

Topics

Introduction

The Need for Social Housing

How does this Amendment deliver Social Housing

Stated Goals of this Amendment?

Concerns with Current Amendment as presented

A Better Option



The Need for Social Housing

It is largely accepted that rising costs in the City, have also increased the need for REAL social housing capacity. Numerous surveys support this logic.

Survey suggests
90% agree

Does not imply 90% agree
with this amendment

<35% of all Social
Housing in the city
lies in these zones

Goal should be to target 100%
of existing Social Housing for
Senior Govt Funding, not just
35% today

Buildings developed
could have as little as
30% for Social
Housing.

Ambiguity in definition of
Social Housing, allows for
misinterpretation. RM4, RM3
are targeted due to high
potential of Market Rent



How does this amendment Deliver Social Housing?

This example shows the concerns from many existing below market renters and other existing low rental options. E.g. Informed Co-Op tenants, affordable renters

Example Existing Property (12,000 Sqft lot RM4)	Current Property	Under this Amendment
Total Potential Floorspace	(1.45 FSR) - 17,400 sqft	(2.5 FSR) 30,000 sqft
Low Income/Below Market Floor Space	17,400 sqft	9000 sqft
Market or near market	-	21,000sqft
Total gain/loss of Social		17,400-9000 = 8400 sqft loss of Social Housing. And 21,000 sqft market rental gain.



Stated Goals for those supporting this amendment

A number of statements are made as to why this amendment should be approved, however there are numerous other ways to accomplish these goals

- 01 | “To set up non-profits to leverage senior government funding programs temporarily in place”
- 02 | “1st priority is to renewing the existing social housing stock”

So why do we need a amendment to accomplish this, and why are we focussing on zones with <35% of the existing Social Housing stock?



Concerns with current amendment as written

1

Numerous references and important items which are defined by language such as “typical”, “where possible”, “should”, “where practical”

2

Important items such as setbacks as well as others are left as “at the discretion of the Director or Planning”. These are often important items which affect the community for generations.

3

Ambiguity in the definition of Social Housing with the City (only 30% of the units need to be social to call it 100% social).

4

As has been seen in other cities in North America where similar policies have allowed advantageous zoning, many Non-Profits have become developers and driven up low cost housing, but increased their cashflow/asset base. No checks or balances exist in this amendment to prevent this.

Better Options



If time is of the essence to gain Senior Govt money, that is available for a finite period of time, and the need to refresh/enhance existing stock, a “fast track” process should be put in place,, that includes 100% of the social housing stock (not <35% as this amendment does).

Also data emerging Post COVID, suggest the makeup of social and supportive housing in the coming decade will be different, and any projections based on previous data may be inaccurate (2016 data was presented)

Ask council to reject this amendment and ask the City to implement a fastrack rezoning process, similar to SHORT, which can be used for 100% of existing Co-Op and Social sites, to take advantage of this funding and ensure more social housing is created.

This catches 100% of Social, and council would not be putting in place a amendment which would remain, even after funding ceased to be available. Rezoning amendment is a permanent change which will still be in effect after the funding ceases and is open for abuse.