




PEACE RIVER REGIONAL DISTRICT

Housing Needs Report Electoral Area E

2021



This report was prepared for
Electoral Area E 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 E. The purpose of this report is to establish an understanding of housing needs in the Electoral Area 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 E 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 supportive housing options, senior accommodations, affordability, availability and suitability of housing, and proximity to transit services and amenities.

Population and Age

From 2006 to 2016, the population of Electoral Area E decreased slightly to 2,949 (a decline of 82 residents). However, it is projected that since 2017 the

population of Electoral Area E has increased again to approximately 3,032 in 2020. The median age of residents was 44 in 2016, compared to BC's 43.0, indicating an older 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


From 2006 to 2016, the number of households increased by 4.8% (55 households), from 1,145 to 1,200 while the average household size decreased from 2.6 to 2.4 persons. The majority of Electoral Area E households are occupied by 1 or 2 persons (66%) and consist of families with and without children (36% and 39%), or one-person non-census families (23%). The majority of Electoral Area E households are owned (85%).

Income

The medium income of owner households increased from 2006 to 2016, and were double the median income of renter households in 2015.

Current Housing Stock

As of 2016, there were 1,200 dwellings in Electoral Area E, 73% of which were single-detached dwellings. The majority of all dwelling types had three or more bedrooms. The majority of rented dwellings 2 bedroom dwellings. Thirty eight percent (38%) of



housing units in Electoral Area E were built prior to 2000, and the majority only require regular maintenance (52%) or minor repairs (34%). In 2019, the average sales price for a single-family dwelling (2 bedrooms) was \$530,053.

Housing Indicators

Of all Electoral Area E households in 2016, 16% lived in inadequate dwelling units, 5% lived in unsuitable conditions, and 10% spent more than 30% or more of their income on shelter costs indicating issues with affordability. Of senior households, 16% of households experiencing housing need had issues with adequacy of their unit, 16% had affordability issues, and 5% had suitability issues. Additionally, a much higher proportion of renters than owners experienced Core Housing Need¹ (23.5% vs. 5.4%) and Extreme Core Housing Need (5.9% vs. 1.8%).

Key Areas of Local Need

Affordable Housing

Stakeholders indicated that housing affordability is greatly influenced by the cyclical nature of the economy in 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. Stakeholders indicated that the high cost of rental housing was one of their top concerns in the community.

Special Needs Housing

Stakeholders indicated that despite recent improvements in housing for individuals with disabilities there is a need for additional supportive housing and services. Additionally, stakeholders

indicated that individuals experiencing mental health issues often face barriers when looking for housing due to their condition, limiting access to support.

Housing for Seniors

Stakeholders indicated that there are long waitlists for seniors housing which has prompted 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.

Housing for Families

Families in Electoral Area E are generally well served by the housing choices available to them. Over 79% of couples with children, couples without children, and other families live in a single-detached house, while 57% of lone-parent families and 51% of non-family live in single-detached houses.

Another challenge faced by the rural population of the PRRD is that the farming population is aging. There is a desire to build additional dwelling units on rural parcels. However, additional residential development is largely limited by Agricultural Land Reserve regulations.

Homelessness

Few support services for individuals experiencing homelessness in Electoral Area E exist currently. Stakeholders indicated a need for emergency housing or emergency shelters in strategic locations in the region to address these needs and provide support services.


¹ 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

Executive Summary	1
1.0 Introduction.....	4
1.1 Overview	5
1.2 Housing Needs Report Requirements.....	6
1.3 Data Limitations	7
2.0 Community Engagement Findings	8
2.1 Overview	8
2.2 Findings for Electoral Area E	8
2.3 Regional Findings	10
2.4 Opportunity Areas.....	12
3.0 Electoral Area E Community Profile	14
3.1 Population	14
3.2 Age	15
3.3 Mobility	17
3.4 Households.....	17
3.5 Economy.....	20
3.6 Household Median Income	21
3.7 Summary	24
4.0 Housing Profile	26
4.1 Overview of Housing Stock	26
4.2 Trends in the Homeownership Market	30
4.3 Trends in Rental Market.....	33
4.4 Non-Market Housing.....	33
4.5 Homelessness.....	33
4.6 Student Housing.....	33
4.7 Housing Indicators	33



4.8	Core Housing Need	35
4.9	Summary	37
5.0	Anticipated Population	38
5.1	Population and Household Growth.....	38
5.2	Age Projections	39
5.3	Household Projections	40
5.4	Summary	42
6.0	Shadow Population and Work Camp Implications.....	43
6.1	Community and Industry Benefits	43
6.2	Community and Industry Impacts	44
6.3	Managing Housing Pressures	44
7.0	COVID-19 Implications	46
7.1	Preliminary Economic Impacts	46
8.0	Summary of Key Areas of Local Need	48
8.1	Number of Units Needed by Unit Size	48
8.2	Statements of Key Areas of Local Need	48
	Glossary	51
	Appendix A – Data Appendix	56
	BC Assessment	56
	Census.....	62
	CMHC 65	
	Appendix B – Engagement Summary.....	67
1.0	Housing Needs Survey Summary	67
1.1	Introduction	67
1.2	Demographic Questions.....	67
1.3	Housing Experiences	69
1.4	Community Issues	72
2.0	Interview and Focus Group Summary	74



2.1	Participants	74
2.2	Peace River Regional District.....	79
2.3	Electoral Area E	83
Appendix C – Population Projection Methodology		85
	Limitations	85



1.0 Introduction

The Peace River Regional District (PRRD) is divided into four electoral areas: B, D, C, E. Electoral Area E covers the most southwestern portion of the regional district, and shares an eastern border with Electoral Area D and northern border with Electoral Areas B and C. As of the 2016 Census, Electoral Area E had a population of 2,949 residents, the smallest of the four electoral areas.

Much like other rural residential areas in the regional district, Electoral Area E residents face unique housing challenges. 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 understand current and future housing needs and use the findings to inform local plans and policies. Each local government must complete their first report by 2022 with updates required 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 also been prepared for each electoral area within the PRRD. All reports are developed based on the local context while also providing a regional lens for housing in the PRRD.

The purpose of the PRRD Housing Needs Assessment 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 E 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 endeavour.


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 E is located in the southwest portion of the PRRD and surrounds the District of Chetwynd. The District of Hudson's Hope is located on the northern border and the District of Tumbler Ridge is located on the southern border of the Electoral Area. As of 2016, Electoral Area E had a population of 2,949 residents, which is approximately 5% of the total PRRD population.

Census data labelled as Electoral Area E 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, 73% of dwellings within Electoral Area E were single-detached dwellings. Across the rural areas of the PRRD, including Electoral Area E, housing related challenges can be attributed to a decreasing and aging population, resulting in a shift in housing needs to support change demographics and development trends.



Portions of Electoral Area E fall under two different PRRD Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaws. The Rural OCP (Bylaw 1940, 2011) includes policies to encourage the development of affordable housing, special needs housing, age-friendly housing, and housing with universal design features. The Rural OCP indicates that typical dwellings in the rural area are single family dwellings, and allows for one to two dwellings per parcel, with exceptions to be made for farm help, temporary family dwellings, multi-family dwellings in communal farm zones, and affordable housing for people with disabilities or seniors. Furthermore, the Rural OCP includes policies to permit secondary suites within single family dwellings and permits mobile homes throughout the area as an affordable housing option. Secondly, the West Peace Fringe Area OCP (Bylaw 2312, 2018) covers the area within the Electoral Area around the District of Chetwynd. The OCP indicates that the majority of housing in the area is either single-detached or movable dwellings. The OCP encourages a variety of housing development including affordable housing, rental housing, age friendly housing, and accessible housing. Secondary suites within single-detached dwellings and additional suites or dwellings per parcel may be permitted for farm help, temporary dwellings for family members, or affordable housing for seniors or individuals with disabilities.

1.2 Housing Needs Report Requirements

Housing Needs Reports Regulation (B.C. Reg. 90/2019) requires 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.² 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 available for Electoral Area E can be found in the Data Appendix (Appendix A).

This document fulfills the Housing Need Report requirements for Electoral Area E, 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, the current number of households in Core Housing Need, and statements about key areas of local need, in fulfilment of Housing Needs Reports regulations.³

² https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/housing-and-tenancy/tools-for-government/uploads/summaryhnrrequirements_apr17_2019.pdf

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



1.3 Data Limitations

This report refers to both the standard Census Profile from Statistics Canada for Electoral Area E, 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.

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 data is used as supplementary data to inform historical household and housing related trends between 2006 and 2016.

The statistical data reported in this document 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 summary at the end of each section considers 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 the region.



2.0 Community Engagement Findings

2.1 Overview

To better understand local housing needs, 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 E 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 12 respondents from Electoral Area E responded to the survey. Nine respondents were homeowners and two respondents neither rent nor own their home. Survey respondents were between the ages of 35 to 84 with annual incomes above \$60,000.

2.1.2 Stakeholder Interview and Focus Groups

A wide range of stakeholders in Electoral Area E were invited to participate in an interview or focus group, including service providers, housing providers, and other community organizations. Interviews for Electoral Area E specifically were completed with the Moberly Lake Community Association and Director Dan Rose. Although there was limited feedback from stakeholders in the electoral area, feedback from regional organizations such as Northern Health, Save Our Northern Seniors, and the South Peace Community Resource Society also informed the housing needs analysis.


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

2.2 Findings for Electoral Area E

2.2.1 Housing Challenges

Stakeholders and survey participants were asked about housing challenges and opportunities specific to Electoral Area E. **Error! Reference source not found.** illustrates the top housing challenges that survey participants identified for Electoral Area E. Seniors without adequate care at home in Electoral Area E was the most common concern (7 respondents), followed by lack of housing options for seniors. Some respondents were concerned with the low availability of rentals available (5 respondents). 2 out of 9 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.** and other challenges mentioned by survey participants.

Figure 2: Top Community Issues in Electoral Area E



2.2.2 Affordability

Participants identified barriers when finding their current home said that the cost was too high (3 respondents) and there is limited availability of rentals available (5 respondents). Four out of the six respondents indicated that they couldn't get financing to purchase a home.

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 (7 respondents), lack of downsizing options (6 respondents) and lack of supportive housing (5 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, three out of four 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 four 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 Regional Findings

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

2.2.1 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.



2.2.2 Senior Housing

For seniors in the PRRD, 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.

2.2.3 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.

2.2.3 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.



2.2.4 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).

2.4 Opportunity Areas

2.3.1 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.

2.3.2 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.

2.3.2 Continued Support for Senior Housing and Affordable Housing Options

There are currently many initiatives aimed at providing more housing options for seniors and supportive living across the region. Stakeholders highlighted senior housing initiatives, including Heritage, the Mennonite's Elder's Lodge, and Better at Home, that provide house keeping duties, food provisions, and medical care for seniors. Stakeholders noted that providers (e.g. Northern Health) are interested in exploring similar opportunities to build and operate senior housing in the region, while investors are specifically interested in opportunities in Fort St. John. 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.

Stakeholders highlighted other housing initiatives that are aimed towards providing housing options to specific groups including BC Hydro's building for Hudson's Hope's staff and medical workers, BC Housing's passive apartment building with allocation for low-income households, and apartments for medical students at CMCH rates.



2.3.3 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 E 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, the population of Electoral Area E decreased by 2.7% from 3,031 to 2,949 residents (Figure 3). The population decrease occurred between 2006 and 2011, with an increase in the number of residents in Electoral Area E (7%) taking place between the 2011 and 2016 Census periods, with a total of 2,949 residents being recorded in 2016 (Figure 4). Over the same time period, the PRRD grew by 4.8%. As of 2016, Electoral Area E residents made up 5% of the PRRD's total population.

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



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


Figure 4 – Population Changes in Electoral Area E and PRRD, 2006-2016



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

Electoral Area E has a total of 550 individuals or 19% of the population in private households (2,945 individuals) who identify as Indigenous as of the 2016 Census (Figure 5). Of this group, 50% identify as First Nations, 47% as Métis, and 2% identified with multiple Indigenous identities. The Indigenous population in Electoral Area E makes up approximately 6% of the overall Indigenous population in the PRRD as recorded in the 2016 Census.

Figure 5 – Indigenous Identity for Population in Private Households, 2016




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profile 2016

3.2 Age

From 2006 to 2016, the median age in Electoral Area E increased from 41 to 44.2 indicating an aging population, and reflecting an older population than the PRRD overall. During this same time period the median age across the PRRD remained relatively constant, decreasing from 34.2 in 2006 to 34.1 in 2016. Several age groups appear to be changing in Electoral Area E. Residents aged 35 to 44 went from representing 17% of the population in 2006 to 10% of the population in 2016. In the same time period, older adults from 55 to 64 went from 13% to 18% of the population. Youth aged 15 to 24 also decreased from 14% to 10%. This reflects both an aging demographic amongst adults in Electoral Area E, but also that children and youth are aging.

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




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

3.3 Mobility

In Electoral Area E, 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 E, 4% were intra-provincial migrants (people who moved from elsewhere in BC), 1% were inter-provincial migrants (people who moved from another province), and 0% were external migrants (people who moved from outside of Canada). The PRRD and Electoral Area E had equal proportions of individuals who had moved intra-provincially in the year prior to the Census. This suggests that most new migrants to Electoral Area E are from within BC or other provinces, rather than from outside the country.

Figure 7 – 1 Year Ago Mobility Status in Electoral Area E, PRRD and BC




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016

3.4 Households

From 2006 and 2016, the number of households in Electoral Area E grew by 55 households, or 4.8% from 1,145 to 1,200 in Electoral Area E. Compared to the decrease in population of 82 individuals over the same time period, the increase in household growth suggests that new households are being created by the existing population. The average household size in Electoral Area E was 2.4 in 2016, compared to the 2.5 for the PRRD. The average household size in Electoral Area E decreased from 2.6 persons in 2006 and 2011 to 2.4 persons in 2016, which is reflective of both the decrease in population and the increase in the number of households noted above. This also coincides with smaller family households (2-person households) or non-family households (1-person households), which in turn correlates with the aging trend noted in Figure 6. Households in Electoral Area E are predominantly one and two-person households (23% and 43% respectively). In 2016, 34% of households in Electoral Area E were 3 person or more households (i.e. family households), compared to 39% of PRRD households (Figure 8).


Electoral Area E has a lower proportion of family households with children than the PRRD (36%), and higher portion of family households without children (39%). Electoral Area E also has a lower proportion of non-census family households than the PRRD (26%) (Figure 9). Again, both of these are indicative of older households in the area.

Figure 8 – Household by Size Comparison in Electoral Area E and PRRD, 2016



Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016


Figure 9 – Households by Household Type in Electoral Area E 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 E, 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 (61% of renters were under the age of 55, and 32% were under the age of 35), while 49% 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 E has seen the proportion of owner households decline slightly over the past three Census periods, from 92% in 2006 to 85% in 2016 (Figure 11)⁴. This also reflects an overall decrease in owners from 1,050 households to 1,025 households. The proportion of renter households in Electoral Area E has increased over the same time period, from 8% to 15%, and shows actual growth in terms of actual households, from 90 to 175 households. Similarly, the PRRD experienced the same trend of owner households decreasing from 74% to 70% and renter households increasing from 25% to 28% over the same time period. In part, this tenure breakdown can be attributed to higher household incomes (i.e. more ability to afford to own) or lack of available rental properties within the Electoral Area, and is typical of rural communities. The decrease in owner households and increase in renter households could be attributed to the changes in industry demand within the region.

⁴ There was no data available for 2011

Figure 11 – Households by Tenure in Electoral Area E, 2006-2016



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


3.5 Economy

Between 2006 and 2016, the Electoral Area E labour force participation rate decreased from 77% to 67%. The unemployment rate in Electoral Area E fluctuated between 7.2% in 2006 to 6% in 2011 and 13.1% in 2016 (Figure 12). However, the estimated unemployment rate for Northeast region of BC in October 2019 is much lower at 2.6%⁵. 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% over the same time period, which may be related to the 2014-2015 downturn in the oil and gas industry.

In 2016, the top five industries employing Electoral Area E residents included agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting (24%), manufacturing (14%), mining quarrying, and oil and gas extraction (8%), construction (8%), and transportation and warehousing (7%). However, the current distribution of labour force by industry in Electoral Area E 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 Dawson Creek and in work camps situated across the PRRD, and some employees may be residents of neighbouring communities.

⁵ As reported by Statistics Canada from the Labour Force Survey. Table 14-10-0293-02 Labour force characteristics by economic region, three-month moving average, unadjusted for seasonality (x 1,000).

Figure 12 – Labour Participation Rate and Unemployment Rate in Electoral Area E 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 29% in Electoral Area E, compared to the 24% across the PRRD. In 2016, Electoral Area E had comparable but slightly lower median incomes than the PRRD. In 2016, the median income in Electoral Area E was \$87,721; about \$6,000 lower than the PRRD median income of \$94,046 (Figure 13).

Median household income differs by household type. Female lone parents and non-census families (typically individuals living alone) have the lowest median household incomes across household types. Couples with children had the highest median income, 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 often lower than the median owner household income. In Electoral Area E, the median renter household income in 2016 was \$55,740, compared to the median owner household income of \$98,726 meaning that median renter incomes were 57% that of owners (Figure 15). The median income of renter households decreased by 11%,⁶ while median incomes of owner households grew by

⁶ This may reflect local downturns in the economy, but also differs from other electoral areas in the PRRD, all of which saw income growth in renters.

42%. Renters typically experience higher levels of Core Housing Need than owner households, and are generally less secure in their tenure.


Of the renter households, 68% earn less than \$80,000, while 31% earn less than \$40,000. Owner household income is more evenly distributed across income groups (Figure 16). This indicates that lower-income 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 Income by Household Type in Electoral Area E 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 E 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, 2006-2016



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 E population decreased by 2.7% from 3,031 to 2,949. However, it is estimated that the population began to grow after 2017, and in 2020 it is projected to be 3,032 (See Section 5.1). The median age of Electoral Area E residents was 44 in 2016, which was higher than the median age of the total PRRD population of 34.1, indicating an older population. There are 550 individuals who identify as Indigenous in Electoral Area E (50% First Nations, 47% as Métis and 2% identified multiple Indigenous identities) who make up 6% of the overall Indigenous population in the PRRD as recorded in the 2016 Census.

In 2016, Electoral Area E experienced some population change as a result of individuals moving to the area from elsewhere in British Columbia. Only 1% of new Electoral Area E residents that year relocated to the area from another province.

The number of households in Electoral Area E increased by 4.8% between 2006 and 2016. During the same period, the average household size decreased slightly to 2.4 persons. The majority of households in Electoral Area E are occupied by 1 or 2 persons. Compared to the PRRD, Electoral Area E had comparable family households with and without children and a lower percentage of one-person non-census family households.

In Electoral Area E, 85% of households are owned and 15% are rented, and the median income of owner households increased from 2006 to 2016 while the median incomes of renter households decreased; renter



households also had lower median incomes, earning about 57% of what a median-earning owner household would.

Between 2006 and 2016, the unemployment rate in Electoral Area E fluctuated between 7.2% to 13.1% and the participation rate also decreased from 77% to 67%. However, the unemployment rate for October 2019 for the Northeast region of BC is estimated to be 2.6%. However, the median income of private households in Electoral Area E increased slightly over the same time period with a decrease in 2016. Households with the highest median income in 2016 were couples with children.

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 1,200 dwellings in Electoral Area E. 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. Compared to the PRRD as a whole, Electoral Area E has a higher proportion of single-detached houses (73%) and movable dwellings (27%), but fewer numbers of all other dwelling types (Figure 17). While this is true of the region, Electoral Area E has a higher proportion of single-detached houses than the PRRD and few of any other dwelling types. There is also a significant proportion of movable dwelling units (27%) in Electoral Area E.

Figure 17 – Dwelling by Structure Type in Electoral Area E and PRRD, 2016⁷




Source: Statistics Canada Census Program, Census Profiles 2016

In 2016, 71% of all dwellings in Electoral Area E had three or more bedrooms and 48% of rented dwellings had two or less bedrooms (Figure 18). The most common structural housing type in Electoral Area E occupied by both owners and renters are single-detached houses. However, owner households occupied a greater proportion of single-detached houses than renter households (Figure 19).


⁷ 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%. A small proportion of Electoral Area E residents resided in other attached or semi-attached dwelling units, but not a large enough number to be significant in this analysis.

Figure 18 – Households by Bedroom Number and Tenure in Electoral Area E, 2016⁸



Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population, Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-400-X201622

Figure 19 – Dwellings by Structure Type and Tenure, 2016




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

⁸ 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%.

4.1.2 CONDITION OF HOUSING


Most dwellings require regular maintenance only (52% of all dwellings), while 34% require minor repairs and 14% require major repairs. A greater proportion of owner households required only regular maintenance or minor repairs, while a greater proportion of renter households required major repairs, indicating that rented dwellings are generally in worse condition than owned dwellings (Figure 20). Dwellings in Electoral Area E are comparable in age with the PRRD as a whole, with 43%-47% of dwellings being built before 1980 (Figure 21). However, a greater proportion of dwellings were built between 1981 and 2000 in Electoral Area E compared to the whole PRRD, and a smaller proportion were built between 2001 and 2016.

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 E 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 E, 93% of private dwellings were occupied and 7% (231 units) were unoccupied.

Table 1 – Occupied Private Dwellings, Electoral Area E, 2016

	Number of Dwellings	Proportion of Total Private Dwellings (%)
Total private dwellings	1,430	100%
Private dwellings occupied by usual residents	1,199	93%
Private dwellings not occupied by usual residents	231	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 E 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 E, 2016-2019


	2016	2017	2018	2019
Residential Dwelling Building Permits	6	5	0	2
Demolition Permits	0	1	0	1

Source: Peace River Regional District, 2020

4.1.5 HOUSEHOLDS AND STRUCTURE TYPES

In Electoral Area E, the majority of all family types live in a single-detached house. Other than single-detached houses, the remaining population resides in moveable dwellings (Figure 22), indicating that this may be an affordable option for households who can't afford single-detached dwellings in Electoral Area E.

Figure 22 – Households by Structure and Family Type in Electoral Area E, 2016




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

4.2 Trends in the Homeownership Market

Based on assessment values for residential properties in Electoral Area E, the average house value (e.g. includes all housing types), has increased from \$97,200 to \$241,729 over the last 14 years. This equivalent to an increase of approximately 149% from 2006 to 2019. The upward trend has been steady for Electoral Area E over this time period.


Figure 23 – Average Assessed Residential Values in Electoral Area E, 2006-2019



Source: BC Assessment, 2019


In the Electoral Area E homeownership market, single-detached dwellings with three or more bedrooms had the highest average conveyance price in 2019 (Figure 24). Single family dwellings with three or more bedrooms also had the highest median residential value, followed by single-detached dwellings with one bedroom (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, Electoral Area E, 2019



Source: BC Assessment, 2019

Figure 25 – Median Residential Category Residential Value by Type and Bedroom Type, Electoral Area E, 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 E.

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.⁹

The main gaps in affordability are in non-census families affording single-detached 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 other census families 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.

Table 3 – Affordability Gap Analysis for Owners in Electoral Area E¹⁰

	Median Household Income (2019)	Affordable Monthly Shelter Costs	Monthly Shelter Affordability Gap:
			Single Family Home (\$299,202)
Couples without children	\$76,520	\$1,913	-\$202
Couples with children	\$98,262	\$2,457	\$342
Lone parent families	\$56,884	\$1,422	-\$692
Non-census families	\$34,920	\$873	-\$1,242
Other census families	\$116,198	\$2,905	\$790

**For the purposes of this analysis, mortgage payments are calculated using a 25-year amortization, with 2.14% interest rate, and a 10% downpayment.*

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

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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.



4.3 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 E. Additionally, data for short-term rental market is unavailable for Electoral Area E. 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 **Error! Reference source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.**) provide an indication of the challenges renters currently face in Electoral Area E.

4.4 Non-Market Housing

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

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 E, as of 2016, 16% of households were living in inadequate housing, and 5% were living in unsuitable housing. Affordability is the second most common housing standard not met in Electoral Area E; this means that Area E differs from many communities, affordability is the largest issue typically facing both renters

and owners (Figure 26). Ten percent (10%) of all households in 2016 spent 30% or more of their income on shelter costs, including 21% of renter households and 8% of owner households. Renter households experienced significantly higher proportions of unsuitability, inadequacy, and unaffordability as compared to owner households, however it is important to remember there were 1,025 owner households in Electoral Area E in 2016, compared to 175 renter households.


Figure 26 – Unsuitable Housing by Tenure for Private Households in Electoral Area E, 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 an indication of how seniors may differ from the population as whole with regards to housing issues. Of senior households in Electoral Area E (aged 65 and over), 16% of households experiencing housing needs had issues with adequacy and 16% had issues with affordability (Figure 27). Thirty-eight percent (38%) of seniors who rent are paying more than 30% of their income toward shelter costs, and compared to 21% of renters overall and compared to only 18% of seniors who own. Senior renters are also more likely to experience issues with adequacy than senior owners. Seniors have fewer issues with suitability than the population as a whole in Electoral Area E. This all suggests that a small but important number of senior households are experiencing housing vulnerability in Electoral Area E.

Figure 27 – Housing Indicators of Senior Households, 2016



Source: Statistics Canada - 2016 Census. Catalogue Number 98-400-X2016231.


4.8 Core Housing Need

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 E had a much higher proportion of renters than owners experiencing Core Housing Need (23.5% vs. 5.4%). This is not atypical of BC communities, where renters with lower incomes are more likely to experience housing vulnerability. Of those households in Core Housing Need, a higher proportion of renters again experienced Extreme Core Housing Need compared to owners (5.9% vs. 1.8%) (Figure 28). However, overall, Electoral Area E has 40 renter households and 45 owner households in Core Housing Need who need housing supports.


Compared to the PRRD, Electoral Area E had 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 E 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 1,200 dwellings in Electoral Area E, 73% of which were single-detached dwellings. The remaining units were movable dwellings. Of all dwellings, 48% had three or more bedrooms, while 66% of all households had one or two occupants, suggesting some of the population may be living in larger homes than they need. Forty-eight percent (48%) of owned dwellings had three or more bedrooms and 37% of rented dwellings had two or less bedrooms. Owned dwellings consisted of 74% single-detached houses and 25% movable dwellings. Rented dwellings consisted of 51% single-detached dwellings and 49% single-detached dwellings. There may be a lack of options within Electoral Area E 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 E dwellings, 52% require only regular maintenance and 34% require minor repairs, 14% needing major repairs. The need for repairs also corresponds with the fact that 81% of dwellings in the District were built prior to 1980. In 2019 the average sales price for a single-detached dwelling (2 bedrooms) was \$530,053.

Of all households in Electoral Area E in 2016, 16% were living in inadequate dwelling units, 5% were living in unsuitable conditions, and 10% were spending 30% or more of their income on shelter costs indicating issues with affordability. Additionally, a much higher proportion of renters than owners experienced Core Housing Need (23.5% vs. 5.4%). Of senior households, 16% of households experiencing housing need had issues with adequacy of their unit, 16% had affordability issues, and 5% had suitability issues. This suggests there may be a lack of affordable rental options with Electoral Area E 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 South Rural for Electoral Area E. While the service area's boundaries encompass a larger area than Electoral Area E, the projections provide insight as to how population growth may occur in Electoral Area E 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

Between 2001 and 2011, the Electoral Area E population decreased from 3,142 to 2,764, before increasing again to 2,949 in 2016. From 2016 to 2025, the population is expected to increase to regain the approximate population levels of 2001. 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 E's population projection trend for that time period. This 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 E population is projected to have started growing since 2017, to reach an approximate population of 3,032 in 2020 (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
Population	2,965	2,677	2,778	-288	101

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

5.2 Age Projections


The 35 to 44 years age category is expected to experience the greatest growth period between 2020 and 2025. During the same time period, the 15 to 24 age group, 25-34 age group, 55-64 age group, and 85 years and over age group are expected to shrink. The median age in Electoral Area E is projected to have slightly decreased from 44.4 in 2016 to 44 in 2020 (Table 5).

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

	2016 to 2020	2020 to 2025
0 to 14 years	-15	15
15 to 24 years	-56	-16
25 to 34 years	-14	-19
35 to 44 years	-10	74
45 to 54 years	-137	-2
55 to 64 years	-62	-39
65 to 74 years	14	73
75 to 84 years	3	19
85 years and over	29	-4
Total	-288	101

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

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



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

Table 6 – Median and Average Age, 2016- 2025

	2016 Actual	2016 Estimate	2020	2025
Median	44.2	44.4	44.0	44.2
Average	40.5	40.7	41.2	42.5

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

5.3 Household Projections

Household projections in Electoral Area E anticipated are an additional 54 households between 2016 and 2020 and 101 between 2020 and 2025 (Table 7).

Table 7 – Projected Households Growth

	2016	2020	2025	Change from 2016 to 2020	Change from 2020 to 2025
Households	1,150	1,204	1,305	54	101

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

The number of households decreased across all family between 2016 and 2020 except for the lone-parent category. This decrease could have been due to the downturn in the economy in which families may have perceived the region to be a less attractive place to reside. It is expected that between 2020 and 2025, all households will increase all family types except for the lone-parent category (Table 8). Growth in the couples without children is likely related to the aging population trend, which is typically accompanied by an increase in individuals and couples living alone as adult children age and move out.

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

	2016 to 2020	2020 to 2025
Couple without Children	-31	10
Couple with Children	-34	24
Lone-Parent	10	-1
Other-Census-Family	-7	0
Non-Census-Family	-22	21
Total	-84	54

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

Table 9 shows estimates of the 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. These 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 required 2-bedroom dwellings.

Table 9 – Households by Family Type to Bedroom Conversion Rates

	Bachelor / 1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3+ Bedroom
Couple without Children	50%	50%	0%
Families with Children and Other Families	0%	33%	67%
Non-Family	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
Anticipated Housing Growth	-84	54	-30
Anticipated Housing Units	0	54	54
Bachelor/ 1 Bedroom	0	18	18
2 Bedroom	0	19	19
3+ Bedroom	0	17	17

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 3,161. Accordingly, the number of households is expected to increase to 1,305 by 2025. It is also projected that the 15 to 24, 25 to 34, 45 to 54, and 55 to 64 age categories will experience a decline in 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 with and without children. However, the need for a range of sizes of units are still needed to accommodate other family types that will also experience some growth between 2020 and 2025 (a total of 54 units). The number of currently unoccupied dwellings in the community should also be considered in accommodating these needs.



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 future¹¹.

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.

¹¹ 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



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.¹²


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;

¹² 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 2020¹³.
- 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

¹³ 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 2020¹⁴. As of September 2020, the regional unemployment rate has declined to 7%, making it the lowest rate in all of British Columbia¹⁵.

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 2020¹⁶.

¹⁴ 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>

¹⁵ 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>

¹⁶ 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.

8.1 Number of Units Needed by Unit Size

Table 11 presents the projected housing units needed in Electoral Area E 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 E can also be considered to accommodate any future increases in population.

Table 11 – Anticipated Units Projection

	2016-2020	2020-2025	Total
Anticipated Housing Growth	-182	162	-20
Anticipated Housing Units	0	162	162
Bachelor/ 1 Bedroom	0	49	49
2 Bedroom	0	61	61
3+ Bedroom	0	52	52

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 E. Ten percent (10%) of all Electoral E households in 2016 spent 30% or more of their income on shelter costs, including 21% of renter households (35 households) and 8% of owner households (70 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 8% to 15% representing an increase of 84 renter households in the community. Renter households predominantly reside in single-detached dwellings (51%), with the remaining renter households occupying movable dwellings (49%).

In 2016, Electoral Area E had a higher proportion of renters (17% or 30 households) than owners (3.6% or 30 households) experiencing Core Housing Need.

Through engagement, stakeholders indicated that the high cost of rental housing was one of their top concerns in the community.



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.

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.

Of senior households in Electoral Area E (aged 65 and over) 16% of households experiencing housing need had issues with adequacy and 5% had issues with suitability. Sixteen percent (16%) of these households experienced issues with affordability.

8.2.5 HOUSING FOR FAMILIES


Families in Electoral Area E are generally well served by the housing choices available to them. Over 79% of couples with children, couples without children, and other families live in a single-detached house, while 57% of lone-parent families and 51% of non-family live in single-detached houses. Other than single-detached houses, the majority of households reside in movable dwellings.

8.2.6 HOMELESSNESS

Homelessness was identified as an issue in Electoral Area E 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 E with the lowest household incomes included male and female lone parent households, and non-census family households.
- Median incomes of renter households were 56% that of owner households in Electoral Area E in 2016.
- In 2016, Electoral Area E had a higher proportion of renters than owners experiencing Core Housing Need (23.5% vs. 5.4%). Of those households in Core Housing Need, a comparable proportion of renters and owners experienced Extreme Core Housing Need (5.9% vs. 1.8%). Overall, Electoral Area E has 40 renter households and 45 owner households in Core Housing Need.
- Across Electoral Area E, 27% of renter households had issues with affordability, 21% had issues with adequacy, and 12% had issues with suitability.

- 
- Of senior Households in Electoral E, 38% (15 households) had issues with affordability, and 25% (10 households) had issues with adequacy.
 - 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 E, the most apparent housing need is in lower income households and renter households. Stakeholders also indicated challenges with lack of supportive housing for seniors and lack of options for seniors to downsize from their current homes and receive adequate at home care.



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	\$97,200	\$118,310	\$123,915	\$127,972	\$164,421	\$170,084	\$183,216	\$194,755
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	\$199,670	\$216,718	\$253,086	\$240,927	\$237,969	\$241,729	\$258,576
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
Average Assessed Value by Structural Type					
Single Family	\$124,105	\$140,511	\$148,207	\$143,376	\$166,921
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	\$32,809	\$31,253	\$32,077	\$33,181	\$38,713
Median Assessed Value by Structural Type	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Average Assessed Value by Structural Type					
Single Family	\$178,530	\$194,892	\$202,888	\$207,728	\$222,465
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	\$40,333	\$40,987	\$44,426	\$55,765	\$58,714
Median Assessed Value by Structural Type	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Average Assessed Value by Structural Type					
Single Family	\$273,277	\$266,606	\$248,859	\$251,364	\$282,637
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	\$68,836	\$64,815	\$62,925	\$64,776	\$68,094
Median Assessed Value by Structural Type	\$254,566	\$250,804	\$243,516	\$249,843	\$260,472

*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
Average Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$70,429	\$90,158	\$93,574	\$102,805	\$138,835
2	\$60,109	\$73,714	\$79,186	\$82,223	\$110,533
3+	\$136,965	\$165,113	\$170,344	\$172,557	\$214,824
Median Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	N/A	N/A	\$93,574	\$102,805	\$138,835
2	N/A	N/A	\$79,186	\$82,223	\$110,533
3+	N/A	N/A	\$170,344	\$172,557	\$214,824

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Average Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$141,545	\$145,270	\$158,717	\$165,902	\$181,900
2	\$111,082	\$119,817	\$128,346	\$129,425	\$138,396
3+	\$225,515	\$243,069	\$254,200	\$260,807	\$280,698
Median Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$141,545	\$145,270	\$158,717	\$165,902	\$181,900
2	\$111,082	\$119,817	\$128,346	\$129,425	\$138,396
3+	\$225,515	\$243,069	\$254,200	\$260,807	\$280,698

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Average Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$236,422	\$207,447	\$198,204	\$200,090	\$220,883
2	\$169,594	\$156,878	\$156,850	\$159,306	\$171,027
3+	\$317,937	\$307,007	\$300,095	\$302,266	\$321,966
Median Assessed Value by Number of Bedrooms					
0	\$236,422	\$207,447	\$198,204	\$200,090	\$220,883
1	\$169,594	\$156,878	\$156,850	\$159,306	\$171,027
2	\$317,937	\$307,007	\$300,095	\$302,266	\$321,966
3+	\$236,422	\$207,447	\$198,204	\$200,090	\$220,883

*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	\$97,094	\$118,641	\$146,098	\$181,418	\$175,926	\$195,807	\$211,302	\$215,293
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	\$217,421	\$230,421	\$289,053	\$265,625	\$251,123	\$319,297	\$254,287
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	\$147,000	\$152,650	\$230,900	\$174,600	\$179,317
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	\$23,721	\$35,862	\$20,157	\$47,847	\$73,222
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	\$144,667	\$245,000	\$136,750	#DIV/0!	\$285,500
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	\$32,257	\$41,927	\$75,686	\$45,986	\$30,375
Median Sales Price by Structural Type	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Average Sales Price by Structural Type					
Single Family	\$358,000	\$195,000	\$259,357	\$220,000	\$341,300
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	\$35,486	\$114,857	\$203,211	\$72,829	\$87,500
Median Sales Price by Structural Type	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
Average Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$129,500	\$123,680	\$132,000	\$100,000	#DIV/0!
2	\$50,223	\$63,290	\$79,341	\$118,793	\$88,073
3+	\$140,144	\$173,346	\$234,147	\$222,249	\$233,030
Median Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Average Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms					
0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	\$108,200	\$385,000	\$164,000	\$186,000	\$196,667
2	\$126,182	\$147,422	\$131,841	\$127,431	\$162,950
3+	\$263,749	\$255,976	\$264,972	\$294,125	\$311,014
Median Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Average Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms					
0	\$281,750	\$110,000	\$140,000	\$290,000	N/A
1	\$214,883	\$186,447	\$132,582	\$131,178	\$163,692
2	\$345,898	#DIV/0!	\$332,904	\$432,945	\$348,657
3+	\$281,750	\$110,000	\$140,000	\$290,000	#DIV/0!
Median Sales Price by Number of Bedrooms	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	1,870	1,655	1,600

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	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	1,875	100%	1,655	100%	1,595	100%
All Categories	1,865	99%	1,625	98%	1,570	98%
11 Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	375	20%	205	12%	380	24%
21 Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction	130	7%	265	16%	120	8%
22 Utilities	35	2%	60	4%	50	3%
23 Construction	235	13%	105	6%	125	8%
31-33 Manufacturing	175	9%	195	12%	225	14%
41 Wholesale trade	60	3%	35	2%	10	1%
44-45 Retail trade	115	6%	70	4%	65	4%
48-49 Transportation and warehousing	135	7%	115	7%	110	7%
51 Information and cultural industries	15	1%	25	2%	25	2%
52 Finance and insurance	20	1%	40	2%	15	1%
53 Real estate and rental and leasing	20	1%	0	0%	0	0%
54 Professional, scientific and technical services	45	2%	60	4%	50	3%
55 Management of companies and enterprises	10	1%	0	0%	0	0%
56 Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services	40	2%	0	0%	35	2%
61 Educational services	105	6%	70	4%	60	4%
62 Health care and social assistance	110	6%	75	5%	75	5%
71 Arts, entertainment and recreation	25	1%	0	0%	0	0%
72 Accommodation and food services	40	2%	40	2%	95	6%
81 Other services (except public administration)	85	5%	180	11%	80	5%
91 Public administration	80	4%	60	4%	35	2%
Not Applicable	10	1%	25	2%	25	2%

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)]

	#	%
Total	905	100%
Commute within census subdivision (CSD) of residence	15	2%
Commute to a different census subdivision (CSD) within census division (CD) of residence	875	97%
Commute to a different census subdivision (CSD) and census division (CD) within province or territory of residence	20	2%
Commute to a different province or territory	0	0%

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
Average	\$82,403	\$106,092	\$109,249
Owner	\$85,093	\$111,657	\$117,422
Renter	\$51,572	\$59,839	\$61,912

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
Total	2,990	2,680	2,895
Mover	160	230	275
Migrant	100	105	130
Non-migrant	60	125	145
Non-mover	2,830	2,455	2,620

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
Average	\$82,403	\$106,092	\$109,249

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	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	1,145	100%	1,025	100%	1,200	100%
\$0-\$4,999	20	2%	0	0%	25	2%
\$5,000-\$9,999	0	0%	10	1%	10	1%
\$10,000-\$14,999	15	1%	0	0%	25	2%
\$15,000-\$19,999	45	4%	20	2%	35	3%
\$20,000-\$24,999	30	3%	30	3%	20	2%
\$25,000-\$29,999	55	5%	60	6%	45	4%
\$30,000-\$34,999	70	6%	20	2%	35	3%
\$35,000-\$39,999	70	6%	55	5%	25	2%
\$40,000-\$44,999	55	5%	50	5%	40	3%
\$45,000-\$49,999	55	5%	0	0%	30	3%
\$50,000-\$59,999	90	8%	40	4%	60	5%
\$60,000-\$69,999	100	9%	95	9%	80	7%
\$70,000-\$79,999	85	7%	25	2%	90	8%
\$80,000-\$89,999	45	4%	20	2%	90	8%
\$90,000-\$99,999	75	7%	80	8%	55	5%
\$100,000-\$124,999	105	9%	165	16%	135	11%
\$125,000-\$149,999	80	7%	80	8%	105	9%
\$150,000-\$199,999	95	8%	145	14%	135	11%
\$200,000 and over	60	5%	100	10%	155	13%

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
Subsidized housing units	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	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Renter households	95	100%	110	100%	175	100%
Renter households in subsidized housing	N/A	N/A	0	0%	0	0%

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

CMHC

Average rental prices for all units and by unit size [Section 6 (1) (h) (i), (ii)]

Average and Median Monthly Rent by Number of Bedrooms															
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Average	N/A														
No-bedroom															
1-bedroom															
2-bedroom															
3-or-more bedrooms															

Source: CMHC Primary Rental Market Survey



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 E are presented here.

A total of 12 respondents from Electoral Area E responded to the survey. 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 E.


Figure 32 – Communities Where Respondents Live (N=10)



1.2.2 AGE

The survey received responses from individuals between the ages of 35 to 84. The survey did not receive any responses from individuals between the ages of 15 to 34 and 85 and over.


Figure 33 – Age of Respondents (N=11)



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 (4 respondents) or without (5 respondents) children.

Figure 34 – Household Types (N=11)



Respondents were also asked about the size of their household (Figure 35). Most respondents live in two-person (6 respondents) or three-person households (3 respondents).


Figure 35 – Number of People in Households (N=12)



1.2.4 HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Figure 36 shows the annual household income distribution of survey respondents. All respondents' annual incomes were above \$60,000. Four respondents preferred not to disclose their annual household income information.

Figure 36 – Annual Household Income (N=11)



1.3 Housing Experiences


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

1.3.1 CURRENT HOME

Respondents were asked about their tenure type. Nine respondents reported that they owned their home and two respondents reported they neither rent nor own their home.


Most respondents live in homes with three or more bedrooms (Figure 37).

Figure 37 – Number of Bedrooms in Current Home (N=11)



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 difficulties in getting financing (4 respondents) and the limited supply of the type of home they were looking for (4 respondents).


Figure 38 – Barriers During Search of Current Home (N=6)



1.3.2 CURRENT HOUSING COSTS

Respondents were asked about their housing costs each month, including rent, mortgage payments, condominium fees, and utilities. There were a wide range of reported housing costs as shown in Figure 39.

Figure 39 – Housing Costs (N=11)



Respondents were asked if they believed their housing costs were affordable to them. Ten respondents reported that their housing costs were affordable and one reported that their costs were not affordable.

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.

Figure 40 – Top Current Housing Issues (N=4)





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. All respondents that answered the question anticipate that their homes will be too far amenities (4 respondents).


Figure 41 – Top Housing Issues Anticipated in the Next 5 Years (N=4)



1.4 Community Issues


Figure 42 shows the community issues reported by respondents in Electoral Area E. Respondents suggested that the lack of adequate at-home care (7 respondents) and supportive housing (6 respondents) for seniors are the top issues. One respondent commented that seniors are having to move away once they retire because there is a lack of affordable options and access to medical or hospital services.

Figure 42 – Community Housing Issues (N=9)



Respondents were asked what forms of housing were missing in the community. Respondents suggested that the most needed forms of housing in Electoral Area E are row houses or town houses (6 respondents). Two respondents commented that while there is housing available, prices are unaffordable. Three respondents suggested that more housing options are needed for couples, seniors, and individuals with low-incomes.

Figure 43 – Forms of Housing Needed (N=9)



Respondents were asked if they had any additional comments. Two respondents commented that more access to services and transportation is needed in the community. Two respondents commented that the price of rent is unaffordable, especially for young adults wanting to move out of their parents’ home. One respondent suggested that a new townhouse complex dedicated to employees in the public sector who are moving into the community would provide a sense of local connection.

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		
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 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 nature of local industries impacts the district's housing market. When the industry 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 PRRD. 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

The following opportunities were discussed in the interviews:

- 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 E

2.3.1 CHALLENGES / NEEDS

There are limited housing-related stakeholders in Electoral Area E. 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 following information was collected through two interviews, which identified the following needs:

- Lack of downsizing options for seniors
- Seniors without adequate home care
- High cost of renting, low vacancy rates
- Lack of supportive housing for people with mental health concerns
- Transportation and amenities are far away, making it challenging for some to reach the services they need.
- Industry shifts – many people commuting to work or living in camps.
- Rural areas and municipalities need to work together to fill housing gaps.



Appendix C

Population Projections Methodology and Limitations

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 E 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.¹⁷ 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 E) certainly will impact the formation of households and the development of housing in Electoral Area E, in an attractive and growing region, the provision of housing may determine

¹⁷ 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 E (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.