



PEACE RIVER REGIONAL DISTRICT

# Housing Needs Report Electoral Area C

2021

This report was prepared for  
Electoral Area C through a joint  
project with the Peace River  
Regional District.

February 26, 2021

File: 0601.0089.01

This report is prepared for the sole use of Peace River Regional District. No representations of any kind are made by Urban Systems Ltd. or its employees to any party with whom Urban Systems Ltd. does not have a contract. © 2020 URBANSYSTEMS®.

# Executive Summary

This Housing Needs Report provides a detailed assessment of relevant housing related data for Electoral Area C. The purpose of this report is to establish an understanding of housing needs in the District prior to the development of future policy considerations.

Recognizing that the 2016 Census data used throughout this report is already somewhat dated, particularly for a region with a largely cyclical economy, this information nonetheless remains the most reliable data available for the purposes of this type of reporting, as it is collected only through Statistics Canada's Census. The legislative requirements stipulate the use of census data in British Columbia Housing Needs Reports. This data is supplemented by more recent data from sources such as Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and BC Housing, as well as feedback collected from residents and stakeholders in the community. Report updates are required every five years and can be used to monitor trends.

## Community Engagement

Residents of Electoral Area C were invited to participate in an online survey and stakeholders were invited to participate in focus groups and individual interviews. The top housing challenges identified through community and stakeholder engagement were housing affordability and the need for senior housing and supportive housing.

## Population and Age

Since 2006, the population of Electoral Area C increased slightly from 6,350 to 6,772 in 2016. The median age of residents was 35 in 2016, indicating a younger population overall in the community.

## Shadow Population

The shadow population that exists throughout the region has a significant impact on housing in both rural areas and the municipalities within the PRRD. With mining, hydro, oil and gas, forestry and agricultural industries active in the region, there are significant numbers of work camps situated across the PRRD to house employees that do not live permanently in the surrounding communities. Work camps reduce the impact of large numbers of individuals moving in and out of communities as work is available, and influencing vacancy and rental rates on a large scale.

## Households

The number of households increased by 6.4% over the same time period, and the average household size remained steady. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of Electoral Area C households are occupied by 1 or 2 persons and 78% of households consist of families with or without children. The majority of Electoral Area C households are owned (86%).

## Income

The median income of owner households increased from 2006 to 2016, and the median income of owner households was 73% more than the median income of renter households.

## Current Housing Stock

As of 2016, there were 2,470 dwellings in Electoral Area C, 82% of which were single-detached dwellings. The majority of all dwelling types had three or more bedrooms. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of housing units in Electoral Area C were built after 1980, and the majority only require regular maintenance (64%) or minor repairs (29%). In 2019, the average sales price for a single-family dwelling (3 bedrooms) was \$574,600.

## Housing Indicators

Of all Electoral Area C households in 2016, 7% lived in inadequate dwelling units, 2% lived in unsuitable conditions, and 12% spent more than 30% or more of their income on shelter costs indicating issues with affordability. Of senior households, 7% of households experiencing housing need had issues with adequacy of their unit and 12% had affordability issues. Additionally, a much higher proportion of renters than owners experienced Core Housing Need<sup>1</sup> (11.3% vs. 2.9%).

## Key Areas of Local Need

### Affordable Housing

Affordability is one of the most pressing housing issues facing residents in Electoral Area C. Through engagement, service providers indicated that it can be difficult to recruit staff due to lack of available affordable housing especially for one-person or single-income households.

### Rental Housing

Between 2006 and 2016, both the number and proportion of renter households increased, from 7% to 13% representing an increase of 175 renter households in the community. In 2016, Electoral Area C had a higher proportion of renters (8% or 25 households) than owners (1.7% or 35 households) experiencing Core Housing Need.

### Special Needs Housing

Stakeholders indicated through engagement that despite recent improvements in housing for individuals with disabilities and/or mental health issues in the community, there is still a need for

more supportive housing options as many rely on extended hospital stays or long-term care homes that do not provide the services they need.

### Housing for Seniors

Stakeholders indicated that there are long waitlists for seniors housing and in some cases individuals are prematurely placed in long term care facilities when appropriate supportive housing units are not available.

### Housing for Families

Families in Electoral Area C are generally well served by the housing choices available to them. However, a major challenge faced by the rural population of the PRRD is that the farming population is aging. In many cases, there is a desire to build additional dwelling units on rural parcels to accommodate children of the property owner to support the farming operation or have dwellings for farm employees.

### Homelessness

Stakeholders indicated a need for emergency housing or emergency shelters in strategic locations in the region to address these needs and provide support services. Across the region there are known trends of couch surfing, various people cycling through homes that are overpopulated, and instances of people living in their vehicles.

---

<sup>1</sup> CMHC defines Core Housing Need as a household whose housing does not meet the minimum requirements of at least one of the adequacy, affordability, or suitability indicators. In addition, it would have to spend 30% or more of its total before-tax income to pay the median rent of alternative local housing that is acceptable (meets all three housing standards). Those in

Extreme Core Housing Need meet the definition of Core Housing Need and spend 50% or more of their income on shelter costs.

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Overview .....	5
1.2 Housing Needs Report Requirements .....	6
1.3 Data Limitations .....	6
<b>2.0 Community Engagement Findings .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Overview .....	8
2.2 Findings for Electoral Area C .....	8
2.3 Housing Opportunities .....	10
2.4 Regional Findings .....	10
2.5 Opportunity Areas .....	12
<b>3.0 Electoral Area C Community Profile .....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Population .....	13
3.2 Age .....	14
3.3 Mobility .....	15
3.4 Households .....	16
3.5 Economy .....	19
3.6 Household Median Income .....	20
3.7 Summary .....	23
<b>4.0 Housing Profile .....</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 Overview of Housing Stock .....	24
4.2 Trends in Homeownership Market .....	29
4.3 Trends in Rental Market .....	32
4.4 Non-Market Housing .....	32
4.5 Homelessness .....	33
4.6 Student Housing .....	33

4.7	Housing Indicators .....	33
4.8	Core Housing Needs .....	35
4.9	Summary .....	36
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Anticipated Population .....</b>	<b>38</b>
5.1	Population and Household Growth.....	38
5.2	Age Projections .....	40
5.3	Household Projections .....	41
5.4	Summary .....	42
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Shadow Population and Work Camp Implications .....</b>	<b>43</b>
6.1	Community and Industry Benefits .....	43
6.2	Community and Industry Impacts .....	44
6.3	Managing Housing Pressures .....	44
<b>7.0</b>	<b>COVID-19 Implications .....</b>	<b>46</b>
7.1	Preliminary Economic Impacts .....	46
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Summary of Key Areas of Local Need .....</b>	<b>48</b>
8.1	Number of Units Needed by Unit Size .....	48
8.2	Statements of Key Areas of Local Need .....	48
	<b>Glossary .....</b>	<b>51</b>
	<b>Appendix A – Data Appendix .....</b>	<b>56</b>
	BC Assessment .....	56
	Census.....	61
	<b>Appendix B – Engagement Summary.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Housing Needs Survey Summary .....</b>	<b>65</b>
1.1	Introduction .....	65
1.2	Demographic Questions.....	65
1.3	Housing Experiences .....	67
1.4	Community Issues .....	69
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Interview and Focus Group Summary.....</b>	<b>72</b>

2.1	Participants .....	72
2.2	Peace River Regional District.....	77
2.3	Electoral Area C.....	81
	<b>Appendix C – Population Projection Methodology .....</b>	<b>84</b>
	Limitations .....	84



## 1.0 Introduction

The Peace River Regional District (PRRD) is divided into four electoral areas: B, D, C, E. Electoral Area C is the smallest electoral area in terms of land mass. Electoral Area C is located centrally within the PRRD and is bordered by Electoral Area B to the North, Electoral Area D to the Southeast, and Electoral Area E to the Southwest. As of the 2016 Census, Electoral Area C had the highest population among the electoral areas with 6,772 residents.

Electoral Area C residents face unique housing challenges, based on their location, the context of the community and current economic and growth drivers within the community and the region. Across BC, a housing affordability crisis has emerged due to high demand for housing from a growing population, low interest rates, and the attractiveness of housing as an investment. Increasingly, the cost of renting and owning is creating unprecedented financial burdens for households.

In 2019, the Government of BC introduced changes to the *Local Government Act*, Part 14, Division 22, requiring municipalities and regional districts to complete Housing Needs Reports to help better understand current and future housing needs and incorporate these into local plans and policies. Each local government must complete their first report by 2022 with updates every five years thereafter. The Union of British Columbia Municipalities (UBCM) is providing funding for local governments to support the completion of the first round of reports. The PRRD was awarded funding through this program and retained Urban Matters to complete Housing Needs Reports for four constituent communities, and the four electoral areas. Separate reports have been prepared for each participating community and electoral area, which are based on local context while also providing a regional lens.

The purpose of the PRRD Housing Needs Report Project is to:

- Develop an understanding of the current housing availability, suitability, and affordability across the entire housing continuum;
- Make projections and recommendations on future population growth and significant expected changes in housing demand;
- Provide a breakdown of housing units by type, size, condition, and state of repair; and
- Provide recommendations for relevant policy updates for participating local governments.

This Housing Needs Report includes relevant housing related data for Electoral Area C and establishes a baseline understanding of housing need prior to the development of full housing needs reports across the PRRD and its partner municipalities in this endeavor.

Recognizing that the 2016 Census data used throughout this report is already somewhat dated, particularly for a region with a largely cyclical economy, this information remains as the most reliable data due to its basis in the Census. It is required through legislation that this data be used in British Columbia Housing Needs Reports. The future needs projections and engagement sections are intended to ensure that a more current snapshot of needs is captured. Over time, as future Housing Needs Reports are produced, it will be important to be able to track trends in both Census data and qualitative data collected through engagement.




## 1.1 Overview


Electoral Area C is located centrally in the PRRD and surrounds the City of Fort St. John and borders the District of Taylor. As of 2016, Electoral Area C had a population of 6,772 residents, which is approximately 11% of the total PRRD population.

Census data labelled as Electoral Area C refers only to the population within the municipality's boundary and does not account for the population living within First Nation reserves. Census data labelled PRRD refers to all populations within the boundaries of the regional district, including First Nations, municipalities, and electoral areas. There are 320 households or 1% of the total private households in the PRRD who reside in band housing as of the 2016 Census.

**Figure 1 – Study Area Overview Map**



As of 2016, 82% of dwellings within Electoral Area C were single-detached dwellings. Across the rural areas of the PRRD, including Electoral Area C, housing related challenges can be attributed to a relatively stagnant and aging population, resulting in a shift in housing needs to support changing demographics and development trends. Due to its locality surrounding the major service centre of Fort St. John, Electoral Area C has a high demand for rural residential properties to accommodate residents who wish to live outside the city but remain within commuting distance.



Electoral Area C falls within the PRRD North Peace Fringe Area Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw 1870, 2009. This OCP includes policies to recognize the varied housing needs and to provide for a range of locations, types, tenures, and densities to ensure there is housing suitable to meet the needs of residents. The OCP supports special needs and affordable housing opportunities within the plan area. Furthermore, the OCP accommodates Home Based Businesses within certain zoning designations and includes policies to accommodate secondary studies, special needs housing, rental units, and housing for seniors.

## 1.2 Housing Needs Report Requirements

Housing Needs Reports regulations require the collection of approximately 50 different data indicators about past and current population, households, income and economy, and housing stock, as well as projected population, households, and housing stock.<sup>2</sup> Most of this data is made available by the Government of BC through their data catalogue. While not all 50 data indicators are summarized in the body of the report, all required data that is currently available can be found in the Data Appendix (Appendix A).

This document fulfills Housing Need Report requirements for Electoral Area C, providing information on housing needs across the housing continuum, including an estimate of the number and size of housing units required to address existing demand and future growth over the next five years. This report is intended to be used by the Electoral Area, the PRRD, and other stakeholders to inform the planning and development of housing, through local plans, policies, and the management of development. It is also a public document intended to support decision-making around housing and provide information to stakeholders to help improve local understanding of housing needs.

This report provides an overview of housing needs based on analysis of quantitative data, as well as qualitative data from engagement. This data is used to identify housing units required currently and over the next five years, number of households in core housing need, and statements about key areas of local need, in fulfilment of Housing Needs Reports regulations.<sup>3</sup>

## 1.3 Data Limitations


This report refers to both the standard Census Profile from Statistics Canada for Electoral Area C, as well as custom data that was prepared for the purpose of completing the Housing Needs Reports. The custom data refers to private households only and figures may be different than what is available through the public Census Profiles.

Recognizing that the 2016 Census data used throughout this report is already somewhat dated, particularly for a region with a largely cyclical economy, this information nonetheless remains as the most reliable data available for the purposes of this type of reporting, as it is collected only through Statistics Canada's Census. The legislative requirements require that it be used in British Columbia Housing Needs Reports. In order to address this limitation, the future needs projections and engagement sections are intended to ensure that a more current snapshot of needs and issues is captured. Over time, as future Housing Needs Reports are produced, this tool and approach

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/housing-and-tenancy/tools-for-government/uploads/summaryhnrrequirements\\_apr17\\_2019.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/housing-and-tenancy/tools-for-government/uploads/summaryhnrrequirements_apr17_2019.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/housing-tenancy/local-governments-and-housing/policy-and-planning-tools-for-housing/housing-needs-reports>



will be important to be able to track trends in the Census data and qualitative data collected through engagement. This report is intended to provide a baseline against which to assess changes.

The 2011 National Household Survey (NHS) was voluntary and as a result had a much lower response rate than the mandatory long-form Census. Because of this, data from the 2011 NHS is of a lower quality than Census data from other years.

The statistical data included in this report was collected prior to COVID-19 and may not entirely reflect current housing trends. The data reported should be considered together with Section 7 – COVID-19 Implications of this report. The findings in the concluding sections consider both available data, desktop research on COVID-19 implications on the housing system, and what was heard from stakeholders during engagement about the on-the-ground implications in Electoral Area C.



## 2.0 Community Engagement Findings

### 2.1 Overview

To better understand local housing needs, a community and stakeholder engagement was completed between July and September 2020. This process collected insight on local housing challenges and opportunities from the perspective of Electoral C residents, local stakeholders, and neighbouring First Nations. Additional stakeholder interviews were undertaken in December 2020 and January 2021 to ensure stakeholders across the region were well represented in the study. This section provides an overview of the engagement process.

#### 2.1.1 Community Survey

A community survey was available from July 15 to August 13, 2020. It was available through the PRRD website as well as through paper copies by request. The purpose of the survey was to collect information about the housing needs and challenges of residents.

A total of 14 respondents from Electoral Area C responded to the survey, including one individual that identified as Inuit and one individual that identified as Metis. All respondents identified as homeowners between the ages of 25 to 84 with a wide range of household incomes.

#### 2.1.2 Stakeholder Interview and Focus Groups

A wide range of stakeholders in Electoral Area C were invited to participate in an interview or focus group, including service providers, housing providers, and other community organizations. The following stakeholders in Electoral Area C participated: Director Brad Sperling, Upper Pine School, Fort St. John Women's Resource Society, Fort St. John Association for Community Living.

The full results of the survey and focus groups and interviews can be found in Appendix B.

### 2.2 Findings for Electoral Area C

#### 2.2.1 Housing Challenges

Stakeholders and survey participants were asked about housing challenges and opportunities specific to Electoral Area C. **Error! Reference source not found.** illustrates the top housing challenges that survey participants identified for Electoral Area C. The high cost of buying a home in Electoral Area C was the most common concern (6 respondents), followed by lack of housing options for seniors. Some respondents were concerned with the lack of supportive housing for individuals with mental health issues or disabilities (3 respondents). Three out of 14 respondents were also concerned about homes in the community needing repair or maintenance. The following sections summarize the challenges shown in **Error! Reference source not found.** Figure 2 **Error! Reference source not found.** and other challenges mentioned by survey participants.

Figure 2 – Top Community Issues in Electoral Area C



## 2.2.2 Affordability

Three out of five participants that identified barriers when finding their current home said that the cost was too high and there is limited supply of the type of home they were looking for.

Survey participants were also asked to identify any housing challenges that they anticipate in the next five years. Two out of three participants that answered the question said that they were unsure whether they would be able to afford future mortgage payments.

## 2.2.3 Senior Housing

As shown in (**Error! Reference source not found.**), survey participants felt that the one of the top community issues was the lack of senior housing available, including at-home care (6 respondents), supportive housing (5 respondents), and downsizing options (4 respondents). Survey participants felt that the most needed forms of housing are assisted living facilities (6 respondents).



#### **2.2.4 Lack of Nearby Services and Amenities**

When asked about current housing challenges they are facing, all five survey participants that responded to the question said that their home is not well serviced by public transit. Survey participants also anticipate that in the next five years, their homes will not be serviced by public transit and will be too far away from amenities.

#### **2.2.5 Homes Needing Repairs**

Two out of three respondents that identified their current housing issues said that their home is poor condition and need repair while three respondents felt that homes needing repairs or maintenance was one of the community's overall issue.

### **2.3 Housing Opportunities**

Survey participants were invited to identify opportunities to build new housing or support groups in need. The following are their suggestions:

- Build additional suites or carriage houses for extended members to live together
- Provide additional government support for housing in the region

### **2.4 Regional Findings**

The following section provides a summary of housing challenges and opportunities stakeholder interviewees mentioned that were relevant across all PRRD communities.

#### **2.4.1 Housing Affordability and Supply**

Interviewees observed that there are more housing developments during industry cycles which increases the availability of housing. However, these industry cycles were also observed to drive housing unaffordability as prices rise due to the influx of workers. For some service providers, it has also been challenging to recruit staff, partly due to housing. Finding affordable housing options is reported to be especially challenging for one-person or single-income households.

#### **2.4.2 Senior Housing**

For seniors in the region, interviewees report that there are long waitlists for seniors housing of up to two to three years. Having fixed incomes makes it difficult for many seniors to find appropriate housing and some end up living in sub-standard units. Stakeholders report a need for services to support seniors who choose to age in place in their own homes, for example, support with meals, snow removal, etc. Improved accessibility would also help many remain independent over a longer term. It was also reported that seniors with dementia who do not have access to appropriate housing and supports may be prematurely placed in long-term care. In rural communities with limited services, seniors may find it difficult to access health care services close to home and may move to more urban areas to access to these services or be closer to family.

#### **2.4.3 Supportive Housing**

Stakeholders identified a need for supportive housing for vulnerable population such as seniors, Indigenous Elders, youth, individuals with disabilities, and individuals with mental health issues. Additionally, some service providers face challenges of recruiting staff.



## Youth

Stakeholders point out that youth, under 19, who require medical care are put into long-term care. More youth housing near larger municipalities would ensure that they can attend nearby schools and receive education.

## Individuals with Disabilities

Despite recent improvements in housing for individuals with disabilities (such as brain injuries, mobility issues, MS), there is still a need for more housing options for these individuals in new buildings. Individuals who receive disability support face many challenges in finding appropriate housing because of restricted budgets. Interviewees also report a need for additional accessible housing units for individuals with disabilities who are able to live independently. Stakeholders noted that the default accommodations (such as extended hospital stays or long-term care) for individuals with disabilities is not suitable for their needs and prevents them from accessing services. Individuals stay for extended periods of times in hospitals when there isn't proper housing available, which have resulted in over capacity in hospitals.

## Individuals with Mental Health Issues

Interviewees pointed out that individuals suffering from mental health issues often face additional barriers when looking for housing. Service providers reported that there is a lack of low barrier housing available for people at different stages of their lives and individuals are often turned away from rentals and shelters due to their conditions, limiting them to access the supports they require. One stakeholder mentioned there is a particular need for increasing programming that serve men with mental health issues.

## Vulnerable Population

Interviewees indicated there is a need for supportive housing for individuals leaving abusive relationships and or families fleeing negative or dangerous living situations.


## 2.44 Households with Income Assistance

Housing affordability was a concern for stakeholders, with particular mention of individuals on income-assistance. Despite rental availability, many individuals on income-assistance are unable to market housing. The stigma of income-assistance has also resulted in some rental companies discriminating individuals from housing opportunities.

## 2.4.5 Indigenous Housing

There is a shortage of housing for Indigenous households living both on and off reserve. Interviewees report that Indigenous households need better access to medical services, mental health supports, and safe homes when living off reserve.

One of the major issues influencing the availability of housing on reserve is the lack of funding for repairing existing homes or building new ones. The application process to receive funding is time-consuming and difficult. Additionally, interviewees report that the current minimum building code is unsuitable for meeting the needs of climate conditions (e.g. high snow load). Many homes have not been built to withstand climate conditions and need to be replaced. Materials for replacements are limited locally and must be sourced from communities that are farther away.



Interviewees reported a need for better quality housing suited for the northern climate that serves diverse household needs (e.g. families, singles, Elders). There is also need for more nearby community infrastructure and services to support existing homes (e.g. schools, shops, medical support for Indigenous Elders).

## 2.5 Opportunity Areas

### 2.5.1 Collaborations and Partnerships

Stakeholders highlighted the importance of fostering collaborations in the District between communities and First Nations, and pursuing partnerships with service providers, housing providers and BC Housing.

Stakeholders identified a need for collaborative conversations between emergency service providers, health care workers and District Officials to better understand the housing needs of vulnerable populations.

### 2.5.2 Research and Policy

Those involved in housing development indicated a need for the PRRD and municipalities to review development procedures to reduce any unnecessary restrictions on development and incentivize development through tax incentives. Collecting data and conducting assessments were identified as important to addressing current and future housing needs and issues. Stakeholders felt that increasing knowledge of housing needs will support the District in preparing for future funding and investment opportunities.

### 2.5.3 Continued Support for Senior Housing and Affordable Housing Options

Stakeholders highlighted the importance of fostering collaborations in the District between communities and First Nations, and pursuing partnerships with service providers, housing providers and BC Housing. Collecting data and conducting assessments was identified as important to addressing current and future housing needs and issues. Stakeholders felt that increasing knowledge of housing needs will support the District in preparing for future funding and investment opportunities. Stakeholders suggested that a database of senior accommodation and support services available across the region should be established to help residents access the services they need.

### 2.5.4 Other Opportunities

Stakeholders identified a number of other opportunities for building new housing or providing supports for specific groups:

- Provide more off reserve housing across the region for First Nations
- Provide mental health housing that allow independence for tenants
- Provide private assisted living facilities to increase options and availability for seniors
- Provide housing options for individuals living in hospital care
- Increase funding for the Homeless Prevention Program
- Repurpose underutilized hotels for affordable housing units
- Utilize underutilized buildings and undeveloped properties to develop housing projects or accommodate support services




## 3.0 Electoral Area C Community Profile

The demographic and economic context of a community shape its housing needs. Age and stage of life, household type and size, income, and employment all directly affect the type of housing units, sizes, and tenures needed. This section provides an overview of these factors, using a combination of data from the Statistics Canada Census Profiles and data tables and custom data prepared for Housing Needs Reports.

### 3.1 Population


Between 2006 and 2016, Electoral Area C grew by 6.4% from 6,350 to 6,772 residents, an increase of 422 residents. Over the same time period the PRRD grew by 4.8%. The population in Electoral Area C grew at a slight rate between 2006 and 2011, before experiencing an increase over the last two census periods (2011 and 2016) (Figure 3).

**Figure 3 – Population Changes in Electoral Area C and PRRD, 2006-2016**



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2006, 2011, 2016


**Figure 4 – Population Changes in Electoral Area C and PRRD, 2005-2016**



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2006, 2011, 2016

Electoral Area C has a total of 785 individuals or 11.7% of the population in private households (6,710 individuals) who identify as Indigenous as of the 2016 Census (Figure 55). Of this group, 41% identify as First Nations, 51% as Métis, 5% as multiple indigenous identities, and 1% as Inuk. The Indigenous population in Electoral Area C make up approximately 8% of the overall Indigenous population in the PRRD.


**Figure 5 – Indigenous Identity for Populations in Private Households, 2016**



## 3.2 Age

From 2006 to 2016, the median age in Electoral Area C increased from 37 to 38, indicating a trend of older residents in the area, and an older population than the PRRD overall. During the same time period, the median age in the PRRD remained relatively consistent, decreasing from 34.2 to 34.1. The age group distribution in Electoral Area C has a greater proportion of residents in the 45 to 54 age category and fewer residents in the 25 to 34 age category as compared to the PRRD in 2016.

Figure 6 – Age Distribution in Electoral Area C, 2006-2016




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2006, 2011, 2016

### 3.3 Mobility

In Electoral Area C, 4% of the population moved into the area in a one-year period between 2015 and 2016, compared to the 6% in the PRRD and 7% in BC. Of those who moved to Electoral Area C, 86% were intra-provincial migrants (people who moved from elsewhere in BC), 10% were inter-provincial migrants (people who moved from another province), and 6% were external migrants (people who moved from outside Canada). Compared to the PRRD, Electoral Area C has a lower proportion of individuals who moved intra-provincially. This means the large majority of new residents were from within Canada, with only a small number from outside the country.

Figure 7 – 1 Year Ago Mobility Status in Electoral Area C, PRRD and BC<sup>4</sup>



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016


## 3.4 Households

From 2006 and 2016, the number of households in Electoral Area C grew by 155 households, or 6.4% from 2,315 to 2,470. Compared the average household size for Electoral Area C was 2.7 persons in 2016, compared to the 2.5 persons for the PRRD. The average household size in Electoral Area C did not increased between 2006 and 2016. In 2016, 42% of households in Electoral Area C were 3 person or more households (i.e. family households), compared to 39% of PRRD households (Figure 88). This higher proportion of larger household sizes in Electoral Area C than the PRRD suggests a greater prevalence of families in Electoral Area C than the PRRD, rather than other household types. This correlates to the relatively young median age, and the fact that it decline between 2006 and 2016.

Electoral Area C has a higher proportion of family households with and without children (28%) than the PRRD (and corresponds with the demographic data shown in (Figure 9), and lower proportion of one-person non-census-family households (17%). These figures suggest that families are more likely to live in the Electoral Area than the region, as a whole as family households make up the majority of households in the community (78%).


<sup>4</sup> Due to randomized rounding implemented by Statistics Canada, there are some cases where proportions do not add up to 100%.

**Figure 8 – Household by Size in Electoral Area C, 2016**



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016


**Figure 9 – Households by Household Type in Electoral Area C and PRRD, 2016**



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016

Figure 10 shows the ages of primary household maintainers by tenure, to illustrate the distribution of tenure across age groups in 2016. Primary household maintainer refers to the person leading a household. The census allows two to be identified per household and the data is based on the first entry. In Electoral Area C, there was a smaller proportion of households headed by the youngest and oldest age groups. Renter households are more likely to be led by a younger age group (67% of renters were under the age of 55, and 42% were under 35), while 31% of owners were 55 or older.

**Figure 10 – Age of Primary Household Maintainer by Tenure, 2016**




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016

### 3.4.1 TENURE

Electoral Area C has seen the proportion of owner households decline over the past three census periods, from 93% in 2006 to 89% in 2011, and 86% in 2016, leading to a corresponding increase in renter households, from 7% in 2006, 11% in 2011, and 13% in 2016. For comparison, in 2016, 70% of PRRD residents were homeowners and 28% were renters. In part, this tenure breakdown can be attributed to affordable housing prices and high household incomes and a lack of available rental properties within the Electoral Area, which is fairly typical of rural regions and communities. The decrease in owner households and increase in renter households could be attributed to the changes in industry demand within the region.

Figure 11 – Households by Tenure in Electoral Area C, 2006-2016<sup>5</sup>



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2006, 2016, NHS Profile 2011

### 3.5 Economy


Between 2006 and 2016, the Electoral Area C labour force participation saw a slight decrease in labour participation and an increase in unemployment in 2016. The unemployment rate in Electoral Area C increased from 3.7% to 10.8% over the same time period. This increase in unemployment took place during a period of time where there was a downturn in the oil and gas economy, and these numbers reflect that; however, it is likely that current unemployment rates would be lower than in 2016. Comparatively, the PRRD participation rate decreased from 76% to 73% and the unemployment rate increased from 5.5% to 12.1%, which may be related to the 2014-2015 downturn on the oil and gas industry.

In 2016, the top five industries employing Electoral Area C residents included Mining, quarrying, oil and gas extraction (16%), construction (14%), transportation and warehousing (10%), other services (except public administration) (9%), and retail trade (8%). However, the current distribution of labour force by industry in Electoral Area C is likely to have changed from 2016. Since 2016, there have been several large projects initiated in the PRRD, including the construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline, Site C construction, Pembina pipeline expansion, and major growth in the Montney region. Many employees working on these projects live in Electoral

<sup>5</sup> Where small data sets may appear as 0, or in some cases may lead to proportions not adding to 100%.

Area C and in work camps situated across the PRRD, and some employees may be residents of neighbouring communities such as Fort St. John.

**Figure 12 – Labour Participation Rate and Unemployment Rate in Electoral Area C and PRRD, 2006-2016**



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

## 3.6 Household Median Income

Between 2006 and 2016, median before-tax private household income grew by 17% in Electoral Area C, compared to the 24% across the PRRD. As of 2016, Electoral Area C residents had significantly higher median household incomes than the total PRRD population. In 2016, the median income in Electoral Area C was \$123,945; \$29,046 higher than the PRRD median income of \$94,046 (Figure 1313).


Median household income differs by household type. In Electoral Area C, female lone parents and non-census families (typically individuals living alone) have the lowest median income. Other census families and couples with children had the highest median incomes, which is typical as they represent households generally at the peak of their earning potential and may have two-income streams (Figure 14). Couples without children typically represent older couples whose children have left and contain both households nearing retirement (who may be high earners) and couples who are retired, who are living off investments and pensions. Households with lower incomes are likely to be more vulnerable to housing issues, as the options for what they can afford are naturally lower.

The median renter household income in a community is typically lower than the median owner household income. In Electoral Area C, the median renter household income in 2016 was \$74,836, compared to the median owner household income of \$132,667, meaning median incomes of renter households were about 56% that of owners (Figure 1515). Median renter income also decreased between 2006 and 2011 and rose again between 2011 and 2016. This could be attributed to a larger economic downturn in 2008 and its impacts. Of the renter households,




50% earn less than \$80,000 and nearly a third (31%) earn less than \$40,000, while 43% of owner household incomes is \$150,000 and over (Figure 16). This indicates that renters may not necessarily choose this tenure but rent because they are unable to afford ownership as an option.

**Figure 13 – Median Before-Tax Private Household Income, 2006-2016**




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

**Figure 14 – Median Total Household Income in Electoral Area C and PRRD, 2016**




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

**Figure 15 – Median Income by Tenure in Electoral Area C and PRRD 2006-2016**



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

**Figure 16 – Renter and Private Household Income by Income bracket, 2016**



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing



### 3.7 Summary

Between 2006 and 2016, Electoral Area C population increased only slightly and reached 6,772 in 2016. However, it is estimated that the population began to grow after 2017, and in 2020 is project to be 2,753 (see Section 5.1) The median age of Electoral Area C residents was 35 in 2016, which was comparable to the median age of the total PRRD population of 34.1, indicating a younger population. There are 785 individuals how identify as Indigenous in Electoral Area C (41% First Nations, 51% as Métis, 5% as Multiple Indigenous Responses) who make up 12% of the Electoral C population in private households.

In 2016, Electoral Area C experienced some population change as a result of individuals moving to the area from elsewhere in British Columbia. Only 25 new Electoral Area C residents that year relocated to the area from another province and 15 from outside Canada.

The number of households in Electoral Area C increased by 6.4% between 2006 and 2016 and the average household size remained steady. The majority of households in Electoral Area C are occupied by 1 or 2 persons. Compared to the PRRD, Electoral Area C had more family households with and without children and a lower percentage of one-person non-census family households.

In Electoral Area C, 86% of households are owned and 13% are rented, and the median income of both owner and renter households increased from 2006 to 2016. The median income of renter households in 2016 was 56% that of owner households.

Between 2006 and 2016, the unemployment rate in Electoral Area C increased from 3.7% to 10.8% and the participation rate also decreased from 80% to 72%. However, the median income of private households in Electoral Area C increased slightly over the same time period. Households with the highest median income in 2016 were other census families.

Although there was a fluctuating unemployment rate in Electoral Area C between 2006 and 2016 due to a downturn in the oil and gas industry in 2014 and 2015, the unemployment rate for October 2019 for the Northeast region of BC is estimated to be 2.6%.

## 4.0 Housing Profile


This section provides an overview of community housing stock (dwelling type, size, and age), market and non-market housing trends, and indicators of housing need. The content in this section forms the basis of the statements about key areas of local need provided in Section 8.

### 4.1 Overview of Housing Stock

#### 4.1.1 HOUSING UNITS

As of 2016, there were 2,470 dwellings in Electoral Area C. It is noted that there may be a large number of unaccounted for dwellings or communal dwellings in the Electoral Area that didn't respond to Census takers. The dominant form of housing in Electoral Area C are single-detached homes (82%). The other dominant form of housing in Electoral Area C includes movable dwellings, which represent 17% of the housing stock (Figure 177).

**Figure 17 – Dwelling by Structure Type in Electoral Area C and PRRD<sup>6</sup>**




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016

In 2016, Eighty-one percent (81%) of dwellings in Electoral Area C had three or more bedrooms. Most dwellings with four bedrooms or more were owned (45%), and 9% of the dwellings of that size were rented. Forty-six

<sup>6</sup> Some unit types may not show the number of units. This is due to randomized rounding implemented by Statistics Canada, where small data sets may appear as 0, or in some cases may lead to proportions not adding to 100%.

percent (46%) of rented dwellings had two bedrooms or fewer. The most common structural housing type in Electoral Area C occupied by both owners and renters are single-detached houses. However, owner households occupied a greater proportion of single-detached houses than renter households, while renter households occupied more movable dwellings (30%) compared to owner households (15%). This indicates a strong supply of rented moveable dwellings. There is also a small proportion of renters who occupied an apartment in a flat or duplex.<sup>7</sup>

**Figure 18 – Households by Bedroom Number and Tenure in Electoral Area C, 2016<sup>8</sup>**




Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population, Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-400-X2016220

<sup>7</sup> StatsCan defines a duplex as a single-family dwelling with a secondary suite, not what the public typically identifies as a duplex which is a semi detached dwelling.

<sup>8</sup> Some unit types may not show the number of units. This is due to randomized rounding implemented by Statistics Canada, where small data sets may appear as 0, or in some cases may lead to proportions not adding to 100%.

**Figure 19 – Dwellings by Structure Type and Tenure, 2016**




Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population, Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-400-X2016227

#### 4.1.2 CONDITION OF HOUSING


In 2016, dwelling conditions were similar between renter and owner households, with most dwellings requiring regular maintenance only (64% of all dwellings), while 29% required minor repairs and 7% required major repairs (Figure 20). Compared to the PRRD, dwellings in Electoral Area C were slight older, with the highest proportion of houses being built before 1981 (43%) as compared to 47% of homes being built in the same time period in the PRRD (Figure 21).

**Figure 20 – Condition of Dwelling by Tenure, 2016**



Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2016, Data Table 98-400-X2016227

**Figure 21 – Dwellings by Period of Construction in Electoral Area C and PRRD, 2016**



Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population, Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-400-X2016227

### 4.1.3 OCCUPIED PRIVATE DWELLINGS

Private dwellings that are occupied by usual residents means a house in which a person or household is permanently residing. Dwellings that are not occupied by usual residents usually means that the housing unit is either vacant or rented out on a temporary or short-term basis. In Electoral Area C, 93% of private dwellings were occupied and 7% (193 units) were unoccupied (Table 1).

**Table 1 – Occupied Private Dwellings, Electoral Area C, 2016**

	Number of Dwellings	Proportion of Total Private Dwellings (%)
<b>Total private dwellings</b>	2,664	100%
<b>Private dwellings occupied by usual residents</b>	2,471	93%
<b>Private dwellings not occupied by usual residents</b>	193	7%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016

### 4.1.4 RECENT CHANGES IN HOUSING STOCK

Between 2016 and 2019, the annual number of building permits for new residential dwelling units approved in Electoral C remained relatively stable, indicating steady demand for new residential units (Table 2). However, because building permits are only issued in some areas of each Electoral Area, this may not accurately reflect all new residential developments. In some cases, un-licensed builds may account for a large number of dwellings. Note that these figures do not include permits for decks or accessory buildings such as garages and sheds, and only includes permits for residential dwelling units.

**Table 2 – Residential Dwelling Building Permit and Demolition Permits, Electoral Area C, 2016-2019**


	2016	2017	2018	2019
<b>Residential Dwelling Building Permits</b>	11	13	6	8
<b>Demolition Permits</b>	0	1	1	1

Source: Peace River Regional District, 2020

#### 4.1.5 HOUSEHOLDS AND STRUCTURE TYPES

In Electoral Area C, the majority of all family types live in a single-detached house. The remaining proportion of households reside either in a movable dwelling and a small proportion occupy other attached dwellings, indicating that these dwelling types may be affordable options for households who can't afford single family homes in Electoral Area C (Figure 22).

**Figure 22 – Households by Structure and Family Type in Electoral Area C, 2016<sup>9</sup>**



Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population, Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-400-X2016227


<sup>9</sup> The graph below includes both owners and renters. "Other attached dwelling" includes apartment or flat in a duplex, row house, semi-detached house.



## 4.2 Trends in Homeownership Market

Based on assessment values for residential properties in Electoral Area C, the average house value (e.g. includes all housing types), has increased from \$216,396 to \$426,466 over the last 14 years (Figure 23). This equivalent to an increase of approximately 97% from 2006 to 2020. The upward trend has been ready for Electoral Area C over this time period.


**Figure 23 – Average Assessed Residential Values in Electoral Area C, 2006-2020**



Source: BC Assessment, 2019


In the Electoral Area C homeownership market, single family dwellings with three or more bedrooms had the highest average conveyance price in 2019. Two-bedroom single family dwellings were comparable on average to manufactured homes with three or more bedrooms (Figure 24). Duplexes with three or more bedrooms had the highest median residential value, followed by single family dwellings also with three or more bedrooms (Figure 25). Note that these sales prices are highly dependent on the number of sales occurring in the given year of the assessment (e.g. 2019) and should be interpreted in comparison to the 2019 assessed values.

**Figure 24 – Average Residential Category by Conveyance Price Type and Bedroom Type in Electoral Area C, 2019**



Source: BC Assessment, 2019

**Figure 25 – Median Residential Category Residential Value by Type and Bedroom Type in Electoral Area C, 2019**



Source: BC Assessment, 2019



#### 4.2.1 HOMEOWNERSHIP AFFORDABILITY GAP ANALYSIS

An affordability gaps analysis was prepared to assess gaps between shelter costs and household incomes. This provides insight into whether households are spending an unaffordable amount of monthly income on shelter costs. Affordability is defined as spending less than 30% of gross household income on shelter costs.

For ownership housing, shelter costs are primarily driven by housing prices via mortgage payments, but also include other monthly expenses like property tax, utilities, home insurance, municipal services charges, and strata fees. The shelter costs for the affordability analysis use the 2019 average conveyance price (e.g. sales price) for the most common structural types in Electoral Area C.

The values highlighted in green, orange, and red are the difference between what is affordable for each household type and shelter costs per month. Green cells indicate the household is spending less than 30% of monthly household income on shelter costs; orange indicates they are spending 30% to 49%, and red indicates they are spending 50% or more.<sup>10</sup>

The main gaps in affordability are in non-census families affording single family dwellings as well as lone parent families and non-census families in affording a row house style dwelling (Table 3). Other family types have considerably higher median household incomes than these family types because they typically can include multi-generational or other family living arrangements with multiple incomes. All other housing types at the average 2019 sales price were affordable for all other family types.

---

<sup>10</sup> Statistics Canada considers households spending 30% or more of total before-tax household income to be living in unaffordable housing. This may include households in Core Housing Need. Households spending 50% or more of total before-tax household income may be in Extreme Core Housing Need. These indicators are described in more detail in Sections 4.7 and 4.8.

**Table 3 – Affordability Gap Analysis for Owners in Electoral Area C<sup>11</sup>**

	Median Household Income (2019)	Affordable Monthly Shelter Costs	Monthly Shelter Affordability Gap
			Single Family Home (\$299,202)
Couples without children	\$89,224	\$2,231	-\$879
Couples with children	\$127,052	\$3,176	\$67
Lone parent families	\$51,262	\$1,282	-\$1,828
Non-census families	\$49,714	\$1,243	-\$1,867
Other census families	\$135,021	\$3,376	\$266

Sources: Statistics Canada, 2016, BC Assessment, 2019.

	Spending less than 30% of their income on shelter costs
	Spending approximately 30%-49% of their income or less on shelter costs
	Spending 50% or more of their income or less on shelter costs

Sources: Statistics Canada, 2016, BC Assessment, 2019.

## 4.3 Trends in Rental Market

The rental market can be divided into primary rental and secondary rental. The primary rental market consists of purpose-built rental buildings with multiple units while the secondary rental market consists of rented homes, secondary suites, individually rented condominium units, and other dwellings that are not purpose built. Both primary and secondary rental unit data is unavailable through CMHC for Electoral Area C. Additionally, data for short-term rental market is unavailable for Electoral Area C. While there are data availability issues on rent and vacancy for many smaller communities in British Columbia, including communities in Peace River, housing indicators and core housing need (sections 4.7 and 4.8) provide an indication of the challenges renters currently face in Electoral Area C.

## 4.4 Non-Market Housing

As of March 31, 2020, there was one reported non-market unit in Electoral Area C where BC Housing had a financial relationship, which was a rental assisted unit in the private market.

<sup>11</sup> Note that these calculations did not include costs for services such as water, sewer, and garbage disposal as they differ among households across the rural areas.



## 4.5 Homelessness

Across the region there are known trends of couch surfing, various people cycling through homes that are overpopulated, and instances of people living in their vehicles. Typically, homelessness is more visible in warmer months in the region when people may live in parks or alleyways, but in the winter, homelessness is much less visible. Levels of homelessness have also fluctuated with the success of local industry and when downturns occur there are more instances where people have issues making ends meet and may end up homeless. Stakeholders indicated a need for emergency housing or emergency shelters in strategic locations in the region to address these needs and provide support services.

## 4.6 Student Housing

The only purpose built post-secondary student housing known in the PRRD is at Northern Lights College in Dawson Creek and Fort St. John. Dawson Creek has a 190 bed student dormitory and Fort St. John has a 102 bed dormitory. As of the 2018/2019 school year, there was a total of 599 full-time equivalent enrolments at Northern Lights College across all campuses. Between the 2008/2009 and 2018/2019 school years, the Northern Lights College full-time equivalent enrollments decreased by 37% respectively.


## 4.7 Housing Indicators

Housing indicators show when households are not meeting housing standards defined as follows:

- Adequate housing is reported by their residents as not requiring any major repairs.
- Affordable housing costs less than 30% of total before-tax household income.
- Suitable housing has enough bedrooms for the size and makeup of resident households according to National Occupancy Standard (NOS) requirements.

In Electoral Area C, as of 2016, 7% of households were living in inadequate housing, and 2.1% were living in unsuitable housing (Figure 26). Affordability is the most common housing standard not met in Electoral Area C, typical of the regional and provincial trends. Twelve percent (12%) of all households in 2016 spent 30% or more of their income on shelter costs, including 15% of renter households and 12% of owner households. Renter households were nearly twice as likely to experience adequacy issues, compared to owners; however suitability and affordability issues were relatively comparable. Typically renters experience much higher rates of affordability issues; however, this does not appear to be the case in Electoral Area C. Although there are higher proportions of renter households not meeting suitability, adequacy, and affordability standards, it is important to remember there were 2,135 owner households in Electoral Area C in 2016, compared to 330 renter households.


**Figure 26 – Unsuitable Housing by Tenure for Private Households in Electoral Area C, 2016**



*Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing*

Seniors housing is an important topic in the region, and as such housing indicators for seniors provide insight into how seniors may differ from the population as whole with regards to housing issues. Of senior households in Electoral Area C (aged 65 and over), 7% of senior households experiencing housing needs had issues with adequacy and 12% had issues with affordability. Seniors who rent are more likely to experience issues with affordability and adequacy, however they also represent a relatively small portion of overall households. This all suggests that a small but important number of senior households are experiencing housing vulnerability in Electoral Area C.

Figure 27 – Housing Indicators of Senior Households, 2016




Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population, Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-400-X2016231

## 4.8 Core Housing Needs

CMHC defines Core Housing Need as a household whose housing does not meet the minimum requirements of at least one of the adequacy, affordability, or suitability indicators. In addition, a household would have to spend 30% or more of its total before-tax income to pay the median rent of alternative local housing that is acceptable (meets all three housing standards). Those in Extreme Core Housing Need meet the definition of Core Housing Need and spend 50% or more of their income on housing.


In 2016, Electoral Area C had a much higher proportion of renters than owners experiencing Core Housing Need (11.3% vs. 2.9%) (Figure 28). Of renter households experiencing core housing need, 3.2% were experiencing extreme core housing need as compared to 1.2% of owner households. As compared to the PRRD, Electoral Area C has a lower proportion of households living in Core Housing Need and Extreme Core Housing Need (Figure 29).

**Figure 28 – Private Households by Core Housing Need and by Tenure, 2016**



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

**Figure 29 – Private Households in Core Housing Needs in Electoral Area C and PRRD, 2016**




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

## 4.9 Summary

As of 2016, there were 2,470 dwellings in Electoral Area C, 82% of which were single-detached dwellings. The remaining units were movable dwellings and a small proportion of other dwelling types. Of all dwellings, 81% had three or more bedrooms, while 57% of all households had one or two occupants, suggesting some of the population may be living in larger homes than they need. Eighty-six percent (86%) of owned dwellings had three or more bedrooms and 46% of rented dwellings had two or less bedrooms. Owned dwellings consisted of 85% single-detached houses and 15% movable dwellings. Rented dwellings consisted of 67% single-detached houses, 30% movable dwellings, and 3% apartment or flats in a duplex. There may be a lack of options within Electoral Area C for older adults looking to downsize out of large single family homes and for families looking for rental units with enough bedrooms to suit their needs without having to enter the homeownership market. It is likely that older adults looking to downsize and families in the rental market would find more suitable housing options within a town or city in the region.





Based on median income levels, homeownership is likely out of reach for single-income households like lone-parent and non-census families as they would need to spend 50% or more of their monthly income to be able to afford most housing types.

Of all Electoral Area C dwellings, 64% require only regular maintenance and 29% require minor repairs, leaving only a small proportion needing major repairs. The need for repairs also corresponds with the fact that 57% of dwellings in the District were built after 1980. In 2019 the average sales price for a single-family dwelling (3 bedrooms) was \$574,600.

Of all households in Electoral Area C in 2016, 7% were living in inadequate dwelling units, 2% were living in unsuitable conditions, and 12% were spending 30% or more of their income on shelter costs indicating issues with affordability. Additionally, a much higher proportion of owners than renters experienced core housing need (11.3% vs. 2.9%). Of senior households, 7% of households experiencing housing need had issues with adequacy of their unit, 12% had affordability issues, and 17% were experiencing more than one housing need indicator. This suggests there may be a lack of affordable rental options with Electoral Area C that are accessible and suitable for aging, thus senior individuals may be more likely to relocate to a town or city in the region to find suitable housing options.



## 5.0 Anticipated Population

This section summarizes population, household, and housing unit projections for the next five years, as required for Housing Needs Reports. Population projections such as these offer a glimpse at a possible future scenario. Real community growth depends on many influencing factors, including the economy, housing market, growth in the region, trends in neighbouring communities, locational desirability, and planning and development decisions. The availability, type, and affordability of housing in the community will influence growth and the demographic make up of the community.


The projections presented here use 2016 as the base year, which was the last year of a full population counts through the census. This means that projections are presented for 2016 to 2020, as well as 2020 to 2025. Although the years 2017, 2018, and 2019 have already passed, full population counts were not conducted in these years, which means that data for these years is projected from 2016. The population projections are based on BC Statistics' population projections for the nearest Community Health Service Area, the Peace River North Rural for Electoral Area C. While the service area's boundaries encompass a larger area than Electoral Area C, the projections provide insight as to how population growth may occur in Electoral Area C if it were to follow sub-regional trends. Appendix C provides a summary of the population projection methodology used in this report.

### 5.1 Population and Household Growth

Traditionally, Electoral Area C has experienced moderate population growth and decline. It is expected with a cyclical economy that there will be major population changes that correspond with the current state of local industries.

BC Statistics estimates there was a population decrease between 2016 and 2017 for the Peace River South service area which is reflected in Electoral Area C's population projection trend for that time period. The slight decrease can be attributed to the economic downturn the region experienced in 2016 and the resulting impact on oil and gas activities across northeastern BC. Due to renewed activity in the oil and gas industry, the Electoral Area C population is expected to start growing again between 2016 and 2025, but only reach a population of approximately 7,195 (Figure 30). This period of growth is expected to be significantly less rapid than the increase in population experienced prior to 2015.

**Figure 30 – Historical and Projected Population, 2001-2025**



Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom PRRD Population Projections

**Table 4 – Projected Population and Population Growth, 2016-2025**

	2016	2020	2025	Change from 2016 to 2020	Change from 2020 to 2025
<b>Population Projections</b>	2,500	2,448	2,753	52	305

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom Electoral Area C Population Projections

## 5.2 Age Projections


Between 2016 and 2020 the most significant population decline was in the 15 to 24 years age category. It is projected that between 2020 and 2025 the most significant decline will be in the 25-34 years age category (Table 5).

**Table 5 – Projected Population Change by Age, 2016-2025**

	2016 to 2020	2020 to 2025
<b>0 to 14 years</b>	-13	24
<b>15 to 24 years</b>	-58	54
<b>25 to 34 years</b>	-94	-46
<b>35 to 44 years</b>	27	195
<b>45 to 54 years</b>	-146	40
<b>55 to 64 years</b>	4	34
<b>65 to 74 years</b>	43	162
<b>75 to 84 years</b>	17	74
<b>85 years and over</b>	50	58
<b>Total</b>	-170	595

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom Electoral Area C Population Projections

**Figure 31 – Projected Population Change by Age, 2020-2025**



Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom Electoral Area C Population Projection

**Table 6 – Median and Average Age, 2016-2025**

	2016 Actual	2016 Estimate	2020	2025
<b>Median</b>	38.7	38.6	39.0	40.9
<b>Average</b>	37.5	37.5	38.3	39.9

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom Electoral Area C Population Projections

## 5.3 Household Projections

The number of households in Electoral Area C increased by 52 between 2016 and 2020 and is expected to increase again by 305 households by 2025 (Table 7).

**Table 7 – Projected Households Growth, 2016-2025**

	2016	2020	2025	Change from 2016 to 2020	Change from 2020 to 2025
<b>Household Projections</b>	2,500	2,448	2,753	52	305

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom Electoral Area C Population Projections

The number of households only increased in households with couples without children between 2016 and 2020. It is expected that between 2020 and 2025, all households are expected to increase across all family types, most significantly in the couples without children category. This likely related to the aging population trend, which is typically accompanied by an increase in households comprised of individuals living alone and couples without children, as adult children age and move out.

**Table 8 – Household Change Projections by Census Family Type 2016-2025**

	2016 to 2020	2020 to 2025
<b>Couple without Children</b>	19	150
<b>Couple with Children</b>	-51	67
<b>Lone-Parent</b>	-6	13
<b>Other-Census-Family</b>	-4	9
<b>Non-Census-Family</b>	-10	66
<b>Total</b>	-52	305

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom PRRD Population Projections

Table 9 shows estimates of unit sizes required to house additional households of various types. Note that these are rough estimates based on an assumed number of bedroom preferences for each household type. The actual size of units required is dependent on a number of factors, including individual family preference and lifestyle, as well as economic means and affordability. The estimates are used to project the additional units needed by bedroom sizes. About 67% of families with children and other families will require dwellings with 3+ bedrooms and 50% of couples without children will require 2-bedroom dwellings.

**Table 9 – Household by Family Types to Bedroom Conversion Rates**

	Bachelor / 1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3+ Bedroom
<b>Couple without Children</b>	50%	50%	0%
<b>Families with Children and Other Families</b>	0%	33%	67%
<b>Non-Family</b>	60%	30%	10%

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom PRRD Population Projections

Table 10 provides an estimate of unit sizes required for 2016 to 2020 and 2020 to 2025 based on projected household growth. Based on the population projections for 2016-2020, it is expected that no new housing units will be needed for this period of time. However, looking forward to the 2020-2025 period, based on population projections, it is anticipated there will be household growth and a need for additional dwelling units, which are distributed fairly equally across the different unit sizes.

**Table 10 – Projected Additional Dwelling Needs by Bedroom Type 2016-2025**

	2016-2020	2020-2025	Total
<b>Anticipated Housing Growth</b>	-52	305	253
<b>Anticipated Housing Units</b>	0	305	305
<b>Bachelor/ 1 Bedroom</b>	0	115	115
<b>2 Bedroom</b>	0	124	124
<b>3+ Bedroom</b>	0	66	66

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom PRRD Population Projections

## 5.4 Summary

If past trends continue, between 2016 and 2025, the population is expected to increase to 7,195. Accordingly, the number of households is expected to increase to 2,753 by 2025. Most growth is expected to be driven by growth in the 35 to 44 years and 65 to 74 years age category, indicating an increasingly senior led population. Projections for household type and unit size requirements are also affected by the dominant growth projected for seniors. For household types, most growth is projected for couples without children. As a result, most new housing units needed to meet these households' needs are expected to be small units.



## 6.0 Shadow Population and Work Camp Implications

With mining, hydro, electric power generation, forestry, and agricultural industries active in the PRRD, there are significant numbers of work camp style developments throughout the region to house employees that do not live permanently in the surrounding communities. This has created a significant shadow population in the region. As a result, there is increased pressure on housing, infrastructure, transportation, and services for health, education, and community support due to the present shadow population. It is difficult to understand the true impact of the shadow population in the region due to the lack of available data on the number of non-permanent workers living in the region.

The region experiences both benefits and challenges from hosting a shadow population and allowing for work camps. It is important for communities in the region to understand the impact of shadow populations and work camps to assist in planning for development and being able to anticipate requirements for community infrastructure, including housing, in the future<sup>12</sup>.

### 6.1 Community and Industry Benefits

Communities can benefit from permitting work camp style developments and a large shadow population in that there is potential for significant job creation and employment opportunities. Specifically, in terms of housing needs, work camps exist to house a set number of people for a determined period of time, so their existence reduces the need to develop new permanent residential areas to accommodate temporary increases in population. Because work camps are largely self servicing, surrounding communities are somewhat protected from impacts of cyclical economies.

Industry benefits from housing employees in work camp style developments in that there are often fewer start-up costs to get to the operation stage, thus increasing the number of employment opportunities in the region more quickly than trying to find housing units for all employees in surrounding communities. The use of work camps also spreads the risk and impact of economic downturns over many communities where workers may be commuting from as opposed to a singular community. Additionally, the investments in camp infrastructure and accommodations may be reused multiple times in various locations, creating significant efficiencies. Work camps are seen as the less expensive option to house employees temporarily rather than buying or renting units in nearby communities.

---

<sup>12</sup> Policy, Communications, Capacity: A Time to Lead – Scoping the Impacts and Benefits of Work Camps in the Peace Region – W. Beamish Consulting (June 2013) [http://prrd.bc.ca/board/agendas/2013/2013-15-8827692533/pages/documents/4bPolicyCommunicationsCapacity-AtimetoLead\\_June25\\_001.pdf](http://prrd.bc.ca/board/agendas/2013/2013-15-8827692533/pages/documents/4bPolicyCommunicationsCapacity-AtimetoLead_June25_001.pdf)



## 6.2 Community and Industry Impacts

There is great concern for the negative impacts associated with a shadow population in the region that affect economic, social, environmental, demographic, and cultural factors. In many cases, the presence of work camps creates an increased need for community health services and social services as well as an increase in crime and safety concerns due to the non-permanent nature of the population. There is a great deal of concern around the maintenance of a community's social fabric when the permanent resident workforce is in the minority and there is less of a meaningful commitment to the host community. There are also demographic factors to consider, as male populations in a community are usually larger where there is a large shadow workforce.

The major implication that the shadow population has on housing in the region include a more limited availability of all housing types, shortage of rental properties, shortage of available hotel rooms for tourists, and limited accommodations for students and non-industry workers. In some cases, real estate prices are driven up due to companies and employees working in the region buying up available units, thus decreasing housing affordability for locals. In addition to the homeownership market, this scenario also tends to lead to increased rental prices due to companies renting units for employees, and thus decreasing availability and affordability for permanent residents. Overall, where there is a significant shadow population, there are often less affordable housing options available for middle- or low-income brackets of permanent residents. When demand significantly outpaces supply due to a shadow population in a community, there are also often increases in illegal suites, campground stays, hotel stays, etc.<sup>13</sup>

The waves of economic activity specifically increase use on infrastructure assets including water, sewage, utilities, roads, etc. directly from industry which brings new workers to the community and increases the shadow population. Especially during times of economic downturn, the resulting losses in household income can create increased demand for welfare, education, training, and other support services, in addition to creating strains on physical and mental health and social relationships.

## 6.3 Managing Housing Pressures


Several communities within the PRRD have been reviewing the impact of the shadow population and work camps in the region for the past decade. As a result, there have been many policies already developed to ensure the permanent populations continue to have access to appropriate and affordable housing units, and the non-permanent populations can still be accommodated. Community responses to housing pressures as a result of a shadow population have included:

- Amending Official Community Plans and Zoning Bylaws to encourage development of legal secondary suites to increase density and available housing;
- Providing additional support for low income permanent residents to retain affordable housing;

---

<sup>13</sup> Ryser, L., Markey, S., Manson, D., & Halseth, G. (2014). From boom and bust to regional waves: Development patterns in the Peace River region, British Columbia. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 9(1), 87-111. <https://journals.brandonu.ca/jrcd/article/view/837/185>



- 
- Providing financial incentives such as tax breaks on multi unit developments;
  - Encouraging the establishment of long term lease agreements to mitigate constant turnover;
  - Encouraging the development of additional hotels, apartments, and condo units; and
  - Developing additional social housing units.



## 7.0 COVID-19 Implications

In March 2020, COVID-19 was declared a global pandemic. Local economies have been, and continue to be, significantly impacted as governments closed international borders, mandated businesses to close, and issued stay-at-home directives for everyone but essential workers.

This section provides an overview of preliminary economic impacts based on the information available during this study process. While there were immediate economic effects due to precautionary measures, the full impact of the pandemic is still emerging and will continue to need monitoring.

### 7.1 Preliminary Economic Impacts


The economic impact has been and continues to be greatest in industries such as tourism, accommodations, food services, recreation, transportation and retail. The effect on employment and income are significant and the repercussions of reduced incomes—and reduced savings—will be felt for months and years to come. Several key demographics are expected to face significant challenges:

- Students approaching graduation and recent graduates seeking part-time or full-time work will likely see delays in finding work compared to previous years.
- Bars, restaurants, retail, and similar service jobs are unlikely to return to 100% capacity for some time due to social distancing measures.
- Older workers who have lost their jobs and may face difficulties re-entering the workforce.
- Those nearing retirement may be pushed into retiring earlier than planned for or see their savings impacted.
- Those who own their homes are typically in more stable financial positions than renters, particularly long-time homeowners. However, those who recently entered the homeownership market will be facing significant pressures if one or more members of their household has lost their job. As of the end of June 2020, 16% of mortgage holders in Canada have enrolled in mortgage deferrals since the pandemic started and the impact of these will likely not be felt until late 2020<sup>14</sup>.
- Owners who rent their properties in the secondary market either long term or short term may find it more difficult to rent their units or see their revenue decrease as renters face job loss.

In the PRRD, the impacts of COVID-19 can be felt by residents, workers, businesses, and industries. As of March 2020, 39,000 individuals were employed in the Northeastern economic region of British Columbia, as compared to 35,400 employed in July 2020. As of July 2020, the unemployment rate of the Northeastern British Columbia economic region had reached 9.5%, compared to 4.9% at the same time last year. Comparatively, the

---

<sup>14</sup> Global News (August 2020). Mortgage deferrals will end soon for many Canadians. Then what? Retrieved from <https://globalnews.ca/news/7286008/coronavirus-mortgage-deferrals-end-canada/>.



unemployment rate across British Columbia reached 11% in July 2020<sup>15</sup>. As of September 2020, the regional unemployment rate has declined to 7%, making it the lowest rate in all of British Columbia<sup>16</sup>.

According to the British Columbia Northern Real Estate Board (BCNREA), sales in the northern region were down 22% in the first six months of 2020 as compared to the same time period in 2019. The value of total sold properties was also down by 24%. Properties of all types available for purchase were down 16%. According to the British Columbia Real Estate Association (BCREA), the region can expect to continue to see weaker sales figures due to the global pandemic, however as the economy gradually reopens, demand is expected to pick up and resale supply will be slow to respond, thus forecasting an increased average sale price through to the end of 2020<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> Alaska Highway News (August 2020). Northeast B.C. adds 1,800 jobs in July. Retrieved from: <https://www.alaskahighwaynews.ca/regional-news/northeast-b-c-adds-1-800-jobs-in-july-1.24182694>

<sup>16</sup> Alaska Highway News (September 2020). 1,700 jobs added in August. Retrieved from: <https://www.alaskahighwaynews.ca/regional-news/1-700-jobs-added-in-august-1.24197903>

<sup>17</sup> British Columbia Northern Real Estate Board (July 2020). Second Quarter News Release. Retrieved from: <http://bcnreb.bc.ca/files/images/graphs/Q22020/2020SecondQuarterNewsRelease.pdf>

## 8.0 Summary of Key Areas of Local Need

This section includes most of the information that is required by the regulations, including the number of units needed by unit size (from Section 5) and statements of key areas of local need (based primarily on the content in Sections 3 and 4). The statements of key areas of local need are interpretations of the data and engagement feedback. They will be supported by evidence from the work.

### 8.1 Number of Units Needed by Unit Size

Table 11 presents the projected housing units needed in Electoral Area C based on population projections. The overall total column indicates that no new units are needed based on the projections. The number of unoccupied dwellings in Electoral Area C can also be considered to accommodate any future increases in population.

**Table 11 – Anticipated Units Projection**

	2016-2020	2020-2025	Total
<b>Anticipated Housing Growth</b>	-52	305	253
<b>Anticipated Housing Units</b>	0	305	305
<b>Bachelor/ 1 Bedroom</b>	0	115	115
<b>2 Bedroom</b>	0	124	124
<b>3+ Bedroom</b>	0	66	66

*Source: Derived from Statistics Canada Census Program, and BC Stats Custom PRRD Population Projections*

### 8.2 Statements of Key Areas of Local Need

#### 8.2.1 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Affordability as an indicator of core housing need is one of the most pressing housing issues facing residents in Electoral Area C. Twelve percent (12%) of all Electoral C households in 2016 spent 30% or more of their income on shelter costs, including 15% of renter households (15 households) and 12% of owner households (235 households).

Through engagement, stakeholders indicated that housing affordability is greatly influenced by the cyclical nature of the economy in the region. In periods of strong economic gains, housing prices rise due to the influx of workers to the region. Service providers indicated that it can be difficult to recruit staff due to lack of available affordable housing especially for one-person or single-income households.



## 8.2.2 RENTAL HOUSING

Between 2006 and 2016, both the number and proportion of renter households increased, from 7% to 13% representing an increase of 175 renter households in the community. Renter households predominantly reside in single-detached dwellings (67%), with the remaining renter households occupying movable dwellings (15%) or apartments and duplex dwellings (3%).

In 2016, Electoral Area C had a higher proportion of renters (8% or 25 households) than owners (1.7% or 35 households) experiencing Core Housing Need.

## 8.2.3 SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Stakeholders indicated through engagement that despite recent improvements in housing for individuals with disabilities in the community, there is still a need for more supportive housing options as many rely on extended hospital stays or long-term care homes that do not provide the services they need. Additionally, stakeholders indicated that individuals experiencing mental health issues often face barriers when looking for housing due to their condition, limiting them access to the supports they require. Stakeholders identified the lack of supportive housing for individuals with mental health challenges to be one of the top issues in the Electoral Area.

## 8.2.4 HOUSING FOR SENIORS

Through engagement stakeholders indicated that there are long waitlists for seniors housing with wait times of two to three years in the region. There are some cases where individuals are prematurely placed in long term care facilities when appropriate supportive housing units are not available. Throughout the rural areas, many seniors are choosing to move to communities with more services or to be closer to family. Stakeholders identified the lack of affordable senior housing options to be one of the top housing issues in the Electoral Area.

Of senior households in Electoral Area C (aged 65 and over) 12% of households experiencing housing need had issues with affordability and 7% had issues with adequacy.

## 8.2.5 HOUSING FOR FAMILIES

Families in Electoral Area C are generally well served by the housing choices available to them. Over 83% of couples with children, couples without children, and other families live in a single-detached house, while 67% of lone-parent families and 77% of non-family live in single-detached houses. Other than single-detached houses, the majority of households reside in movable dwellings, and a small percent occupy other single attached dwellings.

## 8.2.6 HOMELESSNESS

Homelessness was identified as an issue in Electoral Area C through stakeholder engagement as few support services exist currently. Across the region there are known trends of couch surfing, various people cycling through homes that are overpopulated, and instances of people living in their vehicles. Levels of homelessness also fluctuate with the cyclical economy of the region and weather patterns throughout the year. Stakeholders indicated a need for emergency housing or emergency shelters in strategic locations in the region to address these needs and provide support services.



### 8.2.7 CONCLUSION

- The households in Electoral Area C with the lowest household incomes included female lone parent households and non-census family households.
- Median incomes of renter households were 56% less than owner households in Electoral Area C in 2016.
- In 2016, Electoral Area C had a higher proportion of renters than owners experiencing Core Housing Need (11.3% vs. 2.9%). Of those households in Core Housing Need, a comparable proportion of renters and owners experienced Extreme Core Housing Need (3.2% vs. 1.2%). Overall, Electoral Area C has 25 renter households and 35 owner households in Core Housing Need.
- Across Electoral Area C, 11% of renter households had issues with adequacy, 15% with affordability, and 3% with suitability.
- Of senior households in Electoral C, 12% (50 households) had issues with affordability.
- Through engagement, stakeholders indicated that the cyclical economy of the region greatly influences affordability and availability of rental units. Some service providers indicated that it can be challenging to recruit staff due to lack of available affordable housing options, especially for one person or single-income households.
- Another challenge faced by the rural population of the PRRD is that the farming population is aging. In many cases, there is a desire to build additional dwelling units on rural parcels to accommodate children of the property owner to support the farming operation or have dwellings for farm employees. However, additional residential development is largely limited by Agricultural Land Reserve regulations.
- In Electoral Area C, the most apparent housing need is affordable housing and adequate housing options for seniors.



# Glossary

**Activity Limitation:** “Activity limitations refer to difficulties that people have in carrying out daily activities such as hearing, seeing, communicating, or walking. Difficulties could arise from physical or mental conditions or health problems.”

<https://www03.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/hmip-pimh/en#TableMapChart/59/2/British%20Columbia> – Core Housing Need, Activity Limitations

**Adequate Housing Standard:** “[Housing] not requiring any major repairs.”

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/households-menage037-eng.cfm>

**Affordable Housing Standard:** “[Housing with] shelter costs equal to less than 30% of total before-tax household income.”

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/households-menage037-eng.cfm>

**Apartment in a building that has fewer than five storeys:** A dwelling unit attached to other dwelling units, commercial units, or other non-residential space in a building that has fewer than five storeys.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/guides/001/98-500-x2016001-eng.cfm>

**Apartment in a building that has five or more storeys:** A dwelling unit in a high-rise apartment building which has five or more storeys. Also included are apartments in a building that has five or more storeys where the first floor and/or second floor are commercial establishments.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/guides/001/98-500-x2016001-eng.cfm>


**Apartment or flat in a duplex:** One of two dwellings located one above the other. If duplexes are attached to triplexes or other duplexes or to other non-residential structure (e.g. a store), assign this definition to each apartment or flat in the duplexes.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/guides/001/98-500-x2016001-eng.cfm>

**Census Family:** Census families include couples with and without children, and a single parents with children living in the same dwelling. Census families are restricted to these family units and cannot include other members inside or outside the family (including a grandparent, a sibling, etc.). Grandchildren living with grandparents (and without a parent) would also count as a census family.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/fam004-eng.cfm>

**Core Housing Need:** “A household is said to be in 'core housing need' if its housing falls below at least one of the adequacy, affordability or suitability standards and it would have to spend 30% or more of its total before-tax



income to pay the median rent of alternative local housing that is acceptable (meets all three housing standards).”  
Some additional restrictions apply.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/households-menage037-eng.cfm>

**Household Income:** The sum of incomes for all household members.

**Household Maintainer:** A person in a household who is responsible for paying the rent, mortgage, taxes, utilities, etc. Where multiple people contribute, there can be more than one maintainer.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/households-menage008-eng.cfm>

**Headship Rate:** The proportion of individuals of a given age group who are primary household maintainers.

**Household Type:** “The differentiation of households on the basis of whether they are census family households or non-census family households.”

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/households-menage012-eng.cfm>

**Income:** For the purposes of this report, unless otherwise indicated, income refers to “total income” which is before-tax and includes specific income sources. These specific income sources typically include employment income, income from dividends, interest, GICs, and mutual funds, income from pensions, other regular cash income, and government sources (EI, OAS, CPP, etc.). These income sources typically do not include capital gains, gifts, and inter-household transfers, etc.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/pop123-eng.cfm>

**Labour Force:** The labour force includes individuals aged 15 and over who are either employed, or actively looking for work. This means that the labour force is the sum of employed and unemployed individuals. Individuals not in the labour force would include those who are retired.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/pop056-eng.cfm>

**Mobile Home:** A single dwelling designed and constructed to be transported on its own chassis and capable of being moved to a new location on short notice. It may be placed temporarily on a foundation such as blocks, posts or a prepared pad and may be covered by a skirt.


A mobile home must meet the following two conditions:

It is designed and constructed to be transported on its base frame (or chassis) in one piece.

The dwelling can be moved on short notice. This dwelling can be easily relocated to a new location, because of the nature of its construction, by disconnecting it from services, attaching it to a standard wheel assembly and moving it without resorting to a significant renovations and reconstructions.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/guides/001/98-500-x2016001-eng.cfm>





**Multiple Census Families:** A household in which two or more census families (with or without additional persons) occupy the same private dwelling. Family households may also be divided based on the presence of persons not in a census family.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/ref/dict/households-menage012-eng.cfm>

**National Occupancy Standard:** Standard for the number of bedrooms required by a household based on household composition. For example, lone-parents living with their child would require two bedrooms, one for themselves and one for their child.

<https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Var.pl?Function=DEC&Id=100731>

**Non-Census-Family Households:** Households which do not include a census family. “Non-Census-family households are either one person living alone or a group of two or more persons who live together but do not constitute a Census family.”

<https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Var.pl?Function=DEC&Id=251053>

**Other Family or Other Census Family:** When comparing households one way to distinguish between households is by “household family types.” These types will include couples with children, couples without children, lone-parent families, and non-family households; they will also include “other families” which refer to households which include at least one family and additional persons. For example, “other family” could refer to a family living with one or more persons who are related to one or more of the members of the family, or a family living with one or more additional persons who are unrelated to the family members.

**Other Movable Dwelling:** A single dwelling, other than a mobile home, used as a place of residence, but capable of being moved on short notice, such as a tent, recreational vehicle, travel trailer, houseboat, or floating home.

**Other single-attached house:** A single dwelling that is attached to another building and that does not fall into any of the other categories, such as a single dwelling attached to a non-residential structure (e.g., store or church) or occasionally to another residential structure (e.g., apartment building).

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/guides/001/98-500-x2016001-eng.cfm>


**Participation Rate:** The participation rate is the proportion of all individuals aged 15 and over who are in the labour force.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/pop108-eng.cfm>

**Primary Household Maintainer:** The first (or only) maintainer of a household listed on the census.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/households-menage020-eng.cfm>

**Seniors:** Individuals aged 65 and over.



**Shelter Cost:** Total monthly shelter expenses paid by households that own or rent their dwelling. “Shelter costs for owner households include, where applicable, mortgage payments, property taxes and condominium fees, along with the costs of electricity, heat, water, and other municipal services. For renter households, shelter costs include, where applicable, the rent and the costs of electricity, heat, water and other municipal services.”

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/households-menage033-eng.cfm>

**Subsidized Housing:** “‘Subsidized housing’ refers to whether a renter household lives in a dwelling that is subsidized. Subsidized housing includes rent geared to income, social housing, public housing, government-assisted housing, non-profit housing, rent supplements and housing allowances.”

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/dwelling-logements017-eng.cfm>

**Suitable Housing Standard:** “[Housing that] has enough bedrooms for the size and composition of resident households.”

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/households-menage037-eng.cfm>

**Supportive housing:** A type of housing that provides on-site supports and services to residents who cannot live independently.

<https://www.bchousing.org/glossary>

**Supportive Housing for Seniors:** This document defines assisted living and long term or residential care options as supportive housing for seniors.

**Transitional Housing:** “A type of housing for residents for between 30 days and three years. It aims to transition individuals to long-term, permanent housing.”

<https://www.bchousing.org/glossary>



# Appendix A

## Data Appendix

# Appendix A – Data Appendix

The Housing Needs Reports requirements list a large amount of data that needs to be collected. Most of it does not need to be included in the actual report. While the proposed Housing Needs Report template includes most of the required data, there are some pieces that we generally put in the appendix for the following reasons:

1. Better data is available through other sources. For example, BC Assessment data is only available for 2019 and does not provide a historical view of trends in the housing market. Instead, we report on data available from local real estate boards.
2. It doesn't add to the understanding of housing needs. Some of the data that is required doesn't help us understanding housing needs. For example, we do include labour participation and unemployment rates because these factor into understanding housing affordability trends. However, we don't include a detailed breakdown of workers by industry because this doesn't illuminate housing needs for workers.
3. To manage the length of the report. Housing Needs Reports can be very long. Reporting on too much data can make the report hard to read and less accessible to both local government staff and other stakeholders who may refer to it. Our approach has been to focus on the data that adds to the picture of housing needs and put anything that doesn't in the appendix.

## BC Assessment

### Average and median assessed values for all units since 2005 [Section 6 (1) (f) (i)]

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Average	\$216,396	\$253,344	\$296,142	\$293,725	\$328,271	\$341,375	\$344,255	\$404,636
Median	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Average	\$434,823	\$459,778	\$496,661	\$445,129	\$449,365	\$410,091	\$426,466
Median	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*Information for the median values of individuals units has not been provided. Additionally, given the information available, no estimation approach was identified that would provide a reasonable estimate of the median value across entire types.

## Average and median assessed values by structure type since 2005 [Section 6 (1) (f) (ii)]

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Average Assessed Value by Structural Type</b>					
Single Family	\$225,513	\$264,374	\$307,469	\$301,760	\$322,647
Dwelling with Suite	\$119,900	\$141,200	\$164,200	\$100,900	\$129,700
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, etc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Row Housing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Apartment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Manufactured Home	\$79,440	\$83,762	\$106,028	\$106,584	\$120,015
<b>Median Assessed Value by Structural Type</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Average Assessed Value by Structural Type</b>					
Single Family	\$333,719	\$334,366	\$391,450	\$414,851	\$440,733
Dwelling with Suite	\$129,700	\$128,100	\$151,800	\$161,800	N/A
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, etc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Row Housing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Apartment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Manufactured Home	\$123,180	\$119,945	\$137,041	\$144,056	\$151,604
<b>Median Assessed Value by Structural Type</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<b>Average Assessed Value by Structural Type</b>					
Single Family	\$474,391	\$436,526	\$436,542	\$386,121	\$392,237
Dwelling with Suite	N/A	N/A	\$594,667	\$532,000	\$519,464
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, etc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Row Housing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Apartment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Manufactured Home	\$159,461	\$145,013	\$134,374	\$127,735	\$132,827
<b>Median Assessed Value by Structural Type</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*Information for the median values of individuals units has not been provided. Additionally, given the information available, no estimation approach was identified that would provide a reasonable estimate of the median value across entire types.

## Average and median assessed values by unit size since 2005 [Section 6 (1) (f) (iii)]

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Average Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$174,611	\$220,521	\$239,571	\$251,179	\$298,997
2	\$108,304	\$123,804	\$145,110	\$146,843	\$169,083
3+	\$264,360	\$308,346	\$356,483	\$350,181	\$387,248
<b>Median Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	N/A	N/A	\$239,571	\$251,179	\$298,997
2	N/A	N/A	\$145,110	\$146,843	\$169,083
3+	N/A	N/A	\$356,483	\$350,181	\$387,248

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Average Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$315,324	\$327,748	\$382,038	\$390,070	\$421,983
2	\$172,441	\$172,042	\$199,605	\$220,071	\$227,893
3+	\$401,421	\$404,249	\$475,480	\$507,779	\$535,474
<b>Median Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$315,324	\$327,748	\$382,038	\$390,070	\$421,983
2	\$172,441	\$172,042	\$199,605	\$220,071	\$227,893
3+	\$401,421	\$404,249	\$475,480	\$507,779	\$535,474

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<b>Average Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$455,654	\$413,553	\$415,205	\$383,139	\$382,905
2	\$246,648	\$212,154	\$211,256	\$201,729	\$210,989
3+	\$576,860	\$518,251	\$522,858	\$474,712	\$493,318
<b>Median Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$455,654	\$413,553	\$415,205	\$383,139	\$382,905
2	\$246,648	\$212,154	\$211,256	\$201,729	\$210,989
3+	\$576,860	\$518,251	\$522,858	\$474,712	\$493,318

\*Median value is taken from the set of properties of the given type with the highest folio count. Where the highest folio count is a tie, the average of the medians associated with the tied highest folio counts is taken.

## Average and median sales prices for all unit types since 2005 [Section 6 (1) (g) (i)]

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Average	\$155,207	\$200,457	\$264,407	\$264,003	\$250,913	\$312,010	\$313,687	\$397,274
Median	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A


	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Average	\$155,207	\$200,457	\$264,407	\$264,003	\$250,913	\$312,010	\$313,687
Median	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*Information for the median values of individuals units has not been provided. Additionally, given the information available, no estimation approach was identified that would provide a reasonable estimate of the median value across entire types.

## Average and median sales prices by structural type since 2005 [Section 6 (1) (g) (ii)]

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Average Sales Price by Structural Type					
Single Family	\$189,635	\$326,168	\$323,577	\$365,102	\$296,656
Dwelling with Suite	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, etc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Row Housing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Apartment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Manufactured Home	\$60,820	\$101,464	\$107,401	\$104,294	\$122,395
Median Sales Price by Structural Type	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Average Sales Price by Structural Type					
Single Family	\$360,212	\$383,590	\$405,942	\$432,891	\$487,433
Dwelling with Suite	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, etc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Row Housing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Apartment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Manufactured Home	\$142,369	\$126,254	\$166,271	\$116,432	\$172,252
Median Sales Price by Structural Type	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A



	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<b>Average Sales Price by Structural Type</b>					
Single Family	\$512,553	\$416,069	\$426,094	\$385,023	\$362,111
Dwelling with Suite	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, etc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Row Housing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Apartment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Manufactured Home	\$164,207	\$187,032	\$148,096	\$147,650	\$170,771
<b>Median Sales Price by Structural Type</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### Average and median sales price by unit size since 2005 [Section 6 (1) (g) (iii)]

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Average Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$237,214	\$500,000	\$206,000	#DIV/0!	\$152,500
2	\$64,825	\$111,901	\$139,518	\$141,129	\$118,040
3+	\$218,964	\$256,178	\$322,580	\$330,167	\$332,605
<b>Median Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Average Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$355,000	N/A	\$454,000	N/A	\$242,024
2	\$204,729	\$153,341	\$231,660	\$190,627	\$245,313
3+	\$356,202	\$381,526	\$465,979	\$508,389	\$550,669
<b>Median Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<b>Average Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms</b>					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$240,000	N/A	\$350,000	N/A	\$146,050
2	\$224,221	\$221,056	\$191,259	\$236,603	\$161,744
3+	N/A	N/A	\$545,432	\$538,510	\$444,999
<b>Median Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*Information for the median values of individuals units has not been provided. Additionally, given the information available, no estimation approach was identified that would provide a reasonable estimate of the median value across entire types.



## Census

### Total number of workers over past 3 Census reports [Section 5 (a)]

Workers in the Labour Force for Population in Private Households			
	2006	2011	2016
Workers in labour force	3,965	3,825	3,805

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

### Number of workers by industry over past 3 Census reports [Section 5 (b)]

Workers by NAICS Sector for Population in Private Households						
	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Total</b>	3,965	100%	3,825	100%	3,800	100%
<b>All Categories</b>	3,960	100%	3,800	99%	3,780	99%
<b>11 Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</b>	195	5%	285	7%	175	5%
<b>21 Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction</b>	570	14%	485	13%	615	16%
<b>22 Utilities</b>	75	2%	50	1%	40	1%
<b>23 Construction</b>	475	12%	445	12%	550	14%
<b>31-33 Manufacturing</b>	130	3%	200	5%	175	5%
<b>41 Wholesale trade</b>	170	4%	85	2%	95	3%
<b>44-45 Retail trade</b>	295	7%	420	11%	315	8%
<b>48-49 Transportation and warehousing</b>	425	11%	300	8%	365	10%
<b>51 Information and cultural industries</b>	65	2%	25	1%	15	0%
<b>52 Finance and insurance</b>	125	3%	30	1%	100	3%
<b>53 Real estate and rental and leasing</b>	105	3%	130	3%	70	2%
<b>54 Professional, scientific and technical services</b>	265	7%	215	6%	215	6%
<b>55 Management of companies and enterprises</b>	40	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>56 Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services</b>	150	4%	100	3%	100	3%
<b>61 Educational services</b>	135	3%	225	6%	160	4%
<b>62 Health care and social assistance</b>	185	5%	150	4%	175	5%
<b>71 Arts, entertainment and recreation</b>	70	2%	50	1%	40	1%
<b>72 Accommodation and food services</b>	195	5%	180	5%	140	4%
<b>81 Other services (except public administration)</b>	250	6%	265	7%	325	9%
<b>91 Public administration</b>	40	1%	170	4%	100	3%
<b>Not Applicable</b>	0	0%	20	1%	25	1%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Commuting destination in 2016 (within Census subdivision, to different Census subdivision, to different Census division, to another Province/Territory) [Section 7 (d), (e), (f), (g)]

	#	%
<b>Total</b>	285	100%
<b>Commute within census subdivision (CSD) of residence</b>	2,100	100%
<b>Commute to a different census subdivision (CSD) within census division (CD) of residence</b>	520	25%
<b>Commute to a different census subdivision (CSD) and census division (CD) within province or territory of residence</b>	1,545	74%
<b>Commute to a different province or territory</b>	25	1%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

#### **Renter and owner household income – average [Section 4 (f), (g)]**

	2006	2011	2016
<b>Average</b>	\$126,136	\$120,627	\$149,441
<b>Owner</b>	\$128,985	126,474	\$159,046
<b>Renter</b>	\$86,020	\$71,002	\$87,971

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

#### **Number of non-movers, non-migrants, migrants over past three Census reports [Section 3 (1) (a) (x)]**

	2006	2011	2016
<b>Total</b>	6,265	6,310	6,615
<b>Mover</b>	690	955	740
<b>Migrant</b>	375	435	255
<b>Non-migrant</b>	315	520	485
<b>Non-mover</b>	5,570	5,355	5,875

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

#### **Average household income [Section 4 (a), (b)]**

Average and Median Before-Tax Private Household Income			
	2006	2011	2016
<b>Average</b>	\$126,136	\$120,627	\$149,441

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

### Households in specified income brackets [Section 4 (c)]

Before-Tax Private Household Income by Income Bracket						
	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Total</b>	2,310	100%	2,340	100%	2,470	100%
<b>\$0-\$4,999</b>	50	2%	100	4%	25	1%
<b>\$5,000-\$9,999</b>	10	0%	30	1%	20	1%
<b>\$10,000-\$14,999</b>	35	2%	30	1%	20	1%
<b>\$15,000-\$19,999</b>	50	2%	50	2%	30	1%
<b>\$20,000-\$24,999</b>	30	1%	35	1%	50	2%
<b>\$25,000-\$29,999</b>	75	3%	50	2%	60	2%
<b>\$30,000-\$34,999</b>	45	2%	20	1%	75	3%
<b>\$35,000-\$39,999</b>	80	3%	30	1%	10	0%
<b>\$40,000-\$44,999</b>	55	2%	30	1%	45	2%
<b>\$45,000-\$49,999</b>	65	3%	35	1%	60	2%
<b>\$50,000-\$59,999</b>	90	4%	125	5%	65	3%
<b>\$60,000-\$69,999</b>	95	4%	170	7%	120	5%
<b>\$70,000-\$79,999</b>	140	6%	85	4%	145	6%
<b>\$80,000-\$89,999</b>	140	6%	130	6%	155	6%
<b>\$90,000-\$99,999</b>	155	7%	210	9%	115	5%
<b>\$100,000-\$124,999</b>	390	17%	365	16%	270	11%
<b>\$125,000-\$149,999</b>	255	11%	235	10%	240	10%
<b>\$150,000-\$199,999</b>	320	14%	315	13%	455	18%
<b>\$200,000 and over</b>	235	10%	295	13%	515	21%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

### Number of units that are subsidized housing [Section 6 (1) (e)]

Subsidized Housing Units	
	2016
<b>Subsidized housing units</b>	N/A

Source: Data Set Published by BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Data from BC Housing

### Renter households in subsidized housing [Section 3 (1) (ix)]

Renter Private Households in Subsidized Housing (Subsidized Rental Housing Data Not Collected Until 2011)						
	2006		2011		2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Renter households</b>	155	100%	245	100%	325	100%
<b>Renter households in subsidized housing</b>	N/A	N/A	0	0%	10	3%

Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Custom Data Organization for BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing



# Appendix B

## Engagement Summary

# Appendix B – Engagement Summary

## 1.0 Housing Needs Survey Summary

### 1.1 Introduction

A community survey on housing needs was available from July 15 to August 13, 2020 (extended from the original August 5 close date). It was available online through the PRRD website, as well as through paper copies by request. The purpose of the survey was to collect information about the housing needs and challenges of residents. Survey results for each community have been analyzed and the results for Electoral Area C are presented here.

A total of 14 respondents from Electoral Area C responded to the survey, including one individual that identified as Inuit and one individual that identified as Metis. Respondents were allowed to skip questions, submit the survey at any point, and pick multiple answers for select questions. Responses from open-ended questions were reviewed and summarized by the themes that emerged.

Note: (N=) in figure titles provide the total number of respondents that answered the question.


### 1.2 Demographic Questions

Demographic questions were asked to understand who completed the survey.

#### 1.2.1 COMMUNITY

Figure 32 shows where survey respondents live in Electoral Area C. Most respondents live in Charlie Lake (11 respondents).


**Figure 32 – Communities Where Respondents Live (N=14)**



#### 1.2.2 AGE

The survey received responses from individuals between the ages of 25 to 84. The survey did not receive any responses from individuals between the ages of 15 to 24 and 85 and older which is typical for surveys of this kind.


**Figure 33 – Age of Respondents (N=10)**



### 1.2.3 HOUSEHOLD TYPE AND SIZE


Survey respondents were asked to describe their household (Figure 34). Most respondents live in households with a spouse or partner with (6 respondents) or without children (5 respondents).

**Figure 34 – Household Types (N=13)**



Respondents were also asked about the size of their household (Figure 35). Almost all respondents live in households with two or more people.


**Figure 35 – Number of People in Households (N=13)**



## 1.2.4 HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Figure 36 shows the annual household income distribution of survey respondents. Three respondents preferred not to disclose their annual household income information.

**Figure 36 – Annual Household Income (N=13)**




## 1.3 Housing Experiences

Survey respondents were asked a number of questions about their recent housing experiences.

### 1.3.1 CURRENT HOME


All survey respondents were homeowners and live in homes with two or more bedrooms (Figure 37).

**Figure 37 – Number of Bedrooms in Current Home (N=13)**



Respondents were asked to identify any barriers they faced when searching for their current home. Respondents were able to select as many issues that applied to them. The most common barriers respondents reported were high cost of purchasing a home (3 respondents) and the limited supply of the type of home they were looking for (3 respondents).


**Figure 38 – Barriers During Search of Current Home (N=5)**



### 1.3.2 CURRENT HOUSING COSTS

Respondents were asked about their housing costs each month, including rent, mortgage payments, condominium fees, and utilities. Monthly housing costs for respondents ranged widely (Figure 39). Respondents were asked if they believed their housing costs were affordable to them. Ten respondents said yes that their housing costs were affordable, one said no, and two said they were unsure.

**Figure 39 – Housing Costs (N=13)**



### 1.3.3 CURRENT AND ANTICIPATED HOUSING ISSUES

Respondents were asked about challenges they are currently facing or anticipate facing in the next five years. Figure 40 shows the top housing issues respondents are currently facing. Respondents were able to select as many issues that applied to them. The most common issue respondents are currently facing is that their home is not well served by public transit (5 respondents).



**Figure 40 – Top Current Housing Issues (N=5)**





Figure 41 shows the top housing issues respondents anticipate in the next five years. Respondents were able to select as many issues that applied to them.

**Figure 41 – Top Housing Issues Anticipated in the Next 5 Years (N=3)**



## 1.4 Community Issues


Figure 42 shows the community issues reported by respondents in Electoral Area C. The most common issues were the high cost of buying a home (6 respondents), followed by the lack of housing options for seniors including inadequate at-home care (6 respondents), supportive housing (5 respondents), and downsizing options (4 respondents).

**Figure 42 – Community Housing Issues (N=11)**



Respondents were asked what forms of housing were missing in the community. Respondents suggested that the most needed forms of housing in Electoral Area C are assisted living facilities (6 respondents). One respondent suggested that additional suites or carriage houses are needed for extended family members to live together.

**Figure 43 – Forms of Housing Needed (N=8)**



Respondents were asked if they had any additional comments. One respondent commented that additional housing supports and accommodations that they felt were outlined in the Official Community Plan. One respondent commented that additional government support on housing is needed in the Peace River region.

## 2.0 Interview and Focus Group Summary

This section summarizes the findings from the stakeholder engagement completed in August and September 2020. Interview and focus group questions focused on identifying gaps in housing and housing-related services across the housing continuum. Interviews were completed with staff within neighbouring First Nations, regional elected officials, service providers and housing providers. The questions also sought to uncover the broader community and economic context of housing issues. While questions varied depending on the stakeholder's expertise, they followed three major themes:

- Challenges, barriers and unmet needs in housing and housing-related services
- Potential opportunities
- Potential best practices and strategies to help address housing needs


Stakeholder engagement provides important housing context not captured by statistical information. Each key stakeholder brings important insight and individual perspectives. Some information may be anecdotal or based on personal perspectives. The information in this section should be considered in conjunction with other parts of this document.

Results from the interviews are summarized thematically below. Numbers in parentheses indicate how many interviewees mentioned each statement or topic. In some sections, there was only one interview. In this case, there are no parentheses. Note, these numbers are provided for context, but low numbers do not necessarily indicate that the statement or topic is less relevant. In some cases, one or a few interviewees had specialized knowledge or context that were not provided by others.

### 2.1 Participants

Representatives from the following organizations were interviewed:

Peace River Regional District		
Name(s)	Organization	Description
First Nations or Indigenous Organizations		
Starr Acko	Doig River First Nation	A First Nations community of the Peace River area, which is signatory of Treaty No. 8. The community is comprised of Dane-zaa traditions and language.
Jim Fast	McLeod Lake Indian Band	A community of the Tse'Khene Nation (People of the Rocks), located near the unincorporated village of McLeod Lake.
Cindy O'Brien, Niki Ghostkeeper	Saulteau First Nation	A First Nations community located in the Peace River area, which is signatory of Treaty No. 8. The community is comprised of the Saulteaux (Anishinabe), Nehiyaw (Cree) and Mountain Dunne-Za (Beaver) people.



Peace River Regional District		
Name(s)	Organization	Description
Cliff Calliou	Kelly Lake Cree Nation	The As'in'i'wa'chi Ni'yaw Nation, also known as Kelly Lake Cree Nation (KLCN), is a community of over 800 members, located in the Peace River region.
Service Providers		
Donna Ward, Angela De Smit	Northern Health	An organization that focuses on providing support and services relating to mental health, substance use and elder care.
Jim Collins	Save Our Northern Seniors	An organization that works on extended care for seniors.
Cameron Eggie*	Fort St. John Salvation Army	The Fort St. John branch of the international Christian organization.
Lisa Jewell* (also participated in a stakeholder interview)	Fort St. John Women's Resource Society	A women's resource organization that strives to empower women and girls and people of low income with the tools to improve the quality of their own lives.
Patricia Taylor*	Fort St. John Association for Community Living	A non-profit organization that has contracts with Community Living BC to provide services to adults with developmental disabilities.
Housing Providers		
Liane McNeil and Linda Kennedy	Fort St. John Community Bridge	An organization that provides counselling and housing assistance, including the North Peace Community Housing (a 24-unit complex), the Homeless Prevention Program and the Transition House.
Public Service Agents		
Amber Vieweg* and Kristen Danczak*	Peace River Regional District	The governing body, established in 1987, for the Peace River area that provides regional, sub-regional and local services to residents.

*\*Focus group participants*


Dawson Creek		
Name	Organization	Description
Service Providers		
Jacqueline Janssen	Networks Ministries	An organization that provides support to people experiencing homelessness
Linda Studley*	Better at Home – South Peace Community Resource Society	A non-profit organization dedicated to meeting the social, educational and personal needs of the community by providing services that develop skills for living.



Arden Smith* (also participated in a stakeholder interview)	Housing and Safety – South Peace Community Resource Society	A non-profit organization dedicated to meeting the social, educational and personal needs of the community by providing services that develop skills for living.
Jodi Cousins*	Axis Family Resources	Provides specialized support services – both residential and non-residential – to children and youth, families and adults throughout many communities in the North and Interior Regions of British Columbia.
Deris Fillier	Dawson Creek Salvation Army	Provides provide food, clothing, network support, and a listening ear to those in need.
Linda Walker	Cut Thumb Glass	Rental property manager.
Laurabel and Michelle	Community Living BC Dawson Creek	Provides housing support services for individuals with disabilities and complex needs such as addiction, mental health, history of trauma, etc.
First Nations or Indigenous Organizations		
April McEwen	Nawican Friendship Centre	A non-profit organization that provides services to Aboriginal People in the Dawson Creek and south Peace River area; designed to encourage, enhance, and promote the traditional values, culture, and well-being of Aboriginal people by strengthening individuals, family, and community.
Jenn Selby-Brown	Dawson Creek Native Housing/Aboriginal Housing Management Association	Supporting Indigenous and Metis individuals who are homeless or at risk persons who face barriers in the community.
Housing Providers		
Marla Reed	Dawson Creek Society for Community Living	Provides services for adults with disabilities and social housing for individuals with disabilities, families, and seniors.

\*Focus group participants

Hudson's Hope		
Name	Organization	Description
Service Providers		
Bill Lindsay	Hudson's Hope Health Care and Housing Society	A society providing health care and housing supports.
Patti Campbell	Friend's of Hudson's Hope	Provides food bank services, Christmas hampers, elder care services, outreach services, and support for medical travel expenses.
Shellie Howard	Hudson's Hope Library	Local library resource centre.




Chetwynd		
Name	Organization	Description
Service Providers		
Sara Hoehn and Jason Farquharson	Chetwynd Mental Health & Addictions Community Program	Operates under Northern Health – an interprofessional team providing mental health and medical services to the community.

Pouce Coupe		
Name	Organization	Description
Service Providers		
Sukrit Parmar	Pouce Coupe Food Bank	A non-profit organization dedicated to providing free food to people within the Village of Pouce Coupe and rural area.
Cory Lizotte	Pouce Coupe Community Church	Community church.

Electoral Area B		
Name	Organization	Description
Elected Officials		
Karen Goodings	Peace River Regional District Board	The governing body, established in 1987, for the Peace River area that provides regional, sub-regional and local services to residents.
Housing Providers		
Trevor Bolin	Re-Max	A full-service real estate broker that supports much of the PRRD, specifically Fort St. John and Electoral Areas C and B.
Service Providers		
Glen Longley	Prespatou School	A school with approximately 300 students in Kindergarten to Grade 12 with 34 staff members.
Pat Lang	Wonowon Elementary School	An elementary school in Electoral Area B.
Herman Klassen	Prespatou Farmer's Institute	A regional organization that helps farmers be more efficient and effective and services as a liaison between farmers and government to resolve issues.
Susan Gilmour	Upper Pine School	Elementary and Secondary School in Rose Prairie.

Electoral Area C		
Name	Organization	Description
Elected Officials		
Director Brad Sperling	Peace River Regional District Board	The governing body, established in 1987, for the Peace River area that provides regional, sub-regional and local services to residents.
Service Providers		



Electoral Area C		
Name	Organization	Description
Joseph Lang	Fort St. John Association for Community Living	A non-profit organization that has contracts with Community Living BC to provide services to adults with developmental disabilities.
Lisa Jewell	Fort St. John Women's Resource Society	A women's resource organization that strives to empower women and girls and people of low income with the tools to improve the quality of their own lives.

Electoral Area D		
Name	Organization	Description
Elected Officials		
Director Leonard Hiebert	Peace River Regional District Board	The governing body, established in 1987, for the Peace River area that provides regional, sub-regional and local services to residents.
Service Providers		
Judy Seidl and Art	Tomslake Cultural Community Association	The Association operates a local community hall that hosts regular activities, meals, and events.
Ernie Hiller	Swan Lake Enhancement Society	Volunteer group that works to ensure the community is an enjoyable place to live. They organize events such as community clean ups, trail development, and monitoring the lake.
Jennifer Critcher	Tower Lake Community Centre	The Community Centre hosts a variety of community events and private gatherings.

Electoral Area E		
Name	Organization	Description
Service Provider		
Linda Garland	Moberly Lake Community Association	A registered society made up of Moberly Lake residents and stakeholders.
Elected Officials		
Director Dan Rose	Peace River Regional District Board	The governing body, established in 1987, for the Peace River area that provides regional, sub-regional and local services to residents.





## 2.2 Peace River Regional District

A number of participants worked in multiple communities of the PRRD. This section summarizes the engagement findings for the region as a whole or subregions that include more than one project partner community.

### 2.2.1 FIRST NATIONS OR INDIGENOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Representatives from four First Nations were interviewed: Doig River First Nation, Saulteau First Nation, McLeod Lake Indian Band and Kelly Lake Cree Nation. All nations have some housing on-reserve, ranging from 50 to 150 housing units.

- Saulteau First Nation has 150 units, including three tri-plex units, ten Elder units, and many single-detached homes. There are 30 households on the Nation's waitlist.
- Doig River First Nation has 55 units with recent approval to build five tiny homes for Elders and 20 households on its waitlist.
- McLeod Lake Indian band has 56 units and 25 on its waitlist. Almost all units are single-detached dwellings, with one multi-unit building, which has six units. There are about five houses offered off-reserve as well. The band is about 60 homes below the Canadian average for on reserve housing stock.
- Kelly Lake Cree Nation has 36 houses in the community, including 8 rental homes that the Nation is managing through the Westkagen Housing Management. Twenty-two houses are owned by the Nation, and the rest are owned by the community. The Nation is not included in Treaty 8, resulting in exclusion from many funding opportunities.

#### Challenges / Needs

##### *Off Reserve*


Two nations have off-reserve housing units (Doig River First Nation has three units in Fort St. John and McLeod Lake First Nation has five units off-reserve). Interviewees reported that members living off-reserve in PRRD (including Fort St. John and Dawson Creek) often find that rental units are expensive, limited and often poorly maintained (3). Finding affordable rental is difficult, especially when industry is in a cyclical economic cycle and rents are driven up by an influx of workers. Off-reserve community members need affordable rental units that are closer to services. There are also limited services or supports for those living off reserve, including medical services and mental health supports (1). There is a need for supervised or safe homes for members with mental illness (1).

##### *On Reserve*

There is a shortage of housing on reserve—all nations have a waitlist of community members who wish to move back to the reserve (5). Elder housing is limited and more single-detached dwellings are needed (1). Multiple interviewees discussed the shortage of land for building new housing (3).

More housing is needed on reserve to allow for off-reserve members to move back (4). Saulteau First Nation has 30 households on the waitlist. Doig River First Nation has about 20 on its waitlist, and McLeod Lake First Nation has 25 on its waitlist. Interviewees also reported that there is a need for more housing diversity on reserve to serve a wide range of household needs, including families, singles, and Elders.

There is very limited funding to build new houses or repair existing ones (3). The application process for funding is time consuming and tedious (2). The cost to repair and maintain existing homes is high (4). One interviewee



reported that they go to Fort St. John for all supplies, which increases costs. Funding for repairs is limited, making it difficult to adequately maintain the existing housing stock (3). One nation is currently trying to repair 10-15 houses and replace the roofs (1).

One interviewee discussed the importance of housing that meets the needs of the climate, including the high snow load. The ‘cookie cutter’ approach to housing does not meet the needs of the community or climate. Many homes that were poorly built need to be replaced altogether (1). This interviewee reported that the Nation lost funding for six houses because the community wanted to build homes that varied from the traditional ‘box style’ homes typically seen on-reserve. This minimum building code, said the interviewee, is not enough to withstand the harsh climate. It can also be hard to find materials for repairs that are appropriate for the climate.

There is limited infrastructure to support the existing housing (2). Central heating, water provision and road maintenance are key infrastructure challenges (1). Community members have to travel at least 45 minutes to attend school and access shops and services (1). One Nation is hoping for a new Community Hall (1).

### **Projects / Opportunities**

Interviewees identified the following opportunities for addressing housing in the region:

- One community is building tiny homes, while another is building ten timber homes for Elders. Another reported plans to build more single-family homes and units for individuals over the next five years.
- Data gathering and needs assessments (such as this study) were identified as important to addressing housing needs (1).
- Work with PRRD to provide housing (1)
- Provide off-reserve housing in PRRD towns (1)
- Increase investment and interest in the North in general (2)
- Build and maintain strong relationships with municipalities, including Electoral Area C, Fort St. John and Dawson Creek. Doig River First Nation has a strong relationship with Fort St. John and Dawson Creek. (1)
- Build more awareness for people with mental health concerns and addictions (1)
- Provide mental health housing that offers a supervised setting, providing independence for tenants (1)

## **2.2.2 SERVICE PROVIDERS, HOUSING PROVIDERS, PUBLIC SERVICE AGENTS**


### **Challenges / Needs**

The cyclical cycle of local industries impacts the district’s housing market. When the industry economy is strong, more housing is developed, which increases the availability of housing. One of the major challenges the district faces is housing those who have been in the hospital. In Fort St. John, there is a policy where people will not be discharged into the streets. As a result, many folks stay in the hospital for longer than needed, because there isn’t proper housing available. This impacts the ability for service providers to provide support to community members.

From the experience of housing providers, housing needs have increased and despite rental availability, many residents still cannot afford market housing. Additionally, single people on Income Assistance cannot afford what is offered.

Interviewees identified the following housing needs:

#### *Supportive Housing*

- 
- Mental health supports are needed (2). One interviewee sees many people, particularly men, with mental health issues who are not adequately cared for. People suffering from mental health issues are often turned away from rentals and shelters, due to mental health struggles.
  - The default accommodation for people with disabilities is the hospital or long-term care, which is not suitable. People often stay in the hospital for extended periods of time because there isn't the proper housing available. This limits the ability to provide adequate care in hospitals for acute care, resulting in over-capacity in hospitals. It is costly and ineffective to keep folks in the hospital, but there is often nowhere else for them to go (1).
  - Despite the recent improvements in disability housing, there is a need for at least 10% of new housing to have rooms for disability. Particularly, there is a need for people with brain injuries, mobility issues, or MS, according to one interview. Individuals who receive disability support are often on restricted budgets which makes it difficult to find appropriate housing (2).
  - Housing is needed for young adults (under 19) who need medical care—until they turn 19, they are put into long-term care (1). Youth housing in the larger municipalities would enable youth to attend school.

### *Senior Housing*

- Despite a recent increase in supply, senior housing supply is low (2). The waitlist for senior housing is two to three years.
- Having fixed incomes makes it difficult for many seniors to find appropriate accommodations and as a result there are many who live in sub-standard units (1).
- Dementia friendly housing is needed, as there is none in the area. As a result, people are prematurely placed in long-term care (some live in long-term care for 10-15 years) (1).
- Seniors tend to leave rural areas to move to towns closer to services or back with family, according to one interviewee. These seniors often move into a North Peace Senior Housing Society unit (there is one apartment in Fort St John that caters to seniors). Yet, there are about 80-100 people on the waitlist for units with the North Peace Senior Housing Society. It is important to consider the specific needs of rural seniors (1).
- There is a need to bring Elders from nearby nations closer to medical support (1).

### *Other Challenges and Needs*

- Some service providers face challenges recruiting staff, due partly to housing challenges (1).
- The district needs better transportation connections from the more affordable communities (which are more remote) to the economic centres (1).
- The projects provided by Fort St. John Community Bridge need more maintenance that the organization cannot afford (1).
- Physical housing provision has unsustainably high maintenance costs.
- The lack of low barrier housing is a major concern (2). People need a place no matter their life stage or circumstance.
- There is limited housing choice, and the housing that is available is generally unaffordable (2).
  - Limited affordable housing units for one-person and single-income homes (1). Single people on Income Assistance cannot afford what is available.
- One interviewee discussed the stigma towards rental assistance. The Homeless Prevention Program has been working with rental companies to rebuild the relationship between the companies and renters on Income Assistance (1). Rental companies have become cynical about who they support because of the challenges they have experienced. If potential tenants are applying and are on Income Assistance, rental companies automatically do a criminal record check. Some of the rental companies have stopped taking people who are on Income Assistance.
- There is a need for supportive housing for individuals and families leaving abusive relationships.
- The temporary workforce creates challenges for determining housing needs.

- There is a need for accessible housing to support individuals with disabilities and allow seniors to age in place.
- It is difficult for seniors living in rural areas to access health care services. Virtual doctor support is becoming more common but can be a challenge for seniors to access and use. There is a need for dedicated doctors to service rural areas and support those aging in place.

## Projects

Various housing initiatives exist in the community, and other opportunities are being explored. The following projects were identified in the interviews:

- Mennonite's Elder's Lodge which provides meals and housekeeping for seniors in Prespatou. Service providers are working with BC Housing to develop further initiatives (1).
- Heritage, an assisted living facility, has 24 suites and provides meals and medical care to residents (1).
- According to one interviewee, there is opportunity to provide private assisted living, which could provide more options and availability (1).
- BC Hydro built an apartment in Hudson's Hope for staff and medical workers, who can stay there for free (1).
- BC Housing built a passive apartment building (50 units) which includes an allocation for low income housing (1).
- There are two apartments for medical students who can rent at CMHC rates.
- Northern Health is working on a proposal to build a space for long term/mild dementia, and which community is best suited for that (1)
- Northern Health is exploring opportunities to build and operate senior housing in the region. Private investors are interested in Fort St. John (1).
- Northern Health recently opened a tusher house with four beds (1)
- The Better at Home initiative provides support with house-keeping duties and food provision, servicing 150 people (1).
- Northern Lights College in Dawson Creek provides Northern Health staff with housing.

## Opportunities

- Collaboration between government, industry, Treaty 8 and the community has the potential to provide improved services and housing across the PRRD. Northern Health is very interested in pursuing partnerships (2).
- Use of hotels for temporary housing (as seen in Victoria) or repurposing hotels into affordable housing units (2).
- It is important to have an overarching plan for the PRRD to identify the core issues and needs (1). PRRD should prepared for future funding announcements from the province. If proposals are ready when funding is announced, PRRD will be better suited to receive the funding (1).
- Provide housing for those leaving the hospital.
- Additional funding is required to support the Homeless Prevention Program (2).
- Pursuit of BC Housing Funding for services (2).
- There are many unused buildings and undeveloped sites in rural areas and municipalities that could be repurposed for housing projects or accommodate support services.
- Encourage development by providing tax incentives or property tax extensions.
- PRRD should implement a Development Service Bylaw.
- Review development application procedures to understand any road blocks to development.
- Collaborative conversations need to take place between emergency services, District Officials, and healthcare workers to understand need and possible housing solutions.
- Establish a database of senior accommodations and support services across the region.



## 2.3 Electoral Area C

There are limited housing-related stakeholders in Electoral Area C. A number of community organizations were invited to participate in an interview or focus group. Participants included service providers, housing providers, and First Nations or Indigenous organizations.

### 2.3.1 CHALLENGES / NEEDS

There are limited housing-related stakeholders in Electoral Area C. A number of community organizations were invited to participate in an interview or focus group. However, there was limited participation during the engagement period for this project.

The interviewees identified the need to provide more housing options (including low barrier shelters, affordable housing, supportive housing and social housing) that are well-maintained and are managed by people who treat tenants with respect (2).

#### *Homelessness and Shelters*

In the past five years, homelessness has become an increasing concern (2). More people are accessing services, and homelessness is more visible on the street. Service providers, such as Networks Ministries, struggle to continually support those in need (1). There are limited shelter options in Fort St. John and many individuals are staying in shelters over the long term because they have no where else to go. Stakeholders emphasized that shelters are not long-term solutions. People who utilize shelters also need support in obtaining employment and covering other basic living expenses.

#### *Housing for Seniors*


Assisted living options are needed in Fort St. John (2), particularly for people with specific needs such as dementia (1). Financial support would also be useful for seniors—many seniors struggle to afford the cost of living (2). It can be difficult for some seniors to find accessible housing. Fort St. John is a hub for health care as most seniors from surrounding communities commute to the City to be closer to health care services, but an increase in assisted living options could allow seniors to age in place (2). Stakeholders have reported that there is a waitlist for senior accommodations in FSJ.

#### *Affordable Housing*

Interviewees indicated affordability issues is an ongoing issue for individuals escaping domestic abuse, battling addictions, struggling with mental health issues, living in poverty and those at risk of homelessness. Where there are issues with finding affordable housing, stakeholders indicated that many people end up living in substandard housing. Stakeholders identified a need for affordable housing units where rent is geared to income.

#### *Supportive Housing*

There are very few housing options in the North for individuals who face barriers to being housed such as having high needs, mobility issues, behavioural challenges or experiencing addictions (2). There is a need for supports to be attached to housing and for people to be sensitive to high need and vulnerable tenants. In addition to securing



appropriate housing, stakeholders indicated a need to help people retain their current housing. Interviewees also identified that there is a lack of communication among supportive housing and service providers which results in overlapping services and fights for funding. Interviewees suggested establishing a full list of supportive resources including agencies, funds and services available in the community. Housing providers and supportive agencies need to work together collaboratively to provide effective services.



# Appendix C

## Population Projections Methodology



## Appendix C – Population Projection Methodology

The population projections presented in this report are based on BC Stats population projections developed for the PRRD and the municipalities therein. These population projections are based in large part on historical fertility, mortality, and migration for the PRRD, adjusted where possible to take into account expected changes in the region.

The household projections presented within this report are the result of combining the population projections presented above with headship rates by age of primary household maintainer, household family type, and household tenure. These headship rates describe the proportion of individuals within a given age group who “head” a household of a given type (defined by a combination of maintainer age, household family type, and tenure). In general, for simplicity, and due to the relatively consistent headship rates observed over time, the headship rates in Electoral Area C are assumed to remain constant (by age group) over time.

The household projections are arrived at by combining the population projections and the headship rates in the following way: if population projections indicated there would be an additional 100 individuals between the ages of 45 and 54, and the headship rates in 2016 suggested that 20% of individuals aged between 45 and 54 led couple households without children, and owned their homes, then we would project that there would be an additional 20 couple households without children where the occupants owned their home, and the where the head of the home was between the ages 45 and 54.

Simplistic projections of the number of units by bedroom required to house these households are based on an assumed distribution of bedroom-needs by household family type.

### Limitations

The population projections presented here are limited by the fact that they are, by necessity, based on historical patterns of growth. Implicitly, these population projections assume that conditions will generally remain the same.<sup>18</sup> Of course, this may not be the case – it may be that economic factors will change the pattern of growth, that preferences will change substantially, or even that the supply of housing will lead to changes in the factors that make up population change.

The household projections are limited inherently by their reliance on their major inputs: in so far as population projections are limited, so too are the household projections as they rely on these.


Similarly, the household projections are limited by the assumption of constant headship rates over time.

In general, the direction of the projections presents a conceptual limitation. While “population demand” (interest in moving to, or staying in Electoral Area C) certainly will impact the formation of households and the development of housing in Electoral Area C, in an attractive and growing region, the provision of housing may determine

---

<sup>18</sup> Or will continue to change in the same manner as they have been changing in the past.





household and population growth. In summary, the actual provision of housing over time may invalidate the population and household projections presented within this report.

Due to the relatively small population of Electoral Area C (for the purposes of projections) detailed household projections by household family type, tenure, and age of primary maintainer are not presented in this report. The smaller community size leads to poorer data quality for the necessary inputs.