



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 Charlayne Thornton-Joe

Date: Sept 24, 2018

Email: charlaynetj@outlook.com Phone: 250-217-0776

Website: www.charlayne.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 X	
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__	Yes, according to the report, although new housing is generally unaffordable to low-income households, increasing middle-priced housing supply tends to increase lower-priced housing through filtering and over time as the new housing depreciates in value.
Our urban population grows approximately 1.5% annually. Although housing supply currently grows at about that rate, most new units are downtown or at the urban fringe. The <i>1.5% Neighbourhood Affordability Solution</i> (see below) sets neighbourhood infill targets.	3. Do you support the <i>1.5% Solution</i> neighbourhood housing growth targets? Yes X No__ Maybe X	Yes, I support the 1.5% solution neighbourhood housing growth targets generally but we need to see more larger units for families and as James Bay and Fairfield are already very dense, although they are efficient due to their proximity to downtown and local services they 1.5 may be too much for these already dense neighbourhoods.

Context	Questions	Comments
<p>Neighbourhoods' actual annual housing growth rate versus their 1.5% annual growth targets</p> <p>Legend: Blue house icon: The first number is the actual number of new units built annually during the 2001-2016 period, the second number reflects the 1.5% annual growth target. Green house icon: Green colour indicates the neighbourhood has exceeded the 1.5% annual growth target.</p> <p>Logos: Cities for Everyone, City of Victoria OCP, Talk to ARYZE</p>		<p>Cities for Everyone's 1.5% Neighbourhood Affordability Solution sets targets to increase neighbourhoods' housing supply by approximately 1.5% annually, to match the City's population growth rate.</p> <p>Most of this housing should be middle-priced (\$1,200-2,500 per month), so it is initially affordable to middle-income households, and becomes affordable to lower-income households as it depreciates in the future.</p> <p>This ensures that more lower- and middle-income households can afford suitable housing in walkable urban neighbourhoods.</p>
<p>Most residential neighbourhoods only allow two stories and limit densities, which excludes most <i>missing middle</i> housing (see below). Affordable housing requires upzoning.</p>	<p>4. Do you support upzoning:</p> <p>Neighbourhood-wide _____</p> <p>For all corner and larger lots _____</p> <p>Only on a case-by-case basis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>There is often no perfect scenario for upzoning so often it must be considered on a case by case basis. It may be a corner and larger lot but it may be next to a heritage house, or by approving upzoning may make to much of a change in the character of the neighbourhood.</p>
		<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"/></p> <p>For higher-priced housing _____</p> <p>Only on a case-by-case basis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Under no circumstances _____</p>	<p>Depending on each application, 5% might be good but in others 15% might work. If the units are larger for families we might want to consider a smaller percentage.</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 developments even if some neighbours object?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No _____ Maybe _____</p>	<p>I have supported reduction in parking even when neighbours have objected but often it depends on the parking availability in the neighbourhood, the proximity</p>

