

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: Ned Taylor

Date: Saturday, September 22, 2018

Email: nedtaylor4saanich@gmail.com Phone: 250-477-8960 Website: www.votened.org

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	This will certainly be one of my top priorities if elected.
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 ___	We need to increase density and diversify our housing market in key urban areas where residents can walk, bus or bike to amenities.
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 _____ In some neighborhoods X Only on a case-by-case basis _____ In no existing neighborhoods _____	Certain neighbourhoods like Uptown, Shelbourne, along McKenzie/Quadra can certainly increase in density. However, it's also important that we protect rural areas such as Blenkinsop.
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 X	I believe we need to diversify our housing market by supporting much of what is in the image below, along with tiny homes, garden suites, lane way housing, and more.

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

<p><i>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.</i></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: For all new housing _____ For higher-priced housing _____ Only on a case-by-case basis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Under no circumstances _____</p>	<p>I'm certainly open to this, however it has to be done right so that we can still bring in new, quality developments into key areas.</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 X</p>	<p>I have to look at this at a case-by-case basis. If a development is close to amenities, transit, bike/sidewalk networks, then I'm definitely open to it.</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? Generally approve _____ Generally reject _____ Approve if: It makes sense for that neighbourhood</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: Reject it _____ Approve it _____ Approve if: It makes sense for that neighbourhood</p>	<p>I can't say that I'm going to automatically approve or reject developments with these circumstances. I have to be open to public input to certain developments when the time comes and look at each proposal in a case-by-case basis.</p>
<p>9. What other municipal affordability strategies do you support?</p> <p>I support working towards keeping property taxes under control so that residents can afford them. For many years now tax rates have been rising much faster than the rate of inflation, which is making it harder and harder for residents to get by. I also support improving our public transit system and active transportation network so that people can actually get to and from work, and to other areas of the region without being forced to own a vehicle.</p>		
<p>10. Please let us know if you have other thoughts concerning our community's inaffordability problems and solutions?</p> <p>I appreciate the constructive questions you ask on how to increase supply, density and diversity in our housing market. These are important issues and if I'm elected addressing housing affordability will be one of my top priorities.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>		