



RENTAL, SOCIAL AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING TASK FORCE

Virtual Meeting – Thursday, October 22, 2020

7:00 – 9:00 pm – MS TEAMS

Public is invited to attend and observe via MS Teams – [Join Microsoft Teams Meeting](#)

[+1 604-335-2530](#) Canada, Vancouver (Toll) Conference ID: 374 029 49#

MINUTES

Present: Kelly Bond
Keith Collyer
Bruce Crowe
Ian Cullis
Phil Dupasquier (Chair)
Katherine Fagerlund
Heather Fowler
Derek Holloway
Ellison Mallin (Vice Chair)
Michael Sadler

Regrets: Hesam Deihimi

Staff: Darren Veres, Senior Community Planner
Mary Jukich, Committee Clerk

1. Welcome

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

The Chair recited First Nations Territorial acknowledgement.

2. Adoption of Agenda

The following two items were added to the agenda:

- Resolution requiring an email sent to the District Council added as item #6; and
- Resolution about the request for extension of the Task Force term added as item #7

Mr. Crowe moved and Ms. Fowler seconded
To adopt the revised agenda.

CARRIED

3. Adoption of October 8th, 2020 Minutes

Ms. Bond moved and Mr. Crowe seconded
To adopt the minutes with the revisions as suggested.

CARRIED

4. DNV Update

Mr. Veres informed the Task Force that he may be requesting some input from the members on certain recommendations in order to complete the report. In particular, assistance may be requested around Priority Action Item 4B from the Interim Report and the reference to lobbying the provincial government to change the RTA with regard to the difference between secondary suites and purposeful rental.

5. Housing Continuum

Mr. Veres presented the new updated housing continuum for review. He explained that the main difference between the document reviewed by the members and the document available on the development statistics update is that the continuum presents an inventory of all the units that have been built and occupied since 2011 to 2019, and the stats on the website presents only those built between 2011 and 2019 resulting from development approvals from Council. On discussion, the following comments were provided:

- Information is required to help understand how the numbers were arrived at and the only way is to understand where the numbers come from.
- A question was raised on whether there was a report detailing how the graph/chart was derived. Staff responded that there is no report and that the information is similar to information presented on the website with additional data provided on occupied units that were not approved through a rezoning process.
- There was concern that the Continuum does not differentiate between the number of “beds” and “units” in each category. For instance, it is impossible to tell what the 80 “units/beds” in the subsidized rental section are referring to. Staff responded that units in the subsidized rental section are referring to 70 rental units in the Seylynn development and 10 units the Cedar Springs Pacific Arbour development. This information was aggregated for the sake of simplifying the presentation of information. Staff have a breakdown of this information and can provide it.
- A Task Force member suggested that it may be beneficial to differentiate more clearly between units and bedrooms on the continuum.

- Information was requested on the origins of the “2030 Estimated Demand” units on the continuum. It was noted that the 600 – 1,000 units included in the RAHS originally came from Metro Vancouver’s 2016 housing demand estimates for the District and the remaining estimates for the non-market portion of the housing continuum were provided by staff in a RAHS update to Council in spring 2018.
- A question was raised if the demand took into account the regional growth strategy and if demand should be changing with the housing needs. Staff responded that Council recently endorsed an application for funding from the province for the District to undertake the legislatively mandated Housing Needs Report. This work will help determine if the estimates/targets in the Housing Continuum are still relevant or need to be revised. There is potential for the Task Force to participate in the Housing Needs Report process.
- A Task Force member suggested that it would be useful to further breakdown the subsidized rental category in order to get a more accurate picture of how many units are available for people at different incomes i.e. income assistance vs moderate income units. A request was made to get a breakdown of the beds and units, as well as a breakdown for subsidized versus affordable rental. It was noted that information for the rental piece may be more challenging as the District does not have access to the rent levels for all of the units.

6. Resolution Requiring an Email Sent to the DNV

Members reviewed and discussed draft wording for a motion directing that an email be composed and sent to Mayor and Council requesting that Mayor and Council act quickly on the priority actions as submitted in the interim report, specifically Action 1. Accordingly, it was suggested that the Chair prepare the draft wording for the email, forward the wording to the Task Force for review and then send the email to Mayor and Council.

Mr. Crowe moved and Mr. Cullis seconded:

Whereas Mayor and Council stated they are fully engaged on RSAH issues and expressed a desire to move forward with solutions at the Workshop held on Sep.28th, 2020;

And; whereas the Task Force members are of the opinion that Priority Action #1 in the RSAHTF Interim Report is of utmost importance;

Then; be it agreed that an email be sent to Mayor and Council as soon as possible, informing them of our request to proceed with action on that item without delay.

CARRIED

7. Work Plan Next Steps

Members were invited to provide comments and feedback on moving forward with the work plan and next steps:

- The Task Force should not be doing work for the DNV.
- Focus on hard metrics at defining what is affordable and what would count as an affordable in the DNV because the 30% affordability definition is abstract and preference would be for “hard” numbers.
- The Task Force could address items at a smaller level; however to make an impact on affordable rent for the District, housing has to be delivered quickly.
- Continue to work on the Tenant Relocation Policy and see that to fruition. As well, the 30% affordability definition is vague and unrealistic. The Task Force should be proactive and search for more creative housing solutions besides new buildings and consider other options that may not cost too much to build.
- The Task Force needs to look at what affordability means for different socio-demographic groups.
- There is a need for discussion on housing alternatives and ways of being creative while understanding that although the Task Force is not supposed to do the work.
- In terms of the Covid-19, consider looking at the effect on short-term rentals, what disappeared and the impacts. Data would be beneficial and assistance from staff to assist the Task Force as this information can inform the Task Force on rental, social and affordable housing. In this regard, information was provided that with the OCP targeted review, staff are intending to apply a Covid-19 lens to the “housing” topic areas.
- Concern was expressed that the Task Force may be operating in a “bubble” as other municipalities are working on similar issues and perhaps consideration be given to reaching out to those municipalities to look at other solutions.
- Although it could be a task for the new hire, the Task Force could start looking at information on how land is acquired, what are the operations, could the Federal government buy District land, etc.
- In terms of next steps, the goal has to be hard numbers, and look at the number of partnerships that the District will form, dollars leveraged that are brought into the municipality, and the rental index.
- Look at precedents in other Canadian cities and from other countries and determine if there is anything that can be directly applied to the DNV.

- The revision of the Residential Tenant Relocation Assistant Policy is urgent and needs to be given fair consideration.
- There was previously conversation around the “dungeons” (i.e. secondary suites in basements) being built. The Task Force will need to decide if quality of the rentals are part of the Task Force’s mandate.
- Some clarity around the Residential Tenancy Relocation Assistance Policy regarding the provision of the replacement rentals being not more than 10% of current rent. This target is not realistic and needs to be revised to something that is achievable using Task Force comments on the Residential Tenancy Relocation Assistance Policy.
- Developers are currently coming forward with development proposals that include 10% of the total units as non-market rental units. The Task Force should develop a policy or advise Council to advise staff on a policy that every project should have a percentage of non-market units or rent geared-to-income units. Many other municipalities have implemented this approach through an Inclusionary Zoning strategy.
- Develop a Family Housing Policy that would require a percentage of family housing in every project as well. Would like to see something written for staff to guide the developer in applications.

8. Resolution about the request for extension of the Task Force term

Members discussed the possibility of putting forward a request to Council to extend the Task Force’s term for a further six months. A suggestion was presented that as an option, and because a lot of work was identified in the interim report and in order to figure out the next steps, consider re-engaging the facilitator. The facilitator could help refine the work plan to determine if an extension is, in fact, needed.

Concern was expressed that prior to re-engaging the facilitator, it may be more beneficial for the Task Force to have a brain storming session first and once the ideas are gathered, then the Task Force can use the facilitator more efficiently. A further suggestion was presented that the Task Force consider a roundtable discussion for idea sharing at the beginning of the meetings.

9. Any Other Business

No other business was presented.

10. Next Meeting

Prior to setting the next meeting date, members indicated agreement to give Council a chance to look at the interim report, and therefore for the next couple of months, the Task Force would meet once per month. The following two meeting dates were scheduled:

- November 19, 2020
- December 9, 2020

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.