

Town of Sidney
Housing Needs Assessment
Appendices

October 2019



APPENDIX A BACKGROUND DOCUMENT REVIEW

As part of the Housing Needs Assessment for the Town of Sidney, the following information sources were reviewed to identify any information relating to housing:

- Town of Sidney Official Community Plan, 2007
- Town of Sidney Zoning Bylaw, 2012
- West Side Local Area Plan
- Downtown Local Area Plan, 2008
- Saanich Peninsula Affordable Housing Needs Assessment Report, 2016
- Recent affordable housing initiatives in Sidney (from the Town of Sidney Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes, April 1, 2019)

Town of Sidney Official Community Plan, 2007

The OCP articulates an overall vision of the Town of Sidney as balanced, vibrant, waterfront community with a revitalized town centre which caters to residents, visitors, and businesses through the provision of a broad range of services.

There are six planning principles in Town of Sidney’s OCP, including smart growth (i.e. compact, complete communities) and attainable housing. For attainable housing, the Town “shall encourage a wide range of housing by type, tenure, and price to ensure that people of all ages, household types and incomes have a diversity of housing choice.”

The OCP recognizes the eight strategies within the Capital Regional District’s (CRD) Regional Growth Strategy. One of the strategies is to improve housing affordability by allowing varied residential densities, types, and forms throughout Sidney to encourage housing for all income groups.

Residential Lands

Sidney has a limited supply of undeveloped lands and is largely built-out. This combined with a prominent senior’s population has led to a dominant development and housing market towards new-multi-residential housing. Sidney’s policies also intend to ensure the form and character of single-family areas are maintained while higher densities are directed to select areas.

In terms of affordable housing and groups in need of housing, a few of Sidney’s policy objectives are intended to encourage:

- Housing for households with children and households comprised of young adults

- Housing for all income groups
- Adaptable housing for persons with special needs

The policy objectives also support a mix of housing densities in Sidney.

Sidney's policies on inclusive and attainable housing are:

- Housing for those with special needs as well as attainable non-market housing is considered a desirable component in new and existing residential areas and is encouraged.
- In an effort to enable the citizens of Sidney to "age in place", the Town shall support the provision of a range of senior's housing and alternative care options – proximity and accessibility to services and amenities is encouraged
- The development of secondary suites is encouraged within areas zoned to permit single-family dwellings
- The Town may consider bonus density, site coverage, parking relaxations or other development variances for development proposals with affordable housing
- Explore housing development opportunities on key sites and to continue to work with government agencies, developers, social service agencies, faith-based organizations, and other community resources to develop and maintain affordable housing and related support services
- Consideration will be given to the preparation of a future comprehensive Housing Strategy, including issues related to:
 - a. The provision of affordable (attainable) housing
 - b. The provision of family-oriented housing
 - c. The provision of seniors' housing
 - d. The retention of the "small town character" of Sidney

Town of Sidney Zoning Bylaw, 2012

The permitted housing types in the residential zones of Sidney are highlighted below. There are three broad categories: detached residential zones, multi-family residential zones, and comprehensive development zones.

Zone	Permitted Residential Uses
Detached Residential Zone	
R1 – Single-Family Low Density Residential	Low density single-family housing
R1.1 – Single-Family Residential	Low density single-family housing; secondary suite
R1.2 / R1.3 -- Single-Family High Density Residential - Swiftsure Area / Orchard Area	Small-lot single-family housing; low density single-family housing; secondary suite; detached secondary dwelling
R2 – Single- and Two-family Residential	Mixture of low density single-family housing; secondary suite and two-family housing
R3 -- Single-Family and Couplet High Density Residential	Attached couplet housing; small-lot single-family housing; low density single-family housing; secondary suite; detached secondary dwellings
R5 -- Urban Single and Two-Family Residential	Small-lot single-family housing; two-family dwellings; secondary suite; detached secondary dwellings
Multi-Family Residential Zone	
RM5 -- Multi-Family Low Density Residential	Attached row housing; multi-family housing at a maximum height of 2.5 storeys; single- and two-family housing
RM6 -- Multi-Family Medium Density Residential	Attached row housing; multi-family housing at a maximum height of 3 storeys; single- and two-family housing
RM7 -- Multi-Family High	Attached row housing at a maximum height of 3 storeys; high

Zone	Permitted Residential Uses
Density Residential	density multi-family housing at a maximum height of 4 storeys, and single- and two-family housing
RM-C – Care-oriented residential	To provide for Abbeyfield, congregate care, and assisted living housing, with a market apartment dwelling component.
Comprehensive Development Zones (Special zones that are created to reflect specific developments, usually single-site development)	
e.g. 10030 Resthaven Dr.	To provide land for a Seniors Centre with a Residential and Institutional component to provide assisted living

Sidney’s zoning bylaw contains a section on Adaptable Housing Design Standards and requires twenty-percent of new units to meet this standard.

The bylaw defines adaptable housing as an approach to residential design and construction in which dwelling units can be modified, at minimal cost, to meet occupants’ changing needs over time. These include basic accessibility features in common areas; design and construction features to support installation of grab bars; accessible position of electrical outlets, switches, and doors and faucet handles.

West Side Local Area Plan, 2017

The West Side Local Area Plan identified the following key directions on affordable housing:

- There is significant demand for workforce and attainable/affordable housing in Sidney and the Saanich Peninsula.
- Affordable housing is part of the vision for the future of the West Side. West Side already has more attainable housing than other Sidney neighbourhoods and offers opportunities for the future.
- Higher densities (5-6 storeys) are possible in the West Side if attainable/affordable units are provided.

Downtown Local Area Plan, 2008

The Downtown Local Area Plan identifies a lack of attainable housing as one of the major challenges to attracting younger residents. The following policies are supportive of attainable housing:

- Promote mixed-use commercial development with opportunities to accommodate various forms of attainable housing on vacant lands south of the Mary Winspear Community Centre.
- Attainable housing was identified as one of the preferred land uses for several of the opportunity sites (Memorial Park Society Lands, Fifth / Seventh Street Block South, Seaport Place Lands).

The plan also included the consideration to reduce DCCs for developments that include attainable housing, a tool that has been used by the Town in recent years.

Saanich Peninsula Affordable Housing Needs Assessment Report, 2016

This report found that “based on the rental market data that are available for Sidney, there appears to be a severe under supply of affordable, and market priced rental housing units available on the peninsula”.

The report shows that the Sidney Lions Food Bank served a total of 990 individuals (372 households) in March 2016. The Sidney Lions Food Bank serves clients living in the Saanich Peninsula area, including in Sidney. The majority (67%) of the households accessing the Sidney Food Bank lived in private market rental housing 17% indicated they lived in on reserve. A small number of households reported they were homeless.

Recent affordable housing initiatives in Sidney (from the Town of Sidney Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes, April 1, 2019)

Sidney’s Council approved the Greater Victoria Development Society affordable housing project, a 56-unit affordable housing project with a covenant in place to ensure it remains a rental property. The Town offered several incentives to support the project, including a tax exemption and waivers of permit fees and development cost charges.

APPENDIX B BEST PRACTICES

Best and emerging practices offer insights, tools, and approaches to address challenges related to housing in Sidney. Research findings are drawn from across British Columbia, as communities in this geographic region share common social, political, economic, and regulatory contexts.

Families and workers in the Town are experiencing significant challenges with the availability and affordability of appropriate housing options. The population of adults 65 and over is growing faster than other age groups, though stakeholders report that this trend may be changing with more families moving into the community in recent years. There is a need to ensure that affordable and appropriate service and housing options are available across the housing and care continuum for adults 65 and over, while also increasing affordable options for others.

The best practices research is organized around six themes that support housing options across the housing continuum:

- Gentle density
- Downtown revitalization
- Local government incentives and regulations
- Partnerships and innovative arrangements
- Options for seniors
- Public engagement

This review recognizes that any new initiatives build on significant work that has already been done in Sidney to diversify the housing stock.

Gentle Density

Best Practices	Community	Description
Encourage infill development in single family neighbourhoods through accessory dwelling units	Canmore	Canmore incentivizes the installation of secondary suites. Homeowners are eligible for reimbursement of up to 50% of expenses to the maximum of \$10,000. Homeowners must commit to rent the suite to a Canmore resident at 10% below market rental rate for 5 years.

Best Practices	Community	Description
	District of West Vancouver	<p>The District amended their OCP and Zoning Bylaw to permit detached secondary suites in all residential zones that already permit secondary suites. To ensure development matches the neighbourhood, the District requires applicants to obtain form and character development permit for siting and building / landscaping.</p> <p>To encourage uptake, the District provides comprehensive information guides to assist prospective applicants with the design and development process.</p>
	City of North Vancouver	<p>Secondary suites and coach houses area allowed on lots zoned for single family development. The City chose to allow both options on the same lot in an effort to increase the availability and affordability of rental housing, while offering homeowners opportunities for additional income and accommodating extended family members.</p> <p>Secondary suites are allowed in all single family dwellings and duplexes. Since 2017, coach houses are allowed in addition to secondary suites, provided a development permit is secured and the property maintains compliance with allowable density.</p>
	SFU University	<p>The City of Burnaby worked with SFU University to allow lock-off suites (“secondary suites in the sky”) in multi-family developments. Lock-off suites condo dwellers to rent their suite for additional income and provide flexibility over time as family needs change, meaning they can support the needs of young homebuyers needing a mortgage helper or extra bedroom for a growing family, as well as seniors who require live-in care or want to have extra space for visiting family. They have been reported to be popular with buyers.</p>
	Richmond	<p>The City requires all new single-family developments to be built with secondary suites. As renovating existing homes to allow for secondary suites is a major financial and technical hurdle for many homeowners, this requirement means that there is a large stock of ready-built secondary suites in the community. Homebuyers can use the suites as mortgage helpers, for family members, or as extra space,</p>

Best Practices	Community	Description
		allowing a high level of flexibility as a household's needs change over time.
Explore ways to connect those with extra space with those with housing need	Vancouver	Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood House has a pilot project that matches seniors living at home with student / worker tenants who need rental housing, so the seniors can maintain their housing.

Downtown Revitalization

Best Practices	Community	Description
<p>Complete a community visioning process for the downtown core / revitalization strategy*</p> <p>*The Town Council adopted a Downtown Local Area Plan in 2008 but, 11 years on, components of this plan may need a refresh.</p>	Chemainus	A Town Centre Revitalization Plan was developed to provide a roadmap for increasing the density and vibrancy of the community core. The plan envisions redeveloping older, single-storey buildings into three or four-storey mixed-used buildings that include both commercial and residential.
	Courtenay	<p>Downtown Courtenay Playbook: A Partnership Action Plan is the result of a public and multi-stakeholder engagement process that brought partners to the table to image the redevelopment of the downtown core. It identifies opportunities and roles for all partners, not just the municipality, with the goal of creating a more compact and vibrant downtown for all ages.</p> <p>To support the goal of downtown revitalization the plan identifies a few strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a Revitalization Tax Exemption Bylaw • Encouraging more downtown residents • Completing an infill housing study to establish incentive programs, design guidelines, and housing forms that make use of underutilized properties • Developing an incentive program that assists residential development

Best Practices	Community	Description
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing and re-evaluating current zoning and Development Permit Guidelines • Developing site specific guidelines for key development sites • Permitting process assistance and prioritization • Exploring financial feasibility of development options

Local Government Incentives and Regulations

Best Practices	Community	Description
Design and implement a package of municipal incentives for priority unit types (e.g., affordable, attainable, adaptable, 3+ bedrooms, etc.)	Kelowna	The City’s Healthy Housing Strategy includes a suite of incentives aimed at increasing affordability of rental and market housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax incentive program to allow <u>all</u> purpose-built rental housing projects to apply for a 100% municipal tax exemption. Eligible projects must be located within certain areas (including the Urban Core Area and University South) and constructed to Step 4 of the Energy Step Code. • DCC grant for non-market, purpose-built affordable rental housing. The annual budget allocated to offset the cost of DCC’s is \$120,000. The recent strategy recommending increasing that amount to \$180,000. • Identifying potential municipally-owned land for affordable housing.
	Nanaimo	The City’s Affordable Housing Strategy aims to develop a package of incentives that includes density bonus for 100% rental housing, reducing or waiving of community amenity contributions, parking relaxations

Best Practices	Community	Description
		<p>in transit nodes and corridors, financial incentives, and concurrent processing.</p> <p>The City is exploring the possibility of additional incentives where a share of the rental units is available at below market rent levels, targeting households with low and moderate incomes. The incentives being explored include revitalization agreements for lowering property taxes when below-market rents are secured for a period of time, additional density, and reduced parking standards near transit.</p>
<p>Density bonusing for priority unit types (e.g., affordable, attainable, adaptable, 3+ bedrooms, etc.) *</p> <p>*There are precedents in Sidney to the practices described here (e.g., the West Side Local Area Plan).</p>	Coquitlam	<p>Through its Zoning Bylaw, the City offers density bonusing for “priority unit types” which are defined in the OCP as below-market rental units, non-market rental units, accessible units, or units with three or more bedrooms.</p>
	Sechelt	<p>Offers a 2% density bonus for every 10% of the total number of units built adaptable and accessible in a development, based on a maximum density of 11 units/ha). The Zoning Bylaw also stipulates that no less than 20% of any density bonus units in a development will consider of Affordable Housing for Groups in Need.</p>
	Burnaby	<p>Burnaby’s Community Benefit Bonus (CBB) offers additional density to developers in four town centre areas in Burnaby in exchange for providing affordable housing, social amenities, or a combination of the two:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bonus is implemented through a zoning bylaw, which includes base densities and ultimate densities, and provides clear guidelines for assessing bonus density proposals. • In the case of affordable housing, the city wishes to receive and maintain title to the affordable units created in a development under the CBB. It then leases the units to a non-profit organization, which selects eligible

Best Practices	Community	Description
		<p>residents and, if required, supports the residents in their homes with appropriate assistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The non-profit also participates in the design of the units, which are constructed for particular resident groups.
<p>Introduce inclusionary zoning for priority unit types or cash-in-lieu*</p> <p>*Inclusionary Zoning means the establishment of zoning regulations that require affordable housing development. In some cases, it may be a percentage of the developed units that must be affordable, some allow off-site construction of the affordable units, while others allow cash-in-lieu paid into a housing fund.</p> <p>The concept is based on the premise that the developer achieves added value by increasing the development capacity of the land and can therefore afford to give something back to the municipality in terms of needed housing or community services.</p>	<p>Kelowna</p>	<p>To increase supply of affordable housing through new development, Kelowna’s land use regulations include a combination of inclusionary rezoning (outside the urban core) and density bonusing (inside the urban core) to achieve meaningful contributions to affordable housing from the development community. (Note Kelowna’s Health Housing Strategy is new so it will take time to see its impact)</p> <p>Kelowna is also establishing a cash-in-lieu policy that encourages projects to contribute to an Affordable Housing Land Acquisition Fund in place of developing a small number of affordable units in their projects.</p>
	<p>Richmond</p>	<p>The City of Richmond’s Inclusionary Housing Policy has seen significant success in building low end of market rental units or collecting cash in lieu. The Inclusionary Housing Policy requires that multi-family buildings with more than 80 units build at least 10% (or a minimum 4 units) of the total building area (based on the residential Floor Area Ratio) as low end of market rental units. For developments with less than 80 residential units, the City requires a cash contribution based on square footage that goes to the City’s Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.</p>
<p>Relax parking requirements for affordable/non-market housing</p>	<p>Port Coquitlam</p>	<p>The Parking and Management Development Bylaw includes the following provisions:</p>

Best Practices	Community	Description
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the required spaces for 3-bedroom units to 1.5 • Require non-market projects to provide a minimum of 1 space per unit • Allow secured market rental projects to reduce parking requirements by 10%
	Kamloops	<p>Kamloops also provides reductions in minimum parking requirements for affordable residential units. Upon the submission of a Housing Agreement, a development can receive a 7% reduction in parking supply if they provide a minimum of 50% of the total units as affordable housing.</p>
Protect priority units for those in need through eligibility programs and housing agreements	Langford	<p>City has an Affordable Housing Program that requires purchasers of affordable single family homes to be households of two or more people, who do not currently own real estate, with a combined income of less than \$60,000, who have been employed in the City for at least 6 months and have lived there for at least two years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application form with eligibility criteria • House has a price cap for 5 years, that increases slightly after that. • City manages the sale and purchasing processes for these homes. <p>As of 2019, there were 39 single family and 8 multi-family homes built through this program.</p> <p>The City leveraged a fast growing development context, significant land base for growth, and a relatively modest ask of developers.</p>
	Various	<p>In most communities where incentives are provided for rental or non-market housing, housing agreements or covenants are used to ensure that the units are maintained as promised (e.g., rental, for certain</p>

Best Practices	Community	Description
		demographics, etc.). Anecdotally, enforcement of these agreements is a concern in some communities.

Partnerships and Innovative Arrangements

Best Practices	Case Study	Description
Promote provincial capital grants to non-profit organizations	Provincial Program	Capital project grants can be used for facilities construction, renovation, or maintenance of facilities. The applicant must have matching funds, and the maximum grant amount is \$250,000.
Build partnerships for the development of affordable housing	Clearwater	The municipality has integrated goals around building partnerships for housing into its Official Community Plan .
	Kelowna	<p>Like many other communities right now, the City is working to establish a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with BC Housing that lays out roles and responsibilities in delivering new affordable housing units in Kelowna. The MOU will identify the City’s role in providing land and reducing development costs, while reinforcing the role of BC Housing as working with non-profits to fund and deliver the units. This type of MOU can help facilitate BC Housing projects in the community. The City of Vancouver delivered over 1,100 units of supportive housing through a similar MOU.</p> <p>Regardless of whether an MOU is signed, municipalities can support non-market housing development by starting conversations with BC Housing and demonstrating support to organizations trying to get projects off the ground.</p>

Best Practices	Case Study	Description
	Nelson	The City seeks funding from granting organizations (such as BC Non-Profit Housing Association or Columbia Basin Trust) to support non-profits in moving forward on housing goals.
	Nelson	The City worked with the Kootenay Co-op Grocery Store when the Co-op began looking for a newer, bigger space. The Co-op purchased an adjacent property and developed Nelson Commons , a mixed-use development with the Co-op Grocery Store on the bottom and three floors of residential units on top. The Vancity Credit Union and Co-op contributed funds to offer three residential units as restricted resale homes, which will be offered to buyers who meet certain financial criteria at 25% below-market value. The City established a Restricted Resale Condominium Program to secure these units, which must be owner-occupied and will remain in the restricted resale program in perpetuity.
Use policy levers to support partnerships and non-profit projects	Clearwater	The municipality has integrated goals around building partnerships for housing into its Official Community Plan .
	Nelson	<p>The City's Housing Strategy outlines specific objectives to engage in “regeneration” projects with local organizations. These types of objectives recognize that many non-profits or faith-based organizations that own aging buildings are looking to redevelop in the near future and may need support to make the best use of their land.</p> <p>A municipality can support by working with organizations to complete a land inventory, by being a contributing partner on new projects (see Port Moody) example, by providing incentives and demonstrating support to BC Housing, and by convening partners.</p>

Best Practices	Case Study	Description
Use Housing Reserve Fund to support local projects	Port Moody	The City is a partner on a church redevelopment project along with the St. Andrews-IOCO United Church and BC Housing. The Province, through BC Housing, provided approximately \$9.5 million in capital funding and construction financing for the project. The City of Port Moody provided \$528,000 through the Port Moody Affordable Housing Reserve . The land, valued at \$4.3 million, was provided by the BC Conference Property Development Council of the United Church of Canada and was the former site of St. Andrew's United Church Port Moody.
Support non-profit housing development through research and by convening stakeholders and partners	City and Township of Langley	A seniors housing forum identified the need to conduct a municipal land audit to flag land which might be made available (donated, sold below-market, leased) or utilized for affordable, accessible and appropriate senior housing (i.e. decommissioned or unused or surplus school sites, church property).
Promote affordable housing projects in church and institutional development/redevelopment projects	Vancouver and many others	<p>The Oakridge Lutheran Church redevelopment provided a six story mixed-use building with retail at grade, the Church and community space on the second floor and four levels of affordable housing above. This included a partnership with a non-profit real estate developer who partnered specifically with community organizations to develop real estate, much of which includes affordable housing.</p> <p>Across BC, many faith-based organizations with aging buildings are exploring opportunities to redevelop their lands. Many are looking to integrate non-market and/or seniors housing and other services into redevelopment to better serve their communities. A study was completed in 2013 on best practices for redevelopment church land with a focus on Vancouver Island.</p>

Best Practices	Case Study	Description
	Vancouver	1 Kingsway is in a 9 storey mixed-use building that houses the Mount Pleasant Community Centre, the Mount Pleasant Library, a daycare, and a café on the first floor. Remaining floors are residential units. The building serves as a community hub.

Options for Seniors

Best Practices	Community	Summary
Increase options for seniors in locations close to transit, services, and community activity	Capital Regional District	The need for accessible, attainable and supportive housing for our aging and vulnerable populations was identified in the Capital Regional District's (CRD) 2012-2014 Strategic Plan . There began a search for a viable solution to address factors such as population growth and aging, unaffordable housing, outdated residential care facilities, and homelessness (a perpetual concern particularly within the core region of the CRD). Mount View Heights was developed to help address these concerns. Located in the District of Saanich, the site is within walking distance of shopping centers, a major public transit exchange, medical services, and a public library. There are 260-bed residential care facility for seniors (with 40 beds for seniors with dementia), 55 affordable housing units for seniors, 36 supportive housing units to reduce homelessness, and 18 housing units available to middle- to low-income families, which include 4 flex-suites designed for people with disabilities. This innovative project is part of a regional plan and partnership with the Province of British Columbia, the Vancouver Island Health Authority, the Capital Regional Hospital District and Baptist Housing to replace obsolete long-term care facilities in the Capital Region and provide more care and housing options for the growing senior population.
	Chilliwack	The new Elim Village Garrison Crossing, upon completion, will offer a model for a community of care to support seniors as they age and their needs change. By co-locating independent living, assisted living, and residential care on the same site in a highly desirable neighbourhood close to community recreation facilities and shopping, the facility will serve the needs of seniors over time while providing opportunities for residents to stay connected to their community.

Best Practices	Community	Summary
		While Elim Village offers a private-pay option, there is also a need to support seniors with lower incomes through communities of care.
Support innovative housing and care options for seniors	Provincial Program	Many local governments promote and the Home Adaptation for Seniors Initiative (HASI) actively in their communities. The program offers financial assistance for minor home adaptations that will help low-income seniors to perform daily activities in their home independently and safely. Homeowners and landlords qualify if the occupant is 65 years or older and has difficulties with daily living and the total household income is at or below the program limit for the area.
	Langley	The Village is a memory care community that recently opened in the City of Langley and may be the first of its kind in Canada. It is based on similar innovative models pioneered in The Netherlands. This type of facility is also called a “dementia village”. The purpose is to offer safe, meaningful, and appropriate care for individuals with dementia who are not well served living in the community or in traditional seniors facilities. Dementia villages are designed so that residents are able to walk on the grounds, garden, participate in activities, and otherwise be active while in a protected space. They are intended to provide residents with as much autonomy as possible. This option is only offered through private pay at this time. Another dementia village is being planned in Vancouver (Providence Health Care and St. Vincent Hospital).
	Terrace	The City of Terrace provides financial support to help senior citizens and homeowners with physical disabilities hire help to clear snow from their driveways. The city reimburses 50 percent of the snow-removal cost, up to \$250 each winter. Volunteer Terrace , a non-profit organization in the community, runs a handyman program that provides services like shovelling free of charge for seniors in the community. Delta and Canmore also offer similar programs. A similar model could be considered for home repairs or other home based services that support seniors to age-in-place.

Best Practices	Community	Summary
		Similar programs could be designed to help meet other seniors needs and support aging in place (e.g., collecting leaves, minor home repairs, etc.)
	National program	Innovative co-housing programs such as HomeShare allow homeowners to provide accommodation within their home in exchange for help around the house. This option can provide homeowners with social benefits while also filling housing gaps, such as affordable housing options for students.

Public Engagement

Best Practices	Community	Description
Build awareness and support for diverse housing options* *This best practice can be integrated into other planning processes (e.g., OCP, area plans, etc.).	Various	Through experience on contentious housing projects, BC Housing reassessed engagement on a proposed project. Lessons learned found that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for preliminary inquiry into community concerns, prior to selecting a site of affordable housing. • Project proposals should attempt to address community concerns through location, site placement, design, and operations.
	Kelowna	The City has a Communication and Engagement Strategy focused on the entire housing continuum and the City's priorities and directions. The purpose of this communication is to ensure the public understands what the City's priorities are and that stakeholders know of municipal opportunities to support housing projects.
Use pilot projects to test ideas and bring community members on board	West Vancouver	The District of West Vancouver designated a block for infill housing development as a pilot project to help educate the community about the value of infill housing and demonstrate how it can be developed in a way that maintains neighbourhood character.

APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL PRESCRIBED TABLES

3(1)(a)(i) Total Population

	2006	2011	2016
Population	10,615	10,655	11,130

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(a)(ii),(iii) Average and Median Age

	2006	2011	2016
Average	49.6	51.9	53.1
Median	53	55.7	58.2

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(a)(iv) Age Group Distribution

	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	10,620	100%	10,660	100%	11,125	100%
0 to 14 years	1,320	12%	1,160	11%	1,175	11%
15 to 19 years	520	5%	485	5%	435	4%
20 to 24 years	400	4%	400	4%	370	3%
25 to 64 years	4,950	47%	4,895	46%	4,850	44%
65 to 84 years	2,890	27%	3,000	28%	3,535	32%
85 years and over	550	5%	725	7%	760	7%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(a)(v) Households

	2006	2011	2016
Households	5,195	5,325	5,605

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(a)(vi) Average Household Size

	2006	2011	2016
Average household size	2	2	2

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(a)(vii) Households by Size

	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	5,195	100%	5,325	100%	5,605	100%
1-person	1,890	36%	2,035	38%	2,130	38%
2-person	2,110	41%	2,190	41%	2,335	42%
3-person	540	10%	515	10%	525	9%
4-person	440	8%	395	7%	405	7%
5-or-more-person	210	4%	190	4%	205	4%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(a)(viii)

Households by Tenure

	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	5,195	100%	5,325	100%	5,605	100%
Owner	4,015	77%	4,280	80%	4,250	76%
Renter	1,185	23%	1,045	20%	1,355	24%
Other (Band Housing)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(a)(ix)

Renter Households in Subsidized Housing (Subsidized Rental Housing Data Not Collected Until 2011)

	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Renter households	1,180	100%	1,045	100%	1,355	100%
Renter households in subsidized housing	#N/A	#N/A	55	5%	85	6%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(a)(x)

Mobility Status

	2006	2011	2016
Total	10,515	10,590	11,050
Mover	1,485	1,150	1,415
Migrant	905	525	875
Non-migrant	580	625	545
Non-mover	9,025	9,440	9,640

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(b)

Population Growth (period between indicated census and census preceding it)

	2011	2016
Growth (#)	40	475
Percentage Growth (%)	0.4%	4.5%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

3(1)(c)

Number of Students Enrolled in Post-Secondary Institutions Located in the Area

	2006	2011	2016
Students	0	0	0

3(1)(d)

Number of Individuals Experiencing Homelessness

	2006	2011	2016
Individuals experiencing homelessness	NA	NA	NA

3(2)(a)

Anticipated Population

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Anticipated population	12,067	12,176	12,261	12,364	12,459	12,540

Source: Developed using BC Stats Population Projections/Estimates, and Statistics Canada Census Program Data

3(2)(b)

Anticipated Population Growth (to indicated period)

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Anticipated growth (#)	59	109	85	104	95	81
Anticipated percentage growth (%)	0.5%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.6%

Source: Developed using BC Stats Population Projections/Estimates, and Statistics Canada Census Program Data

3(2)(c),(d)

Anticipated Average and Median Age

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Anticipated average age	55.2	55.5	55.8	56.1	56.4	56.8
Anticipated median age	61.0	61.5	62.0	62.5	63.0	63.5

Source: Developed using BC Stats Population Projections/Estimates, and Statistics Canada Census Program Data

3(2)(e)

Anticipated Age Group Distribution

	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Anticipated total	12,067	100%	12,176	100%	12,261	100%	12,364	100%	12,459	100%	12,540	100%
0 to 14 years	1,190	10%	1,206	10%	1,200	10%	1,203	10%	1,206	10%	1,192	10%
15 to 19 years	442	4%	428	4%	419	3%	414	3%	414	3%	423	3%
20 to 24 years	398	3%	396	3%	385	3%	375	3%	358	3%	341	3%
25 to 64 years	4,802	40%	4,767	39%	4,720	38%	4,690	38%	4,652	37%	4,599	37%
65 to 84 years	4,046	34%	4,187	34%	4,335	35%	4,475	36%	4,618	37%	4,754	38%
85 years and over	1,189	10%	1,191	10%	1,202	10%	1,207	10%	1,211	10%	1,232	10%

Source: Developed using BC Stats Population Projections/Estimates, and Statistics Canada Census Program Data

3(2)(f)

Anticipated Households

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Anticipated households	5,880	5,949	6,019	6,101	6,175	6,247

Source: Developed using BC Stats Population Projections/Estimates, and Statistics Canada Census Program Data

3(2)(g)

Anticipated Average Household Size

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Anticipated average household size	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

Source: Developed using BC Stats Population Projections/Estimates, and Statistics Canada Census Program Data

4(a),(b)

Average and Median Before-Tax Household Income

	2006	2011	2016
Average	\$69,305	\$74,831	\$77,560
Median	\$58,413	\$60,538	\$64,151

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

4(c)

Before-Tax Household Income by Income Bracket

	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	5,195	100%	5,325	100%	5,600	100%
\$0-\$4,999	90	2%	65	1%	60	1%
\$5,000-\$9,999	25	0%	70	1%	65	1%
\$10,000-\$14,999	80	2%	95	2%	100	2%
\$15,000-\$19,999	240	5%	235	4%	210	4%
\$20,000-\$24,999	320	6%	375	7%	275	5%
\$25,000-\$29,999	265	5%	260	5%	260	5%
\$30,000-\$34,999	370	7%	210	4%	270	5%
\$35,000-\$39,999	250	5%	375	7%	270	5%
\$40,000-\$44,999	275	5%	230	4%	295	5%
\$45,000-\$49,999	295	6%	260	5%	250	4%
\$50,000-\$59,999	475	9%	465	9%	595	11%
\$60,000-\$69,999	490	9%	375	7%	465	8%
\$70,000-\$79,999	305	6%	480	9%	380	7%
\$80,000-\$89,999	330	6%	420	8%	405	7%
\$90,000-\$99,999	295	6%	345	6%	255	5%
\$100,000-\$124,999	515	10%	535	10%	555	10%
\$125,000-\$149,999	300	6%	240	5%	370	7%
\$150,000-\$199,999	185	4%	195	4%	350	6%
\$200,000 and over	95	2%	115	2%	175	3%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

4(d)

Before-Tax Renter Household Income by Income Bracket

	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	1,180	100%	1,045	100%	1,355	100%
\$0-\$4,999	30	3%	15	1%	20	1%
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	1%	0	0%	40	3%
\$10,000-\$14,999	35	3%	20	2%	60	4%
\$15,000-\$19,999	60	5%	50	5%	120	9%
\$20,000-\$24,999	95	8%	145	14%	110	8%
\$25,000-\$29,999	95	8%	60	6%	80	6%
\$30,000-\$34,999	140	12%	50	5%	85	6%
\$35,000-\$39,999	65	6%	80	8%	60	4%
\$40,000-\$44,999	70	6%	40	4%	75	6%
\$45,000-\$49,999	85	7%	75	7%	55	4%
\$50,000-\$59,999	115	10%	110	11%	155	11%
\$60,000-\$69,999	100	8%	105	10%	115	8%
\$70,000-\$79,999	40	3%	90	9%	60	4%
\$80,000-\$89,999	35	3%	40	4%	120	9%
\$90,000-\$99,999	60	5%	30	3%	35	3%
\$100,000-\$124,999	85	7%	85	8%	75	6%
\$125,000-\$149,999	50	4%	25	2%	65	5%
\$150,000-\$199,999	10	1%	0	0%	35	3%
\$200,000 and over	0	0%	0	0%	10	1%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

4(e)

Before-Tax Owner Household Income by Income Bracket

	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	4,015	100%	4,285	100%	4,250	100%
\$0-\$4,999	60	1%	45	1%	40	1%
\$5,000-\$9,999	15	0%	60	1%	25	1%
\$10,000-\$14,999	40	1%	75	2%	40	1%
\$15,000-\$19,999	180	4%	190	4%	90	2%
\$20,000-\$24,999	225	6%	225	5%	165	4%
\$25,000-\$29,999	170	4%	200	5%	175	4%
\$30,000-\$34,999	220	5%	155	4%	190	4%
\$35,000-\$39,999	185	5%	295	7%	210	5%
\$40,000-\$44,999	200	5%	195	5%	225	5%
\$45,000-\$49,999	210	5%	185	4%	200	5%
\$50,000-\$59,999	355	9%	350	8%	440	10%
\$60,000-\$69,999	395	10%	270	6%	350	8%
\$70,000-\$79,999	260	6%	390	9%	325	8%
\$80,000-\$89,999	300	7%	370	9%	285	7%
\$90,000-\$99,999	240	6%	315	7%	220	5%
\$100,000-\$124,999	435	11%	450	11%	480	11%
\$125,000-\$149,999	255	6%	220	5%	305	7%
\$150,000-\$199,999	180	4%	185	4%	315	7%
\$200,000 and over	95	2%	110	3%	170	4%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

4(f),(g)

Average and Median Before-Tax Household Income by Tenure

	2006	2011	2016
Average	\$69,305	\$74,831	\$77,560
Owner	\$74,293	\$79,900	\$84,354
Renter	\$52,356	\$54,045	\$56,260
Median	\$58,413	\$60,538	\$64,151
Owner	\$64,081	\$65,354	\$69,489
Renter	\$43,230	\$47,192	\$47,939

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

5(a)

Workers in the Labour Force

	2006	2011	2016
Workers in labour force	4,895	4,740	4,800

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

5(b)

Workers by NAICS Sector

	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	4,895	100%	4,745	100%	4,800	100%
All Categories	4,860	99%	4,655	98%	4,720	98%
11 Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	20	0%	45	1%	60	1%
21 Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction	15	0%	0	0%	15	0%
22 Utilities	55	1%	0	0%	10	0%
23 Construction	265	5%	285	6%	285	6%
31-33 Manufacturing	435	9%	330	7%	340	7%
41 Wholesale trade	160	3%	120	3%	80	2%
44-45 Retail trade	565	12%	570	12%	570	12%
48-49 Transportation and warehousing	340	7%	370	8%	420	9%
51 Information and cultural industries	95	2%	70	1%	65	1%
52 Finance and insurance	200	4%	160	3%	145	3%
53 Real estate and rental and leasing	115	2%	100	2%	95	2%
54 Professional, scientific and technical services	390	8%	315	7%	385	8%
55 Management of companies and enterprises	0	0%	0	0%	15	0%
56 Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services	295	6%	225	5%	230	5%
61 Educational services	265	5%	245	5%	260	5%
62 Health care and social assistance	575	12%	600	13%	685	14%
71 Arts, entertainment and recreation	105	2%	125	3%	120	3%
72 Accommodation and food services	330	7%	290	6%	450	9%
81 Other services (except public administration)	275	6%	255	5%	165	3%
91 Public administration	370	8%	525	11%	315	7%
Not Applicable	35	1%	85	2%	80	2%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

6(1)(a)

Housing Units

	2016
Housing units	5,605

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

6(1)(b) Housing Units by Structural Type

	2016	
	#	%
Total	5,605	100%
Single-detached house	1,990	36%
Apartment in a building that has five or more units	130	2%
Other attached dwelling	3,480	62%
Semi-detached house	490	9%
Row house	585	10%
Apartment or flat in a duplex	765	14%
Apartment in a building that has fewer than five units	1,625	29%
Other single-attached house	15	0%
Movable dwelling	0	0%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

6(1)(c) Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms

	2016
Total	5,600
No-bedroom	35
1-bedroom	820
2-bedroom	2,295
3-bedroom	1,580
4-or-more-bedroom	875

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

6(1)(d) Housing by Period of Construction

	2016	
	#	%
Total	5,600	100%
1960 or earlier	435	8%
1961-1980	2,210	39%
1981-1990	1,340	24%
1991-2000	830	15%
2001-2010	575	10%
2011-2016	205	4%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

6(1)(e) Subsidized Housing Units

	2016
Subsidized housing units	168

Source: BC Housing - Non-Market Housing, provided by BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

6(1)(f)(i) Average and Median Assessed Housing Values

	2019
Average	\$688,487
Median	NA

Source: BC Assessment

6(1)(f)(ii) Average and Median Assessed Housing Values by Structure Type

	2019
Average	\$688,487
Single Family	\$849,196
Dwelling with Suite	\$801,143
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex	\$724,395
Row Housing	\$644,354
Apartment	\$505,886
Manufactured Home	\$374,549
Other	\$821,389
Median	NA
Single Family	NA
Dwelling with Suite	NA
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex	NA
Row Housing	NA
Apartment	NA
Manufactured Home	NA
Other	NA

Source: BC Assessment

6(1)(f)(iii) Average and Median Assessed Housing Values by Number of Bedrooms

	2019
Average	\$688,487
1-bedroom	\$355,193
2-bedroom	\$614,142
3-or-more-bedroom	\$798,373
Median	NA
1-bedroom	NA
2-bedroom	NA
3-or-more-bedroom	NA

Source: BC Assessment

6(1)(g)(i) Average and Median Housing Sale Prices

	2019
Average	\$653,639
Median	NA

Source: BC Assessment

6(1)(g)(ii) Average and Median Housing Sale Prices by Structure Type

	2019
Average	\$844,463
Single Family	\$916,413
Dwelling with Suite	\$838,957
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex	\$622,193
Row Housing	\$517,689
Apartment	\$337,129
Manufactured Home	NA
Other	\$653,639
Median	NA
Single Family	NA
Dwelling with Suite	NA
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex	NA
Row Housing	NA
Apartment	NA
Manufactured Home	NA
Other	NA

Source: BC Assessment

6(1)(g)(iii) Average and Median Housing Sale Prices by Number of Bedrooms

	2019
Average	\$653,639
1-bedroom	\$383,470
2-bedroom	\$575,473
3-or-more-bedroom	\$832,650
Median	NA
1-bedroom	NA
2-bedroom	NA
3-or-more-bedroom	NA

Source: BC Assessment

6(1)(h)(i) Average and Median Monthly Rent

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Average	\$758	\$788	\$790	\$870	\$912	\$911	\$939	\$1,011	\$986	\$894	\$937	\$930	\$1,011	\$1,027
Median	\$730	\$750	\$770	\$875	\$884	\$910	\$900	\$925	\$925	\$875	\$925	\$960	\$1,000	\$1,038

Source: CMHC Rental Market Survey

6(1)(m)(ii)

Housing Units Demolished by Structure Type

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Structure Type 1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Structure Type 2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Structure Type 3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6(1)(m)(iii)

Housing Units Demolished by Tenure

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Owner	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Renter	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other (Band Housing)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6(1)(m)(iv)

Housing Units Demolished by Number of Bedrooms

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
No-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4-or-more-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6(1)(n)(i)

Housing Units Substantially Completed

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Housing units completed	33	34	47	29	66	48	125	72	94

Source: CMHC Starts and Completions Survey

6(1)(n)(ii)

Housing Units Substantially Completed by Structure Type

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total	33	34	47	29	66	48	125	72	94
Single	8	9	3	8	6	11	47	37	16
Semi-Detached	13	14	4	1	12	12	20	18	14
Row	0	9	9	5	32	10	3	0	3
Apartment	12	2	31	15	16	15	55	17	61

Source: CMHC Starts and Completions Survey

6(1)(n)(iii) Housing Units Substantially Completed by Tenure

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total	33	34	47	29	66	48	125	72	94
Owner (Total, less Renter)	26	26	42	26	50	47	118	66	91
Renter	7	8	5	3	16	1	7	6	3

Source: CMHC Starts and Completions Survey

6(1)(n)(iv) Housing Units Substantially Completed by Number of Bedrooms

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
No-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4-or-more-bedroom	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6(1)(o) Number of Beds Provided for Students by Post-Secondary Institutions in the Area

	2019
Number of beds	0

6(1)(p) Number of Beds Provided by Shelters for Individuals Experiencing Homelessness and Units Provided for Individuals at Risk of Experiencing Homelessness

	2019
Beds for individuals experiencing homelessness	NA
Beds for individuals at risk of experiencing homelessness	NA

6(3)(a) New Homes Registered

	2016	2017	2018
New homes registered	109	102	100

Source: Collected through Licensed Residential Builders and Owner Builders through New Home Registration and Owner Builder Authorization forms

6(3)(b) New Homes Registered by Structure Type

	2016	2017	2018
New homes registered	109	102	100
Single Detached	55	27	18
Multi Unit	54	75	82
Purpose Built Rental	<5	<5	<5

Source: Collected through Licensed Residential Builders and Owner Builders through New Home Registration and Owner Builder Authorization forms

6(3)(c) New Purpose-Built Rental Homes Registered

	2016	2017	2018
New purpose-built rental homes registered	<5	<5	<5

7(a)(i),(ii) Unaffordable Housing by Tenure

	2006			2011			2016		
	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure
Total households	5,010	100%	100%	5,135	100%	100%	5,430	100%	100%
Owner	3,895	78%	100%	4,125	80%	100%	4,160	77%	100%

Renter	1,115	22%	100%	1,010	20%	100%	1,265	23%	100%
Total households in unaffordable housing	1,175	23%	23%	1,410	27%	27%	1,185	22%	22%
Owner	685	14%	18%	895	17%	22%	635	12%	15%
Renter	490	10%	44%	515	10%	51%	555	10%	44%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

7(a)(iii),(iv) Inadequate Housing by Tenure

	2006			2011			2016		
	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure
Total households	5,010	100%	100%	5,135	100%	100%	5,430	100%	100%
Owner	3,895	78%	100%	4,125	80%	100%	4,160	77%	100%
Renter	1,115	22%	100%	1,010	20%	100%	1,265	23%	100%
Total households in inadequate housing	185	4%	4%	305	6%	6%	190	3%	3%
Owner	130	3%	3%	260	5%	6%	125	2%	3%
Renter	60	1%	5%	45	1%	4%	65	1%	5%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

7(a)(v),(vi) Unsuitable Housing by Tenure

	2006			2011			2016		
	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure
Total households	5,010	100%	100%	5,135	100%	100%	5,430	100%	100%
Owner	3,895	78%	100%	4,125	80%	100%	4,160	77%	100%
Renter	1,115	22%	100%	1,010	20%	100%	1,265	23%	100%
Total households in unsuitable housing	65	1%	1%	160	3%	3%	100	2%	2%
Owner	30	1%	1%	95	2%	2%	35	1%	1%
Renter	35	1%	3%	65	1%	6%	65	1%	5%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

7(b),(c) Unemployment and Participation Rates

	2016
Unemployment rate	4.3%
Participation rate	48.2%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

7(d),(e),(f),(g)

Commute to Work

	2016	
	#	%
Total	3,635	100%
Commute within CSD	1,330	37%
Commute to different CSD within CD	2,175	60%
Commute to different CD within BC	95	3%
Commute to different province	35	1%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

8(1)(a)(i),(ii)

Core Housing Need by Tenure

	2006			2011			2016		
	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure
Total	5,010	100%	100%	5,130	100%	100%	5,430	100%	100%
Owner	3,895	78%	100%	4,125	80%	100%	4,165	77%	100%
Renter	1,120	22%	100%	1,010	20%	100%	1,265	23%	100%
Total in core housing need	555	11%	11%	760	15%	15%	670	12%	12%
Owner	280	6%	7%	425	8%	10%	270	5%	6%
Renter	275	5%	25%	330	6%	33%	400	7%	32%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

8(1)(a)(iii),(iv)

Extreme Core Housing Need by Tenure

	2006			2011			2016		
	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure	#	% of total	% of tenure
Total	5,010	100%	100%	5,130	100%	100%	5,430	100%	100%
Owner	3,895	78%	100%	4,125	80%	100%	4,165	77%	100%
Renter	1,120	22%	100%	1,010	20%	100%	1,265	23%	100%
Total in extreme core housing need	285	6%	6%	250	5%	5%	280	5%	5%
Owner	190	4%	5%	125	2%	3%	70	1%	2%
Renter	90	2%	8%	130	3%	13%	210	4%	17%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, custom data provided via BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing