



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 COLIN PLANT

Date 9.24.18

Email colin@colinplant.com

Phone 250-514-1439

Website www.colinplant.com

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 X | At the door housing is the #1 issue I am hearing. I agree. I have children and I see affordability becoming an issue more and more. Land use decisions the municipality makes must address this. |
| 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 X No ___ Maybe ___ | The solution to this is to not focus on only one segment of the housing continuum. We must look at the middle and lower levels as well. |
| Affordable infill (more compact housing types, such as multiplexes, townhouses and low-rise apartment buildings, within existing urban areas) is often opposed by neighborhoods who want to preserve existing conditions. | 3. Do you support affordable infill: In all neighborhoods X In some neighborhoods ___ Only on a case-by-case basis ___ In no existing neighborhoods ___ | All neighbourhoods need to take this into consideration. |
| 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 X For all corner and larger lots ___ Only on a case-by-case basis ___ | This is an area which will take time to educate the public about but must be considered if we truly wish to address affordability. |

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

| Context | Questions | Comments |
|--|--|---|
|  | | |
| <p>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.</p> | | |
| <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:</p> <p>For all new housing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X</p> <p>For higher-priced housing <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Only on a case-by-case basis <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Under no circumstances <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>I am pursuing this in Saanich by asking Saanich to have inclusionary zoning. It can't come soon enough.</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?</p> <p>Yes ___ No ___ Maybe X</p> | <p>This is a good idea in principle but we must keep in mind if there is transit, cycling and walking infrastructure in place to support this. Overall I am open to the idea.</p> |
| <p>Infill development often requires variances to allow taller buildings, higher densities and fewer parking spaces than codes require. Neighbors often oppose these variances.</p> | <p>7. Would you approve variances needed for medium-priced infill?</p> <p>Generally approve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X</p> <p>Generally reject <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Approve if _____</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 neighbors, would you:</p> <p>Reject it <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Approve it <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Approve if _____ X _____</p> | <p>If it is identified as possible then we need to consider it. What the local area plan suggests would need to be considered.</p> |
| <p>9. What other municipal affordability strategies do you support?</p> <p>Inclusionary zoning, pre-zoning, density bonussing, detached parking where appropriate, including bus passes, carshare, bikeshares as amenities.</p> | | |
| <p>10. Please let us know if you have other thoughts concerning our community's inaffordability problems and solutions?</p> <p>I think that this survey has been very interesting to fill out and I thank you for reaching out to me.</p> | | |