2: Moving Forward .....	x
<i>Theme 1: Ending Street Homelessness by 2015</i> .....	x
<i>Theme 2: Increasing housing choice for low &amp; modest income households</i> .....	xii
Introduction.....	1
Session 1: Current Actions.....	1
<i>Theme 1: End street homelessness by 2015</i> .....	1
City working with partners to increase low-barrier shelters.....	1
Permanent supportive housing (e.g. 14 sites).....	6
Mental Health Commission of Canada – At Home Project.....	8
Provincial Homeless Intervention Project (HIP).....	9
Interfaith Alliance to end homelessness .....	9
<i>Theme 2: Increasing housing choice for low and modest income households</i> .....	10
Rate of Change Regulations.....	10
Affordable Housing in new neighbourhoods (20% policy) .....	11
Short-term Incentives for Rental Housing Program (STIR) .....	13
Secondary Suites Expansion .....	14
Laneway Housing.....	15
Federal/Provincial affordable housing programs .....	16
Other possibilities.....	17
Session 2: Moving Forward .....	19
<i>Theme 1: End Street Homelessness by 2015</i> .....	19
Draft City Strategies: .....	19
Strategy 1 - Provide land for 1,200 new supportive housing units.....	19

Strategy 2 - Ensure that street homeless are housed in the neighbourhoods where they feel safe and connected .....	22
Strategy 3 - Publish regular report card.....	24
<b>Key actions over the next 3 to 5 years needed to end street homelessness by 2015:.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Longer term actions needed (2020) to end homelessness:.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b><i>Theme 2: Increasing housing choices for low &amp; modest income households .....</i></b>	<b><i>28</i></b>
Strategy 1 - Tailor zoning approaches and conditions to meet local housing needs and opportunities .....	28
Strategy 2 - Integrate successful strategies for rental inventory into current neighbourhood planning initiatives.....	30
General input on increasing housing choices for low & modest income households .....	30
Strategy 3 - Publish Regular report card.....	32
<b>Key actions over the next 3 to 5 years needed to increase housing choices for low &amp; modest income households: .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Longer term actions needed (2020) to increase housing choices for low &amp; modest income households: .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix A - Workshop Participants.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<i>Participants .....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Invited, Not Able to Attend.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<b>Appendix B - Supplementary Feedback .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<i>Current actions to end street homelessness by 2105 .....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Current actions to increase housing choices for low &amp; modest income households.....</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Moving forward to end street homelessness by 2015 .....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Moving forward to increase housing choices for low &amp; modest income households.....</i>	<i>48</i>

## **REPORT SUMMARY**

On April 27<sup>th</sup> 2011, as part of a public and stakeholder engagement program, “Talk Housing With Us”, the City of Vancouver hosted a Stakeholder Workshop. The purpose of Talk Housing With Us was to gather input from the public and key stakeholders on the City’s future Housing and Homeless Strategy and to consider approaches to take over the next ten years. Around 80 individuals participated, who came from a wide range of organizations including those that have experience and expertise in housing the homeless and creating affordable housing.

The full-day Stakeholder Workshop began with a brief overview of the housing continuum in Vancouver and covered the City’s current & future strategies based on two key themes; ending street homelessness by 2015, and increasing housing choice for low and modest income households.

Each of these themes were covered separately during the two Workshop Sessions; Session 1 focused on Current Actions (What’s working well? What can be improved?), and Session 2 focused on Moving Forward (the City’s proposed strategies; goals for the next 3-5 years; the role of stakeholders & partners; 10-year vision for all parts of the housing continuum).

This Report Summary provides an overview of the Stakeholder Workshop and a synopsis of the different views and opinions expressed by participants.

**Insert photo**

## **Session I: Current Actions**

### ***Theme 1: Ending Street Homelessness by 2015***

*Vancouver City Council is committed to ending street homelessness by 2015. In December 2008, Mayor Robertson launched the Homeless Emergency Action Team (HEAT) Initiative in partnership with the Province, Streethome Foundation and non-profit agencies. HEAT added 450 additional low-barrier shelter beds immediately, a 60% increase in shelter capacity in the city. The City, Province and non-profit partners went on to launch the Winter Response shelter initiative, adding a further 160 beds over the past two years during the winter months.*

*The shelter spaces opened through the HEAT and Winter Response programs lowered barriers to people coming inside. The maximum length of stay was removed, storage was provided for carts and people were welcomed inside with their loved ones (pets, partners). Shelter guests received two hot meals every day, had access to shower and laundry facilities and were connected to basic health services (primary care, dental and mental health services).*

*Since 2007, the City and Province have been working in partnership to develop social and supportive housing projects on 14 sites provided by the City. In May 2010, the Province and Streethome Foundation committed funding to develop supportive housing on all of the 14 sites. The partnership will result in over 1,500 new supportive housing units by 2013. The City has also provided grants to help make additional supportive housing projects a reality, including projects with Union Gospel Mission, Lu'ma Native Housing and the Aboriginal Mothers Centre.*

*In addition to these projects, other sectors of government and the community are actively involved in ending homelessness. Some of the key projects and partnerships include:*

- *The Mental Health Commission research demonstration project, At Home/Chez Soi, is an investigating mental health and homelessness in five Canadian cities including Vancouver. It is based on a Housing First approach for homeless people living with a mental illness; evaluating the effectiveness of giving people a place to live and services to assist them over the course of the initiative and providing meaningful and practical support to 300 people. The overall goal is to provide evidence about what services and systems could best help people who are living with a mental illness and are homeless.*
- *The Homelessness Intervention Project (HIP) is a B.C. provincial government initiative to help homeless British Columbians connect quickly and effectively to services they need in five cities including Vancouver. HIP aligns the programs and resources of several government ministries, health authorities, non-profit and other agencies supporting a common cause – to reduce chronic homelessness.*
- *The Vancouver Interfaith Alliance to End Homelessness is a non-partisan group of over 60 faith-based leaders dedicated to ending street homelessness in Vancouver by 2015 and meeting the longer term goal of providing affordable housing for all. This group has been most active in exploring how to tap into the sources of the faith community and encouraging leaders to muster the political will needed to achieve long-term solutions to homelessness.*

*In addition to providing input on these actions, workshop participants identified and discussed a variety of other initiatives targeted at ending street homelessness. Key themes from these discussions are summarized below:*

- 1. Low-barrier shelters are an important element in addressing the basic needs of the most vulnerable people, facing the largest housing challenges.**
  - Low barrier shelters provide a supportive environment where basic needs are addressed and an opportunity is created where trust can build with those who have the most difficulty in being housed
  - Overall, shelters are seen as a viable and important part of a housing continuum, and as a first step alternative to living rough
  - A significant benefit of shelters is that they provide a focus (i.e. physical location) for the integration of services for vulnerable people who have varied and often significant needs for support
- 2. While shelters are answering a housing need, they are not an end in themselves but need to be part of a more comprehensive housing continuum.**
  - One of the main concerns is that reliance on the shelters can lead to the illusion that the problems of homelessness are addressed but they do not focus on the causes of homelessness nor on prevention
  - Another concern is that shelters can function as a barrier when people are “stuck” in them with no clear options for something more sustainable
  - There is a concern that too much of a focus on shelters is taking resources away from long-term solutions for homelessness such as other social housing options
- 3. Supportive housing provides an important element in the housing continuum by providing housing stability and support services to people with significant challenges.**
  - Supportive housing is a way of helping the homeless integrate back into society
  - The supportive housing that is in place or is currently under development has provided an opportunity to refine the integration of services and to support a range of partnerships that have broadened the parts of the population being served
- 4. Supportive housing also has challenges that need to be addressed.**
  - While the City’s Supportive Housing Policy is helpful in setting some key principles, there is still perceived resistance from communities who do not accept that street homelessness exists throughout the City
  - Providing the 14 sites was significant but not enough; City policies and procedures, together with community resistance, have led to delays in getting the planned new supportive housing in place in a timely manner
  - As with the danger that people can get stuck in shelters, without a more comprehensive plan and other social housing options, people in supportive housing also run the risk of being stuck
  - Where possible, people should be supported to move onto more independent living
- 5. Geography is important to address street homelessness.**
  - The Downtown East Side has the highest number of both visible street homeless and of low barrier shelters however street homelessness exists

throughout the City and the Region; at this point, shelter distribution doesn't yet meet the needs in communities where there are street homeless

- While much focus has been on street homelessness in Vancouver, this is a regional issue and the City cannot take on the challenge without involving neighbouring municipalities doing their part
- The 14 new supportive housing sites the City has supplied go some way toward supporting a more city-wide balance for housing those people in need of such housing in their neighbourhoods but still does not reach all the neighbourhoods where there is a need

**6. The resources that are required are being supplied by a network of agencies and service providers but there is room for improved coordination of these resources and services.**

- The City is only one body in a constellation of government and non-government organizations that are committed to ending street homelessness - the City has been working in and facilitating many partnerships with all levels of government, non-profit service providers, the inter-faith community and business organizations, all of whom bring various capabilities and components of the overall solution that will be required to end homelessness
- While there are many groups involved in the efforts to end homelessness, the partnerships and alliances face numerous bureaucratic challenges both from within the City but also in these partnership with service providers that need to be addressed or minimized to be more effective in ending homelessness
- In spite of the acknowledged need to better integrate the services and resources that are currently available, there is a recognition that there is a need for more resources and for creative approaches to look outside the sources that currently exist

**7. Need to remember that the homeless are people and that the funding needs they have vary widely.**

- Homelessness is a situation faced by many and it is important to ensure the focus is on people as individuals, not merely "client" populations
- Some of the housing options and services currently available do focus on the needs of specific groups (e.g. youth, women) and it is important to continue to keep in mind the needs of specific populations in developing options for homelessness - a "one size fits all" model doesn't really work

**8. While gains are being made in the shelter and supportive housing resources available, there is room for improvement to ensure homelessness is addressed more comprehensively.**

- It is important to address the social, economic, health and political factors in play that are blockages to individuals being stuck in an ongoing cycle of homelessness
- There is a need to develop a better housing continuum that provides sufficient resources, housing options and adequate opportunities to move out of the cycle of poverty and homelessness to stability and integration into society
- With the number of agencies and partnerships involved, there should be a concerted effort to identify (perhaps with the help of partners outside the organization) where City policies and practices are in themselves blockages to finding better solutions

- The community as a whole needs to understand the benefits of ending street homelessness from a social, economic and health perspective; this includes developing a recognition that homelessness exists throughout the City and these needs are not only those of the visibly homeless on the Downtown East Side
- More resources will be required to truly end all homelessness that provide a full range of housing options for the homeless, preventative measures for those in danger of becoming homeless and support for those trying to transition to more independent living; these resources will likely need to come from new sources

## **Theme 2: Increasing housing choice for low & modest income households**

*The existing stock of market rental housing plays an important role in providing relatively affordable housing to Vancouver renters. The City has rate of change regulations that preserves rental housing in most apartment areas by requiring one-for-one replacement for redevelopment projects involving six or more dwelling units.*

*Since 1988, the City has required 20 percent of the units in new neighbourhoods and larger developments be available for the development of affordable housing. The City works closely with the developers in these areas to produce a housing mix and with senior governments and others partners to fund and construct social housing projects.*

*STIR is a 2.5 year program introduced in June 2009 and responds to the market rental shortage by providing incentives for the development of new market rental housing. The incentives offered are: waiving of development cost levies on rental units, parking requirement reductions, discretion on unit size, increased density and expedited permit processing.*

*Secondary suites supplement the city's purpose-built rental housing stock and provide accommodation to low and modest income renters, particularly families. They are permitted in all single family and multi-family areas in the city. In 2009, to facilitate the creation of more secondary suites, zoning changes were approved to enable full-size basements and more livable basement suites in all single family areas.*

*In 2009, laneway houses were allowed as a new form of rental and family housing in single family areas in Vancouver.*

*Increasing the supply of affordable housing requires participation of Federal and Provincial governments. Over the last decade, senior government funding for constructing and operating non-market housing has been significantly lower than previous decades. The Province of BC is now primarily responsible for non-market housing with the federal government providing limited funding under the Canada-British Columbia Affordable Housing Agreement. In recent years, most new non-market housing financed by the Province is targeted towards the homeless or seniors requiring assisted living.*

*In addition to providing input on these actions, workshop participants identified and discussed a variety of other initiatives targeted at increasing housing for low and modest income households. Key themes from these discussions are summarized below:*

- 1. Rate of change regulations (Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan) has some positive elements but there are concerns around the long-term health of the stock.**



- The main positive element of this regulation is that it protects the existing rental housing stock
  - The regulation doesn't generate new supply as it does not allow for redevelopment without one-for-one replacement of rental units, Some participants felt this would lead to deterioration of the existing rental stock over the long-term
  - As the stock continues to age, the regulation should be modified to be more flexible and allow for some redevelopment and regeneration of the existing rental stock
  - The regulation focuses on retention, but there are currently no incentives in place to repair and maintain the existing rental stock
- 2. There is support for the City's policy of requiring 20% of the units in new neighbourhoods be available for affordable housing, but implementation of the policy needs to be improved as it doesn't require that affordable units are actually built.**
- Participants expressed support for the city-wide focus of the policy
  - Need to address funding challenges - the policy was developed at a time when there was senior government housing programs in place to providing funding for construction and operations; these programs are very limited
  - Need to address implementation challenges - density is being provided without requirement for social housing to be built
  - The concept of affordability needs to be redefined considering today's realities; it is important for the City to work with partners to find ways to enhance affordability by supply rental units
- 3. The Short-term Incentives for Rental Housing Program (STIR) has been effective in encouraging the development of more purpose-built market rental housing, but concerns exist around affordability of units and community impacts of projects.**
- From a project viability perspective, STIR combines the best incentives available at the local level to encourage development of purpose-built market rental
  - STIR fits needs of income earners that cannot afford to own, but affordability for lower income earners are not addressed
  - The incentives allow greater density, smaller units and reduced parking requirements, which have raised community concerns related to density and building heights
  - The City needs to rethink how the requirements and incentives can work together to improve affordability of units. Partnerships are needed with senior governments, non-profits and private sector to achieve deeper levels of affordability
- 4. The City's expanded allowance of secondary suites has been an important source of affordable rental housing for low and modest income earners.**
- For renters, secondary suites generally tend to be more affordable than new purpose built rental housing; for the owner, they do not require subsidies as there is a financial incentive to have a suite in place (e.g. mortgage helper)
  - By allowing these suites to be built throughout the City, there is a better distribution of affordable rental units and the legalization of suites produces safer housing

- Secondary suites could be expanded further (e.g. townhouses, homes with two suites, etc.)
  - Illegal suites still exist – there are concerns around suites that do not meet building codes
- 5. Laneway housing has added to the rental housing stock but does not address affordability for lower income households.**
- Like the STIR Program, this has added more rental housing stock in the City and allows for people of different ages to remain in their community (e.g. seniors, young people)
  - There are no affordability requirements so much of this housing is not available for low and modest income earners
- 6. The Federal/Provincial affordable housing programs have been critical in producing social housing and should be extended.**
- Need to develop a revised national housing strategy that addresses the issue of homelessness and ensuring adequate affordable housing for low and modest income households
  - Co-op housing is a good model although the concept of affordability needs to be indexed to the cost of living in Vancouver
  - There is support for building non-market projects but it may be more cost effective to encourage other types of affordable housing including secondary suites and laneway housing
  - income earners; this strategy needs to be backed up with dedicated, long term financing

## **SESSION 2: MOVING FORWARD**

### ***Theme 1: Ending Street Homelessness by 2015***

*The City of Vancouver has three draft strategies to end street homelessness in the City by 2015. These are:*

- ⇒ The City will provide land for 1,200 supportive housing units.*
- ⇒ The City will ensure that street homeless individuals are housed in the neighbourhoods where they feel safe and connected.*
- ⇒ The City is committed to tracking progress towards its goals and an annual report card will be produced. To track progress on towards ending street homelessness by 2015 an annual homeless count will be conducted each year in March.*

*The draft strategies to end street homelessness by 2015 were discussed during the second part of the workshop. In summary, key themes from these discussions included the following:*

- 1. The City's strategies are generally supported, but the strategy to house people in their neighbourhoods needs to be clarified.**
  - In order to ensure that the 450 units are built and operating by 2015, the delays that have beset some of the projects currently underway or still in the planning stage need to be addressed – this includes streamlining the processes both internally in the City and with partners
  - It is important to look past the 450 units and look at existing stock and other types of property to increase capacity – one example suggested was development of supportive housing on church lands
  - It is critical that this addition to the supportive housing units is part of a broader and long term strategic plan that includes multiple partners – both government and non-government
  - The intent of this strategy is not clear in terms of location (i.e. does this mean the DTES?); there was support for the idea that this strategy could provide support for housing the homeless throughout the City, not just in the DTES or in neighbourhoods where homeless are found in the Homeless Count
  - It is important that consideration is given to ensure that the appropriate support services will be available in conjunction to where the housing is located
- 2. The strategies need to be expanded to include broader considerations for other parts of the housing continuum, integration and improvement of social services, policy change in key areas (e.g. income policy and prevention).**
  - Providing land is important, but not a strategy – more is required
  - Shelters are one part of the housing continuum – there is a need for a broader strategy that includes more than just 'street homeless', such as social housing for seniors, youth and families
  - Need better coordination and integration of services – access to healthcare, mental health services, nutrition, etc.
  - There needs to be a fuller discussion of prevention strategies

- Need involvement from senior governments to improve existing social services (e.g. income policies, policies around youth and corrections) to reduce poverty and homelessness
- 3. **Participants felt it was important to monitor and track progress. The strategy of regularly publishing a report card was supported, particularly in conjunction with other agencies. However, there was concern over the cost and usefulness of an annual homeless count.**
  - It is important to have good information on the whole housing continuum
  - There must be careful thought to the information that needs to be included, the frequency and who the partners (or other data sources) should be
  - Some participants felt an annual homeless count would be expensive, labour intensive and not particularly useful; they preferred a three-year assessment

### **KEY ACTIONS TO END STREET HOMELESSNESS BY 2015:**

- Continue to provide low-barrier shelters
- Develop a strategy to better integrate supportive housing in neighbourhoods (e.g. improved stakeholder and community engagement process)
- Work with senior governments to explore the impact of current income policies on homelessness
- Develop a broader strategy that includes the entire housing continuum with senior levels of government and other partners; Need to establish long-term financial commitments
- Develop prevention strategies to stop the flow of people into homelessness
- Focus on the housing and support needs of specific groups (e.g. Aboriginal, youth, women, the aging homeless population, etc.). We are developing a lot of supportive housing and have improved programs for the general homeless; the next step is to explore the needs of different groups
- Develop strategies to better integrate and coordinate services between service providers, governments, non-profits and private sector. Start with the assumption of no new funding for services. How can we do more with what we have?

## **Theme 2: Increasing housing choice for low & modest income households**

*The City of Vancouver has three draft strategies to increase housing for low and modest income households. These are:*

- ⇒ *Tailor zoning approaches and conditions to meet local housing needs and opportunities*
- ⇒ *Integrate successful strategies for rental inventory into current neighbourhood planning initiatives*
- ⇒ *The City is committed to tracking progress towards its goals and an annual report card will be produced.*

*The draft strategies to increase housing for low and modest income households were discussed during the second part of the workshop. In summary, key themes from these discussions included the following:*

- 1. There is strong support to continue to work towards increasing housing for low and modest income households.**
  - Continue to use incentives to encourage rental housing (e.g. STIR)
  - Continue to encourage secondary rental stock (e.g. more laneway housing and secondary suites)
  - Explore density as a mechanism to create more affordable housing (e.g. infill developments, transit-oriented development, etc..)
  - Need to provide diversity of housing choice city-wide – mix of tenure and types
  - Explore creative ways to maximize use of existing sites in developing social housing (e.g. consider new forms of affordable housing, consider building market-rental and then convert to social housing to help with financing)
  - It is important to protect the existing rental stock, but there are currently no strategies in place to address the challenges associated with maintaining the stock
- 2. The strategy of tailoring zoning approaches and conditions to meet local housing needs and opportunities should be aimed at creating affordable housing.**
  - Use zoning as a tool to create affordable housing (e.g. allow additional density, create zones that allow more secondary suites etc.)
  - Develop a city-wide housing plan to identify current and future needs of Vancouverites
  - Pre-zone areas to include different forms of housing (e.g. rental, infill, townhouses, etc.)
  - Review the City's Financing Growth Policies so that the process around Community Amenity Contributions is clearer
- 3. There is support for the strategy to integrate rental inventory strategies into current neighbourhood planning initiatives, however participants felt firm leadership from the City is necessary to ensure the strategies are implemented**
  - If the City is committed to ensuring affordable rental housing throughout the City, it is imperative that there is clear leadership from the City in guiding development and implementation in all neighbourhoods

- 4. Participants felt it was important to monitor and track progress; the strategy of regularly publishing a report card was supported as a way to do this.**
- Measurement is important to gauge progress and re-evaluate directions
  - Report card should be used as an advocacy tool in collaboration with other municipalities and the region

**KEY ACTIONS TO INCREASE HOUSING CHOICE FOR LOW & MODEST  
INCOME HOUSEHOLDS:**

- Continue the 20% affordable housing policy, but modify to improve implementation options and ensure the housing is built
- Continue to use incentives (e.g. density) to encourage rental housing
- Continue to encourage secondary rental stock (e.g. more laneway housing and secondary suites)
- Explore providing incentives for maintenance of existing rental stock
- Link rental development with transportation planning
- Clear direction with strong leadership is needed to implement affordable housing policies; better community engagement strategies are necessary to address community concerns
- Develop strategic partnerships with non-profits, private sector and other levels of governments to find alternative sources of financing

## **INTRODUCTION**

On April 27<sup>th</sup> 2011, as part of a public and stakeholder engagement program, “Talk Housing With Us”, the City of Vancouver hosted a Stakeholder Workshop. The purpose of Talk Housing With Us was to gather input from the public and key stakeholders on the City’s future Housing and Homeless Strategy and to consider approaches to take over the next ten years. Around 80 individuals participated, who came from a wide range of organizations including those that have experience and expertise in housing the homeless and creating affordable housing.

The full-day Stakeholder Workshop began with a brief overview of the housing continuum in Vancouver and covered the City’s current & future strategies based on two key themes; ending street homelessness by 2015, and increasing housing choice for low and modest income households.

Each of these themes were covered separately during the two Workshop Sessions; Session 1 focused on Current Actions (What’s working well? What can be improved?), and Session 2 focused on Moving Forward (the City’s proposed strategies; goals for the next 3-5 years; the role of stakeholders & partners; 10-year vision for all parts of the housing continuum).

This section of the report contains notes from these sessions. In addition, participants and those who were invited but were unable to attend were provided with a supplementary feedback form to provide additional comment on the same topics as were explored during the workshop. The forms that were returned have been summarized in Appendix B.

*PLEASE NOTE – in the following material, the notes reflect the various note-taking styles of the several recorders who generously volunteered their time to assist with the breakout sessions at this workshop. The notes attempt to present the different views and opinions expressed by participants.*

### **Session 1: Current Actions**

#### ***Theme 1: End street homelessness by 2015***

Participants were asked to comment on some specific City actions targeted to end street homelessness as well as identify and other actions/initiatives they felt were working well.

#### ***City working with partners to increase low-barrier shelters***

*The shelter spaces opened through the HEAT and Winter Response programs lowered barriers to people coming inside. This means they provided storage for carts and welcomed people inside with their loved ones (pets, partners). Shelter guests received two hot meals every day, had access to shower and laundry facilities and were connected to basic health services (primary care, dental and mental health services).*

***What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?***

**Provides a supportive environment that brings people inside**

- Having the ability to maintain relationships with individuals (time and capacity to do so), building trust and focus on permanent housing

- Builds a trusting relationship – encourages the homeless to move towards permanent housing
- Removal of barriers means people can bring pets, have visitors, enter/exit unlimited, intoxicated, etc.
- Gives sense of continuity and less pressurized environment so the homeless can focus on other important things in their lives
- Allows people to sleep during the day
- No maximum stay creates non-pressurized environment
- Focus groups of shelter users have identified easy access (e.g. no ID), community feel, safety, food, relationship with staff and each other
- Fluidity/ flow of people (daytime and night-time people) using the shelters

**Creates a viable alternative as part of a housing continuum**

- There may be a certain population who is attracted to shelters, i.e. those who don't like living in a box, people may want to live communally (different models needed)
- Non-profits have created a culture that has adapted to the needs of the homeless in their community – this makes people comfortable, opens doors, improve health of individuals
- Attraction for some people is the ability to maintain an element of control over own lives
- Broader housing options offers people choice
- Communal sleeping space is desirable for some
- Outreach program successful in getting people off-streets as a transition to housing

**Integration of services / addressing multiple and integrated needs**

- When HEAT closed, BC Housing worked closely with service providers to place people in more permanent housing and that effort worked well
- Primary health care – (previous year had both primary health care and mental health)
- Food – also research done on impact of food by nutritionist
- Amalgamation of services e.g. shelters, supports, transitional housing (one example is Langley Gateway of Hope project)

**Improvements seen in young people**

- Decrease in youth detox users, might be related to availability of shelters; shows the issues linking age, addiction and homelessness are complex

**Appropriate locations – homeless are housed locally**

- Locations are right
- Regional dispersal of shelters
- Policy initiatives in neighbourhood that help the homeless
- Success dependant on scale and location (Scattered throughout the City works well, outside DTES)

**It serves a need**

- The service is obviously needed
- Should have been started earlier
- Non-profit organizations are dynamic and each shelter is better than the last
- Community benefits (lowers crime on the street)



- Ratio of staff to residents is low (which is great)
- Pre HEAT was faith based community; running shelters/out of the cold programs, volunteer based; HEAT has filled major gap and will major funding has been able to do more
- Huge difference in 2010/11 Winter Response shelters, after first year a number of improvements were made to address locational challenges and impact on community

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

**Clear, long term City direction and policies**

- It seems there is an “emergency response” mentality every year for winter shelter; we know winter is coming every year
- Creates chaotic and sporadic public consultation, start-up, staffing, etc. - no coordinated, fluid plan
- Current prevention service isn’t 100% so we’re not meeting future demands

**Longer term integrated plan with a regional focus**

- City can help by being strategic; we don’t know if we are successful if we can’t measure it against a clear strategic framework; Mayors of different cities need to work together and have revenue returned from Province so they have the adequate resources
- A lot of homeless people are mobile (moving within the region); need a regional plan
- Lack of regional services means some shelters are picking up needs from outside of Vancouver
- Bring other municipalities into developing their homelessness services to diversity people’s choice of where they would like to be housed
- Need regional approach, not simply municipal strategy
- Portland, Oregon has a model of housing that helps people across the continuum

**Bureaucracy challenges**

- Funding streams and system not necessarily set up in a way that allows for creativity by the organizations (e.g. BC Housing budgets entirely separate, Shelter budget is separate from permanent housing and a surplus can’t be moved across); need to better coordinate ways to incentivize the dollars in the system
- An agency should have the right to move surplus funds around between programs in order to achieve their agency/program goals; this would give an agency more flexibility to support their clientele
- Funding mechanisms are restrictive, need more services outside DTES and in other areas (e.g. Dunbar – need to move local people into the new building without all the restrictions such as the need to be clean and sober)
- Community services have been institutionalized
- Mental health teams are at capacity so if client doesn’t show for one appointment, then their file is immediately closed
- There is also a silo from the funders’ budgets - e.g; housing providers will save money in policing, health services etc; but the saving doesn’t go back to housing; the Ministries need to work closer together; there’s no one responsible for the “global budget” and accounting for “leveraged dollars” by NGOS (e.g. in-kind,

donations by board members, corporate partnerships) as part of the budget; need a business case mentality; e.g. in the UK they have that approach

**Shelter distribution**

- Need to make sure avail; housing options are in communities where the person feel connected and has support networks
- Process of how shelters are located in neighbourhoods needs to be improved
- Development Permit process has been difficult (some improvement with Winter Response), still battling community concerns and people upset about how HEAT shelter process was initially conducted; some operators have been able to mitigate some of the concerns (e.g. RainCity)

**Better integration of resources, services, approaches**

- Health resources are important and connecting health with homelessness services. (e.g. at hospital); when HEAT shelters closed, detox users went up again; need to look into these issues in more details
- Absolutely needs better coordination of services, especially how services that might not be typically seen as homeless-focused, how they connect to homeless service e.g. releasing people onto the streets from hospitals and no follow up, or can lead to eviction
- Some lack of coordination is related to tight resources, service providers started trying to focus on core mandates only
- Instead of looking at “housing first” lens, might be more useful to look at how to support people with addiction, what support they need
- Shelters managers also have responsibilities to the neighbourhood/communities, not just the homeless population they are housing; the broader communities also have their right; when there are issues, the communities don’t know who to call other than the Police; there’s no one coordinating the continuum of services; who is responsible really? Who does what? Maybe there can be a “catch-all 24 hour command centre” where all services can be coordinated; we can do this now with existing resources! Let’s start thinking by assuming there is no more resource, how can we improve with what we already have; coordination is best done by frontline service providers; lack of identification of gaps
- Service providers feel disconnected; even they are not clear about City’s policies
- There are turf wars between non-government organizations (NGOs); NGOs are “guarding” their funding; this contributes to lack of coordination and collaboration
- Funders need to talk to each other too, instead of just funding initiatives individually
- Operators can work together to overcome challenges of location and working with neighbours
- Need for consistency in service and management of shelters, effects on local businesses, effects police calls – disruption, break and enters in area etc
- Need services and support for those with health challenges
- Little or no access to health services (e.g. medication) in the neighbourhood where shelter is located
- Need to tie housing to other programs (e.g. mental health)
- Increase in 24/7 shelter capacity(beyond HEAT), focus on case mgmt and partnerships with city, province, non-profit has been key

**Development of “Best Practices”**

- Haven't been able to participate at "good practice" workshops/research, to get more collaboration and get beyond discussing issues only; practitioners (e.g. service providers) can lead this
- Implement best practice from HEAT shelters to other shelters

**Integration of housing with community / responding to community concerns**

- Significant effort has been spent convincing people/stakeholders who are not supportive because of ideological differences
- Need community development effort; NGOs need to get out of the mindset of working for the funders and talking to friends only; need to work together with businesses; it should be the closer you are to a service, the better off and safer your neighbourhood is
- One suggestion is for example each Business Improvement Area (BIA) can meet with different housing providers one on one, since they are not all the same; relationship building is key
- Good Neighbour agreements are vital
- Need for consistency in service and management of shelters, effects on local businesses, effects police calls – disruption, b and e in area etc

**HEAT Shelters - consideration for moving forward**

- HEAT cannot be the only long term strategy; it's a means to an end and need to know what the end is; are we spending too much energy on shelters at the expense of more longer term strategies?
- We fight fires, we might be spending money at the wrong place
- Need to remember shelter is not the cheapest option, adequate housing is
- With a lot of different types of shelter out there, need to focus on various shelters out there
- Hastings BIA – focus on shelter may be too much, as this is not the answer; need to shift focus onto housing
- Will need to look at what the role of permanent shelter is in the system further down the road; when we move beyond the overflow shelters and back to short stay shelter beds, might be more costly, but more effective overall
- BY 2020 perhaps shelters will be dealing w/ less of a multiple barriered population and a shift in the street population
- Need 'rain' shelters – allow people to get out of the elements and keep themselves and their things dry, otherwise leads to health issues
- Additional challenges facing shelters today, balance of extended stay without making it permanent stay (when not necessarily better option for the individual/family)

**Consider needs of specific populations**

- Not all people want to go into permanent housing, some might go shelter to shelter and want to remain homeless – need to be conscious of where we allocate our resources
- Amalgamation of services might work for a particular population e.g. Union Gospel Mission is abstinence based, but does not work for all
- Allow homeless to use the shelter and services on their own terms (e.g. explore wet-shelters - this means they can drink in the shelter)
- Some people in the shelter are there to deal drugs because of the population base, not to move on to supportive and adequate housing

- Women have to leave children behind often when going into shelter (and transition house), Ministry doesn't allow children to visit shelter if in care
- No 24 hour drop-in centre for women
- Niche populations - Women struggle in the shelter system in general
- Women have specific needs, women and children only shelters needed (fear of assault)
- How come we don't intervene with people who have serious mental health and addictions issues and are not independent?
- Mental Health Commission - MH, addiction issues, trauma etc. – strong evidence based practice that still needs to be worked on, additional supports etc that could be offered
- Need to examine needs of mentally ill- have supports at all shelter

**Lack of resources to deal with all needs**

- Need to spread resources across all housing types
- Still not enough appropriate beds (e.g. few or no beds for couples, beds for families, beds that are gender appropriate) - need to have shelters that look at the diversity of needs and allows for choice

**Develop a better housing continuum**

- Need fuller discussion of prevention and transition to supportive housing
- Need to be strategic in the types and diversity of first touch services and housing we provide; need appropriate strategy, system and structure to do so
- Ultimate goal is to transition people to permanent housing, not building and providing permanent shelters

**Focus on people**

- Need to think less about homeless people as "clients", they are also citizens and are responsible to their neighbours
- Chez Soi – people don't always believe it's possible for them to succeed in moving forward towards a better housing choice (nb for people to hear from those who have succeeded)

**Miscellaneous**

- Improve communication and coordination – need to communicate City's roles, City's policies, why does City want HEAT shelters, how will it help etc
- SROs are in such bad shape that some people are opting to stay in shelters
- Need to solve bed bug issue and have a place to store their things
- Lack of privacy for all different groups that use shelters

**Permanent supportive housing (e.g. 14 sites)**

*Since 2007, the City and Province have been working in partnership to develop social and supportive housing projects on 14 sites provided by the City. In May 2010, the Province and Streetwork Foundation committed funding to develop supportive housing on all of the 14 sites. The partnership will result in over 1,500 new supportive housing units by 2013. The City has also provided grants to help make additional supportive housing projects a reality, including projects with Union Gospel Mission, Lu'ma Native Housing and the Aboriginal Mothers Centre.*

***What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?***

**Provides one element of stable housing**

- HEAT-shelters are closing
- Fully supportive housing is good and recognizes true needs (some need permanent supports)
- Example of “More Than a Roof” – complete outreach services includes Neighbourhood House staff help, community group support, etc. (full circle community help)
- Supportive housing is the answer to help homeless integrate back into society
- Need to create a sense of community for people living there
- Role models of healthy living needed in housing situations
- Supportive housing at Fraser Street is a good example

**Supporting people in communities throughout the city is important**

- Regional dispersion across the city is good
- City has recognized street homelessness as a city-wide problem and has taken the initiative to build supportive housing
- Need to be integrated across the city in various neighbourhoods, City-wide distribution of housing is essential

**Miscellaneous**

- City doesn't get in the way of what non-profits are doing (e.g. Collingwood Neighbourhood House)
- Some supportive housing is not regulated (means service providers sometimes take advantage of clients)
- The rate of conversion (Single Room Accommodation Bylaw) is not monitored

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

**Important to integrate developments into community**

- Massing of the supportive housing projects may be too concentrated/intense for neighbourhood (example of housing in Dunbar is at an ideal scale for that neighbourhood)
- For large sites, need to ensure diverse tenant selection (e.g. not just hard to house people) and ensure that this meets provision of services in that community
- Need to educate neighbours, once a project is a 'success' neighbours become supportive
- Need community consultation (collaborative approach) to develop strategies rather than relying on outside experts

**Key element is good management**

- Needs to be well run, well managed in the various communities

**Better integration of resources and services for those in supportive housing**

- Food budget is not adequate (should not expect residents in supportive housing to pay for their own food from their income); this can lead to public back-lash; providing three meals a day (like available in shelters) provides stability, a routine and normalcy
- Resources need to be placed on mental health and addiction issues, not solely housing issues
- Backfilling of support services to older social housing units and rental housing-many at risk of homelessness

**Need an integrated plan with transitions on the continuum**

- Gaps in housing types and diversity don't allow people to transition and move up into better housing types as their situation improves
- Not necessarily lack of support/ communication- it's lack of inventory for next steps on continuum
- Need capacity to move people thru the continuum (transition supports)
- Ultimate goal is to get people out of system
- Long-term solution necessary not simply 'band-aid' projects
- Target should be not to push people out but fill in other segments of population through diversity of housing
- Regional/provincial/national strategy needed (homelessness exists everywhere)
- Concern that shelter becomes permanent part of system / solution, taken for granted, like food banks - become people's home / community- concern is people get stuck for years - over the long term people deteriorate in that environment

**Time lag in providing facilities / not enough supportive housing**

- Takes 3 years to build but are needed now
- Not enough units/ inventory, spaces not available in supportive housing when people are ready
- Need more than 14 sites – we are still catching up
- Need to determine mix of people in housing set up (i.e. not all hard to house people should be put in one development)
- Concern that most intractable people will be still ghettoized to DTES
- Should not be concentrated in DTES/Chinatown

**Provide housing for specific populations**

- Seniors/ youth/ women need specific supports- medical/ additions/ healthcare
- Seniors with drug addictions/ alcoholism- need low barrier low term care facilities

**Mental Health Commission of Canada – At Home Project**

*The Mental Health Commission research demonstration project, At Home/Chez Soi, is a investigating mental health and homelessness in five Canadian cities including Vancouver. It is based on a Housing First approach for homeless people living with a mental illness; evaluating the effectiveness of giving people a place to live and services to assist them over the course of the initiative and providing meaningful and practical support to 300 people. The overall goal is to provide evidence about what services and systems could best help people who are living with a mental illness and are homeless.*

**What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?**

**Important opportunity that has created supportive housing along with development towards “Best Practices”**

- When housing is provided, people with mental health issues settle down
- Bosman Hotel has about 300 clients and is a research based program; clients can choose where they live because gross rental subsidy is large enough (85% success with clients); the service is very responsive (can house people within 3 days)

- Research based program creates lots of learning and increases the tool box so we can take advantage of the knowledge that is created – could be used as a guide to assist other supportive housing projects in the Lower Mainland
- Need to support people where they are ‘at’

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

**Short term project**

- Bosman program is only funded for 3 years

**Use of control group results in some people not getting the support they need**

- Uses research control group which is inappropriate because many are rejected from participating in program

## **Provincial Homeless Intervention Project (HIP)**

*The Homelessness Intervention Project (HIP) is a B.C. provincial government initiative to help homeless British Columbians connect quickly and effectively to services they need in five cities including Vancouver. HIP aligns the programs and resources of several government ministries, health authorities, non-profit and other agencies supporting a common cause – to reduce chronic homelessness.*

***What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?***

- Easy access to welfare services through this program is a huge benefit
- Models that integrate supportive housing into the communities is ideal
- Problems are overlapping and ‘not ministry specific’

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

**Capacity limitations**

- HIP – the program can only refer so many clients to welfare services, so if you can’t access the HIP program it’s a great barrier for most to navigate the welfare service on their own
- More staff are needed to sustain associated services
- Doesn’t include home support

**Regional approach**

- Limited supportive housing outside of Vancouver – this weak link creates pressure on Vancouver

## **Interfaith Alliance to end homelessness**

*The Vancouver Interfaith Alliance to End Homelessness is a non-partisan group of over 60 faith-based leaders dedicated to ending street homelessness in Vancouver by 2015 and meeting the longer term goal of providing affordable housing for all. This group has been most active in exploring how to tap into the sources of the faith community and encouraging leaders to muster the political will needed to achieve long-term solutions to homelessness.*

***What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?***

- Homeless population is being interviewed by the City, housing providers, funders (e.g. BC Housing) so that they have an opportunity to be placed in neighbourhood housing projects (e.g. Westside Kits neighbourhood)
- Wesley Church has donated funds to house a person for a year

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

- Interfaith community could be doing more by creating new housing
- Should think strategically to leverage the government and other resources

***Ending Street Homelessness - Miscellaneous***

- Fear of gentrification and loss of SROs
- Market looking for rental not simply pressure from developers

## ***Theme 2: Increasing housing choice for low and modest income households***

Participants were asked to comment on some specific City actions that increase housing for low and modest income households, as well as identify and other actions/initiatives they felt were working well.

### **Rate of Change Regulations**

*The existing stock of market rental housing has an important role in providing relatively affordable rents to Vancouver renters. The City has rate of change regulations that preserves rental housing in most apartment areas by requiring one-for-one replacement for redevelopment projects involving six or more dwelling units*

***What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?***

- Protects existing housing stock
- Need to upgrade and protect existing stock
- Need to provide housing for those who are the economic backbone of the city (waiters, labourers etc). Economy is affected- not just a housing issue

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

**Doesn't add to rental stock and allow for redevelopment**

- Successful in saving rental but problem persist in being able to provide rental and replacing rental
- Does not provide new stock: renewal and expansion
- Challenge is that things are frozen in time and people expect things to remain the same
- Much of the older housing stock located on under-utilised sites (difficult to make economics work to intensify and replace rental housing at same rental rents)
- Market force is not allowed to work
- Rate of change seen as a 'stop' sign to redevelop

**Prevents renewal of existing rental stock**

- Stock is deteriorating, yet affordable rental tends to be 'old' and 'tired'
- Difficult to keep housing affordable in light of maintenance costs for older buildings
- Prevents people from trying to redevelop, results in 'older' housing stock and low quality



- Redevelopment of older sites is challenging due to difficulty in renovating without relocating / evicting / etc
- Policy is used as 'stick' but no incentive (i.e. zoning/density change)

**Modify regulation to allow for flexibility in implementation**

- Rate of change policy has some merits; but the mechanism of implementation needs improvements; the policy prevents upgrading and maintenance; it became sort of a "stop play" policy; we end up not allowing some rental housing buildings that might make sense to be redeveloped and replace the rental housing units in the process; the stock is stagnating; also criticism of difficulty of going through the City's process for redeveloping; how can we improve this policy

**Difficult to address displacement of current tenants when rental units are being renovated/replaced**

- Find a way to work with people currently living in these units to include them in the changes at time of renovation keeping in mind the additional cost associated

**Get creative in what is allowed**

- Allow upper level 'penthouses' or other high end units to be built on top of older buildings, to offset costs of maintenance (ie lightweight steel framing on roof of 4/6 storey buildings)
- Difficult for smaller developers who do not have the infrastructure for management of affordable housing, consider consolidating purpose-built affordable housing of smaller development
- Rental housing could be considered a CAC
- Sites are often under utilised in relation to current zoning / building practices
- Densification is needed to support affordability of rental markets, also less environmental impact

**Miscellaneous**

- Family units are hard to replace, not specified in the by-law but there is staff expectation
- Disconnect with goal to replace and add density
- Excellent documentation on rental housing, but overestimates condition of current stock
- Perhaps consider case by case development
- Rent controls can be a challenge when looking to fund capital expenses; rent controls are hurting the people they were designed to protect, as there is low turnover

**Affordable Housing in new neighbourhoods (20% policy)**

*Since 1988, the City has required 20 percent of the units in new neighbourhoods be available for the development of affordable housing. City works closely with the developers in these areas to produce a housing mix and with senior governments and others partners to fund and construct social housing projects.*

**What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?**

- Like the city wide focus
- Developer gets to build condos, city gets affordable units

**What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?**

**Concept of affordability needs to be redefined**

- Need to redefine definition of 'affordable'- working people, people on welfare- look at range
- Rethink affordable housing definition – social housing? What does that mean to anybody? To be affordable 2 bedroom rental is \$1400/month

**Explore innovative ways to be more efficient**

- Is affordable housing being built affordably?
- There needs to be more efficiency (i.e. design / build)

**Improve implementation of policy – require units to be built**

- Good policy but need to rethink implementation i.e. Council approved zoning to Concord and gave City options to sites but social housing was not built; density was given for free but should have had units built
- Requires built affordable housing (thresholds as defined by BC Housing) in order to have the additional density; e.g. Richmond

**Address funding challenges**

- Programs were designed at a time when there were provincial and federal operating dollars for affordable housing; today, these subsidies are virtually non-existent; consequently, city has to rethink the 20% policy and come up with solutions that will result in a reduced number of units without dependence on subsidies
- Use money from property endowment fund to acquire sites, or get developers to donate sites to the City to create, at no cost to the City, a number of affordable rental units as part of new condo developments on those lands
- Without money from government partners, difficult to incorporate 20% into buildings

**Find ways to enhance affordability for supplying rental units**

- We need to have an 'example' site help demonstrate what you can get from rental
- Consider no FSR for social housing portions; e.g. North Vancouver
- Consider financing site and rent at full market, take profit from market rents to subsidize affordable housing; example C-side
- Whistler model has inclusionary zoning, developers provide 15% non-subsidized non-market housing homeownership or rental; cost of land is absorbed into market units priced at construction cost

**Coordination between levels of government and private sector required**

- Need collaboration and cooperation between organizations/government
- Vancouver needs a Housing Authority to bring together non-profits and developers and provide authority / mechanisms

Non-profit can act as a bridge between the city and developer in managing affordable housing

**Miscellaneous**

- There are a lot of young '40ish' developers that want to take on small projects to add rental but are denied by the City based on location
- Allow projects to target different levels of affordability (e.g. not just social housing)

## **Short-term Incentives for Rental Housing Program (STIR)**

*STIR is a 2.5 year program introduced in June 2009 and responds to the market rental shortage by providing incentives for the development of new market rental housing. The incentives offered are: waiving of development cost levies on rental units, parking requirement reductions, discretion on unit size, increased density and expedited permit processing.*

***What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?***

- Rental housing is identified as a community amenity
- Combines the best incentives available at the local level to encourage rental
- STIR fits needs of people that have steady incomes (above median income) but cannot afford to own housing and need to rent

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

### **Affordability is still not addressed**

- These units are not affordable; affordable rental is extremely important to provide a continuum and a next step from social housing; also need units for families; rent supplements don't work as well in cities with very low availability of rental stock
- Affordability is a key issue, marketed to yuppies and down sized seniors
- Need to make market ownership housing affordable, not only purpose built rental
- Price point is still too high; program uses all the tools in the toolkit to create rental and if the "best" that can be done is market rent at \$2.20/sf, how is this affordable?

### **Community concerns**

- Has increased density and/or building height which many people don't like
- Adding density (height) into community is out of context
- STIR is seen as a replacement to regular CAC's for developers, which does not provide the same community benefit, such as child care, parks etc
- Stronger community consultation process is needed
- There is a negative perception of rental housing in neighbourhoods
- Achieves objective to accelerate rental construction but community objectives are not met (unit type and amenity) and will meet resistance from community

### **Developing rental housing is not viable – incentives need to encourage this**

- People do not recognize the cost of providing rental (i.e. the need to increase the density in order to provide the rental, not 1-1 replacement but costs 3.4-1), need to inform the public that density is required and it is the way to achieve
- Large sites are required to provide the density and units required or need to consolidate sites
- Growing gap between cost (amount of density) required to provide rental and rental rates
- The markets functions and the only reason you will not get pure rental housing is if you have a barrier preventing it; the market will provide for rental housing (though not necessarily affordable or geared towards lower income populations)
- No longer achieving the same returns on rental but there is still the expectation that values will be rescued by inflation

**Rethink City requirements and incentives**

- Need to have guidelines provided on size, scale, density, etc
- High parking requirement increase costs and is not necessary/appropriate in some neighbourhoods (i.e. West End, transit corridor)

**Need greater incentives for developers**

- leverage taxes at other levels of government
- property taxes abatement not just processing time incentive

**Involve other levels of government and organizations**

- Partnerships needed with other levels of government, non-profits and private sector
- Need greater senior government incentives
- Taxation incentives from 40/50 years ago worked
- Need to include market sector by tax incentives
- Other examples of incentives VanCity, springboard mortgages; Calgary, defers collecting on sales of land
- Connect with organizations that own land (schools, churches); return on investment goals and interest may be better aligned with City goals

**Communicate importance of rental housing**

- Provide a justification of rental against neighbourhood interests (i.e. this is how the neighbourhood goals are translated into concrete actions)
- Convince existing renters that increase in stock would increase support for their interests

**Take on a longer time perspective**

- Long-term planning necessary, not simply short-term solutions
- Too short a time frame, takes 2 years to develop project (e.g. rezoning, development permit process)
- If it was continued there would be more take up

**Miscellaneous**

- Increasing supply but not the unit type that the City needs; units being built are studio units and 1 bedrooms, not family units (2+ bedrooms)
- Neighbourhood not willing to accept change, political backlash
- Shift emphasis from concept of home ownership as end objective (need to shift societal paradigm towards accepting rental)

## **Secondary Suites Expansion**

*Secondary suites supplement the city's purpose-built rental housing stock and provide accommodation to low and modest income renters. They are permitted in all single family and multi-family areas in the city. In 2009, to facilitate the creation of more secondary suites, zoning changes were approved to enable full-size basements and more livable basement suites in all single family areas.*

***What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?***

- More affordable rents than purpose built housing
- Legalization of suites produces quality and standards/codes (safe) housing

- Excellent opportunity as a mortgage helper, as well as short term potential housing option
- The most successful of all rental housing
- Good policy

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

**Illegal suites issues**

- Illegal suites still exist (need greater knowledge of what and how many there are citywide)
- Not regulating illegal suites created a culture of non-compliance (i.e. no need to get a permit for other construction)
- Safety concerns with illegal suites - not meeting code
- No mechanism for accountability therefore less stable supply; for tenants no means to make complaints

**Expand concept of secondary suites**

- Need to be 'everywhere'
- Potential to look at the creation of 'two' legal suites on large lots
- Allow for basement suites in townhouses within existing zones/properties

**Miscellaneous**

- Need more 2 and 3 bedroom suites for families
- A rate of change type policy for secondary suites may be needed to allow for a more balanced growth
- Secondary suites affect affordability of buying/selling homes
- Reasons why there aren't more suites can be associated with costs, regulations, etc.

## **Laneway Housing**

*In 2009, laneway houses were introduced as a new form of rental and family housing in single family areas in Vancouver.*

***What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?***

**Good way to increase density with little community impact**

- Increases density and adds housing supply
- Greater acceptance of density (less community backlash)
- City-wide policy rather than neighbourhood

**Addresses affordability issues**

- Well designed pre-fabricated units keep costs down
- One element in strategy towards affordability
- Cannot be stratified therefore no speculation and adds rental
- Aging in place as parents/grandparents/young people can remain in neighbourhood

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

**May not meet affordability objectives**

- High-end units results in high rents (but high-end units necessary for community acceptance)

- No affordability restrictions
- Must meet strict regulations/fees lead to higher costs
- Very expensive and for the 'select' few
- Affects affordability of homes (makes single family homes more expensive)

**Need for incentives**

- Needs to be an appetite for looking at alternative forms of housing, innovation to have different kinds of laneway housing (i.e. more affordable, different standards, etc.)
- Financial Bond or other incentives?
- High cost of construction is not incentive to add rental housing

**Parking and storage issues**

- Real Estate Board thinks that the impact of laneway housing on parking and storage of cars and boats needs to be considered; others feel there is no issue with parking and storage in relation to laneway housing

## **Federal/Provincial affordable housing programs**

*Increasing the supply of affordable housing requires participation of Federal and Provincial governments.*

*Over the last decade, senior government funding for constructing and operating non-market housing has been significantly lower than previous decades. The Province of BC is now primarily responsible for non-market housing with the federal government providing limited funding under the Canada-British Columbia Affordable Housing Agreement. In recent years, most new non-market housing financed by the Province is targeted towards the homeless or seniors requiring assisted living.*

***What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?***

- Co-op housing is a good model
- Focus on street homelessness provides much needed assistance

***What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?***

**Need better financial mechanisms in place to encourage more rental housing**

- Need to advocate to senior governments to index income benefits to housing market - Vancouver housing much more expensive than in other parts of Canada
- Need more funding commitments from federal and provincial governments
- Federal tax breaks for home owners to improve secondary rental stock
- No commitments from federal and provincial governments for subsidy programs targeted to individuals (governments tend to favour capital projects)
- Federal tax changes needed to encourage investment in rental housing (e.g. capital gains rollover, harmonize tax advantages with other industries, etc.)
- Housing as an investment and not a subsidy (e.g. C-side - is there a possibility to do that elsewhere?)

**Balance focus on street homelessness and rental housing**

- Focus on street homelessness diverts resources away from affordable rental housing

**Increase rental stock**

- Lack of quality affordable rental stock

**Develop a coordinated approach with all levels of government**

- Need a coordinated response from the Federal government
- Need to lobby federal government for National Housing Policy
- Need shift in structure of regional government with added authority and mechanisms (need regionally elected officials to represent interests of the region, difficult for locally elected municipal officials to prioritize regional interest over constituency)
- Need for unified approach by largest municipalities/regions for collective advocacy at the national level
- Municipalities need to take stance against downloading of responsibilities from senior levels of government
- City as a facilitator with other agencies to acquire land (churches, veteran associations, transit) to build housing; need another equity position
- Need a strategic plan; look at where we can best spend our resources

**Miscellaneous**

- Broadway and Fraser project; one of the 14 city supportive housing sites; the 3 floors of rental housing was not approved because the decision was “usurped” by Planning; there is lack of coordination or philosophy/vision between City departments
- Need to re-evaluate income thresholds, 30% is commonly used but not applicable to reality; affordable vs. adequate housing

## **Other possibilities**

**Look at opportunities in other (non residential) zones**

- Sites currently zoned Industrial (M1) that would lend themselves to the development of SRO and affordable housing without neighbourhood objection; the City needs to be open to allow these ideas
- The City is adamantly opposed to adding housing into job space; explore wherever possible to prove that doing this would not ‘kill’ the industrial land
- There is a perception that industrial land is not being used and thus should be allowed for housing
- Is it possible to have both affordable rental and industrial?
- Potential to put a covenant on title that residents of a building cannot ‘complain’ about adjacent uses
- Nice to allow for small projects here and there, rather than all in one spot
- Need to make better use of land
- C-2 was downzoned, removed rental or unit capacity and placed demand into other zones; need to consider consequences of city-wide rezonings

**Explore other zoning tools**

- Look at zoning for tenure, rather than just residential; this may not be allowed by the City’s legal department
- Explore inclusionary zoning
- How does the Charter influence potential for opportunities in zoning, when you can only zone for uses and not ‘people’

**“Fair Share Policy”**

- In Seattle they have a fair share policy that calls for every neighbourhood to have a mix of housing
- We need to be intentional and focus on understanding the people and their needs for other types of housing, not just putting all the focus on street homelessness alone; this is something the City should research and explore

**Co-operatives**

- Is there a role the City can play in encouraging this type of housing?

**Be creative in finding affordable housing supply**

- Creative ways to take advantage of existing condo supply to create affordable housing (i.e. buy existing stock rather than purpose built new)
- Develop a low risk investment strategy, that allows for people to purchase/trade/sell entire properties, rather than breaking things down
- Prioritisation of resources necessary to create more housing

**Need to define affordability**

- Definition of affordability needs to shift and be expanded: need continuum of housing affordability (not simply defined as highly subsidized housing)
- Difficult to deliver on 'affordability' as there are no funding mechanisms to make affordable
- Partnering with non-profit and use of value created through up-zoning to fund affordable home ownership / affordable rental
- Develop a portable rent subsidy
- Look at rent controls geared to income and a demand vs. supply analysis

**Address roadblocks in the City bureaucracy**

- City costs for development are huge – need to streamline process
- Make it easier to build lock off suites in older stock
- Look at changing bylaws for items that support housing (ie parking)
- Collaborative approach rather than adversarial
- Fast tracking/prioritization of affordable housing developments

**Ensure diversification**

- Need to look at more densification (secondary market: rental market provides affordable homes for service sector)
- Ensure diversification in housing (mixing in stock), not just lowest end of continuum
- Look at a cross-pollination of mixed developments
- Build an inclusive city to meet a range of housing options

**Explore other housing models**

- Whistler Housing Authority model (municipal corporation) bonus density provided for affordable home ownership / rental contribution (50/50)

**Miscellaneous**

- Other options for construction beyond wood and concrete?
- Reduce risk for construction, marketability
- Identify an Ombudsperson at the City who can deal with difficulties by anyone who is trying to create affordable housing but run into problems with the system (i.e. permits cannot be approved etc.)



- Currently, not only is rental not being built but it's stagnating other development
- There are 52% renters in the City
- Affordable long-term home ownership with resell restrictions necessary, rather than simply creating short-term affordable housing
- Challenge if change will happen fast enough to meet the growth

## **Session 2: Moving Forward**

### ***Theme 1: End Street Homelessness by 2015***

Workshop participants provided input into the City's draft strategies to end street homelessness by 2015 and identified key actions for moving forward.

#### ***Draft City Strategies:***

#### **Strategy 1 - Provide land for 1,200 new supportive housing units**

*By 2015, the City will add 450 new housing units to provide the capacity to end street homelessness by 2015. An additional 750 units will be added from 2015 to 2020 to prevent more homelessness*

#### ***Thoughts on strategy (e.g. good, needs improvement, etc.) and why?***

##### **Address needs of other groups as well**

- Need to ensure families are represented/ need more attention
- Need family housing- rents supplements do not work in Vancouver
- How do we envision our neighbourhoods moving forward, perhaps its not another 14 sites, perhaps its 14 mixed use sites (townhouse options, family, affordable ownership)? There is true value in having integrated communities and the 14 sites goes against this
- Do we want to continue to put all the people who are alike in their issues in one building i.e. all hard to house vs. looking to see what other option are available to us
- Still an increase in homelessness, stop focussing on "street homelessness"
- Ensure appropriate planning for people exiting corrections (jails)

##### **Community engagement process has been very beneficial**

- City has engaged community/ neighbours in a proactive manner

##### **Overly optimistic in terms of meeting these targets**

- Timing may be optimistic to provide 450 units of housing, unless we acquire and convert (e.g. old Biltmore has 100 units)

##### **Review policies to ensure that they encourage supportive housing**

- More flexibility in City policy to allow for supportive housing and other types of housing
- LEED Standard requirements cost a lot and it takes more time to built (and not sure it's cost effective in the long-term); assess difference between Silver and Gold Standard

- Need strategic density bonusing for supportive housing or core housing
- In the short-term, increase the percent of DCL allocated to affordable housing to allow the 450 units to be built
- Reduce the hoops to build housing in order to meet schedule (e.g. providing an architectural model and detailed feedback from urban design panel requires significant time)
- Toronto examples – OPTIONS TO HOMES – much more doable in Ontario given lower construction costs/development costs, not as easy here
- City could provide funding resources besides just land (e.g. tax forgiveness, fee forgiveness, etc.)

**Utilize existing stock and other types of property to increase capacity**

- Maximize use of a site (e.g. use the first 2 floors of a building to enhance social enterprise opportunities); employ residents who live in the supportive housing building to work there too
- Use existing housing services and expand on this for additional housing (e.g. expand operating hours, some buildings not used to their capacity or just need a kitchen to make it a viable unit)
- Inventory left over/odd pieces of property (e.g. Victoria has used Right-of-Ways) for opportunities to build housing
- While waiting for supportive housing permits or remediation, look for ways to temporarily use vacant land for housing (and not community gardens); explore housing units such as the use of shipping containers or other modular housing on these sites
- these 14 sites are so valuable, we need to get every unit possible out of these sites
- City could relax its taxing on SROs and other privately owned market buildings, on buildings with issues under Standard of Maintenance Bylaw etc. with a possible agreement to secure affordability in the buildings

**Engage partnerships and improve coordination**

- Engage charitable, non-profit, or profit sector (e.g. BC Hydro) to develop bright ideas (e.g. modular housing) and the means to meet the City's housing strategy; don't limit the creative process - think outside the box
- Create non-competitive environment by allowing groups of smaller organizations to come together to secure land for housing
- Hire housing recipients to work at their supportive housing building; make a condition of Development Permit or rezoning that housing recipients must participate in creating the supportive housing units then they get housing priority (it's an income); create low barrier jobs and connect this to creating supportive housing - this breaks down community barriers; attach this to a non-profit
- City can facilitate discussion with other levels of government for operating funds; role is to leverage for operating dollars
- The land is a lever for the City to get the province to the table, political lever often comes ahead of the discussion/commitment of what you want to do on the land; City could say we are only prepared to provide these sites if there is a cohesive strategy to prevent homelessness and use this as a bargaining tool
- Could also be used as a lever to gain a unified vision and consensus on numbers (targets)

- Accountability goes hand in hand with putting forward a target, but need to have Province at the table; the development of the 14 sites has in many ways strained the relationship between the City and the Province
- Need to coordinate services amongst various departments: health, welfare, etc
- Need to encourage other municipalities to step up, Vancouver always taking the lead
- 1993 Feds got out of affordable housing- need them involved again

**Develop a comprehensive, long term strategic plan**

- Plan needs to include commitment for operating dollars besides just providing land, need long term commitment
- Need an emergency/crisis plan for DTES like the rest of Vancouver
- Need to balance short and long term perspectives on this
- Overall prevention strategy needed, no one goes onto the street from corrections, out of hospital, aging out of care; stating a target of 750 units to prevent is not a strategy in itself
- What is City's jurisdiction in prevention strategy?
- Once the next 12 sites are released, the non-profits will be chasing down the opportunities; need to think through exactly where you are headed before releasing this; how can we use the scarce resource of land in the most effective way?
- Need to have housing in advance of closing shelters, need more coordination between governments and non-profits
- An active strategy is missing - if the land is acquired then what?

**Develop new ways of financing**

- Tools missing from City – ability to lever property tax e.g. \$50 from each property owner to go towards social infrastructure vs. opinion why am I working so hard and these folks are getting subsidized beautiful new units? Vancouver Foundation has asked this question and the answer from property owners have been positive; City needs to be more entrepreneurial with initiatives like this (\$50 /property owner)
- City's land contribution is an asset – could be used as an asset with units built out, or sold and cash put towards other efforts to end street homelessness; politically the ground breaking is what the politicians use
- Cash could go into a new endowment fund to build or to support scattered site units; logic of City building high end condos and selling them off has a different optic than building social housing units
- Need operating dollars

**Miscellaneous**

- City takes ownership of amenities as density contribution
- Need to keep momentum going for shelters and supportive housing
- If 450 are the dual diagnosed, should the 750 additional be more of the same?
- Need to understand what's happening in other cities i.e. Surrey, Richmond, etc

***What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?***

- Non-profits are involved in supportive housing on temporary vacant land
- Need capital (e.g. from BC Housing and the federal government)
- Renew Memorandum of Understanding with the Province

- BC Corrections and Health
- Welfare connecting with corrections facility before released

***How can your organization contribute?***

- Possible to come to table to provide capital dollars (e.g. MPA contributed their own money to one of the supported housing site at 7th and Fir)
- BC Non-Profit Association supporting and facilitating non-profits
- Redeveloping church land (e.g. First United Church)

**Strategy 2 - Ensure that street homeless are housed in the neighbourhoods where they feel safe and connected**

*The City will track access for homeless individuals into 14 supportive housing projects underway on City-owned land to maximize impact on street homelessness while maintaining manageable tenant mixes. The City will also locate new supportive housing sites in neighbourhoods with significant homeless populations but limited supportive housing options*

***Thoughts on strategy (e.g. good, needs improvement, etc.) and why?***

**Clarify the intent of this strategy in terms of location**

- Needs further exploration on “neighbourhood where they feel safe and connected”, re-wording to ‘neighbourhood of their choice’
- May need repatriation from DTES to other community, but they may want to stay
- Strike the words: “significant homelessness population but” because we need to provide housing everywhere including those places where there isn’t significant homelessness because those that are homeless may wish to live there and because it also allows a homeless person to have anonymity
- Is the overall target of the sites for the larger goal of ending street homelessness or is it targeted to the local street population – there can be tension created between the service providers (operator) and other groups they need to create a manageable building
- Private money is also focussed on wanting to end street homelessness – this is what the public sees on a daily basis; are there multiple objectives here, or just one?
- The connection is what is key in your own community, without that some will spiral back down
- Should not be the only criteria to house somebody because appropriate services may be in another part of the City

**Also need to focus on service provider’s responsibilities**

- Stress importance on operator’s/ service provider responsibility for tenant selection and managing mix of tenants

**Need broader housing strategy for supportive housing**

- Why are we so focused on street homelessness? Visibility issue; recommendation is more efforts on building housing for everybody including refugees, youth, seniors, families
- Need to use lens to provide safe housing for women for every housing development

- Can we create opportunities for people to move out of housing with supports into independent units (from an RGI unit) but maintain the supports to assist with the transition
- Chez Soi has shown that people can move right from the street into market housing (with supports) in a neighbourhood of their choice and do well; we're too focussed on the step by step approach along the continuum which maybe is not for everyone; allow choices for people
- In some supported buildings where everything is provided inside – need to encourage people to go out into the community and continue to build the bridges looking to a time when they move into independent housing
- Need to ensure people with addictions are supported through the continuum
- Need to look further than street homeless for 14 sites (i.e. Burnaby Centre etc.)

**Integration of services**

- Need to continue efforts of the Four Pillar strategy and how it fits with housing strategy
- Need more services in local areas outside of DTES

**Have flexibility in who is being housed in supportive housing units**

- Recommendation to re-commit to mix of tenants on various sites even when community is vocally opposed
- Addiction free model meets a gap for certain people- need to tailor models/ mix to individuals/ community in need
- Need to create specific mix of kinds of units in each housing development and understand its dynamics as future needs change
- Ensuring we don't put ourselves into too narrow a box as to who goes in to these buildings, i.e. too fixed of a model based on what has been done before
- Need to look at population that needs to move into these buildings – street homeless, the SRO residents, the service groups who are engaging the local homeless individuals; e.g. Dunbar – did the research, know the average age and needs; because the process took so many years things have changed
- Not a lot of understanding about how difficult it is to house some people (e.g. recognition of pathways to homelessness); if we're to be client centred then need to understand this in order to build appropriate housing; quantitative and qualitative (the City should believe what we hear) data is important
- If moving from SROs, need to look at where they've come from and look at who is then moving into the SRO unit, are they street homeless?
- With HIP tracking drove the decision making, we can't let tracking drive the selection here; it is not necessarily the way to maximize the impact on homelessness; accountability to funders
- Getting hung up on one population to house vs. letting things sort themselves out and realizing that backfilling will also house people in need
- Having a variety of Operators helps to allow us to house a wider population

**Provide incentives to develop supportive housing**

- Create policy to ensure every development allocates 5% for the disabled (mental health or physical) - this will lower the barriers to housing; developers provide funding for disabled units through density bonusing

**Need more supportive housing and diversity of housing options across the City**

- L'Hermitage on Robson has some supportive housing attached to this tower which works well for all the tenants

- Create as much variety and choice for the homeless and how they are housed or integrated in with other standard housing types (this will break down community barriers) so that the City is both remediating and preventing homelessness; the City's housing strategy needs to be flexible and change with future needs
- Need more supportive housing scattered around the City not just Core or DTES
- Need more affordable housing scattered around City too

**Need to consider sustainability**

- Political vision does not match up to a sustainable vision; funding is not always there for the support services needed
- In the DTES - are large scale sites the answer, or do we need another smaller scale solution; is this the best way to create sustainable community in the DTES?
- Chronic under-funding for non-profits to adequately provide sustainable services in neighbourhood

**Miscellaneous**

- The issue is more difficult in buildings outside of the DTES
- Need to ensure that people aren't forced from DTES due to gentrification etc
- Support for sites throughout neighbourhoods

***What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?***

- BC Housing
- Vancouver Coastal Health
- Business groups
- Residents associations
- Apartment owners associations

***How can your organization contribute?***

- Already do, mediate with landlords, etc
- Business groups need to be more involved and be the voice of reason to other business owners to settle fears; share experiences and comfort other businesses
- Province should provide more options and services (e.g. more Income Assistance offices/services)
- Include non-profits in siting locations and needs assessments

**Strategy 3 - Publish regular report card**

*The City is committed to tracking progress towards its goals and an annual report card will be produced. To track progress on towards ending street homelessness by 2015 an annual homeless count will be conducted each year in March*

***Thoughts on strategy (e.g. good, needs improvement, etc.) and why?***

**Important to have good information on the whole housing continuum**

- Tracking is needed
- Need to track individuals across continuum of housing
- Stop focussing on street homelessness, it's one group of homeless
- Need to pay attention to those 'at risk' of homelessness

- Monitoring is good idea, should be done

**Reconsider frequency of producing a report**

- Annual report card doesn't provide much additional information; three year assessment is good
- Hugely expensive, labour intensive - every 3 years is enough otherwise just evaluating weather i.e. sunny days see more homeless, rainy day see fewer

**Consider what information we need to focus on**

- Need to have a discussion on what are the indicators of health, who has jurisdiction on these indicators
- Calgary's report card includes wages of outreach workers and front line staff
- Need some standardized definitions across service providers
- The City should track things like new supportive housing units, neighbourhood impacts, issues, etc. and publish the findings; at the same time, a service provider who takes in higher risk clients could be demonized for the possible negative impact this service provider may have on the community, so be strategic about what is included in the report card; make sure that the report card shows the broad story – the whole story; put the light on the successes and the personal stories that humanize the achievements
- The City should use the information that providers gather from the Homeless Count Interview Guide when they talk to their clients; this would make the homelessness count more thorough
- Hidden homeless hard to find – build services where these folks can come to and then capture
- Homeless women are underrepresented in homeless count
- Include indicator of affordability
- The report card should also include stats on how many condos are built in a given year compared to supportive housing units
- Building another 12 sites would have a positive outcome, but doesn't allow for opportunity to be creative; need to take opportunity to evaluate the first 14

**Need an integrated approach**

- What people see out there is real progress on the part of the City taking street homelessness on as a priority, what they also see is a need for a better relationship between the Province and City – working together better; Coleman holding on to the housing portfolio has been a positive; need for joint reporting in place of multiple report cards and strategies etc.
- If viewed from policy vs political perspective the way this is done (separate reports) does not make a lot of sense
- Coordinate indicators with other funders
- City, Streetchome, Province – all groups can publish their own report card; the risk being, people see it as a political tool and may not necessarily trust the results; why do we all need to issue separate report cards?
- Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance (MEIA) interviewed all NFA in West End offices, did third-party checks with n=300 and showed that they're actually homeless and not necessarily bunking up; MEIA can share data with the City

**Challenge in providing good data/monitoring**

- Difficult to track when individuals move from Vancouver Coastal Health support to BC Housing

- May be difficult to track individuals at a project level
- Resources are needed for the service provider to track and monitor progress

***What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?***

- Provincial Ministries (MEIA or welfare) “no-fixed address” is very close to homeless count; need to match up systems between governments
- Why don’t City and Feds invest in Streethome’s reporting and ask them to be the authority on this?
- Need projections from BC Corrections and others
- Records from Residential Tenancy Branch to find those who lose housing
- Partner with Health authorities/ BC Housing etc to use existing data
- Vancouver Coastal Health would find it helpful to integrate data collection

***Key actions over the next 3 to 5 years needed to end street homelessness by 2015:***

**Have a strategy for the whole housing continuum**

- Need to move people along housing continuum
- Need a piece that the City will be focussing beyond street homelessness
- Build enough housing to house total current needs (catch-up plus current yr need)

**Continue to provide shelters**

- Provide year-round funding for low barrier HEAT shelters
- Use multiple lens on the provision of housing (gender, youth, seniors)
- Create strategies around length of stay in shelters that address some people are using shelters like permanent housing
- Focus on prevention side – understand where they’re coming from and provide support to those who are housed in privately owned SROs

**Establish agreements with senior levels of government and other partners**

- Need senior levels of support to meet this time-line
- Engage non-profits, partnerships, etc.

**Find creative ways to protect, improve and increase capacity**

- Rent bank- supports tenants in times of need (e.g. Prince George, Fraser Valley, Surrey partnered with VanCity)

**Protect and renovate SROs**

- Protect current stock of affordable housing in SRO and create ways to make SROs safer
- Create a replacement strategy for existing SROs that need repair or that need to be replaced
- Get service providers into privately owned SROs to understand the quality of SROs

**Address financial constraints that maintain the status quo for the homeless**

- Change the welfare policy because homeless is poverty; if people were allowed to make some money and then have this topped up with welfare funds, then people would be motivated to find work; also should remove criteria for person



to provide a damage deposit because this is another barrier for people needing housing

- Provide portable rent subs
- Province needs to raise minimum wage and welfare dollars

**Improve resources and services**

- Expand services or graduate people from system AND allow them to retain rent subs to free up services
- Need more resources for the hard-to-house i.e. mental health and addictions, primary health, housing, etc
- Need mental health teams (Vancouver and Health get together) to provide services across entire City; Health should not be permitted to ever close a file
- Ensure that operating funding is not “whittled down” i.e. \$800K operating fund includes janitor costs

**Miscellaneous**

- Create a standard ratio of staffing per client
- Need for bed bug strategy; it's a health issue and a City issue because people are choosing to be on the street because they don't want to go to units with bedbugs (e.g. timers on saunas are only 1 hour and not 1.5 hours, which is needed to kill the bedbug eggs); need to deal with this on a community level because service provider can't afford to seal all the baseboards in each room); bedbugs becomes a mental health issue (e.g. people can't bring blankets into shelter)
- Need a local area plan for DTES- not a 'Balkanization' of plans (need something like Mt Pleasant community plan)- City leadership needed

***Longer term actions needed (2020) to end homelessness:***

**Prevention strategies**

- Need to explore childhood environment and how it relates to homelessness
- Focus on affordability so as to prevent homelessness from happening again or increase
- Get rid of pay-day loans businesses (e.g. Money Mart)

**Look at the needs of specific groups**

- Supporting youth (i.e. youth moving out of care)
- Populations leaving hospitals/ institutions (e.g. Burnaby Centre/ Riverview)
- Continuum needs to include those that have 'aged' out or moved beyond need for supportive housing
- Plan for aging of homeless population
- Provide access to affordable housing to those 'at risk' to reduce waitlists

**Address the integration of services**

- More supports for social services across the board
- Through the Union of BC Municipalities, the City could advocate for provincial policy changes (e.g. welfare policy)
- Push for National Mental Health Strategy as well as National Housing Strategy

**Develop creative approaches to financing**

- Creative thinking amongst government; e.g. instead of funding people through welfare, fund the building

- Need to bring federal government in discussion –not just for bricks and mortar but also operating funds beyond just five-year cycle
- Need to spread funding more widely across the continuum and at transition points

**Develop long term commitments from partners**

- Never say it's solved, need to be diligent, need long term commitment
- Be aware and plan for expiry of operating dollars of non-profits

**Miscellaneous**

- Supportive housing and transitional housing are not covered under the Residential Tenancy Act; this would allow non-profits to house people who are challenging
- Continue the conversation like today with stakeholders, hold annually

## ***Theme 2: Increasing housing choices for low & modest income households***

Workshop participants provided input into the City's draft strategies to increase housing for low and modest income households and identified key actions for moving forward.

### **Strategy 1 - Tailor zoning approaches and conditions to meet local housing needs and opportunities**

*Thoughts on strategy (e.g. good, needs improvement, etc.) and why?*

**Develop or modify existing policies that support the development of affordable housing**

- Policy to create situations (density) to help non-profit housing projects where the development does not create profit; excess profits would go to the city; use funds like the public art fund to leverage funding and put the equity back into the project for housing
- Key is to have extra gains go back into affordable housing fund
- Make building rentals as profitable as building condos
- Need to consider tax consequences of zoning (i.e. rental housing on under-utilized site)
- Allow for major developers to give land/units for social housing, by sharing sites
- Allow uses like daycare in residential housing units with larger units
- Common/universal principles with flexibility/customization to accommodate local uniqueness/needs
- Don't wait for province or federal government; instead be creative on sites like Concorde, Coal Harbour lands, etc by taking social housing units from major developments
- Could build market rental initially and then switch over to non-market to help this pay for itself
- RT-10 zoning and resulting increase in property values; can the City do inclusionary zoning to prevent this; areas like Knight/Kingsway and Nanaimo/Kingsway have affordable rental
- Use zoning as a tool where possible and consider secondary suites, laneway housing as additional sources of housing; laneway housing should not be

approved carte blanche if it's not creating affordable units; secondary suites have seen rise in rents as a result of zoning changes

**Develop new or modify existing zoning districts**

- Pre-zoning to determine areas and types of growth; downside is that the City loses CACs and communities do not achieve amenities with the added density
- Pre-zone areas for rental – may be an issue of legality re tenure restriction? Would bring land value down to level of rental
- Pre-zoned land may force the selling of land because the land value would increase
- There's a need for freehold townhouse zoning

**Clarify the Financial Growth policies and CACs**

- Look at the 75% CAC lift, as it is reducing the attractiveness of increasing density
- Pre-zoned land and CAC loss, can recapture pre-zoned property land lift through rezoning policies; need to explore mechanism to require rental and recapture lift; lift should be divided between the property owners and the developer
- Develop a revised policy which establishes DCLS on a neighbourhood by neighbourhood basis to reflect the cost of providing new amenities to serve a new population; if amenities are not covered by the DCLs, then other City funds should be used to supplement and build

**Develop a City-wide housing plan**

- Identify housing and zoning needs of the City and contextualise in terms of neighbourhoods; the needs of people in Vancouver and the anticipated needs of the future population of Vancouver
- Develop housing targets and look at zoning to facilitate

**Make adjustments to City processes and regulations**

- Support flexibility
- Relax parking
- Speed up approval

**Miscellaneous**

- CAC is difficult because base value is unclear, projected value of property is difficult to understand and it forces maximum density
- Current strategy is very vague
- Look at the trickle-down effect of supply of housing
- Look at examples from other municipalities such as Richmond (social housing), Port Moody (town centre with non profit and hospice) and Toronto (Street to Home)
- There needs to be an evaluation of existing policies, before we start looking at new policies e.g. with CAC's, Rate of Change
- Front line city staff should have more training on how funding works in order for housing projects to work
- Grouping people together, ghettoizing, etc for at risk people can result in more problems, as the 'at risk' people remain in the company of the same people that enable an unhealthy lifestyle

***What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?***

- Province needs to allow freehold townhouse zoning
- We need more support services in close proximity to new housing (ie for seniors, youths, etc)

## **Strategy 2 - Integrate successful strategies for rental inventory into current neighbourhood planning initiatives**

*Thoughts on strategy (e.g. good, needs improvement, etc.) and why?*

### **Develop appropriate ways of assessing non-profit projects**

- City should evaluate non-profit projects differently from market projects; housing agreements should impose rental caps of 30% of income from the offset and let the rents be market, affordability would be achieved over time

### **Provide clear leadership from the City for the existence of rental housing throughout the City**

- Need leadership, staff to create discrete options and recommendations incorporating community comments; example, 14 social and supportive housing sites, decisions were made to create housing on these sites – the same should happen for market projects at Broadway and Commercial; area is identified as location that should have had more development given the location of transit options
- An overall citywide vision is necessary with affordable housing and rental as a component of strategy

### **Clarify Financial Growth Policies, CACs and concept of amenities**

- Affordable housing is seen as a community amenity
- No clear expectation/guidelines of what amenities are required through development rather than through negotiation (no transparency in negotiation)
- Need to clarify differences between DCLs and CACs
- Should identify anticipated need for amenities in neighbourhoods
- CACs are helpful citywide as all residents of Vancouver are overall recipients

### **Miscellaneous**

- Rental economics don't work with new developments
- Rental control rates don't actually control rent, larger market does
- Reality check in planning initiatives; money should be part of the conversation in the community planning programs

### **What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?**

- Needs policy collaboration as Provincial jurisdiction must be taken into consideration (rental rates/tenancy act is a barrier to supply)
- UDI and development partnerships as well with non-profits, working in a collaboration rather than in an adversarial process in negotiation for amenities
- Need greater consultation with stakeholders (e.g. those managing rental housing)

## **General input on increasing housing choices for low & modest income households**

*Thoughts on direction (e.g. good, needs improvement, etc.) and why?*

**Focus on purchasing rather than constructing**

- Acquisition is cheaper than new construction would not decrease supply but protect housing stock over time
- Need to look beyond building new, look at using existing housing that can be made into good rental
- Buy property, take property out of the market, put non-profit in charge

**Increase the opportunities to establish co-ops**

- Convert rental to co-ops; City and other organizations could buy properties and lease back to co-ops; this would achieve affordability over time

**Include models from other markets**

- Look to other markets (e.g. Singapore) and revisit contributions (Provincial, Federal, private) required to create housing that is not determined by the market

**Continue to use/improve policy levers and City processes that encourage supply of purpose-built market rental housing**

- Government intervention needed to provide housing to working class to make market work where it works (e.g. STIR)
- A) Incentives B) Less Bureaucracy
- Facilitate market mechanisms through incentives
- Current barriers to expansion of rental – density, cost/time dealing with City, no guarantees around rezoning process

**Encourage secondary rental supply**

- Make it easier to do/understand laneway housing, secondary suites, etc
- Increasing flexibility of spaces (i.e. lock off suites rather than forcing the delivery of 3 or 4 bedroom units)
- Comprehensive strategy on a health and safety approach to legalize/regulate suites
- Greater emphasis needs to be placed on condos being sold for rental, in addition to purpose built rental

**Establish an overall, sustainable funding strategy**

- Residential taxes as a whole should be increased (not shifting residential to commercial tax as small businesses have difficulties) to fund affordable housing
- Costs should be spread citywide rather than by development
- Acquire funding in any way possible so that rental housing becomes a fundamental building component
- Rental subsidies or other schemes are important

**Help address the challenge for owners to maintain rental stock**

- What makes it viable for building owners to maintain older stock of secondary rental suites (ie condos in older buildings, rental buildings, etc in the face of high maintenance and improvement costs)
- The City can have a grant for upgrades to older rental stock similar to the 'green' incentives
- No incentive to do capital infrastructure improvements
- Protect and maintain, but also improve quality and preserve older housing stock

**Explore density through comprehensive land use planning**

- Support for mixed-used, infill developments
- Incremental increase in density citywide (i.e. Duplexes in single family neighbourhoods)
- City Hall needs to allow greater levels of density for rental

**Link rental development to transit**

- Transit oriented development helps creates affordability by linking transportation to housing
- High cost of land prohibitive, particularly around rapid transit stations i.e. Cambie corridor with speculation on highly desirable sites
- Need to strategically expropriate land for rental housing (i.e. along rapid transit corridors)
- Transit oriented development is important, instead of affordable housing located in areas without transit access (well connected, frequent transit is important)

**Need diversity of housing choice**

- Important to have choices, mix of tenure, unit types
- Growing numbers of singles in the City
- Strategy of scale is needed, which is dynamic and allows for existing and ongoing changes in demographics
- Increasing gap between social and market rental, need middle ground (i.e. controlled rent)

**Miscellaneous**

- Do we know what the needs are, the different groups, how many people are we targeting?
- New purpose built rentals will be too expensive for many of the core needs group
- The availability rates for rental housing are not properly represented; the rental rate is more likely to be 5%
- Need to talk about rent control and how it's hurting the system; need to address this unabashedly; similar to a coop, rent control should be related to 30% of income
- Limited land supply, means high land costs (if you can increase supply land, costs will come down)
- In a mixed tenure building, it's difficult to manage, particularly for a non profit; non profit is being forced into being 'caregivers' of sorts, which they are not equipped to do, nor is that their responsibility
- Greater transparency within government

***What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?***

- Provincial and federal government need to recognize their roles
- Develop functional partnerships with development industry; collaboration rather than 'extraction' of CAC's with affordable housing seen as a community amenity

**Strategy 3 - Publish Regular report card**

*The City is committed to tracking progress towards its goals and an annual report will be produced.*

***Thoughts on strategy (e.g. good, needs improvement, etc.) and why?***

**Measurement useful for gauging progress and re-evaluating directions**

- Need baseline and measure progress
- Choose indicators that are easily gathered and affordable to measure/track
- Monitor results to (re)evaluate policy not just measure progress

***Miscellaneous***

- Third-party report card or in a manner that is transparent
- Advocacy with regional or larger scale

***What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?***

- Advocacy in collaboration with regional bodies/other municipalities

***Key actions over the next 3 to 5 years needed to increase housing choices for low & modest income households:***

**Clear direction with strong leadership**

- Strong leadership to be decisive on essential elements of developing city (example, despite community opposition, Broadway and Commercial should be developed considering the transit options)
- Leadership needed to make the decision for homelessness, affordable housing, seniors housing
- Council and management need to be more transparent re clarity on objectives, what policies are trying to do and knowledge of metrics

**Continue the 20% policy**

- Continuation of the 20% policy with the delivery of built units not just option to purchase land

**Develop strategic partnerships**

- Partnerships with agencies to create affordable housing, involve other levels of government; leadership, clarity on values and work towards those goals
- Management agreement with regional government (i.e. Richmond)
- Creating relationship with non-profit in a collaborative partnership with developers

**Develop different strategies for market and affordable housing**

- Different strategies for market housing vs. affordable housing

**Better community engagement**

- More proactive involvement with community
- Bring together a focus group of stakeholders when creating policy

**Develop a more comprehensive financial strategy**

- Need to find alternative sources of equity, capital, financing sources, etc. (i.e. community development corporations, multi-faith groups, etc.)

**Provide incentives for better maintenance of existing rental stock**

- Incentive program need for homeowners to make improvements/renew suites
- City should be able to mandate improvements or make improvements and bill owners

- Partnership with BC Hydro (other partnerships) to increase environmental sustainability of older stock

**Miscellaneous**

- Value of money vs. value of design
- Quality and condition of existing and new secondary suites need to be addressed recognizing that secondary suites are the largest supply of new affordable rental - ensure basic health and safety through systematic inspection of suites and recognize Provincial rent controls
- Consider smaller units
- Policy needs to be simple and tailored to owners of smaller developments (majority of rental locally owned)

***Longer term actions needed (2020) to increase housing choices for low & modest income households:***

**Develop principles that will support the long term development of sustainable, affordable housing**

- Need to have principles to facilitate, to build an environment of stability and certainty
- Should not rely on subsidies, affordable housing can be provided and regulated by market conditions
- Create a market that is feasible for a rental market (reduce regulation)
- Vancouver market is unique market environment and the market cannot be relied upon to supply rental
- Develop comprehensive economic growth strategy that includes affordable housing for local residents rather than simply off-shore investment/local flipping
- Affordable housing needs to be tied to transit oriented development

**Explore new strategies including using density to increase supply of rental housing**

- Vancouver can create own process/framework so developers can compete/bid to facilitate the development of rental
- Vancouver can provide land via leasehold
- Be bold, new, innovative
- Supply of land can be increased through increased in density
- Review zoning policies in areas where rental is predominant (i.e. Marpole) and look at increasing density for those areas
- Needs to be clear subsidy fund for rental housing not small amounts negotiated



## APPENDIX A - WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

### *Participants*

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Position
Renata	Aebi	Family Services	Director of Youth Services and Employment
Barbara	Bacon	HFBC Housing Foundation	Executive Director
Elizabeth	Ballantyne	Vancouver City Planning Commission	VCPC Manager
Patricia	Barnes	Hastings North BIA	Executive Director
Shawna	Baylis	Atira Women's Resource Society	
Jonathan	Bird	City Gate Leadership Program	Executive Director
Darrell	Burnham	Coast Foundation Society	Executive Director
Andrea	Canales	Multicultural Advisory Committee	Member
Lisa	Colby	The University of BC	
Tom	Durning	Tenant Resource and Advisory Centre	Staff
Margaret	Eberle	BC NON-PROFIT HOUSING ASSOC;	Acting Research Director
Dave	Eddy	Vancouver Native Housing Society	Executive Director
Liz	Evans	PHS Community Services Society	Executive Director
Charles	Gauthier	Downtown Vancouver BIA	Ex Dir.
Michael	Geller	The Geller Group	President
Kate	Gibson	Wish Drop-In Centre Society	Executive Director
Marg	Gordon	BCAOMA, BC Apt. Owners and Managers Assoc.	CEO
Stephen	Gray	First United Church	Director Research and Development
Peter	Greenwell	Collingwood Neighbourhood House Society	Executive Director
Penny	Gurstein	SCARP M.A. Planning (UBC)	Professor and Director
Karen	Hemmingson	BC Housing	Dir Research Corporate Planning

Lorna	Howes	VANCOUVER COASTAL HEALTH Mental Health and Addictions Housing	Director
Catherine	Hume	Mental Health Commission Canada	Vancouver Site Coordinator
Dianna	Hurford	Metro Vancouver	Regional Planner
Dave	Jagpal	Ministry of Social Development	Manager, Integrated Services
Jodyne	Keller	Vancouver Police Department	Police Constable, Homeless Outreach
Alice	Kendall	Downtown Eastside Women's Centre	Coordinator
Darren	Kitchen	Co-op Federation of BC	CHF BC's government relations director
Janet	Kreda	Metro Vancouver	Regional Planner
Claudia	Laroye	Marpole BIA	Executive Director
Don	Littleford	Metro Vancouver/Greater Vancouver Housing Authority	Manager, Regional Housing
Liz	Lougheed Green	Vancity Community Foundation	Manager Social Enterprise
Catherine	Ludgate	Vancity Community Investment	Manager
Al	Martin	Catholic Charities	Assist. Manager
Brian	McCauley	Concert Properties	President
Sharon	McFadyen	Salvation Army - Harbour Light Shelter Programs	Manager
Dave	McIntyre	MPA Society	Executive Director
Allyson	Muir	VANCOUVER COASTAL HEALTH Mental Health and Addictions Housing	Manager, Mental Health Housing Services
Bob	Nicklin	Affordable Housing Advisory Assoc.	Executive Director
Jim	O'Dea	Terra Housing	
Jonathan	Oldman	St. James Community Services Society	Executive Director
Alex	Orr	Orr Development	Development Manager
Karen	O'Shannacery	Lookout Aid Society	Executive Director
Margaret	Pinto	Catholic Charities	Lead Advocate
Gordon	Price	City Program SFU	Director
Bonnie	Rice	Katherine Sanford Housing Society	
Penny	Rogers	Kitsilano Shower Program	Coordinator
Denise	Rudnicki	Vancouver Foundation	Research Manager

Leanore	Sali	Gastown BIA	Ex Dir.
Sylvia	Sam	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver	
Dan	Sanders	Hollyburn Properties	Board Director
Patrick	Santoro	Urban Development Institute	
Victor	Setton	Porte Development Corp.	President
Sandra	Severs	First United Church	Deputy Executive Minister
Tsur	Sommerville	UBC Centre for Urban Economics	Director
Sean	Spear	Raincity Housing And Support Society	
Amy	Spencer-Chubey	Greater Vancouver Homebuilders Assoc.	Dir. Govt. Relations
Leslie	Stern	Lower Mainland Network for Affordable Housing/Womens	Project Coordinator
Henry	Tom	Chinatown Historic Area Planning Committee	Chinatown Merchants' Association Representative
Karen	Ungerson	CMHC	
Dick	Vollet	Street to Homes Foundation	CEO
Tim	Wake	Affordable Housing Consultant	Affordable Housing Consultant
Jill	Weiss	Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee	Co-chairs
Clement	Wong	Chinatown Historic Area Planning Committee	
Jim	Woolsey	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver	

***Invited, Not Able to Attend***

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Position</b>
Janice	Abott	Atira Women's Resource Society	CEO
Nicole	Adams	Street to Homes Foundation	Director
Armin	Amrolia	BC Housing	Dir. Regional Development
Sharon	Belli	Downtown Community Court	Manager, Community Engagement
Gerry	Bradley	Strathcona Mental Health Team	Team Director
Damon	Chan	Westbank Projects Corp.	Development and Acquisitions

Catherine	Clement	Vancouver Foundation	Vice-President Partnership
Dominic	Flanagan	BC Housing Tenant Services Ops.	Director Programs
Haroon	Khan	Interfaith Alliance	Director
Michael	Kierszenblat	BC Housing	
Joji	Kumagai	Strathcona BIA	Acting Ex Dir.
Angela Marie	MacDougall	Battered Women's Support Services BWSS	Executive Director
Mike	McLenaghan	Collingwood Neighbourhood House Society	Director Community Services
Dan	Paris	VanCity Enterprises	Director of Development
Monte	Paulsen	CityHome Properties Ltd.	
Mark	Smith	Raincity Housing And Support Society	Executive Director
Thomas	Tam	S.U.C.C.E.S.S.	CEO

## APPENDIX B - SUPPLEMENTARY FEEDBACK

All those who were invited to the workshop, including participants were offered the opportunity to complete an on-line supplementary feedback form with the same questions posed to the breakout groups at the workshop. A total of 5 responses were provided and the input from these forms is captured in the following tables

### *Current actions to end street homelessness by 2105*

<p><b>Increase low-barrier shelter</b>          - What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About time; showing a realistic approach to shelters for the hard and impossible to house</li> <li>• They are run by experienced non-profit groups who know what they are doing</li> <li>• Shelters are a vital component of the housing continuum and are required as a low barrier entry for people; the ability to identify and move people out of shelters into more supportive housing is a critical link the service providers need to be focused on; shelters only manage homelessness, we need to solve it</li> <li>• Low barrier shelters allow many people to come in from the street who otherwise wouldn't; shelters provide transition housing for many who aren't ready to live independently</li> </ul>
<p><b>Increase low-barrier shelter</b>          - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience will determine gaps and improvements are necessary</li> <li>• These shelters seem to be full just as soon as they are set up; in order for Vancouver to get a handle on its homeless situation, other cities/provinces need to be committed to end homelessness as well; the entire country is interdependent; unless this is addressed in a serious way, Vancouver will always be creating new shelters which will fill up immediately, doing, in essence, the work of other provinces/municipalities</li> <li>• A more standardized service model for shelter operators to follow, with security and safety measures included</li> <li>• Shelters should remain open (important transition phase for some - services, social contact all in one location); all shelters should be physically accessible to all - no stairs; low barrier shelters can be less safe, so there should be a mix; safety in shelters is paramount</li> </ul>

<p><b>Permanent supportive housing</b> - What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More needed units, obviously for the hard to house; gets SOME people off the streets</li> <li>• I think the 14 sites are a real tribute to the social conscience of the City</li> <li>• This is the only answer to solving homelessness and we need to build more supportive housing to allow the housing continuum to become scalable; it will take an entire community including provincial and municipal governments to ensure we are successful</li> <li>• Excellent to provide 14 sites and secure funding - will make a dent in needed affordable housing</li> </ul>
<p><b>Permanent supportive housing</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep program initiative going and pressure on province for continuing funding; challenges will be maintaining support services, the availability of city land and provincial funding</li> <li>• There will be some hard work to do once these facilities are ready to house people; will we relieve some of the obvious homeless situation of the downtown eastside, or will we find the "worried well" homeless in the areas where these facilities are located to ameliorate the apprehension that the neighbourhoods have about having the mentally ill/addicted in their neighbourhoods</li> <li>• A more collaborative working relationship between the city of Vancouver and Provincial Government</li> <li>• More sites needed</li> <li>• All housing should be accessible and some units wheelchair modified; some units should be adaptable</li> <li>• Housing mixes are sometimes preferable</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mental Health Commission of Canada – At Home Project</b> - What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project is pleasantly surprising because it has gone out of its way to find difficult/challenging people; usually research projects "cream" a bit with their research cohort to give positive findings an edge</li> <li>• It allows those most hard to house to become stable and have a chance; the housing first model is tried and tested in other cities with great success; this model should be integrated into the housing continuum and more facilities and market housing made available with the right operator involved</li> <li>• Individual subsidies are excellent and increase affordability without the cost of building additional units</li> </ul>

<p><b>Mental Health Commission of Canada – At Home Project</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The whole question of what will take its place when it is over; these projects are usually successful--and there have been many of smaller Vancouver projects as evidence--but are incredibly expensive to run; they usually serve only a portion of the population who need the service and they all share the problem that it is difficult to get people off the project and over to mainstream services; the challenge would be, does the mental health system have the money to keep such a thing going when the Mental Health Commission dollars are gone?</li> <li>• More facilities and market housing made available for the housing first model</li> <li>• Individualized subsidies should be available to all low income people, not just to seniors and people with mental health issues</li> </ul>
<p><b>Provincial Homeless Intervention Project (HIP)</b> - What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If this is the province buying hotels, I think it has been great</li> <li>• No real tangible results other than the 14 city sites</li> </ul>
<p><b>Provincial Homeless Intervention Project (HIP)</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The non-profits are running these on a shoe string; they don't have any money for staff development and education; someone needs to step forward to offer some relevant training free of charge</li> <li>• Better sharing of data with the sector, if we continue the current way in which we share data then we will continue our "data denial" state; the City of Vancouver, BC Housing and Vancouver Coastal Health need to share common data points that will start to tell the story of where we are making progress and where we need to focus more effort; one entity cannot use one source of data and expect to tell the complete story</li> </ul>
<p><b>Interfaith Alliance to end homelessness</b> - What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I read about this in the paper; don't really know what they do</li> <li>• Unorganized</li> </ul>
<p><b>Interfaith Alliance to end homelessness</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A common table chaired by either the province or the city to make decisions on land, buildings, services and many other resources the inter faith community has at their disposal</li> <li>• Religious groups often have land holdings - this is an inexpensive way to increase land for housing sites; City should explore/facilitate partnerships with faith-based organizations to build integrated housing on their sites; this is a win-win strategy which will provide additional units at reasonable cost, will benefit low income and homeless people and will benefit participating faith-based organizations as well</li> </ul>

<p><b>Other</b> - What about this current action or initiative do you think is working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am inspired by the initiative of the Province (buying the hotels) and the City (taking street homelessness on as one of its core goals)</li> <li>• Rent Banks are a way to address the "at risk" population and prevent people from being evicted for small amounts of money</li> <li>• City's initiatives to offer land are excellent</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again, at the risk of sounding xenophobic, I think there needs to be a look at this problem at a national level; Vancouver can continue to try to address its homeless problems, but unless other provinces/cities do, it will only add to the diaspora of marginalized people on the move to find something/someplace to make their lives better</li> <li>• More market rental stock is required, landlords need to be given incentives to make market housing available to housing first programs, rent banks and other social housing initiatives</li> <li>• More sites needed</li> <li>• Shelters need to remain open</li> <li>• Individualized subsidies should be available to all low income persons</li> <li>• All new affordable housing should be accessible, including wheelchair modified units as well as adaptable units</li> <li>• Incentives needed to build more secondary suites and laneway housing</li> <li>• Partnerships with faith-based or other groups that have land; innovative competitions like those in England to build affordable, sustainable housing</li> <li>• Inclusion of First Nations and disability groups in planning and developing solutions</li> </ul>

***Current actions to increase housing choices for low & modest income households***

<p><b>Rate of Change Regulations</b> - What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No pressure by development industry to redevelop much rental housing; much public support for this bylaw</li> <li>• The rest of the questions are outside my area of expertise</li> <li>• If this is working, it's excellent - prevents elimination of rental stock</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rate of Change Regulations</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some applications to redevelop may be considered on a case-by-case basis</li> <li>• The City need to take a proactive approach to density within the City of Vancouver; creating more social housing and allowing the developers in Vancouver to become part of the solution is critical</li> </ul>



<p><b>Affordable Housing in new neighbourhoods (20% policy)</b> - What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy is fine and well-regarded by the public; however, this mostly relies provincial government funding and/or developer contribution through extra density; it should be retained and evaluated</li> <li>• Yes, but can do more</li> </ul>
<p><b>Affordable Housing in new neighbourhoods (20% policy)</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The '20%' solution is worth retaining; however, many neighborhoods are opposed to any extra density especially if it involves 'towers'; that is the challenge; if a neighborhood is informed soon after the development permit application and that one of the city's priorities is also the construction of rental housing and perhaps even a community charette day is sponsored, these actions would assist in community acceptance</li> <li>• Increase density, in Vancouver</li> <li>• This policy needs to be strengthened with enforcement so that it actually happens</li> </ul>
<p><b>Short-term Incentives for Rental Housing Program (STIR)</b> - What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a good initiative, but poorly introduced and 'marketed'; it provides rental housing; the City should do more to explain how it arrived at this, citing its contributions in CAC's, how reduced parking requirements make for more affordability etc.</li> <li>• Good start</li> <li>• Excellent program to prevent erosion of rental housing stock.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Short-term Incentives for Rental Housing Program (STIR)</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community consultation process - but which should not be drawn out</li> <li>• This program or something similar should be applied to homeowners wishing to build secondary suites or laneway housing</li> </ul>
<p><b>Secondary Suites Expansion</b> - What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Works well, is market driven and necessary</li> <li>• Good start but this will not create enough inventory for the growing problem</li> <li>• Encouraging secondary suites is important and increases affordable housing stock at little or no government cost</li> </ul>
<p><b>Secondary Suites Expansion</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot think of anything at this time; although city should consider allowing secondary suites in duplexes - for this initiative, see the City of North Vancouver</li> <li>• Increase density</li> <li>• Expand this program - there are still many disincentives to build secondary suites; use similar incentives to those already in place for new developments providing rental units - ie implement reduced or no permit fees, expedited processing etc. Make it easy and inexpensive for home owners to build and register secondary suites; this will increase affordable housing stock at little government</li> </ul>

	expense
<b>Federal/Provincial affordable housing programs</b> - What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The province has done a great job of providing housing in the province of BC; other municipalities make it much easier for the Province to create housing alternatives, Surrey is one of the more progressive municipalities</li> <li>Provincial contributions to the 14 sites and ongoing management of them is excellent</li> </ul>
<b>Federal/Provincial affordable housing programs</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make it easier to do business in Vancouver, protecting skylines along the water may not be the best and most efficient use of land; areas of Vancouver operate much different than they did 100 years ago, zoning changes in and around the port for example could open up a great deal of land for development of additional housing</li> <li>Federal participation is essential</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b> - What about these current actions or initiatives do you think are working well and why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase density, raise minimum wages and look at the income side of the equation rather than the housing and cost side of the problem</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b> - What needs to be improved? What are the challenges and gaps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase density</li> <li>Individual rental subsidies should be available to all low income persons/households; this effectively increases the amount of affordable housing quickly without the high cost of building new units</li> <li>30% of a person's income for rent is not affordable for those with the lowest incomes and highest risk of homelessness; for persons with incomes of \$1,000 or less, affordable rent should be no more than 10% of income</li> </ul>

***Moving forward to end street homelessness by 2015***

<b>Provide land for 1,200 new supportive housing units</b> - Thoughts on strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep on the same trajectory, getting as much provincial money as possible when possible</li> <li>Good and required</li> <li>As a non-profit housing provider, I see a great need for supported housing; in our experience when we take people from "transition" housing and move them to "independent" living, within 6 months, they are back in hospital or in shelters; it is the supports that are essential to keeping people housed</li> <li>This is excellent, but needs to be increased - there are likely many more homeless people and people at risk of homelessness and Vancouver's population is increasing rapidly; increasing affordable rental stock is urgently needed.</li> </ul>
---	---

<p><b>Provide land for 1,200 new supportive housing units -</b> What are the gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of consistent provincial funding</li> <li>• Of course, all three levels of government need to be involved</li> <li>• It will take a concentrated effort from Municipal, Provincial government and the private sector to duplicate the efforts of the 14 city sites model of funding</li> <li>• If we are to end homelessness, we need to give the non-profit landlords access to mental health workers who will agree to see tenants in their homes to assist them to comply with the rules necessary to maintain their tenancy; if this does not happen, we are left with no choice but to evict creating another "homeless" person</li> <li>• Shelters that remain open</li> <li>• Individualized subsidies to all low income persons</li> <li>• Accessibility of affordable housing, including wheelchair modified units as well as adaptable units</li> <li>• Incentives to build more secondary suites and laneway housing</li> <li>• Partnerships with faith-based or other groups that have land</li> <li>• Innovative competitions like those in England to build affordable, sustainable housing; inclusion of First Nations and disability groups in planning and developing solutions</li> </ul>
<p><b>Provide land for 1,200 new supportive housing units -</b> What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obviously, the federal government; short term funding in response to public pressure is not the solution</li> <li>• Municipal, Provincial, Health and private sector</li> <li>• THIS will require a change to Provincial legislation or regulation to encourage mental health workers to take a more pro-active approach rather than a strictly hands off/voluntary approach to treatment</li> <li>• Civic, provincial, federal, private, community group</li> </ul>

<p><b>Provide land for 1,200 new supportive housing units -</b> How can your organization contribute?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By being a resource and giving a voice to tenants</li> <li>• We already do; we provide mental health services to a large number of people in the downtown eastside</li> <li>• Streethome can bring the private sector funding to the table, but the city and province need to show unity and collaboration at all levels</li> <li>• We have been purchasing older rental stock to keep it in the hands of the community as a "land trust" for the future; as market tenants move out, we house seniors /older adults from the community who are being priced out of the market; the City could assist us with a property tax exemption which adds about \$50/suite/month to the rent; we have that on some of our old projects which have been grandfathered but not on the 6 buildings we have bought since 1998</li> <li>• The City of Vancouver Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee can provide expertise on meeting the needs of persons with a broad range of disabilities: persons who use wheelchairs, persons who are blind or have low vision; persons with mental health disabilities; persons with developmental disabilities; persons with chronic health conditions, etc. Since the vast majority of homeless persons have some kind of health condition or disability, our help would be invaluable to effectively meet people's needs</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ensure that street homeless are housed in the neighbourhoods where they feel safe and connected -</b> Thoughts on strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City doing good job so far; better than other Metro Vancouver municipalities</li> <li>• Good, however the service providers need to have the final say in who is in the buildings and what the tenant mix will be; the City Site Committee needs to work together as a committee, with representation from province, city, health, STHF to ensure a fair process</li> <li>• Excellent strategy; is it working? how is it being tracked?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ensure that street homeless are housed in the neighbourhoods where they feel safe and connected -</b> What are the gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to work together, we are all learning as we go and trust is a major component of working together</li> <li>• Involvement of First Nations groups, groups representing persons with mental health disabilities (CMHA, MPA, Coast), disability groups; focusing on street homelessness is useful in the short term, but overall homelessness is increasing and this needs to be addressed with significant increases in affordable rental stock</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ensure that street homeless are housed in the neighbourhoods where they feel safe and connected -</b> What partners or other levels of governments need</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other municipalities, the federal and provincial governments</li> <li>• The right ones are around the table, but the Federal Government needs to have a National housing policy in place</li> </ul>

to be involved?	
<b>Ensure that street homeless are housed in the neighbourhoods where they feel safe and connected -</b> How can your organization contribute?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STHF is advocating for a National housing policy and are currently in discussions with Calgary and Toronto who have similar foundations focused on homelessness</li> </ul>
<b>Publish regular report card -</b> Thoughts on strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• good idea, as long as the report card is supported and agreed to with other stakeholders, VANCOUVER COASTAL HEALTH, province, STHF</li> <li>• Excellent strategy, but advice of groups representing those who are homeless is essential to really track this; First Nations, Mental Health groups, disability groups should be involved in developing tracking and monitoring methods that really work</li> </ul>
<b>Publish regular report card -</b> What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many report cards that are created to serve a certain agenda will only confuse the general public and force the sector into a data denial state; the STHF has a policy and data committee with representation from COV, BCH, private sector and independent consultants in a position to gather and report on data from neutral position; this committee has the right people involved and merely requires 100% participation to show some real results</li> <li>• Other municipalities, provincial and federal governments</li> <li>• Involvement of First Nations groups, groups representing persons with mental health disabilities (CMHA, MPA, Coast), disability groups</li> </ul>
<b>Publish regular report card -</b> How can your organization contribute?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STHF has formed the committee mentioned above, as part of our governance model reporting to our Board of Directors through the Executive committee; both the BOD and Executive Committee for STHF have senior representation from COV and BC housing, as well as the private sector and a great deal of problem solving can take place at these tables</li> <li>• Involvement of City of Vancouver Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee is pleased to consult on tracking/monitoring methods; we can liaison with and coordinate input from many disability groups</li> </ul>

<p><b>What do you think are the key actions over the next 3 to 5 years needed to end street homelessness by 2015?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent federal and provincial funding</li> <li>• More housing needs to be built</li> <li>• Rent banks need to be set up and activated</li> <li>• Prevention needs to be a top priority (youth aging out of foster care and prison system)</li> <li>• Increase affordable rental stock; keep shelters open; facilitate the development of individual rental subsidies available to all low income persons; facilitate partnerships with faith-based and other community groups to develop their land for affordable housing; increase incentives for secondary suites and laneway housing; ensure all newly built units are accessible and adaptable; ongoing consultation and involvement of those most affected: First Nations and disability groups; work with provincial/federal governments to define affordability as 10% of income for persons whose monthly income is under \$1,000/month</li> </ul>
<p><b>What longer term actions are needed (2020)?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A national housing strategy is required and an agreement on a single plan to solve homelessness needs to be embraced by provincial, municipal and health care in order to see success</li> <li>• Same answer - the cause of homelessness is the lack of affordable and accessible housing and appropriate supports</li> </ul>

***Moving forward to increase housing choices for low & modest income households***

<p><b>Increase housing for low and modest income households - Thoughts on strategy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforce the city's Standards of Maintenance Bylaw on a more consistent basis</li> <li>• Excellent strategy; lack of affordable accessible housing stock is the root cause of homelessness</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>Increase housing for low and modest income households -</b>  What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other Metro Vancouver municipalities, federal and provincial governments</li> <li>• Accessibility of affordable rental housing units to persons with disabilities; lack of appropriate client-centered supports; individualized rental housing subsidies for all low income people, which enables people to live affordably in many areas of the city at little government cost; lower definition of affordability for people with very low incomes - ie for persons whose income is less than \$1,000/month, 30% is way too high to pay for rent (should be 10%); lack of effective incentives for secondary suites and laneway housing, which would develop more affordable housing stock in all areas of the city at little government cost; lack of partnerships with groups that already have land (develops new housing at reduced government cost in all areas of the city); lack of enforcement/process to actually achieve 20% affordable housing in new areas</li> <li>• Civic, provincial, federal, private, community; especially important to include those representing persons who are most likely to be homeless: First Nations groups, disability groups</li> </ul>
<p><b>Increase housing for low and modest income households -</b>  How can your organization contribute?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Vancouver Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee can provide feedback/input from many disability groups</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tailor zoning approaches and conditions to meet local housing needs and opportunities -</b> Thoughts on strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start city-wide planning process outlining the capacities that each neighborhood has to take more density</li> <li>• Excellent strategy; especially important to facilitate development of more affordable rental stock</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tailor zoning approaches and conditions to meet local housing needs and opportunities -</b> How can your organization contribute?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By giving a voice to renters</li> </ul>
<p><b>Integrate successful strategies for rental inventory into current neighbourhood planning initiatives -</b> Thoughts on strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open process up; have neighborhoods contribute to the best of their ability; do not let process rule and make sure that NIMBY concerns are addressed</li> <li>• Good idea</li> <li>• Excellent strategy - involves community</li> </ul>
<p><b>Integrate successful strategies for rental inventory into current neighbourhood planning initiatives -</b> What are the gaps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives for landlords to participate</li> <li>• Important to ensure the needs of persons with physical disabilities, with mental health disabilities and First Nations people are still met; sometimes individual communities may not be aware of these issues, so the City needs to show leadership or the needs of those already</li> </ul>

	homeless and most at risk of homelessness won't be met
<b>Integrate successful strategies for rental inventory into current neighbourhood planning initiatives</b> - How can your organization contribute?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We can create rent banks and bring funding to support them.</li> </ul>
<b>Publish Regular report card</b> - Thoughts on strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• This is excellent, but the tracking/monitoring process needs to be developed with those representing homeless people, or it won't be effective</li> </ul>
<b>Publish Regular report card</b> - What are the gaps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that First Nations groups and groups representing disabilities have input into tracking/monitoring process</li> </ul>
<b>Publish Regular report card</b> - What partners or other levels of governments need to be involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those representing persons who are homeless or at most risk of homelessness: First Nations groups, disability groups</li> </ul>
<b>Publish Regular report card</b> - How can your organization contribute?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Vancouver Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee is pleased to contribute to this and any part of this strategy</li> </ul>
<b>What do you think are the key actions over the next 3 to 5 years needed to increase housing for low and modest income households?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More density in neighborhoods, pushing more carriage and in-fill housing</li> <li>• Continuing contribution of city land for affordable housing</li> <li>• Facilitate the development of individual rental subsidies available to all low income persons</li> <li>• Facilitate partnerships with faith-based and other community groups to develop their land for affordable housing</li> <li>• Increase incentives and reduce barriers for building new secondary suites and laneway housing</li> <li>• Ensure all newly built units are accessible and adaptable</li> <li>• Work with provincial/federal governments to define affordability as 10% of income for persons whose monthly income is under \$1,000/month</li> <li>• Consider affordable sustainable housing competitions on city land, similar to those already used in England</li> <li>• Ongoing consultation and involvement of those most affected: First Nations and disability groups</li> </ul>