



Cities for Everyone

Cities for Everyone supports more affordable housing and transportation, in order to provide security, mobility and opportunity for people with all incomes and abilities

www.citiesforeveryone.org

Municipal Candidates Affordability Survey

Please fill out this survey and return to info@citiesforeveryone.org by 24 September 2018.

Candidate Name **TREVOR BARRY**

Date **23-Sep-2018**

Email trevor4saanich@gmail.com Phone _____ Website - Trevor4saanich.ca

For more information see the [Victoria Affordability Backgrounder](#) and other documents at www.citiesforeveryone.org.

Context	Questions	Comments
Our region is considered unaffordable, based on income-to-cost ratios (households spending no more than 45% of income on housing and transport), and low rental vacancy rates.	1. What priority do you give to local efforts to increase affordability? Low ___ Medium ___ High ___	I'm especially concerned about millennials wishing to raise young families.
Many middle-income households (\$40-80k per year) spend more on housing and transport than is affordable, and so want more middle-priced (\$1,200-2,500 per month) housing in walkable urban neighbourhoods.	2. Do you support efforts to increase middle- as well as lower-income affordability? Yes ___ No ___ Maybe ___	To the extent that lower income issue is met through accessibility/mobility efficiency improvements foremost.
Affordable infill (more compact housing types, such as multiplexes, townhouses and low-rise apartment buildings, within existing urban areas) is often opposed by neighbourhoods who want to preserve existing conditions.	3. Do you support affordable infill: In all neighborhoods _____ In some neighborhoods _____ Only on a case-by-case basis _____ In no existing neighbourhoods _____	along urban corridors (I am speaking from a Saanich perspective) and radially from centres/nodes.
Most residential neighbourhoods only allow two stories and limited densities, which excludes most <i>missing middle</i> housing (see below). Affordable housing requires upzoning.	4. Do you support upzoning: Neighbourhood-wide _____ For all corner and larger lots _____ Only on a case-by-case basis _____	neighbourhood-wide along corridors, all corner and larger lots on corridors and radially from centres/nodes.



The "missing middle" includes moderate density housing types such as multiplexes, townhomes and low-rise apartments. These are generally the least costly houses to develop.

Municipal Candidate Affordability Survey
Cities for Everyone (www.citiesforeveryone.org)

<p>Many jurisdictions have <i>inclusionary</i> mandates which require that a portion (typically 5-15%) of new units be priced below market rates. However, if this requirement is excessive it can reduce the number of new units built.</p>	<p>5. Do you support mandates: For all new housing _____ For higher-priced housing _____ Only on a case-by-case basis _____ Under no circumstances _____</p>	<p>I chose “higher priced” but this can be interpreted as “the average cost per square foot meets a benchmark”</p> <p>Preference would be differential mil rates by zone/performance. +the first \$100k in assessed value exempt from property tax as a “personal basic allowance”</p>
<p>Urban parking typically costs \$10-60k per space, and an increasing portion of households are car-free. For affordability and fairness sake many experts recommend reducing parking requirements so occupants are not forced to pay for costly spaces they do not need.</p>	<p>6. Do you support reduced parking requirements for infill housing, even if some neighbours object? Yes ___ No ___ Maybe ___</p>	<p>...and in Saanich the answer to NIMBY parking is to have all paid parking everywhere (+resident only) and do enforcement through apps/ crowdsourcing! plus everybody should be issued residency card with \$500 annual credit toward parking, transit, uber, ubike, etc.</p>
<p>Infill development often requires variances to allow taller buildings, higher densities and fewer parking spaces than codes require. Neighbours often oppose these variances.</p>	<p>7. Would you approve variances needed for medium-priced infill? Generally approve _____ Generally reject _____ Approve if _____</p>	<p>see above with respect to parking (but let’s divorce parking from residency e.g. in [new] stratas)</p> <p>height - depending on view cones and neighbourly agreements.</p>
<p>Saanich’s <i>Official Community Plan</i> allows up to eight story residential buildings in <i>neighbourhood centres</i>, but some residents consider these too tall and dense.</p>	<p>8. If a proposed development meets OCP guidelines and includes moderate-priced units (less than \$600k), but is opposed by some neighbours, would you: Reject it _____ Approve it _____ Approve if _____</p>	<p>hedging here... IF is conditional on balancing NIMBY concerns with right mix of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - step code above baseline - social housing - renewable energy - car co-op, etc. - walkscore, etc. - no EDPA-esque concerns
<p>9. What other municipal affordability strategies do you support?</p> <p>as per above, since housing is a human right, no more FLAT (regressive) property taxes: a certain basic personal amount of assessed value of a primary residence, per primary resident inhabitant should be tax free, with marginal revenue-neutral rate applied above that threshold.</p> <p>Also, more density (prioritisation, e.g. faster, ahead of less strategic applications) based on walk-score and transit service levels... as a way to address the forgotten truth that “Affordability” = housing + mobility (transportation) ... reduce the costs of mobility, and what is often conflated as “housing affordability” - these concerns become assuaged.</p>		

Municipal Candidate Affordability Survey
Cities for Everyone (www.citiesforeveryone.org)

10. Please let us know if you have other thoughts concerning our community's inaffordability problems and solutions?

BCgov Speculation Tax is not designed properly. Opposition condo flipping measure should happen, but is kind of obvious. Speculation should be handed through limitations on foreign investment, limited housing size on agricultural land, capital gains, and goofy things like the bare trust loophole.

As a municipality, we should fight at UBCM for legislative powers to differentiate mil rates by zone...

As above, a "personal basic amount" of Saanich-related things should be given to each resident for free, with higher marginal costs applied above the threshold: e.g.

\$100k property tax exemption idea should grow harmonically by number of primary residents.
- 10,000 L of drinking water ; \$500 in mobility services; \$500 in rec centre passes, etc.