

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 1:31 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: redefinition of social housing

From: Letizia Waddington s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 6:22 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: redefinition of social housing

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

For the record, I am opposed to the change in definition for social housing. As you know from listening to years of community members suffering from high rent, a definition that eliminates people on pensions will be a tragedy.

Moreover, this tragedy is well documented through reports from city staff and minutes of all the council meetings taken up by that question of definition and of percentages of social housing needed to meet the housing crisis in Vancouver.

Keeping the definition as it is will not by itself solve the problem but it will significantly avoid making it much worse.

I work as the Housing Coordinator at Jewish Family Services where I meet many low-income people, including people who work at low wages. If they don't have children or are under 60, they cannot have any access to rent relief. Where are they going to live ?

As leaders of our city, please consider creating the legacy of a sound housing strategy, one that will keep the 25 % of low income inhabitants safely inside homes.

Sincerely,

Letizia Waddington

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 1:31 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Public hearing: DODP Amendments

From: Wendy Pedersen
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 9:32 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public hearing: DODP Amendments

Hello Mayor and Council, I hope you will agree to amend the plan and define social housing with at least "50% deep core need." I think "deep core" covers everyone with fixed incomes including pensioners, people on welfare and others. If you set a higher firm bar then everyone will strive to reach it. If you set a low bar, then everyone will relax and know they can always fall back on that. This new definition will send a message to people on fixed low incomes that they are wanted and are included ---and be one small measure toward ending homelessness.

Wendy Pedersen

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Vancouver, Coast Salish Territories

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 3:22 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Proposed Amendments to the Downtown Official Development Plan

From: Foster Ranney 5.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 11:36 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Downtown Official Development Plan

To the Mayor and Council of Vancouver,

I have a comment to register regarding the planned change to the definition of "social housing."

The city's proposed new definition of "social housing" states that "the citywide target in new social housing is 50% at income assistance or Household Income Limits (HILs) and 50% at affordable market rents." This is transparently unacceptable. "Social housing" refers to a welfare program in which people with low or precarious incomes gain access to housing below (artificially inflated) market rates, and the price of social housing must be defined relative to the other options available to that group (e.g., shelter and SRO options). The use of "or" in "income assistance or HILs" clearly allows property owners to classifying their buildings as "social housing" even when their units are unaffordable to poor or precariously employed persons. This implication is obvious to all thinking persons who read the proposed definition.

Social housing in Vancouver must be defined as units renting at welfare shelter rates or below. Otherwise the phrase is abused. To impose other definitions borders on a campaign of deliberate misinformation. Canada has pledged to guarantee adequate housing to all persons within her borders, as the nation's signature on United Nations agreements such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights attests. To define "social housing" in a way that would allow for the complete exclusion of the genuinely poor only creates a shelter for exploitation.

- Foster Ranney

--

Foster A. Ranney, PhD Student
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC
Territories of the Musqueam, Squamish, Sto:lo, and Tsleil-Waututh Nations

--

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 3:56 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Follow up regarding your questions at the Public Hearing for the DODP
Attachments: mayorandcouncil_Downtown Official Development Plan.docx

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential **On Behalf Of** Noy Leksinski
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 2:05 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Follow up regarding your questions at the Public Hearing for the DODP

Hi Mayor and Council,

It was my first time and I certainly learned a lot. I've attached my speech from the Public Hearing for your reference.

After some considerations of your questions, I want to propose some changes to the proposed amendments that I think will satisfy social housing advocates, developers and the public, as well as help the City to meet its social housing mandate. You will see the three specific changes, as well as the reasoning below.

The definition of social housing should be:

"Social Housing" means rental units:

(a) in which the dwelling units are occupied by households with incomes below housing income limits, as set out in the current "Housing Income Limits" table published by the British Columbia Housing Management Commission, or equivalent publication; or

(b) in which dwelling units are designed for persons receiving War Veterans Allowance, Canadian Pension Commission Disability Pension, Guaranteed Income Supplement, Spouses Allowance or income from Guaranteed Annual Income for Need

(c) which is owned by a non-profit corporation, by a non-profit co-operative association, or by or on behalf of the city, the Province of British Columbia, or Canada; and

(d) in respect of which the registered owner or ground lessee of the freehold or leasehold title to the land on which the housing is situate has granted to the city a section 219 covenant, housing agreement, or other security for the housing commitments required by the city, registered against the freehold or leasehold title, with such priority of registration as the city may require;

Reasoning: It adds back in those neediest while ensuring that market rental units do not count as social housing. If social housing units are part of a building, they should be referred to as a mixed market/social housing building.

Section 3.13

This should be amended to allow the DPB to increase FSR to allowable maximum if social housing comprises 30% of the building (this is a density bonus). Beyond allowable FSR, this should be

referred to a rezoning and undergo an Open House, Public Hearing and City Council approval or until a new neighbourhood plan can be re-drafted.

Reasoning: Here is the incentive for developers to build social housing. At the same time, it respects the neighbourhood input for density beyond allowable limit. At the same time, the city should work with the neighbourhood to redefine allowable limits in their neighbourhood. This prevents spot rezonings, and gives the DPB guidelines on allowable limits with public input. Some plans have not been updated since the 90's.

Sections 2, 3, 6 and 7 of Miscellaneous Amendments about changing the Director of Planning and the Development Permit Board's "duties" to "authorities" should not be changed at all. The proposed revised language provides the authority to enforce the By-law, without requiring its enforcement in all cases as a duty.

Reasoning: Unelected officials should not be given the flexibility to decide in which cases they will follow the law. This may not even be legal in that it gives the DOP and DPB the ability to not enforce the law.

I look forward to hearing your thoughts and hope you will see that these compromises will ensure that everyone gets something. And I would like to see another lawsuit avoided if possible. We can't move forward with our aim to build social and affordable housing if we are busy fighting each other in court.

Best regards,

Noy Leksinski

5.22(1) Personal and Confidential

"I am grateful for rain puddles after the storm."

March 24, 2015

Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP)

My name is Noy Leksinski and I live in Downtown South. This is my first time at a Public Hearing, but I strongly felt I had to speak out against the proposed changes to the Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP) and urge the Mayor and City Council to vote against these amendments. I attended the Public Open House and spoke with many city officials who repeatedly said these changes were to help build more social housing, but the change in this definition actually hinders social housing development and allows for abuse of this broad definition.

This new definition of social housing requires that only 30% of units in a given building be set aside for social housing. This means that regardless of the remaining rents of 70% of the other units, all units will count as social housing. **Correct me if I am wrong, if we have a building of 100 units in which 30 is social housing and 70 is market rate, then the building is said to contain 100 social housing units?** This is purposely misleading and it's just bad math. In the case of Jubilee House at 508 Helmcken, the neighbourhood was told the density was to allow for more social housing to be built, when in fact, it was only replacing the existing 87 units. The other 75 units are low end of market rate. Additionally, they are tiny units. Meanwhile, the developer was granted a bonus density for an additional 488 market units. Out of the 650 units of this land-swap project, only 87 will be social housing. This is a clear example of how these proposed changes fail social housing and allows for abuse.

The neighbourhood also loses. When members of the neighbourhood spoke out against the bonus density, they were accused of NIMBYism and being against social housing in their area when really the neighbourhood was against a massive tower that did not fit the neighbourhood. At the Public Open House for **THESE** proposed changes, I was made to feel like a NIMBYist for even asking questions. The City is using social housing to stop public outcry against their practices of allowing developers unlimited density for projects that don't actually give back enough to social housing or the neighbourhood.

This leads me to another concerning issue regarding the proposed amendments, and please correct me if I am wrong. It seems to me that Section 3.13 allows the Development Permit Board to permit an unlimited increase in density of any development that includes social housing. Allowing the Development Permit Board the authority to award density bonus, even with City Council approval removes the requirement of a Public Hearing and public consultation. Any change in FSR beyond allowable limits should be considered a rezoning and require public input.

Additionally, I only found last night a report entitled Miscellaneous Amendments in which sections 2, 3, 6 and 7 seems to be about changing the Director of Planning and the Development Permit Board's "duties" to "authorities". The proposed revised language provides the authority to enforce the By-law, without requiring its enforcement in all cases as a duty. This would have given the Director of Planning the ability to ignore the court's ruling in the 1099 Richards and 508 Helmcken matter and allowed construction to continue. Unelected officials should not be given the flexibility to decide in which cases they will follow the law.

Mayor and Council, there is a lot of misinformation in these proposed changes, the presentation of this material to the public was sloppy and it is your duty to refer this back to staff for work. It is not your authority to decide which information you want to bury deep in miscellaneous documents and which stakeholders you want to listen to. Rather than making changes to try to satisfy legal issues, staff should reach out to local social housing advocates and key neighbourhood representatives to really draft a plan that encourages more social and affordable housing, while maintaining the character and livability of our neighbourhoods.

We must densify and create more social housing stock. We are all aware of that, but we need densification that makes sense. If the City is really committed to building social and affordable housing and a livable city, you must go back and update the neighbourhood plans in consultation with the residents. You must not rush forward to tear down existing social housing stock without a concrete plan to build more that fits the neighbourhood.

Mayor Robertson, you have called for 5000 units of social housing to be added by 2021. This new definition of social housing allows you to consider market rental units in that number. **It is bad math and an outright lie.** All City Council members, as well as City staff who prepared this, should take a step back, examine your moral compass, and ask yourself if this is the notion you had of yourself when you entered civic work. If you are aware of unethical behaviour in the city's processes and relationships, you must bring that information forward.

To move forward as a city, we must be brave, imaginative and decent. Brave enough to stand up to large corporations who may put profits ahead of social responsibility. Imaginative in our solutions beyond tearing down and building towers that are increasing the socioeconomic divide in our city. Above all else, we must be decent and protect those most vulnerable. These amendments do none of that, and that is why it is your duty to vote no to these amendments.

Thank you.

Nov Leksinski

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



Kennett, Bonnie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2015 11:41 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Follow up regarding your questions at the Public Hearing for the DODP

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential **On Behalf Of** Noy Leksinski
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 9:10 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: Follow up regarding your questions at the Public Hearing for the DODP

Mayor and Council,

After consulting with some people with more experience working in social housing, I would like to recommend that you instead adopt the national housing agency's (CMHC) definition of social housing. This definition also adds back those neediest while ensuring that market rental rates do not count as social housing. If social housing units are part of a building, they should be referred to as a mixed market/social housing building.

"Social housing is housing subsidized by governments (often developed in collaboration with the private and public not-for-profit sector) that is made available to those who would otherwise be unable to afford to live in suitable and adequate housing in the private market. Client groups for social housing include low-income singles and families, recent immigrants, lone-parents, seniors, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal people, and victims of domestic violence."

Best regards,

Noy Leksinski

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

"I am grateful for rain puddles after the storm."

On Wed, Mar 25, 2015 at 2:05 PM, Noy Leksinski s.22(1) Personal and Confidential wrote:
Hi Mayor and Council,

It was my first time and I certainly learned a lot. I've attached my speech from the Public Hearing for your reference.

After some considerations of your questions, I want to propose some changes to the proposed amendments that I think will satisfy social housing advocates, developers and the public, as well as help the City to meet its social housing mandate. You will see the three specific changes, as well as the reasoning below.

The definition of social housing should be:

"Social Housing" means rental units:

(a) in which the dwelling units are occupied by households with incomes below housing income limits, as set out in the current "Housing Income Limits" table published by the British Columbia Housing Management Commission, or equivalent publication; or

(b) in which dwelling units are designed for persons receiving War Veterans Allowance, Canadian Pension Commission Disability Pension, Guaranteed Income Supplement, Spouses Allowance or income from Guaranteed Annual Income for Need

(c) which is owned by a non-profit corporation, by a non-profit co-operative association, or by or on behalf of the city, the Province of British Columbia, or Canada; and

(d) in respect of which the registered owner or ground lessee of the freehold or leasehold title to the land on which the housing is situate has granted to the city a section 219 covenant, housing agreement, or other security for the housing commitments required by the city, registered against the freehold or leasehold title, with such priority of registration as the city may require;

Reasoning: It adds back in those neediest while ensuring that market rental units do not count as social housing. If social housing units are part of a building, they should be referred to as a mixed market/social housing building.

Section 3.13

This should be amended to allow the DPB to increase FSR to allowable maximum if social housing comprises 30% of the building (this is a density bonus). Beyond allowable FSR, this should be referred to a rezoning and undergo an Open House, Public Hearing and City Council approval or until a new neighbourhood plan can be re-drafted.

Reasoning: Here is the incentive for developers to build social housing. At the same time, it respects the neighbourhood input for density beyond allowable limit. At the same time, the city should work with the neighbourhood to redefine allowable limits in their neighbourhood. This prevents spot rezonings, and gives the DPB guidelines on allowable limits with public input. Some plans have not been updated since the 90's.

Sections 2, 3, 6 and 7 of Miscellaneous Amendments about changing the Director of Planning and the Development Permit Board's "duties" to "authorities" should not be changed at all. The proposed revised language provides the authority to enforce the By-law, without requiring its enforcement in all cases as a duty.

Reasoning: Unelected officials should not be given the flexibility to decide in which cases they will follow the law. This may not even be legal in that it gives the DOP and DPB the ability to not enforce the law.

I look forward to hearing your thoughts and hope you will see that these compromises will ensure that everyone gets something. And I would like to see another lawsuit avoided if possible. We can't move forward with our aim to build social and affordable housing if we are busy fighting each other in court.

Best regards,

Noy Leksinski

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential