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As the City of Vancouver (the City) continues to face development pressures and affordability concerns, the municipality has adopted an ambitious plan to deliver more affordable housing. This plan, the Housing Vancouver Strategy, completed in 2017, includes the goal of providing the ‘right supply’ of housing which includes an increase in rental, social and supportive housing.

The City has implemented various policies to deliver increased affordable housing, including inclusionary zoning. Inclusionary zoning is a means of obtaining affordable housing by requiring or providing incentives to private developers to build non-market housing as part of market-driven development projects\(^1\). This policy has been embedded in many of the City’s community plans, and often results in air space parcels (ASPs) set within a strata or market rental development, generally acting as separate buildings with separate operators and property managers.

As inclusionary zoning continues to deliver affordable housing units through the private market, the City is experiencing an increasing number of projects which include the combination of non-market and market housing into one housing project. In these projects, developers build both market and non-market units, and the City takes ownership of the non-market units. The City leases the non-market housing component to a selected non-profit housing operator (NPO), on a long-term lease, who is responsible for ongoing maintenance and operation of the air space parcel.

In most cases, spaces in these buildings — including entrances, elevators, garbage, utility rooms and indoor and outdoor amenity spaces — have been kept separate between the non-market and

---

\(^1\) Calavita & Allan, Ch. 1 An International Perspective on Inclusionary Housing
market housing in an effort to ensure clear boundaries and reduced costs for the non-profit operator. The issue of shared versus separate spaces in mixed-tenure housing projects was raised by Council in July 2018, when a West End inclusionary project was brought forward for approval at a public hearing. This project proposed separate entrances and children’s play areas for the market and non-market housing components. While not feasible to combine the entrances here, due to site constraints, the applicant was advised to consider combining the outdoor play areas to be accessible to all residents. It was noted in a memorandum by City staff, addressing this proposal, that “the creation of shared amenity space is an ideal social objective that is generally supported by staff, however, implementation can be challenging”. Factors that make it challenging include financial implications, such as cost sharing and maintenance for co-owned spaces, and site constraints.²

Internationally, media coverage has used the term ‘poor door’ and expressed public concerns of stigmatization and isolation of non-market housing residents, in place of a desired mixed-income community.

To better understand the feasibility and implications of shared versus separate spaces within mixed-tenure buildings, two research reports are being conducted to look at the following spaces:

The City has partnered with students studying affordable housing at the School of Community and Regional Planning (SCARP) at the University of British Columbia (UBC) to focus on this issue of shared versus separate spaces. Focusing on the perspectives from City staff and non-profit housing operators, the researchers aimed to understand financial, operational and social implications of shared and separate spaces and the relative importance of these spaces being shared or separate. A consultant team will further explore this topic through engagement of NPOs, developers, strata/rental managers, residents and City staff.

² Staff memorandum: CD-1 Rezoning: 1068-1090 Burnaby Street and 1318 Thurlow Street
Background & Context

Inclusionary Housing Policy (Or Inclusionary Zoning)

Inclusionary housing policy has been used as a tool for obtaining affordable housing since the early 1970s. The policy originated in the United States, emerging out of the civil rights movement and the recognition that the land use system was perpetuating racial segregation through exclusionary zoning. Since the 1980s, Canadian federal disinvestment in non-market housing has led to a reduced number of affordable housing units being funded by governments. As a result, municipalities have turned to tools such as inclusionary zoning to drive the private market to build non-market housing.

In Vancouver, inclusionary housing policy has been embedded in several community plans and is seen as a significant mechanism through which to deliver more affordable units throughout the city.

Policy Context

The City of Vancouver has multiple policies that address housing and inclusionary zoning:

Housing Vancouver (2017 - 2027)

In 2017, Council approved the Housing Vancouver Strategy (2017 - 2027). The strategy aims to shift the supply of new homes toward the “right supply”, with targets for new units along the housing continuum. The targets are based on the core goals of retaining diverse incomes and households in the city, shifting housing production towards rental to meet the highest need, and coordinating with partners to deliver housing for the lowest income households. Overall, 72,000 new homes are targeted for 2017 to 2027, including 12,000 social, supportive and non-profit cooperative units and 20,000 purpose-built rental units.

3 Calavita & Allan, International Perspectives on Housing, 3
Vancouver’s Affordable Housing Financial and Delivery Strategy

The Affordable Housing Delivery and Financial Strategy sets out the City’s strategic approach to deliver on the targets set in the Housing Vancouver Strategy. Focus is given to delivering 12,000 units of social and supportive housing. The City identifies three primary ways to deliver this type of housing:

- **City Land Contributions**: In partnership with other funding partners, the City provides land at below-market rates for affordable housing development.

- **Inclusionary Zoning**: The City allows for more density for projects which provide a particular percentage of new residential development as social housing.

- **Supporting Non-Profit Sector Projects**: The City provides expedited processing and capital grants for affordable housing projects owned and operated by non-profit housing providers in addition to more density when supportable by policy.

This research project focuses on the experiences, perceptions and implications of the second delivery strategy, inclusionary zoning.

City of Vancouver Community Plans

Inclusionary housing policy has been embedded in three community plans: the **West End, Cambie Corridor** and the **Downtown Eastside Plan**. Compared to the rest of the city, these communities have the most mixed-tenure developments currently in the rezoning/development application or construction stages.

Other Important Documents:

**Housing Design and Technical Guidelines**

This document was developed to provide clear guidelines for developers and housing partners involved with the city’s non-market housing projects. The document provides the minimum standards required by the City for materials, finishes, equipment and technical specifications, including the functional requirements for amenity space, unit sizes, etc. This is the guiding document used by developers when they are building non-market units within a mixed-tenure project that are to be delivered to the City.
The purpose of this project is to explore and document the implications associated with shared and separate entrances and spaces in mixed-tenure buildings from the perspective of non-profit operators (NPOs). This research is guided by the following overarching questions:

1. **What are the social, operational and financial implications of shared entrances and amenity spaces in mixed tenure buildings from the perspective of non-profit operators?**

2. **Which spaces are the most important to be shared or separate?**

Secondary research questions include:

1. What are the perceived advantages and disadvantages of shared and separate entrances and amenity spaces from the perspective of the City and non-profit housing operators?

2. What are the experiences of shared and separate entrances and amenity spaces from the perspective of non-profit operators?

3. How does the relationship function between the non-profit operator and the strata/operator of the market housing?

The majority of this research focuses on semi-structured interviews with City departments and NPOs in Vancouver. The interviewees were identified by the Affordable Housing department at the City.
City Interviews:

Multiple departments at the City deal with the delivery of community amenities such as childcare and affordable housing. These interviews were intended to provide a preliminary understanding on the topic. The following were interviewed:

Affordable Housing Programs
- Facilitates long-term leases with non-profit operators for operation of non-market housing after it is built by developer
- Ensure delivery of social housing as per the design guidelines

Real Estate and Facilities Management
- Manages the City’s facilities and properties (buys, sells, and leases property).
- Provides quality assurance to ensure delivery of social housing as per the design and technical guidelines

Social Policy and Projects
- Facilitate non-profit operator agreements for community facilities (e.g. child care, youth centre, senior centre, etc.) in market buildings
- Ensure delivery of community amenities as per the design guidelines

Non-Profit Operator Interviews:

In early 2016, the City pre-qualified 12 non-profit housing operators through a Request for Qualifications to operate and manage City-owned non-market housing received as in-kind community amenity contributions (CACs) and through inclusionary zoning. For this research, these 12 short-listed organizations were contacted. In addition, Vancouver Native Housing Society (VNHS) who has experience operating a City-owned air space parcel in a mixed-tenure building was also contacted. Of the thirteen initially contacted, ten organizations were interviewed:

The following organizations were interviewed:
- 127 Housing Society
- Atira
- Bloom Group
- Community Land Trust
- Lookout Society
- More Than a Roof
- Sanford Housing Society
- SUCCESS
- YWCA Vancouver
- Vancouver Native Housing Society
What We Heard

Perspectives from the City

The interviews with City departments were informative conversations that provided City perspectives and guided the direction for the questionnaire for the interviews with non-profit operators (NPO).

Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM)

REFM’s perspective is focused on the financial and operational implications of shared and separate spaces. From the experience of REFM, clear jurisdictions about separation of spaces allows for simplified operations and improved relationships between market and non-market housing operators or property managers. Clear jurisdiction refers to who is responsible for what, such as maintenance of an entrance lobby space, if shared. In the view of REFM, when all spaces are separated, the day-to-day and long-term maintenance is more straightforward. If spaces are shared, it is possible that the parties involved will incur higher legal fees to develop clarity around jurisdiction. REFM sees this as a concern,
especially for NPOs who strive to keep costs low and housing affordable. Reciprocal Easement Agreements are used to establish the legal rights related to shared areas between the two or more property owners. Additional agreements that affect how mixed-tenure buildings operate include: Service Level Agreements, Statutory Right of Ways and Strata Acts.

REFM expressed uncertainty about the logistics of the day-to-day relationship between the NPO and strata. As a result of this uncertainty, the researchers included a question in the interviews with NPOs to understand what this relationship looks like. REFM also identified the challenge of timing when NPOs are brought into the development process. The City cannot release a Request for Proposals (RFP) to NPOs for a mixed-tenure building until the rezoning application has been approved. Once a rezoning has been approved, there are limitations to the ability for an NPO to influence changes to design. This timing challenge was echoed by the NPOs as well, which is discussed later in this report.

Social Policy and Projects

The Social Policy & Projects department has experience facilitating the development of community amenities, such as childcare centres, that share building envelopes with strata housing, social housing and other residential and civic uses. Childcare is the most common and abundant type of collocated community amenity, and also presents some of the most significant challenges concerning the use of co-located spaces. Where possible, there is effort to locate childcare centres on the ground floor, which often means a greater opportunity for a childcare entrance that is separate from residential entrances. However, there are many instances where childcare centres are located on an upper floor (i.e on the top of a podium or rooftop level). In these instances, entrances are typically shared and elevators are separate. Service Level Agreements are entered into for maintenance of the facility, which includes consideration of any shared space such as lobby areas, service rooms or elevators. Social Policy staff expressed that it is least complicated from both a legal and management perspective when the spaces and entrances in community amenities are separate, as challenges, such as complications from unclear responsibilities and jurisdictions, are more prone to arise when spaces are shared. However, as an ideal social objective, the Social Policy staff expressed favour for shared spaces, especially outdoor amenities.

Perspectives from Non-Profit Operators

The NPOs that were interviewed have a diverse range of experience operating mixed-income and/or mixed-tenure buildings. As a result, we heard varied perspectives about the experiences and perceptions of shared versus non-shared spaces. During the interviews, most operators spoke from experience with operating a particular building that was either mixed-income (but wholly operated by the NPO) or mixed-tenure (sharing space with strata or market rental). The interview questions can be found in Appendix B. A snapshot of some of the buildings that were discussed by NPOs is found in the Appendix (page 36). The following section provides an understanding of which spaces NPO’s would prioritize as more important to be shared or separate.
Shared or Separate? Prioritizations

Beyond understanding the implications of shared versus separate spaces, this research aims to understand what spaces are most important to be either shared or separate. On a scale of 1 (not important) to 5 (very important), we asked interviewees to rank the level of importance for the following spaces to be shared or separate:

For each space, interviewees were asked whether they felt it should be shared or separate, and how important it was to be that way. The following graphs show how organizations rated the level of importance that each space be shared (as seen in blue) or separate (as seen in green). It is important to note that this type of quantitative ranking system has substantial limitations, discussed in the limitations section of this report. The following section provides a brief overview of general comments we heard about each space of study.

Elevators should be...

With shared elevators, there are concerns of safety for the non-market tenants. One operator suggested it would be most logical to have three elevators: one for the strata, one for non-market housing and one is shared between the two. Another operator, who was in favour of separate elevators, discussed how it does not matter if the elevator is separate, but it should be programmable in such a way that it can be separate.
Entrances sometimes need to be separated for purposes of surveillance and security of the non-profit tenant population. For example, if non-market units are transitional housing, a single entrance for all tenants would result in safety concerns for the transitional housing tenants. Many operators suggested that as long as all of the entrances are designed to equal standards, it does not matter if they are shared or separate. Many suggested that the decision should be made based on practical considerations of the site and building.

Multiple organizations suggested that urban agriculture should be shared due to the social orientation of the space. That said, some discussed the success of the programming that occurs in their separate urban agriculture plots for the non-market tenants only. These operators suggested that spaces should be shared if there is no programming, or if there is programming, there should be both shared and separate urban agriculture. In this way, the non-market tenants could still have programmed urban agriculture as well as shared spaces with strata where they can run into residents of the building and get to know their neighbours.
Many operators discussed the importance for non-market housing to have their own indoor amenity space. These spaces are important for programming and community building. That said, some suggested it is welcomed for there to be both shared and separate indoor amenities. One operator expressed that a shared “gathering space” would be desired. More focus was on the outdoor socially-oriented spaces being shared than indoors. Many NPOs felt that amenities such as pools and fancy gyms would drive up costs and are not needed.

Overall, children’s play areas were identified as the most important to be shared. As one operator said, “kids values are instilled at a young age. If these areas are inside or outside, they should be for everyone.” Many NPOs discussed that children should not feel as though they are unable to play with friends because of financial status. One operator suggested that if there are site constraints that make it difficult to have one large shared play area, the site could have two smaller play areas that are open to all tenants.
Parking should be...

For many operators, parking is seen as pragmatic as opposed to socially oriented, making it less important to be shared. Based on experience operating mixed-tenure buildings, a few operators suggested it is very important for these spaces to be separate. It is common for there to be a shared ramp into the parkade with separate access into the non-market and market parking levels, which generally seems to work well.

Garbage / loading should be...

Similar to parking, garbage and loading is seen as pragmatic as opposed to socially oriented, making it less important to be shared. With shared garbage areas, tenants get blamed for improper disposal of recycling and garbage and this can create tension. However, an operator said that this issue occurs even in buildings with separate garbage rooms. One operator said it makes pragmatic sense for garbage to be separate from a financial and operational perspective. When separate, the costs for the garbage contractor are clear. That said, many operators discussed the logistical importance of shared garbage areas. For example, one operator stated that it is “a logistical nightmare to have more than one garbage room.” They expressed that having one waste removal contractor to pick up the garbage for the entire building (non-market and market) made most sense.
This type of quantitative ranking has limitations, as almost every interviewee provided caveats to their answers. The level of importance for these spaces to be shared or separate depends on the tenant population, type of tenure mix, building scale and physical building design.

**Who is the tenant population?**

When mixed-tenure buildings are being developed, the resident population is usually unknown. Two organizations noted that some potential residents, including those in transitional or supportive housing, may not be ready to engage with other residents in the building. For some tenants, safety, security and confidentiality are top concerns, making separate entrances and spaces much more important.

**Is the building shared with market rental or strata condominiums?**

During the interviews, two NPOs suggested that the ranking considerations are much different if the building is shared with market rental versus strata condominiums. From the perspective of these two operators, spaces should be separated as much as possible if the building is shared with strata. This perspective is primarily due to experienced conflicts sharing spaces with strata condominiums. As one organization suggested, the income difference between non-market and market-rental is minor, but the difference is noticeable and potentially problematic between non-market and strata. This supports literature which has stated that the larger the income gap, the more unlikely it is that residents will be able to bridge socioeconomic and cultural differences.\(^1\) Additionally, strata owners are concerned with property values, which can increase tensions. However, if the building is shared with market-rental, these organizations saw no problem with

---

\(^1\) Anna Zhuo & Vivian Wong, Mixed Income Housing: Assessing the Range and Limitations of Current Models and Design. April 2016. 19
shared spaces, especially if run by a single operator. A 2016 case study analysis of mixed-income buildings by UBC SCARP students noted a trend toward more shared amenities within single-tenure buildings, particularly in buildings with 100% rental tenure, also supporting what some NPO’s expressed.²

**What is the scale of the building?**

The Real Estate and Facilities Management department at the City felt that it is easier to separate spaces when the building is larger-scale. Some operators discussed the importance for spaces to be shared if the building is small, expressing that it should be difficult to discern which units are social housing and which are market-rate. In a smaller building, if entrances and spaces are separate, the separation of market and non-market would be more noticeable, which has negative social implications. Similarly, the literature on mixed-income developments identifies scale as a variable for the design of mixed-income buildings.³ A case study analysis exploring mixed-tenure buildings and their physical design found that the larger the development, the more likely it is for full physical separation of spaces and amenities.⁴

**How is the building designed?**

Physical building design was noted by the majority of NPOs as being important for the issue of shared versus separate spaces. Multiple organizations noted that as long as the design of entrances and spaces are equally celebrated, it does not matter if they are shared or separate. Additionally, if the spaces are separate, they should be designed in a way that is not visible to each other and to avoid a “fish bowl effect”. For example, a non-market unit should not have a view of the strata’s swimming pool. Avoiding this visual connectivity will ensure the minimization of feelings of exclusion, privilege and social othering.

---

² Zhuo & Wong, 19
⁴ Zhuo & Wong, 19

---

Case Example:
The non-market and strata units have a shared entrance and elevators. The resident population of non-market housing are low and moderate income seniors, who are typically very respectful and quiet. As a result, shared spaces is a non-issue from the perspective of the operator.
Financial, operational and social implications are deeply intertwined with one another. As a result, it is challenging to separate social implications from operational and financial. Additionally, due to the diversity of experience from the interviewees, it is difficult to provide clear generalizations about each of the following implications. The following section provides an broad overview of some of the points we heard from the ten organizations:

**Financial Implications**

- No major financial concerns with shared spaces. Shared spaces may actually reduce, rather than increase, capital and operating costs.
- Cost-sharing agreements not likely to lead to increased costs, but can be quite complex in terms of implementation.
- Issues that emerge from cost-sharing agreements are present whether spaces are shared or not.
- NPOs expressed that stratas tend to have more voting power than non-market units (as there is often a higher quantity of strata units than non-market) which results in sometimes having to pay for things they do not believe they need (however, can go both ways)
- Overall, very few NPOs expressed major concerns regarding financial implications with shared or non-shared spaces. Some did express that shared higher-end amenities such as a pool could drive costs up for them.

**Operational Implications**

- Many NPOs suggested that from an operational point of view, separate spaces are advantageous as there is clear jurisdiction about responsibilities and expectations.
- Issues around blame and acrimony by the other party were expressed by many NPOs in mixed-tenure projects.
- Most operators felt that the legal lease agreements for ASPs were not overly confusing.
- Many operators discussed the importance of having their own programmable space in order to build community among their tenants (for example, in private indoor amenity rooms.)
- Operational issues often do not emerge until three or four

**Case Example:**

This ASP shares a building with commercial units. There are frequent issues with heating, water and electricity and these needs are often left unaddressed for long periods of time. The NPO has had to educate the landlord that adequate heat, electricity and water are immediate needs that must be addressed very quickly, as noted in the Residential Tenancy Act. Non-market tenants have complained and as a response, the NPO has sometimes reduced rents for tenants. This cost is absorbed by the NPO, rather than the landlord.
years into operation. Most mixed-tenure buildings in Vancouver have been operating for less than three years.

- It is key to continue to monitor the operational implications of mixed tenure housing.

Social Implications

- NPOs expressed blame and acrimony from market tenants (they are the first to be blamed for issues)
- Desire to reduce stigma and an “us versus them” mentality that many NPOs have experienced in mixed-income communities
- Some NPOs stressed the importance of separating all spaces as a means to reduce social tension and risk;
- Others discussed how shared spaces are important to reduce stigma and send a message of inclusivity to the community.
Involves non-profits earlier in the design process

We heard from Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM) as well as the majority of the non-profit operators (NPOs) that a key challenge about mixed-tenure housing is the timing of when NPOs are brought into the development process. The City cannot release a Request for Proposals (RFP) to NPOs for operation of a mixed-tenure building until the rezoning application has been approved. Once a rezoning has been approved, there are limitations to the ability for an NPO to influence changes to design. This timing was a challenge echoed by multiple NPOs. The NPOs have tremendous insight about the needs of non-market housing and if they were invited to provide their insights earlier in the process, many issues could be mitigated. If there was a way to select NPOs earlier, it would also lead to stronger relationships between the developer, NPO and property manager. One operator said “we need to have a say if we’re going to be able to fully embrace the building”. This operator expressed that there a lot of assumptions by the City, thinking they know what NPOs want, but in reality, they do not want all these things. There are challenges with including NPOs earlier in the process, from NPOs having limited time and resources, developers striving for efficient development application processes, and the risk that a proposal may not be approved by Council. That said, it is important to find a way for NPOs voices to be heard when mixed-tenure developments are being designed. Several NPO’s stated that even if a city staff member called them to ask a question about a particular design component, they would be happy to provide their opinion, and would appreciate being asked. One option is for the City to start a focus group initiative where NPOs can provide insights into the overall development process, as opposed to providing insight on specific buildings.
Encourage spaces that are socially oriented to be shared

Overall, the majority of NPOs expressed the importance of shared social spaces. Most NPOs felt that children’s play areas, outdoor spaces and urban agriculture were very important to be shared, because these spaces are socially oriented. These spaces contribute to opportunities for “strangers to bump into one another” leading to potential social cohesion. Specifically, many NPOs felt that children’s play areas should be shared, so children could play with one another. The City should advocate for shared social spaces in mixed-tenure developments.

Education around de-stigmatizing affordable housing

We heard from many NPOs that there is a stigmatization of an “us versus them” mentality in mixed-tenure buildings. The City often implements inclusionary housing policy by separating non-market housing (as a separate ASP), as opposed to “pepper-potting” units throughout buildings. Pepper-potting refers to units that are spread throughout the building. However, in practice, this is difficult and has challenges as to how the ownership of the units are legally defined. The literature on mixed-income housing has strongly encouraged mixed-income developments to be “tenure-blind”. This reduces the stigmatization that one person may be in an affordable unit and reduces judgment among residents.

At the root of this issue of shared versus separate spaces is the idea that there are two groups and an ‘othering’ of one may occur when spaces are separate. There are assumptions by many people that residents in non-market housing are all on income assistance and paying substantially lower rents. Though this may be the case for a portion of the units, typically rented at shelter rates, two thirds of residents could be paying ten percent below the market rate, as one operator explained. Social housing buildings often have a mix of incomes, ranging from very low income residents on income assistance up to moderate income residents paying low-end of market rents. Households with moderate incomes could be earning as much as $80,000-$100,000 per year and qualify for the 10% below market rate. The income disparity may not be as great as some assume. One operator spoke about the term “social housing” and the stigma attached to that term. They suggested the City should more broadly refer to it as “non-market housing” which may carry less stigma.

Two organizations noted that it seemed as though the strata did not know how non-market housing works. One organization suggested that awareness should be raised for the strata moving into new units that are adjacent to non-market units. If awareness is built from the beginning, expectations could be managed and there could be less issues.

We recommend the City continues to raise awareness for affordable housing and the people who live in these units, which could potentially reduce an “us versus them” mentality, lessen stigma and lead to stronger social cohesion.
Limitations & Next Steps

A primary goal of this research was to understand prioritizations of shared versus non-shared spaces in mixed tenure housing projects. However, there were limitations with asking NPOs to rank and quantify each space. The responses were subjective to each operator’s direct experience with shared or separate spaces, and each ranking had caveats attached relating to tenant population, site design, and tenure mix. Overall, this type of five-point ranking system can be subjective, as what one person defines as “very important”, and therefore a 5 may be different from how another selects their ranking.

Throughout the research, there was slight confusion about the difference between mixed-tenure and mixed-income. This slight misunderstanding may have skewed the results.

Mixed-tenure social housing developments are relatively new to the City of Vancouver, resulting in a limitation to this research.

Finally, there are other determinants that contribute to overall positive experiences of mixed-tenure buildings (whether spaces are separate or shared). These could include management styles, programming, or level of neighbourhood integration.

Next Steps

This research captures a preliminary understanding about City of Vancouver and NPO perspectives about shared versus separate spaces in mixed tenure buildings. The perspectives of strata, developers, residents and property managers have not yet been examined and will provide valuable insights to this issue.

The City intends to hire a consultant to conduct further research on this issue. On April 1, 2019, the City released a “Request for Expression of Interest (RFEOI): in respect of consultant services to review shared common areas in mixed tenure social housing projects.” We have provided suggestions for the consultant based on the three main objectives, as identified in the RFEOI.
RFEOI Objective: Review best practices in municipalities outside of Vancouver on the topic of shared and separate common areas in mixed-tenure buildings and build upon current research project on this topic completed April 2019;

• **Suggestion:** Examine if other municipalities include NPOs in the design process earlier, and how they do so.

• **Suggestion:** Examine how policies in the City of North Vancouver, City of Coquitlam and City of Richmond vary from the City of Vancouver. These cities were identified by NPO’s as municipalities where they operate mixed-tenure buildings.

RFEOI Objective: Analyze current City of Vancouver practices and existing projects through stakeholder interviews (non-profit operators, strata, property managers, developers, etc.) and research; **Suggestion:** Provide a clear definition of “mixed-tenure housing” at the forefront of all interviews. At times during our interviews, there was confusion about mixed-tenure versus mixed-income.

• **Suggestion:** Make a clear distinction between mixed-tenure with strata and market-rental.

• **Suggestion:** Consider examining if any mixed-tenure projects manage the tenant relationships through Good Neighbour Agreements. This consideration was not examined in this phase of research and should be investigated.

RFEOI Objective: Make recommendations for future mixed-tenure social housing projects, including the feasibility of suggestions and feedback put forward by the stakeholders.

• **Suggestion:** Consider studying how NPOs can be included in the design process earlier.
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Appendix B: Interview Questions for Non-Profit Operators

Shared v Separate Entrances & Amenity Spaces in Inclusionary Housing

Interview Questions for Non-Profit Operators

Thank you for taking the time to answer our questionnaire. This research is a partnership between the City of Vancouver Affordable Housing and the UBC School of Community and Regional Planning (SCARP) in the Affordable Housing Policy and Planning course.

Background
Our research examines the issue of shared and separate entrances and amenity spaces within mixed tenure buildings that are a result of inclusionary zoning. Inclusionary Zoning is a policy embedded in many of the City’s community plans, and often results in air space parcels (ASPs) set within a strata or market rental development, generally acting as separate buildings. This issue of shared and separate spaces was raised by Council in July 2018, when a West End Inclusionary project was brought forward for approval at Public Hearing. While not feasible to combine the social and market housing entrances here, the applicant was advised to consider combining the outdoor play areas for use by all building residents. Media coverage on the issue of separate entrances, has used the term ‘poor door’, and outlined public concerns of stigmatization and isolation of the social housing residents, in place of a desired mixed-income community. Traditionally, spaces have been kept separate in an effort to keep costs down for the non-profit or co-op operator and minimize management fees or shared expenses.

To better understand the feasibility and implications of shared versus separate spaces within these buildings, two research reports are being conducted. This UBC student research project will focus on the issue from the perspective of non-profit and co-op housing operators and will include interviews with City staff and non-profit housing providers to understand the financial, operational and social implications of shared and separate spaces, as well as the relative importance of these issues. A consultant’s report will further explore this topic through engagement of non-profit and co-op operators currently managing buildings with shared or separate spaces, as well as developers, strata/rental managers, renters and City staff.

PART 1. Introduction Questions

1. How many non-market buildings do you operate as a society? [Your response]
   a. How many of these buildings are within the City of Vancouver? [Your response]

2. Do you operate any mixed-tenure buildings? (i.e. buildings where social housing is shared with strata or market rental units)? Note: For these purposes, mixed-tenure can be understood as buildings with mixed ownership (i.e. social housing is owned separately from market rental or strata housing.)
   a. If yes, proceed to Part 2A, directly below.
   b. If no, proceed to Part 2B near the end of this document.

PART 2A.
Appendix B: Interview Questions for Non-Profit Operators

Please answer these questions if you answered YES to Question 2 and your organization does operate mixed-tenure buildings.

3. How many mixed-tenure buildings do you operate in total? ##
   a. Are any of these within the City of Vancouver? (if yes, how many?) ##
   b. How many of these are:
      i. Separate air space parcels? ##
      ii. Social housing units contained within a strata or rental building? ##
      iii. Separate buildings (but with some shared space with the strata or market rental)? ##
   c. What are the addresses and/or names of the buildings for each type?
      i. Air-space parcels
         [Your response]
      ii. Social housing units within a strata or rental building
         [Your response]
      iii. Separate buildings
         [Your response]

4. Focusing on shared spaces and services infrastructure. For the mixed-tenure buildings you operate (in the City of Vancouver and beyond), how many have:
   a. Shared entrances: ##
      i. Shared elevators: ##
   b. Shared amenity spaces: ##
      i. If yes, are they outdoor or indoor?
      ii. If outdoor, does this include:
         1. Shared children’s play area? ##
         2. Shared urban agriculture? ##
      iii. If shared indoor amenity (common indoor space that all tenants have access to), how many?
   c. Shared parking: ##
   d. Shared garbage/loading areas: ##

5. Keeping in mind all the categories just discussed, we are interested in learning more about the financial, operational and social issues and/or benefits associated with these shared and separate spaces. What have your experiences been (both positive and negative) in operating these mixed-tenure buildings in terms of:
   a. Financial implications? For example, have there been added maintenance costs with the shared/separate entrances?)
      [Your response]
   b. Operational implications? For example. have there been any programming benefits or disadvantages of having shared/separate spaces?
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[Your response]
c. Social implications? For example, have there been any social benefits or disadvantages to having a shared/separate common outdoor space?
[Your response]
d. Are there any other implications? If so, what?
[Your response]

6. We hope to understand what spaces may be more important than others to be shared or separate. Based on the conversation we just had about the financial, operational, and social implications, which spaces should be shared and which should be separate?

a. Entrances should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]
   i. How important is it that entrances are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Elevators should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]
   How important is it that elevators are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Outdoor children’s play areas should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]
   How important is it that children’s play areas are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Urban agriculture should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]
   How important is it that urban agriculture is either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Indoor amenity spaces should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]
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How important is it that indoor amenity spaces are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 f. Parking should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]

How important is it that parking is either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 g. Garbage or loading areas should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]

How important is it that garbage or loading areas are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow up question: If you think ALL of the above spaces are very important (5) to be either shared or separated, what are the top three most important spaces to be either shared or separate?

7. What has the relationship between you, the non-profit operator, and the strata or property manager been like?
   a. Have there been any conflicts? If yes, what has been the source of these conflicts? If yes, have these conflicts been within stratas or rental tenures? [Your response]

8. Do you have any other thoughts on shared / separate entrances or amenity spaces? [Your response]

Thank you for your time!

PART 2B.

Please answer these questions if you do NOT operate mixed-tenure housing.

As a bit of background, through inclusionary zoning and other policies, the City of Vancouver has a number of mixed-tenure buildings in the application or construction phase, and a handful recently completed. These buildings have the social housing units in a separate air space parcel (separate legal
entities, building within a building), or in some cases have units set within the larger strata or market building. Within these mixed-tenure buildings, some spaces are shared while others are kept separate, depending on the project and other site constraints. The spaces we’re interested in hearing your opinion are, include:

- **a. Shared entrances**
  - i. Shared elevators

- **b. Shared outdoor amenity spaces (common outdoor space that all tenants have access to)**
  - i. Shared outdoor children’s play area
  - ii. Shared urban agriculture

- **c. Shared indoor amenity spaces (common indoor space that all tenants have access to)**

- **d. Shared parking**

- **e. Shared garbage/loading areas**

1. Keeping in mind all of the space categories mentioned, we are interested in learning more about whether you think there would be any financial, operational or social issues and/or benefits associated with these shared and separate spaces.

   - **f. Financial implications? For example, do you think there would be added maintenance costs associated with the shared or separate entrances / other spaces?**
     [Your response]

   - **g. Operational implications? For example do you think there would be any programming benefits or disadvantages of having shared entrances or other spaces?**
     [Your response]

   - **h. Social implications? For example, can you think of any potential social benefits or disadvantages to having a shared common outdoor space / entrance / etc.?**
     [Your response]

   - **i. Are there any other potential implications? If so, what?**
     [Your response]

2. We hope to understand what spaces may be more important than others to be shared or separate. Based on the conversation we just had about the above potential financial, operational, and social implications, how important is it to you that the following spaces are shared or separated (scale of 1 – 5, 1 = not important, 3 = somewhat important, 5 = very important)?

   - **j. Entrances should be (choose one) shared / separate.** [Your response]
     - i. How important is it that entrances are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]
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b. Elevators should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]  
How important is it that elevators are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6d. Urban agriculture should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]  
How important is it that urban agriculture is either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6e. Indoor amenity spaces should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]  
How important is it that indoor amenity spaces are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 f. Parking should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]  
How important is it that parking is either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 g. Garbage or loading areas should be (choose one) shared / separate. [Your response]
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How important is it that garbage or loading areas are either shared or separate (based on your choice above). [Your response on a scale of 1-5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow up question: If you think ALL of the above spaces are very important (5) to be either shared or separated, what are the top three most important spaces to be either shared or separate?

3. Do you have any other thoughts on shared / separate entrances or amenity spaces and why your organization may or may not be interested in operating such a building?
[Your response]

Thank you for your time!