Housing Committee

Agenda

Thursday, July 28, 2016
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
La Cité Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 rue-Marie-Gaboury (91 Street), Edmonton

Agenda Items

1. Call to Order – Councillor Dwight Ganske, Chair

2. Chair Opening Remarks – Councillor Dwight Ganske, Chair

3. Approval of Agenda – Councillor Dwight Ganske, Chair

4. Approval of Minutes of May 27, 2016 – Councillor Dwight Ganske, Chair

5. 2016/17 Housing Workplan Updates – Councillor Dwight Ganske, Chair
   5.1 Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments – Stephanie Chai, Project Manager

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Housing Committee receive the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment Workshop Summary Report for information.

5.2 Sub-Regional Housing Plan Model – Stephanie Chai, Project Manager (verbal)

5.3 2016 ReEnvision Symposium – Stephanie Chai, Project Manager

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Housing Committee receive the 2016 ReEnvision Symposium update for information.

5.4 Our Affordable Future Implementation – Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
   a. Pilot Projects – Our Affordable Future Challenge

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Housing Committee receive the 2016 Our Affordable Future Challenge update for information.
b. Healthy Communities

**Recommended Motion:** That the Housing Committee approve a letter of support, regarding Housing Developments for the Health & Wellbeing of Aging Populations, be sent to the Public Health Agency of Canada by the Capital Region Board Chief Executive Officer.

5.5 2016/17 Budget Update – *Stephanie Chai, Project Manager*

**Recommended Motion:** That the Housing Committee receive the 2016/17 Budget update for information.

6. **2017/18 Housing Workplan** – *Councillor Dwight Ganske, Chair*

6.1 2017/18 Workplan Review and Approval – *Stephanie Chai, Project Manager*

**Recommended Motion:** That the Housing Committee approve the proposed 2017/18 Housing Workplan and that the Workplan be forwarded to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for consideration in the preparation of the Board’s 2017/18 Budget.

7. **Housing Advocacy** – *Councillor Dwight Ganske, Chair*

7.1 Ongoing Correspondence – *Stephanie Chai, Project Manager*

**Recommended Motion:** That the Housing Committee receive the ongoing advocacy correspondence for information.

8. **Adjournment** – *Councillor Dwight Ganske, Chair*

**Next Meeting**
Friday, September 23, 2016
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
Housing Committee

Friday, May 27, 2016
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Strathcona County Community Centre – Rooms 1 & 2
401 Festival Lane, Sherwood Park, AB

Members:
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain (Parkland Sub-Region (Chair)
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert (Sturgeon Sub-Region) (alternate)
Ben Henderson, City of Edmonton (Edmonton Sub-Region) (alternate)
Carla Howatt, Strathcona County (Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region)
Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg (Leduc Sub-Region)
Dan Warawa, Lamont County (Lamont Sub-Region)

Regrets:

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
Charlene Wilcock, Municipal Planning Intern

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Fiona Beland-Quest, Strathcona County
Lydia Chin, Alberta Seniors & Housing
Greg Christenson, Christenson Group of Companies
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Bonnie Dobbs, University of Alberta
Jim Fowler, Sturgeon Foundation
Gary Gordon, Gordon & Associates
Shella Gordon, Seniors United Now
Adil Kodian, CHBA - Edmonton
Judy Koschade, Town of Bruderheim
Daryl Kreuzer, City of Edmonton
Nicole Kurtz, City of Edmonton
Nancy Laing, Leduc Foundation
Marnie Lee, Strathcona County
Lynn Olenek, HHF
Tara Pidporochynski, University of Alberta
Dennis Peck, CHBA - Edmonton
Giri Puligandla, Homeward Trust Edmonton
Shelly Ross, Town of Bruderheim
Lory Scott, City of St. Albert
Lori-Anne St. Arnault, Meridian Foundation
Thom Stubbs, Headwater Group
Paul Stocker, Seniors United Now
Dick Tansey, Seniors United Now

1. Call to Order

Chair, Dwight Ganske called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.
2. Chair Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Housing Committee agenda for May 27, 2016 be approved, with the amendment of moving item #7 (Growth Plan 2.0 Task Force Update) to follow the Approval of the Minutes.

Moved by: Councillor Dan Warawa, Lamont County (Lamont Sub-Region)

Decision: Carried unanimously

4. Approval of Minutes, March 24, 2016

Motion: That the Housing Committee minutes of March 24, 2016 be approved, as amended.

Moved by: Mayor Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg (Leduc Sub-Region)

Decision: Carried unanimously

7. Growth Plan 2.0

7.1 Task Force Update

Motion: That the Housing Committee receive the Growth Plan 2.0 update for information.

Moved by: Councillor Carla Howatt, Strathcona County (Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region)

Decision: Carried unanimously

5. 2016/17 Housing Work Plan Updates

5.1 2016 ReEnvision Symposium

Motion: That the Housing Committee receive the 2016 ReEnvision Symposium update for information.

Moved by: Councillor Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert (Sturgeon Sub-Region)

Decision: Carried unanimously

5.2 Our Affordable Future

Motion: That the Housing Committee approve the 2016 Our Affordable Future Challenge, subject to funding.

Moved by: Councillor Dan Warawa, Lamont County (Lamont Sub-Region)

Decision: Carried unanimously
6. Housing Advocacy

6.1 Federal Response Letter

Motion: That the Housing Committee receive the Federal Response letter for information.
Moved by: Councillor Ben Henderson, City of Edmonton (Edmonton Sub-Region)
Decision: Carried unanimously

8. CRGIS Update

8.1 GIS Demonstration

Motion: That the Housing Committee receive the GIS Demonstration for information.
Moved by: Councillor Carla Howatt, Strathcona County (Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region)
Decision: Carried unanimously

9. Capital Region Board Projects

9.1 Specialized Transit Update

Motion: That the Housing Committee receive the Specialized Transit update for information.
Moved by: Mayor Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg (Leduc Sub-Region)
Decision: Carried unanimously

10. Adjournment

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Housing Committee meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Next Meeting: The Housing Committee requested CRB Administration to confirm an alternate date for the next meeting (July) to address a scheduling conflict for Committee Members.

Committee Chair, Councillor Dwight Ganske
Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments

Recommended Motion

*That the Housing Committee receive the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment Workshop Summary Report for information.*

Background

The Capital Region Growth Plan: Appendix 5 Housing Plan provides direction to develop a 10-year regional housing plan based on sub-regional planning that is responsive to housing need.

The development of a “Sub-Regional Planning Process” was an approved Housing Committee initiative in the CRB 2012-2014 Business Plan.

In 2013, an Environmental Scan was carried out that described the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders currently involved with the provision of non-market housing, and suggested how those roles might evolve as an enhanced approach to planning for non-market housing is implemented. The findings and recommendations of the Environmental Scan confirmed that provincial funding and regional planning priorities should be guided by sub-regional planning efforts – which, in turn, would benefit from the use of standardized planning and assessment tools.

In 2014, the Sub-Regional Needs Assessment Framework and pilot reports were received for information by the Capital Region Board.

The December 2014 Capital Region Board meeting approved the 2015/19 Business plan including the Housing Committee initiative “Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment” under “A” Priority Projects.

In September 2015, the new 2011 Core Housing Need data was acquired.

On October 29, 2015 the Housing Advisory Working Group met to start the process for completing the remaining four sub-regional needs assessments.

Project process and updates were presented at the November 2015 and January 2016 Housing Committee meetings by Gordon and Associates.

From December 2015 to March 2016 meetings/correspondence with each sub-region informed the assessments.

At the March 7, 2016 Housing Advisory Working Group meeting there was consensus to recommend the Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments be approved, through the Housing Committee, by the Capital Region Board.

On March 24, 2016 the Housing Committee recommended the Capital Region Board approve the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments. Administration acknowledged minor discrepancies to be incorporated in the final reports to the Capital Region Board.
On April 14, 2016 the Capital Region Board approved the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments.

On May 27, 2016, the approved reports were graphically designed and made digitally available on the Capital Region Board website.

On May 27, 2016, the Capital Region Board hosted a Housing Needs Assessment workshop to review the needs assessments (need, demand, and supply of all types of accommodation; core housing need; demographics and target markets). Input from the Workshop would be used to inform the next phase of work.

The graphic below summarizes this timeline and identifies the projects completed to date (blue) and future work (green).

Attachments:

1. Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment Workshop Summary
This workshop report summarises the CRB Housing Needs Assessment and discusses next steps towards Housing Plans in the Region.

Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment Workshop
May 27, 2016

Headwater Group
Contents

Overview ....................................................................................................................................................... 2

1. Housing Need Priorities Review.............................................................................................................. 4
   1.1 Addressing Existing and Future Households in Need ........................................................................ 4
   1.2 Diversity of Housing and Households ............................................................................................... 5
   1.3 Options to Encourage Market Affordable Housing........................................................................... 5

2. CRB Regional Housing Planning Framework Review .............................................................................. 7
   2.1 Identifying Housing Framework Priorities ......................................................................................... 7
   2.2 Housing Plan Framework Response .................................................................................................. 8

Appendices.................................................................................................................................................. 10

Appendix One:   Agenda ............................................................................................................................... 10
Appendix Two:   Housing Needs Assessment Policy Options Backgrounder ............................................. 12
Appendix Three: Housing Needs Assessment Priority Exercise Summaries .......................................... 17
Appendix Four:  Capital Region Board Planning Model Context ............................................................... 27
Appendix Five:  Participants ........................................................................................................................ 29
Overview

An important step toward addressing the housing needs of the Capital Region Board (CRB) is determining the extent of the need. The CRB Housing Needs Assessments, recently completed, now serve as the foundation for planning, and will feed into a standardized sub-regional housing planning model and ultimately the plans (to be developed). It was at this juncture that the CRB held this Housing Needs Assessment Workshop.

Objectives

The overall purpose of the workshop was to identify how the needs assessments can be used to assist the CRB member municipalities in developing responsive housing strategies. The workshop objectives cover four areas:

- **Findings**: Highlight key findings of the needs assessments;
- **Issues**: Identify implications and issues arising from the needs assessment;
- **Policy Options**: Stimulate thinking and discussion on potential policy options and actions to address key issues from the needs assessments; and
- **Housing Planning Process**: Review the regional housing planning process and identify how the needs assessments can be used to inform planning.

The Workshop was framed by input gathered from members of the Housing Advisory Working Group and focused to provide context for the Sub-Regional Housing Planning Model. The Agenda is provided in Appendix One. The Workshop also discussed policy and program options and alternatives that sub-regions might consider in seeking to respond to the assessed level of need and housing requirements. Input from the Workshop will be used to inform the next phase of work.

Presentations

To help kick off the Workshop, presentations from two of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region’s main housing partners, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Alberta Seniors and Housing outlined their roles and how they could partner on housing related issues with the region. This was followed by an overview presentation of the recently published CRB Housing Needs Assessment.

Workshop Engagement

The Workshop engaged participants in two main areas – firstly to review and consider policy gaps, implications and options as a result of the Housing Needs Assessments and secondly to provide feedback on the approach to and design of future housing plans.

CRB Housing Planning History

The Capital Region Growth Plan: Appendix 5 Housing Plan provides direction to develop a 10-year regional housing plan based on sub-regional planning that is responsive to housing need. The development of a “Sub-Regional Planning Process” was an approved Housing Committee initiative in the CRB 2012-2014 Business Plan.
In 2013, an Environmental Scan was carried out that described the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders currently involved with the provision of non-market housing, and suggested how those roles might evolve as an enhanced approach to planning for non-market housing is implemented.

In 2014, the Sub-Regional Needs Assessment Framework and pilot reports were received for information by the Capital Region Board.

The December 2014 Capital Region Board meeting approved the 2015/19 Business plan including the Housing Committee initiative “Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

In September 2015, the new 2011 Core Housing Need data was acquired.

On October 29, 2015 the Housing Advisory Working Group met to start the process for completing the remaining four sub-regional needs assessments.

Project process and updates were presented at the November 2015 and January 2016 Housing Committee meetings by Gordon and Associates.

From December to March meetings/correspondence with each sub-region were held to build and inform the assessments.

At the March 7, 2016 Housing Advisory Working Group meeting there was consensus to recommend the Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments be approved, through the Housing Committee, by the Capital Region Board.

On March 24, 2016 the Housing Committee recommended the Capital Region Board approve the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments. Administration acknowledged minor discrepancies to be incorporated in the final reports to the Capital Region Board.

On April 14, 2016 the Capital Region Board approved the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments.

The approved reports were graphically designed and will be made digitally available on the Capital Region Board website. The graphic below summarizes this timeline and identifies the projects completed to date (blue) and future work (green).
1. Housing Need Priorities Review

Workshop participants were tasked with reviewing housing need gaps, implications and policy options for three pre-defined priority areas. To support their work a policy options backgrounder was provided for each priority area was provided (Appendix Two). Participants broke into four working tables. Facilitators led their group through each priority area, collecting group feedback on relevant gaps, implications and policy options.

A summary of the top issues for each priority area is simply provided in this section below. A detailed summary of each group’s feedback is provided in Appendix Three.

1.1 Addressing Existing and Future Households in Need

Gaps
- Disabilities
- Affordable Housing for families and service workers
- Middle income seniors qualification
- Flexible models and accessibility
- Social housing supply
- Policy eligibility barriers

Implications
- Cost to society (i.e. productivity, crime, health costs)
- Lack of available workforce
- Flexibility needed
- Zoning changes needed
- Hidden homeless are not identified
- Variance in CRB sub-regional needs
- Nodes of service accessibility to housing

Priority Policy Options
- Diversity and choice of housing
- Opening of building codes to facilitate flexibility
- Hybrid models
- Policy leadership and clarity to decrease risks
- Community based delivery
1.2 Diversity of Housing and Households

Gaps
- Cultural diversity
- Lack of choice
- Artificial distinctions of housing types
- Preferences that align with different generations
- Awareness of diversity options
- Volatility of rental markets and rental conversion
- Long range vision

Implications
- Distribution of services
- Building code flexibility/ Review existing codes
- Changing zoning to encourage flexibility
- Involuntary household movement

Priority Policy Options
- Funding incentives for flexible options
- Consistent planning policies
- Long term KPIs linked to well being
- Urban design for complete communities
- Reduced zoning complexity
- Municipal bonds

1.3 Options to Encourage Market Affordable Housing

Gaps
- No gaps
- Developer operated rental
- GST double taxation
- No incentives to build in rural areas
- Transportation to housing
- Education on role of private investment

Implications
- Decreased availability
- Increased cost
- Increased rural exodus

Workshop: May 27, 2016
Unsustainable communities
Non-profit sector deterred from innovation

Priority Policy Options
- Down payment assistance
- Social programs to address family needs/ stress
- Integration of market and non-market units in same complex
- Increased collaboration – municipalities/ developers/ non-profits
- Policy to link affordable and energy efficiencies
2. CRB Regional Housing Planning Framework Review

2.1 Identifying Housing Framework Priorities

The CRB Regional Planning Framework sets out to provide direction\(^1\) (i.e. planning and reporting formats, guidelines, funding targets, etc.) to the CRB identified sub-regions\(^2\) for the preparation of Housing Plans every 5 years.

The purpose of the Framework is to confirm the contents and format of Sub-Region Housing Plans, including the determination of required planning processes, roles/responsibilities, targets, timelines, KPIs to be monitored, and implementation strategy for completed plans.

To help inform the Housing Framework, workshop participants were asked to provide input and feedback into the overall design of the Framework through a facilitated exercise. Background for the planning model was provided in advance and is provided in Appendix Four.

Participants were asked:

- First, to identify items for the overall scope, priorities and planning elements for the design of an overall housing planning framework (a housing model). A wall poster was prepared with an initial list of scope, priority and planning elements. Participants were asked to confirm and add items to create an overall list of items for each area of the framework. The priority poster looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities to address *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity of housing options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusive communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration with the Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Second, to prioritize the relative importance of the identified scope, priority and planning elements. Participants were asked to identify their ‘top three’ for each area to provide feedback for the housing framework design. Participants marked up the posters with their three check marks.

\(^1\) Ideally, GoA direction and requirements will be incorporated in the CRB framework and guidelines for Sub-Regional housing plans.

\(^2\) CRB Sub-Regions include the Edmonton Sub-Region, Lamont Sub-Region, Leduc Sub-Region, Parkland Sub-Region, Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region, and Sturgeon Sub-Region.
Thirdly, participants then reviewed their selections and provided further comments on the scope, priorities, planning elements for CRB Sub-regional Housing Plans. Participants made a number of comments with the main two items being around timing and approach, which are discussed below.

The results of Workshop participant’s feedback is summarized in the following sections.

### 2.2 Housing Plan Framework Response

The CRB Housing Planning Framework should address the following elements:

**Scope** – The overall scope for housing plans should cover:

- Regions - Housing plans are required for each sub-region and the Capital Region overall;
- Housing focus - A primary focus for housing plans for non-market housing and secondary focus on market affordable housing;
- Support services - The role of support services and the integration of support services and housing needs to be addressed in housing plans (How is this to be achieved given that they are currently not under our mandate?); and
- Other - Other suggestions identified for the scope of housing plans include a review social housing adequacy and homelessness.

**Priorities** – Priorities to consider in housing plans should address:

- Principles - How the housing plans address the CRB Growth Plan vision;
- The diversity of housing options;
- How housing plans help build inclusive communities; and
• Collaboration within the region in setting housing priorities.

**Housing Targets and Key Performance Indicators** – Measures to track housing plans should include:

• Key performance indicators
• Common data collection protocols and reporting

**Action Plan and Evaluation** – An implementation focus for housing plans should include:

• Action plan steps
• Evaluation approach

**Regional Collaboration** – Each housing plan should identify:

• How regional priorities are addressed within Sub-regional housing plans
• How the CRB Growth Plan vision is addressed within each Sub-regional housing plan

**Roles and Partnerships** – Housing plans should identify:

• Partners in the development and delivery of housing plans and targets
• Roles and responsibilities for partners

**Funding** – Housing plans should identify:

• Funding estimates, targets and sources to deliver the housing plan

**Housing Plan Development**

Workshop participants recommended guidance to help facilitate the early delivery of housing plans:

**Approach**

The overall approach for the development of a Housing Plan Framework should build off of the Housing Needs Assessments and existing housing plans to expedite their completion.

**Timeframe**

Workshop participants underscored the need to develop the housing plans on a priority and timely basis, recommending plan completion by Spring 2017, in advance of the Fall 2017 Municipal elections.
Appendices

Appendix One: Agenda

CRB Housing Needs Assessment Workshop

Friday, May 27, 2016
Strathcona County Community Centre - Rooms 1 and 2 - 401 Festival Lane, Sherwood Park, AB

Context Presentations

10:15 – 11:00 Federal and Provincial Housing Program Overview
Kelly Wager, CMHC
Shannon Marchand, Deputy Minister, Seniors and Housing

11:00 – 12:00 Housing Needs Assessment Findings Summary
Gary Gordon/Thom Stubbs – CRB Housing Needs Assessment Team

12:00 – 12:45 Lunch (provided)
Housing Needs Priority Exercise – What are the Highest Priority Housing Needs?
Sub-Regional Plan Scoping Exercise – What should be in Sub-Regional Plans?

Policy Options – Facilitated Exercises in Sub-Regional Groupings

The Policy Options Backgrounder is attached to help facilitate and explore the afternoon session. Group facilitation and identification of gaps, implications and policy/program options to consider addressing the following areas:

12:45 – 1:30 Addressing Existing and Future Households in Need

1:30 – 2:15 Diversity of Housing and Households

2:15 – 3:00 Options to Encourage Market Affordable Housing
Each Sub-Regional group will provide a quick summary report back to share observations.

Housing Planning and Next Steps

3:00 – 3:50 Scope and Priorities for Housing Plans (facilitated discussion)
  • Overall scope and priorities for planning
Model for Housing Plans (facilitated discussion)
- Relationship to CRB Growth Plan Communities and Housing Principles, Goals and Strategies

3:50 – 4:00  Next Steps Summary
Appendix Two: Housing Needs Assessment Policy Options Backgrounder

Policy Options Backgrounder - Afternoon Session

The overall purpose of the housing workshop is to identify how the needs assessments can be used to assist the CRB and regional municipalities in developing responsive housing strategies. To help focus the Workshop, a Monkey Survey was completed to help identify which priority housing issues can be highlighted in Workshop discussions. The top three priorities identified were:

1. Addressing existing (backlog) and future households in need
2. Diversity of housing and households
3. Options to encourage market affordable housing

A portion of the workshop will include breaking into smaller working groups. Background material is attached for each priority. Gaps, implications and potential policy options are also identified for each priority. The list of options is not intended to be comprehensive and does not imply a preference for any of them – they are simply a list of some options. The intent is to stimulate discussion on the potential policy implications for each priority area. The anticipated outcome is that participants gain some insight into how the needs assessments can be used to develop responsive sub-region housing plans.
1. ADDRESSING EXISTING (BACKLOG) AND FUTURE HOUSEHOLDS IN NEED

Table 1. Renters in Core Need by Household Type and Age, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>15–29</th>
<th>30–44</th>
<th>45–64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>6,880</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>14,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>6,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parents</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>7,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>5,475</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>16,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>30,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Growth of Renters in Core Housing Need by Age of Maintainer, 2015-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Renters</th>
<th>Share %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15–29</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–44</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–64</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–74</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GAPS

Extensive backlog of need:
- Lone-parent families had the highest incidence of need – require larger units;
- Seniors had the second highest incidence of need – require small bachelor and one-bedroom units

Measures to address households with maintainers 65 years and older:
- 46% of new households in need over the next 6 years will be seniors.

IMPLICATIONS

- The limited availability of smaller apartment options as well as few lower-rent properties contribute to affordability (and to a smaller extent to suitability) issues;
- Single person households (including seniors) in need of Non-Market Housing may be forced to leave the Sub-Region to find housing they can afford;
- The 30,720 renter households in core need require deep ongoing subsidies to make their housing affordable.
- Purpose built options are required for seniors across the spectrum of needs

POLICY/PROGRAM OPTIONS

- Reduce taxes for new rental housing;
- New rental housing tax credit (federal and provincial);
- Substantial capital grants for new rental housing;
- Reduce development charges;
- Adopt inclusionary housing policy;
- Mixed-income housing model;
- Provide rental supplements for families renting existing housing (over-supply of housing);
2. DIVERSITY OF HOUSING AND HOUSEHOLDS

Table 3. Distribution of the Housing Stock by Dwelling Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Lamont</th>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Strath/ Ft Sask</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Region Percent</th>
<th>Region No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>265,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Detached</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>118,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324,760</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>22,455</td>
<td>26,640</td>
<td>40,460</td>
<td>34,970</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>451,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Household Ownership Rate

Figure 2. Age Distribution of Household Maintainers, 2011
**GAPS**
- Multiple unit dwellings/density.
- Higher density built form.
- Affordable purpose-built rental units in suburban sub-regions.
- Younger households in the suburban sub-regions.
- Non-family households in suburban sub-regions.

**IMPLICATIONS**
- Limited supply of smaller multiple unit dwelling options, especially in the suburban sub-regions, can lead to higher rents and house prices. It also makes it difficult for single people and seniors, especially renters, to live in these sub-regions.
- Addressing the gaps in the housing stock is required to build an inclusive community where all type of households, age groups, tenures and income levels are able to live and prosper.

**POLICY/ OPTIONS**
- Require more higher density developments in new areas.
- Develop policies to encourage increased density as a requirement of in-fill housing.
- Reduce taxes for new rental housing.
- New rental housing tax credit (federal and provincial).
- Inclusionary housing policy.
- Mixed-income housing model.
3. OPTIONS TO ENCOURAGE MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The following examples include some of the ideas that were expressed during the consultation sessions held for the Capital Region Housing Plan and Our Affordable Future. The examples are for illustrative purposes only and do not represent a comprehensive list or an endorsement of any of the ideas or concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAPS</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS</th>
<th>POLICY/PROGRAM OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable purpose-built rental housing for singles and seniors in suburban sub-regions.</td>
<td>• Single person households (including seniors) and some families requiring Market Affordable Housing may be forced to leave the Sub-Region to find housing they can afford.</td>
<td>Municipal Regulatory Policies and Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable purpose-built rental housing for larger families (including lone parents) in suburban sub-regions.</td>
<td>• The future growth of seniors’ households will require a significant increase in purpose built options across the spectrum of needs.</td>
<td>• Lowering per unit costs through increased density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to address households with maintainers 65 years and older:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Alternative development standards and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 36% of new households requiring Market Affordable Housing over the next 6 years will be seniors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finding efficiencies in the development approval system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater flexibility in land use planning regulations and zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative Building Design and Construction Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Well-designed smaller units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mixed-use building projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative designs (new and existing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative construction techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative construction materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hold an affordable housing design competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative Community Design Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Infill and intensification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinated and integrate affordable housing with transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build more integrated, sustainable, walkable communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshop: May 27, 2016
Committee Meeting: July 28, 2016
Appendix Three: Housing Needs Assessment Priority Exercise Summaries

Group 1

1) ADDRESSING EXISTING (BACKLOG) AND FUTURE HOUSEHOLDS IN NEED.

GAPS

- Difference between the aggregated data and the sub-region data.
- Middle income seniors don’t qualify for many of the housing options (many are shocked that they do not qualify).

IMPLICATIONS

- Hidden homeless is not identified.
- Homelessness itself is not identified (house rich/cash poor person(s)).
- Regional vs sub-regional housing needs are wide and varying and not necessarily identified.

POLICY PROGRAM OPTIONS

- Life-leases on land so you can build more affordably.
- Donating land would result in a tax credit.
- Transferable tax credits for developers/individuals that build mixed use housing.
- Consider mixed use housing models.
- Alternative development standards and regulations.
- Developing programs that help those in supportive/community housing leave the system – instead of changing the supply, you change the demand + decreasing the dependency.

2) DIVERSITY OF HOUSING AND HOUSEHOLDS

GAPS

- Volatility in rental market and the impact that creates.
- Volatility of owner and developers (i.e. slum lords).
- Provincially run life lease laws need to be established.
- Community awareness of rental properties and infill options + awareness and importance of community diversity.
- Ian says we need a new arena.

IMPLICATIONS

- Nothing to add.
POLICY PROGRAM OPTIONS

- Alterative and flexible development standards and regulations.
- Consider the five As of transportation.
- Consider what makes an area attractive to build and live in and have your policies reflect that (urban design concepts / social engineering).
- Developing long term key performance indicators (KPIs) to that show communities are moving towards their goals – directly linked to social well being. Evaluate, monitor, and report.

3) OPTIONS TO ENCOURAGE MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING

GAPS

- Affordable purpose built-rental housing for singles and seniors in rural sub-regions.
- No incentive/no reason to build in rural communities that lack services.
- Transportation issues discourage people from living in outlying/rural communities.

IMPLICATIONS

- Looking at creating whole communities in urban design (inclusionary zoning).
- Market and non-market in the same development which cannot be distinguished from each other.
- Increased exodus of rural and outlying areas.

POLICY PROGRAM OPTIONS

- Offer a social program that would make it less of a financial and personal stress to care for family members (i.e. children, parents).
Group 2

1) **ADDRESSING EXISTING AND FUTURE HOUSEHOLDS IN NEED**

**GAPS**
- Persons with disabilities
- Persons with health issues including mental health and addictions
- Affordable housing for families, service industry workers and new Canadians/immigrants
- Family Housing especially:
  - Lone-parent families
  - Large families (more than 4 children)
  - Multi-generational living together families
- Seniors and caregivers/care workers

**IMPLICATIONS**
- Transportation needs to be factored into housing needs
- Languages/need for interpretative services
- Proximity of housing to work eg. for service industry workers
- Chamber of Commerce involvement – ensuring work force is available
- Planning-around housing/work relationships
- ‘precinct’ on existing services eg. Community needs approximately 100,000 people to support a hospital, etc.
  - Consequence is people in rural communities need to come to larger urban centres for MRIs, health services
  - Impact on aging in rural communities and limited choices
- ‘Nodes’- creating areas or nodes with walkable services otherwise needing drivable access to services (e.g. Nodes would comprise between 10,000 – 25,000 people)
- More decentralization

**POLICY/PROGRAM OPTIONS**
- Policies required to balance between services and funding
- Need for sustainable housing and services
- Accessibility of land
- Diversity of choices
  - Retain land and space to maintain values for rural areas on staying in a smaller community
  - Transitioning from farms
  - “aging in community” (rural parallel to aging in place concept)
- Develop models that share resources to enable increased housing choices particularly in smaller communities
- Building codes are getting excessive and even prohibitive. Need to balance personal risk with building policies
- Hybrid models for public/private sources of capital (including shopping, housing, library, schools, seniors homes)
- Nodes need to aggregate and change zoning to increase capacity, break down silos and increase density

2) DIVERSITY OF HOUSING AND HOUSEHOLDS

GAPS
- Segregation
- Lack of regeneration of lifecycle re: housing-- impacting the community as people age
- Youth leave resulting in increased land values notably in smaller communities
- Lack of long range visioning
- Lack of diversity of available housing
  - Need for entry living housing
  - Need to factor in supportive services

IMPLICATIONS
- Services are not distributed in large urban core
- Lack of hub and spoke model
- People leave
- On line education increases
- Building codes get even more inflexible (institutional or residential) preventing aging in place
- Prescriptive vs performance building regulations
  - People contravene them and create black market putting people at greater risk and providing inconsistency in housing

POLICY/PROGRAM OPTIONS
- Alternate building safety standards for renovations on existing structures
- Communication and long range vision development between government and private developers and across government departments
- Funding incentives for big picture thinking between developments eg. Day cares in senior developments
- Teams for developing roles and responsibility
- Urban village development—services and housing in a concentrated area
- Flexible policies
- Borrowing and financing options outside of allowable funding bodies. Policies are currently too restrictive
- Planning polices be made consistent across the region
- Share models that work in other communities that are innovative and respond to service/housing options in a variety of forms across rural and urban settings

3) OPTIONS TO ENCOURAGE MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING

GAPS
- Access to capital (funding, borrowing)
- Knowledge base on how to sustain affordable housing
- Partnerships and combining resources
- Mixed income models
• Rural communities can get swept under the bus
• Lack of long term vision and intergenerational models
• How to attract private builders (90% of housing market!)
• Private investors need education on benefits of affordable housing

Implications
• No young people
• No service industry (including health care workers)
• Unsustainable, monolithic, homogeneous communities
• Non-profit sector is deterred from innovative developments
• Restricted developments
• No attracting private capital and no leveraging of public dollars
• Diminished labour force
• Planning based on the lowest common denominator

Policy/Program Options
• Inclusionary zoning
• Encourage collaborative planning developments based on the highest common denominator
• Consider future needs for aging/life changes/ community
• Planning around infrastructure e.g. Sewers, bridges etc. to attract development
• Policy built in to affordable housing and energy efficiencies
• Mill rate change to rental property
Group Three

1) ADDRESSING EXISTING (BACKLOG) AND FUTURE HOUSEHOLDS IN NEED

GAPS

- Affordable family housing – short supply of non-apartment units
- Affordable rental for families and lone parents
- Movement away from purpose built rentals
- New condo act – less interest in building multi-family units
- Condo boards protectionist
- Transportation oriented market affordable units
- Costs increasing more than inflation
- Less ability to innovate due to zoning
- Zoning – affordability component necessary
- Artificial distinction between housing types (operational, not built form)
  o Supportive
  o Condominiums
- Zoning goes beyond land use
- Integration of housing and employment doesn’t exist

IMPLICATIONS

- Seniors
  o Accessible house (non-institutional)
  o Planning based on 20-year old demographic model
  o Major growth driver: international migration – looking for very different housing concepts
  o No incentives for shared economies (vehicles/stuff). I.e. Uber
  o Stock-scope of housing not matching living situations (i.e. oil-field workers)
  o Complete segregation of uses and activities (social, essential needs)
  o Flexible/adaptable housing models
  o Mixed/combined uses restrictions discourage development
    ▪ Parking
    ▪ Amenity areas incl. balconies
  o Parking standards outdated – based on 60-year old standards.

POLICY

- GST – double tax (lot, lumber, house cost)
- Advocacy – tax credits & taxes
- Developer operated rental – w/o penalty
  o Mill rate double
  o Special tax for GST
- Secondary suites develop as much as possible in all housing types
• Expedited affordable housing development permits
• Encourage good applications.
• Consistency in interpretation & timelines
• Changing zoning dev. to get what they need – zoning doesn’t allow for anything different
• Deal with zoning regionally (business license)
• Individual municipal character desirable for competition (business location)
• Clarity in community engagement
• Expectation for infill (too much risk)
• Create environment so market can build
• Ability to build a diverse range of housing types.
• Approval process $250/day carrying costs.

3) OPTIONS TO ENCOURAGE MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING

GAPS

• Process and approval consistencies
• Choices are allowed (more choices than single family or apartments)
• Too much complexity in zoning interpretation (requirements based on use)
• Favourable mortgage terms
• Development permit assistance
• Need a variety of choices
• Municipalities nee to accept risk
• Lower servicing standards ($10k/lot Sherwood Park)
• Secondary suites – cheaper when built new
• Clarity from political leadership – policy / political
• Wants vs. needs (perceptions from community)
• Municipality more involved in consultation
  o No innovation without variance in current zoning
Group Four

1) ADDRESSING EXISTING (BACKLOG) AND FUTURE HOUSEHOLDS IN NEED

GAPS

- Supply of adequate housing $:
  - Homeless
  - Lone-parent families
  - Single seniors
  - AISH
  - Disabled
- Awareness of housing options
- Data
- Medical/support services
- Transportation to services/medical
- Policy/legislation/legibility
- Navigation
- User (renters, lower income, disadvantaged) input
- Regional planning
- Effective delivery
- Income
- Public support

IMPLICATIONS

- Cost (crime, health, out migration)
- Lack of workforce
- Have/have not divide
- Increase percentage of income $\rightarrow$ rent, decrease in all else.
- Stress $\rightarrow$ social cost
- Increase demand on non-profit agencies “fire fighting” crisis prevention
- Not servicing those most in need

POLICY

- Dollars
- Increase supply rent supplements
- Increase supply of non-market housing
- Attached supports (Housing First) non-senior, S.L.
- Mixed generation
- Mixed use
- Legislation overhaul
  - Inclusionary zoning (MGA)
• Integrated delivery (regional)
  • Community based delivery
    ○ Regional AH Dollars
  • Lived experience input

2) DIVERSITY OF HOUSING AND HOUSEHOLDS

GAPS

• Cultural diversity
• Economic diversity
• Multi unit buildings
• Rental housing stock
• Non-market housing
• Lack of affordable housing choice

IMPLICATIONS

• Involuntary moves
• Unstable housing
• NIMBY
• Increased need for services
• Homelessness

POLICY

• Targets
• Mixed form developments
  ○ I.e. Beaverbrook
  ○ Increase density → single family
• Developer incentive programs
• Municipal leadership/ champion role
• Mixed-income housing model and tenure
• Municipal bonds
• Lower cost of borrowing
• Work force housing

3) OPTIONS TO ENCOURAGE MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING

GAPS

• NONE
• Used by higher income households
IMPLICATIONS

- Inadequate availability

POLICY

- Non-market affordable housing ownership
Appendix Four: Capital Region Board Planning Model Context

The Capital Region Board (CRB) approved a Housing Plan in 2009 guided by a vision where “there is a sufficient supply, choice and diversity of housing within the Capital Region”. Guiding principles were also developed to support municipalities in achieving this vision.

The 2009 Capital Region Housing Plan included the concept of a 10-year rolling plan that would be updated on a regular basis (every 5 years). To ensure success, the 10-year Regional Housing Plan will use “housing affordability and changing demographics and socio-economic characteristics” to determine non-market and market affordable housing priorities across the region. These were developed with the recently drafted Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments.

The description and diagram below provides an overview of the process and its current status.

![Diagram of the process and current status](image)

1. **Regional Direction (CRB every 5 years)**
   The CRB will provide direction (i.e. planning and reporting formats, guidelines, funding targets, etc.) to the CRB Sub-Regions for the preparation of a Sub-Regional Housing Plan every 5 years. The results from the Environmental Scan and the standardized Housing Needs Assessment Tool will support the development of the sub-regional housing plans.

2. **Sub-Regional Housing Plans (Sub-Regions every 5 years)**
   The CRB will work with each sub-region to develop 6 Sub-Regional Housing Plans every 5 years in coordination with Government of Alberta (GoA) guidelines and requirements. The GoA provides direction to Housing Management Bodies to support capital and operating budgets, business planning requirements, etc. The 6 sub-regional plans will include detailed action plans and indicators to measure progress/success. The CRB will involve Alberta Municipal Affairs in developing the Regional Planning Framework and coordinate with it to ensure capital planning and performance measurement needs and requirements are met.

While the Sub-Regional Plans will be developed every 5 years in accordance with data availability, long term population projections approved by the CRB will be used to estimate the need and demand for market and non-market housing over the next 10 years. However, actions to address the priorities identified in the plans will be limited to 5 years.
3. **Rolling 10 Year Regional Housing Plan** (CRB, every 5 years)

The 6 Sub-Regional Housing Plans will roll-up into a Rolling 10 Year Regional Housing Plan that will include the actions to address the identified priorities over the first 5 year period. The Regional Plan will also provide longer-term population projections and housing need and demand for use by all 24 CRB municipalities, Housing Management Bodies, industry and other housing providers and partners.

4. **Monitoring & Reporting (Sub-Regions on-going)**

The Regional and Sub-Regional Housing plans will include detailed action plans (incorporating provincial housing requirements) and a monitoring and reporting framework that outlines what and when reporting of results will occur for each action included in each sub-regional plan. The information collected through this monitoring will be critical to evaluating performance on a regular basis, so accurate and timely reporting will be mandatory to be effective.

5. **Evaluating & Adjusting (CRB and Sub-Regions annually)**

Results will be evaluated on an annual basis and, depending on performance, adjustments could be made to the type of delivery and cost allocations, both within a sub-region as well as between sub-regions. This suggests that the CRB should be responsible for allocating and reallocating public funding to Capital Region Housing Management Bodies to ensure that resources for new initiatives are balanced with the unmet and future housing needs anticipated across the Region.

---

3 The Capital Region Housing Plan, which was approved by the Government of Alberta in 2009, recommended that province accept the concept of a rolling 10 year Regional Housing Plan.
## Appendix Five: Participants

### CRB Housing Needs Assessment Workshop
**Friday, May 27, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINTED NAME</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori Anne St. Arnault</td>
<td>Meridian Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Stueck</td>
<td>GEF Senior Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td>Country Club 197 ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Bredhead</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Scott</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Ross</td>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Kusche</td>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Ganske</td>
<td>Town of Stony Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Kurz</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Kreuzer</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Laing</td>
<td>Leduc Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Stocker</td>
<td>Seniors United Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Tavney</td>
<td>Seniors United Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRB Leduc Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Barnhart</td>
<td>Leduc 4th Ave (alt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Workshop: May 27, 2016**
### CRB Housing Needs Assessment Workshop

**Friday, May 27, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flora Beland-Quad</td>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Hewatt</td>
<td>Strathcona Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnie Leo</td>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Fowler</td>
<td>Sturgeon Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Wright</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian McLeod</td>
<td>10th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20 Strathcona East/Heritage Housing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attendees:**

- Shaﬁn Kanji
- Tara Pidhorachynski
- Dennis Pech
- Bonnie Dobbs
- Ben Henderson
- Adil Kodian
Our Affordable Future Challenge

Motion

*That the Housing Committee receive the Our Affordable Future Challenge for information.*

Background

The Capital Region Board approved the [Our Affordable Future](#) report in December 2012.

On January 29, 2016, the Housing Committee approved the Our Affordable Future: Implementation priorities of Recommendation #6 Innovative Development Plans, Product Design, and Built-Forms and #9 Pilot Projects, with an understanding that a community approach engagement (Recommendation #8) should be an integral component of specific projects.

On May 27, 2016, the Housing Committee approved the 2016 Our Affordable Future Challenge, subject to funding.

On June 09, 2016 the Capital Region Board approved the Proposed 2016/17 Capital Region Board Budget, as recommended by the Governance Priorities & Finance Committee.

On June 27, 2016, consultants destroythebox were retained to produce and market the Our Affordable Future Challenge.

On July 20, 2016, the Our Affordable Future Challenge was launched.

More information is available at [ouraffordablefuture.com](#).

Next Steps:

2016
- August 15: Call for Pilot Projects Closes
- Week of August 22: Jury Deliberations
- September 15: Award Announcements
Our Affordable Future: Implementation

Motion

That the Housing Committee approve a letter of support, regarding Housing Developments for the Health & Wellbeing of Aging Populations, be sent to the Public Health Agency of Canada by the Capital Region Board Chief Executive Officer.

Background

The Capital Region Board approved the Our Affordable Future report in December 2012.

On October 1, 2014, Dr. Karen Lee spoke as a keynote at the annual ReEnvision Housing Symposium.

On January 29, 2016, the Housing Committee approved the Our Affordable Future: Implementation priorities of Recommendation #6 Innovative Development Plans, Product Design, and Built-Forms and #9 Pilot Projects, with an understanding that a community approach engagement (Recommendation #8) should be an integral component of specific projects.

On February 12, 2016, Dr. Karen Lee requested an exploratory meeting with potential partners for a grant proposal and working group.

On June 30, 2016, Dr. Karen Lee invited the Capital Region Board to partner in a healthier housing development for aging populations initiative.

Rationale

Dr. Karen Lee has been invited by the Public Health Agency of Canada to submit a full proposal for the initiative on creating and evaluating healthier housing for aging populations in Edmonton and Alberta, paired with addressing any systemic opportunities and challenges and disseminating lessons learned to the membership and networks of our different partners.

In addition to the Our Affordable Future Challenge launched on July 18, 2016, a partnership with Dr. Karen Lee integrating market affordable housing and healthy communities is an opportunity to sustain momentum in the Capital Region Board initiative over the next five years. The potential partnership also presents opportunities to support Recommendation #6 Innovative Development Plans and Recommendation #8 community engagement approach as approved in January.

Attachments

1) Federal Grant Proposal Summary and Potential Partner Roles
2) Multi-Sector Partnerships to Improve Housing Developments
3) Draft Capital Region Board Letter of Support
July 20, 2016

From: Dr. Karen Lee, President & CEO, Global Fit Cities Inc. based in Alberta, Canada

Project title: Multi-Sector Partnerships to Improve Housing Developments for the Health & Wellbeing of Aging Populations
(5 year project; anticipated start date January 2017 if grant proposal is successful)

FEDERAL GRANT PROPOSAL BEING SUBMITTED EARLY AUGUST 2016 – PROJECT SUMMARY AND POTENTIAL PARTNER ROLES

Background

The populations in many Canadian cities are aging, including those living in Alberta. There is recognition among different partners in Alberta that the health and wellbeing of aging populations are currently adversely affected by less-than-optimal designs in housing developments, even those targeted at aging populations. Car-reliant housing developments with few amenities for physical activity and healthy food access can impede the ability of people to age in place, to undertake regular physical activity and to eat more healthfully. At the same time, such developments may also be worse for other municipal priorities such as retail business sales, environmental pollution, and universal accessibility. Dependency can quickly ensue once people stop driving, leading to increased and earlier need for expensive supports and care within the healthcare system, already struggling with high and increasing demands.

There are strong interests from multiple partners in Alberta to do something together about this preventable situation and to utilize Dr. Karen Lee’s team to assist them with developing and implementing approaches that have successfully changed the built environment and health outcomes, and improved co-benefits such as economic and environmental benefits, in other jurisdictions.

Initiative Summary

Dr. Karen Lee and her Alberta-based organization, Global Fit Cities Inc., will use the federal government funding being requested in the grant proposal to coordinate:

1) Working with Christenson Developments to maximize healthy living supports into 2 Pilot Housing Development Projects, one in Edmonton (Southwood Village) and one in Whitecourt

2) A Multi-Sector Working Group of partners to give a range of inputs (health, aging, transportation, recreation, planning, business, municipal and other considerations) into
healthy living strategies being integrated into the 2 pilot projects, and to use the pilot projects for identifying opportunities for dissemination and potential solutions to systems-based barriers for such healthy living strategies

3) Development and implementation of dissemination strategies for lessons learned
4) Development and implementation of community engagement strategies
5) Evaluation of pilot projects with Universities of Alberta and Calgary researchers

The pilot developments would become a test for feasibility and ease of integrating in healthy living interventions into housing developments for aging populations. Interventions deemed easy and inexpensive would be disseminated, via strategies to be developed and implemented by the multi-sector working group, to industry and government stakeholders involved in housing developments for aging populations and to surrounding retail businesses that might benefit from improved economic activity such as retail sales. Anticipated dissemination strategies include presentations at existing conferences and events, and use of partner websites; new events and resources may also be created if needed to increase the profile of the initiative and willing partners could potentially co-sponsor such events. The multi-sector working group will also work together to identify potential solutions to barriers identified in the pilot developments, in particular for interventions deemed expensive and difficult to undertake. For example, government policy may be explored to help incentivize such interventions to be more used in the future. With inputs from the working group members, Dr. Lee’s team will also develop and implement community engagement strategies to identify additional strategies to be included in the pilot developments, and to increase public awareness and demand of healthier housing developments to help to support industry best practices as well as any needed political action. Dr. Karen Lee’s firm will also use the federal government funding requested in this federal grant proposal to partner with researchers from the University of Alberta and University of Calgary to undertake health outcome evaluations in the two pilot sites, as well as process evaluations.

Potential Partners and Roles in Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Partners for Multi-Sector Partnership Working Group</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Potential Roles/Contributions in Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christenson Group of Companies</td>
<td>Housing development</td>
<td>Built environment interventions to support active transportation, active recreation, active buildings and healthy food access in the two pilot developments; Staff in-kind for Working Group Participation; Possible new events co-sponsorship;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

©Dr. Karen Lee, Global Fit Cities Inc., 2016
www.drkarenlee.com

Committee Meeting: July 28, 2016
| Chamber of Commerce | Industry | Facilitation of resident recruitment for evaluations
| Canadian Home Builders Association/Home Builder Partners | Industry | Working Group Participation to provide expertise on business issues for consideration; Information sharing with membership and networks; Possible event co-sponsorship
| Other Businesses, such as Architecture Firms | Industry | Working Group Participation to provide expertise on industry issues for consideration; Information Sharing with Networks
| Advocacy Groups such as Alberta Seniors Communities & Housing Association | Advocacy | Working Group Participation; Information Dissemination; Incorporation of Information/Presentations into Events
| University of Alberta Faculty of Physical Education & Recreation | Academia | Evaluation
| University of Alberta Faculty of Medicine, Care of the Elderly Program | Academia/Healthcare | Working Group Participation; Expertise on Health & Healthcare Issues of Seniors
| University of Alberta Faculty of Engineering | Academia | Working Group Participation; Expertise in Engineering Solutions
| University of Alberta Department of Planning | Academia | Working Group Participation; Expertise in Planning; Potential Student Projects
| University of Calgary | Academia | Evaluation
| Other Academic Institutions | Academia | Working Group Participation; Potential Student Projects; Provision of Space for Events
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Alberta Government Ministries</td>
<td>Provincial Government</td>
<td>Working Group Participation; Information Sharing with Government Leadership and Staff; Policy Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Whitecourt (Mayor’s Office and multiple departments)</td>
<td>Municipal Government</td>
<td>Working Group Participation; Information Sharing with Government Leadership and Staff; Policy Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton (Mayor’s Office and multiple departments)</td>
<td>Municipal Government</td>
<td>Working Group and Community Engagement Participation; Data Sharing; Plans to use evaluation results, and working group recommendations; Information Sharing with Government Leadership and Staff; Policy Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
<td>24 Edmonton-area Municipalities (including mayors and municipal staff)</td>
<td>Working Group Participation; Incorporation of Information/Presentations into Events; Information Sharing with Government Leadership and Staff and Industry Partners; Policy Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Institute of Planners Health Committee</td>
<td>Professional Association of Planners</td>
<td>Working Group Participation; Sharing Planning Expertise and Resources; Information Dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-Sector Partnerships to Improve Housing Developments for the Health & Wellbeing of Aging Populations

GRANT ACTIVITIES (2017-2022):

Multi-Sector Partnership Working Group (local and provincial government departments, industry, academic sectors)

Contribute knowledge, experience and expertise about health, aging populations, housing, built environment, municipal needs

Community Engagement

Identification of Community Needs and Desired Solutions for Health & Wellbeing

2 Pilot Housing Developments, provided by Christenson Developments: Edmonton Southwood Village & Whitecourt

- Identify barriers and opportunities for health and wellbeing strategies integration
- Evaluate health and wellbeing outcomes and other co-benefits (by U of A & U of C)

Multi-Sector Partnership Working Group (local and provincial government departments, industry, academic sectors)

Share Opportunities with Networks

Find Joint Solutions to Barriers

Identify/address potential Training & Policy Needs

Committee Meeting: July 28, 2016
July 18, 2016

Public Health Agency of Canada

Re: Multi-Sector Partnerships to Improve Housing Developments for the Health & Wellbeing of Aging Populations

Dear Public Health Agency of Canada:

The Capital Region Board (CRB) is providing this letter to voice our support for the grant proposal being submitted by Dr. Karen Lee’s Alberta company Global Fit Cities Inc. to create a multi-sector partnership in Alberta, including the Edmonton region, for creating healthier housing developments for aging populations, inclusive of considerations for the issues of affordability.

We are a non-profit organization with membership from 24 Mayors from the Edmonton-area municipalities. Our diverse member municipalities range from the Village of Warburg (population 900) to the City of Edmonton with its 877,900 population to complete our regional community. We are committed to addressing our regional issues and challenges collectively for our population of about 1 million residents. Improving our housing availability, affordability, and quality for all populations in our region is one of our top priorities currently. Like many other cities and regions across Canada, the populations in many of our municipalities are also aging. Finding the best models for market-affordable housing and housing targeting aging populations are therefore of primary concern for us.

The Board is dedicated to housing efforts integrated in the regional Growth Plan. The CRB’s Housing Committee includes membership from the following:

- Chair Councillor Dwight Ganske Town of Stony Plain (Parkland Sub-Region)
- Vice-Chair Councillor Ed Gibbons City of Edmonton (Edmonton Sub-Region)
- Councillor Carla Howatt Strathcona County (Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region)
- Mayor Mel Smith Town of Redwater (Sturgeon Sub-Region)
- Mayor Ralph van Assen Village of Warburg (Leduc Sub-Region)
- Councillor Dan Warawa Lamont County (Lamont Sub-Region)

We are very excited to learn from the two pilot housing developments being included in this partnership initiative, with the Edmonton pilot site targeting aging populations also being situated directly adjacent to an existing affordable housing development, and the Whitecourt pilot site anticipated to provide rental housing for non-town resident mill workers as well as aging populations. Participating in this initiative with our multi-sector partners and their broad array of expertise to address and learn from the challenges and opportunities identified in the pilot developments will be very helpful to us. We are also keen to see and use the evaluations being conducted in this initiative on aging and affordable housing resident health and wellbeing for the pilot development sites. We anticipate the lessons we will learn through the grant activities will be greatly informative for our municipal policy and practice processes around housing, development and patterns of growth in our region.

We are familiar with the work of Dr. Karen Lee, who we featured as a keynote speaker at our annual symposium in 2014. As we recognized through this keynote, the health and wellbeing of Edmonton...
Metropolitan Region residents is very important to us and we are extremely interested in identifying
feasible health-promoting strategies to integrate into our regional and municipal housing developments
and growth plans. As such, the activities in this grant proposal will be helpful in this process. We are
therefore willing and interested to participate in the following 5-year grant proposal activities anticipated
to start in early 2017:

- having one or more of our staff and/or members attend the monthly multi-sector partnership
  working group (along with industry, provincial government and academic partners) to address
  healthier and higher quality housing in our region, particularly for vulnerable groups including
  seniors and aging populations
- regular presentations to the Housing Committee to update on progress and improve policy and
  practice processes in the region
- providing in-kind space as required and available for meetings and engagement sessions
- giving inputs into the Southwood Village Christenson Development being created in Edmonton
  and learning from this pilot project (and the second pilot project in Whitecourt, Alberta) the
  barriers and opportunities for integrating health and wellbeing support strategies into real world
  housing projects in our region, both in larger and smaller municipalities
- working with our municipal members and industry partners to identify feasible solutions to
  barriers and to utilize identified opportunities where possible
- sharing lessons learned from the working group with our municipal members and industry
  partners
- including information and/or presentations as appropriate into our future annual events that attract
  municipal staff and leadership as well as those in industry and the private sector who are involved
  in development and planning in the Edmonton region
- including information and lessons learned as appropriate on our website, at our meetings and via
  other information dissemination vehicles
- participating in the planning and/or implementation of community engagement sessions when
  they occur in our municipalities
- helping identify training and other needs related to improving our built environments for health
  and wellbeing - and possible solutions - for our municipal members and industry partners
- helping give input to the project evaluation team regarding any evaluation needs that our
  membership may have as pertains to health and/or other co-benefits
- sharing with our members and partners, any additional opportunities they may have to participate
  in grant-related activities

We estimate the value of our in-kind contributions above to be at least $50,000 per year.

We look forward to a successful grant and to working with Dr. Karen Lee, her team and our municipal,
provincial and industry partners to improve housing developments and the health and wellbeing of our
residents, including our aging populations, in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Bruce
Chief Executive Officer

cc: Dr. Karen Lee, President & CEO, Global Fit Cities Inc.
2017/18 Housing Workplan

Motion

*That the Housing Committee approve the proposed 2017/18 Housing Workplan and that the Workplan be forwarded to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for consideration in the preparation of the Board’s 2017/18 Budget.*

Background


Attachments:

1. Proposed 2017/18 Housing Workplan
## Proposed 2017/18 Housing Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># in Priority</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approx. Start</th>
<th>Rationale for project</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC-2017/18-1</td>
<td>Regional Housing Plan</td>
<td>Phase 4 of Sub-Regional Planning Framework: The purpose of this project is to develop a regional housing plan; determining its format, prioritization criteria, targets and KPIs to monitor. The regional plan will consolidate sub-regional plans to identify regional housing priorities.</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Sub-Regional Planning Framework as approved by the Board in 2015. Report Evaluation and Adjustment to be approved annually after completion.</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC-2017/18-2</td>
<td>Our Affordable Future: Implementation</td>
<td>Phase 2 of Our Affordable Future: The purpose of the project is to identify priority actions to be carried out by CRB to support implementation.</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Our Affordable Future report in 2012.</td>
<td>$35,000 (annually)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC-2017/18-3</td>
<td>Marketing and Awareness Strategy</td>
<td>Develop and implement strategy to challenge misconceptions and promote the individual, community and wider societal benefits of non-market and market affordable housing as being integral to the future and prosperity of the Capital Region.</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>Identified as future work in the 2010 Capital Region Board Housing Plan. Review implementation of the Our Affordable Future Marketing &amp; Communications Program presented in 2012.</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $292,000

*Note: subject to funding, the successful ReEnvision Housing Symposium project will be expanded to include a broader scope of the CRB mandate as the 2017 Regional Symposium in the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee Work Plan.*
Jul 05 2016

Mr. Nolan Crouse
Chair
Capital Region Board
#1100 Bell Tower, 10104 – 103 Avenue
Edmonton AB T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Crouse:

I am responding to your letter, which the Office of the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, the Honourable Amarjeet Sohi, forwarded to me on May 4, 2016. You wrote concerning affordable housing in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, as well as the progress toward the development of a national housing strategy.

I am pleased to tell you that in addition to current federal investments of over $2 billion in housing, Budget 2016 provides an additional $2.3 billion, beginning in 2016-17, to give Canadians greater access to more affordable housing. A significant portion of this investment will be allocated to provinces and territories, through the Investment in Affordable Housing (IAH), which can identify communities where the need for affordable housing is greatest.

Under the IAH, provinces and territories have the flexibility to invest in a range of affordable housing programs in order to meet their local needs and priorities. Funding may be used to create new or to renovate affordable rental housing; to improve affordability such as through rent supplements; and, to foster safe independent living through accessibility modifications. For the Province of Alberta, the total federal investment will be over $42 million over the next two years.

For existing social housing, Budget 2016 includes meaningful short-term investments that will preserve affordability for low-income households living in social housing. As part of this, $574 million will be provided to renovate or retrofit existing social housing. Also, $30 million is provided to renew subsidies for all federally administered social housing projects with operating agreements expiring in the next two years on a transitional basis until the end of March 2018. Housing providers should contact provincial/territorial housing agencies to enquire about funding available in their province/territory.

These are transitional measures to bridge the next two years while consultations are undertaken to develop a national housing strategy.
Budget 2016 investments in affordable housing are part of the first phase of investments under the Social Infrastructure Fund (SIF). The national housing strategy is part of the next phase of SIF and the next step toward establishing our vision for housing in Canada.

I will be leading the strategy with support from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). Through consultations, broad engagement with Canadians, including provinces, territories and municipalities, Indigenous and other communities, key stakeholders and housing experts will be undertaken. In the coming months, we will seek views on how to improve housing outcomes for Canadians as a cornerstone for achieving broader socio-economic objectives.

The strategy will cover the entire housing continuum, from shelters to social and affordable housing, to market housing. We intend to create a strategy that will achieve a number of priorities, including identifying gaps and providing policy and program responses that recognize the diversity and evolving nature of housing needs across Canada.

The consultations will explore new and innovative ways of responding to persistent housing challenges, and we value the expertise and experience that Capital Region Board can contribute to this conversation. More information about the consultations, including key milestones, will be revealed in the coming weeks.

I hope this information is helpful in addressing your concerns. Thank you for supporting our efforts to improve housing outcomes for Canadians.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

The Honourable Jean-Yves Duclos, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Families, Children and Social Development