

EPSG Housing Development Committee



Learning from engagement to date during 2014, 2018, and 2020

*Prepared for the Housing Development Committee, Edmonton Pride Seniors Group
by Ann Goldblatt, August 6, 2020*

EPSG Housing Development Committee

Learning from engagement to date during 2014, 2018, and 2020

This package documents the learning from the surveys conducted during 2014, 2018, and 2020 and from the workshops in 2018, with hyperlinks to key documents. The purpose is to inform the upcoming discussion of the “emerging areas to tackle” (August 2020). Corrections and additions are welcome.

1. **Values, essence** - Clear sense of the values behind this project, what it’s trying to achieve, unpacking aging-in-place.
2. **Who** - For whom this project is being designed, looking beneath the surface to understand the implications of effectively reaching out to and reflecting the housing and related needs of people of mixed income, ability, and ethnocultural diversity as well as gender?
3. **Amenities/design** – To enable people to “age in place” with a sense of community, which are the most critical amenities and design features? Which amenities need to be determined at this stage? Which are part of a later stage of detailed design?
4. **Support** – To enable people to “age in place,” what is the range of support needs for which this housing project should be designed?
5. **Type of construction** – Clear articulation of the research and thinking behind the best option.
6. **Form of tenure** - Clear articulation of the research and thinking behind the best option.
7. **Location** - Clear articulation of the research and thinking behind the best option which includes neighbourhood preferences and proximity to services/facilities and public transportation.
8. **Affordability** – What impact will the choices above have on cost? What are the implications for the income required to live in this housing development?
9. **Governance** – What are the essential guiding principles for the governance model? What needs to be determined at this stage?

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to Date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

1. What values / key guiding principles should guide this project?

Into the Closet Again, Survey 2014 (129 respondents)	
<p>Types of supports within the housing environment [The responses speak to principles for a congregate setting and shed light on the rationale for an LGBTQ2S+ seniors and friends/supporters housing project.]</p> <p>Very important to me 91.4% Partner is respected as main caregiver. 90.2% Allowed to share suite/room with partner. 86.1% Policies against discrimination based on sexual orientation. 77% Relationship-status respected – whether partnered or single. 76.3% People respect me and my partner showing affection. 70.9% Policies against discrimination based on gender identity. 65.6% Staff diversity training in working with LGBTQ2S residents. 65.6% Social activities make LGBTQ residents feel included. 60.8% Someone on staff to approach if feeling excluded/disrespected. 47.6% Having support groups available for issues specific to LGBTQ2S seniors. 45.1% Others who live/work there do not assume I am straight. 16.0% Others who live/work there do not assume my gender identity=sex at birth.</p>	
HDC's Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	HDC Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a choice when one no longer has a choice. • People can age in place (design flexibility) ... A place where people care for and about me ... Maximize independence ... Provide a transition into supportive living. • Inclusive ... Meets diverse community needs (social, health, etc.) ... Mix of residents, not exclusively LGBTQ2S+ • Safe environment – physical, non-predatory, psychological ... Not judged ... Being part of the tribe – not having to prove yourself ... A place where you can be yourself. • A home, not an institution. • Feel at home in a group setting ... To create community and a supportive environment. 	<p>[Not explored in this survey]</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pet-friendly ... Have what we have now [amenities]: garden, green space, peace and quiet, desk. • Can be rental or ownership, depending on model. 	
HDC Survey 2020 (199 respondents)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusiveness and friendliness for LGTBT2S+ seniors and their friends/supporters is the most important housing feature for this project. 	
HDC's Follow-up steps have included ...	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HDC has brought the consistent guiding principles forward at each stage of the planning. 	

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to Date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

2. “Who” – For whom is this housing being developed? Whose voices are represented in the planning?

Survey 2014 (129 respondents)	
“Voices heard, voices yet to be heard”	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-identified gender was roughly half females, half males, with a few people reporting ‘other.’ • Just over half the respondents said they live with a spouse/partner, and just over one-third live alone; a small percentage reported alternate types of arrangements. • More than 70% of respondents reported their health as excellent or very good, and most others the others said they were in good health; however, just under half reported living with one or more chronic health conditions. • More than 90% of respondents identified as White (Western or Eastern European descent). • Almost one-third of respondents reported their annual <i>personal</i> income (from all sources) as \$80,000 or more, and almost two-thirds of them reported \$40,000 or more; at the annual <i>household</i> income level, more than one-third reported it as \$100,000 more; almost two-thirds reported \$60,000 or more. • “The people who participated in the survey were largely well-resourced – White, middle class, and in good health. Recognizing that the fewer the resources individuals have coming into their senior years, in terms of income and social support, and the more compromised their health, the more limited the range of choices available. To reach beyond the dominant population will require time and strategies to be more inclusive.” 	
Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LGBTQ2S+community. • Lower income LGBTQ2S. • Two Spirit seniors. • Culturally diverse seniors ... How does our housing concept fit into the cultural values of Indigenous people and other ethnic groups? • “Core belief”: This LGBTQ community will 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 86.5% Inclusive facility for LGBTQ2S seniors and their friends/supporters. Residence open to both LGBTQ2S residents and friends <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45.5% important • 45.5% very important Exclusive to LGBTQ2S residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31.8% important • 4.6% very important

<p>be multi-generational ... Intergenerational, inclusive of families.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could include housing for homeless LGBTQ youth who could also work at various tasks for the community. 	<p>Open to all</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% somewhat important or not important at all • 35% important or very important
<p>2020 (199 respondents)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 87.4% LGBGTQ2S+ seniors and their friends/supporters • 64% of those who want to move in currently own their own home. • 34% rent their current accommodation. <p>48 of the 52 interested respondents provided gender information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 (63%) identified as male. • 16 (33%) identified as female. • 2 identified as other or trans. 	<p>Age of respondents who want to move in</p> <p>Under 40 2 (4%) 40 to 49 1 (2%) 50 to 59 15 (31%) 60 to 69 22 (45%) 70 plus 9 (18%) Total: 49</p>
<p>Follow-up steps have included ...</p>	
<p>2020 Experience with low income seniors and building and managing not-for-profit housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met with Right at Home Society Housing Society • Met with Greater Edmonton Foundation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting interviews with individuals who completed the survey; hoping to interview approximately 10 individuals (HDC Interviews Working Group).

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to Date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

3. What amenities should this housing project offer?

Survey 2014 (129 respondents)	
[Not explored in this survey]	
Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible design for aging in place. • Prepare food for myself and have access to a dining room. <p>Common space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor space/enclosed space in winter ... Space with fresh air, natural light ... Green space ... Garden ... Greenhouse/atrium ... Peace and quiet. • Kitchen, dining room. • Seating area, TV/theatre room, recreational space. • Parking and/or rideshare. • Main complex should have covered entry for drive-up drop-off. • Land large enough for a large outdoor community space • Guest suite. 	<p>Unit configuration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36.6% One bedroom with den • 27.7% Two bedrooms • 18.2% One bedroom • 9.1 % Studio/bachelorette • 9.1% Two bedroom with den <p>Private space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 86.6% Private outdoor spaces <p>Common space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95.5% Common lounge/gathering space. • 81% Garden/green space. • 77.3% Recreation/exercise space. • 76.2% Courtyard • 76% Underground parking. • 63.7% Atrium • 61.9% Common kitchen and dining area • 57.4% Café • 45.5% Library • 50% Theatre venue
Survey 2020 (199 respondents)	
Total responses	Responses from potential residents
<p>Unit configuration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 48% One bedroom plus den • 26% Two bedroom <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59.6% Private outdoor space <p>Common space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70.1% Recreation space 	<p>Unit configuration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 65.4% Private outdoor space <p>Common space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70.1% Recreation space • 67.3% Common lounge/gathering space • 63.5% Outdoor courtyard • 58.7% Pet-friendly building (i.e., small

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67.3% Common lounge/gathering space • 66.0% Outdoor courtyard • 64% Gardening/green spaces • 59.4% Pet-friendly building (i.e., small dogs, cats, birds) • 56.1% Underground parking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dogs, cats, birds) • 55.8% Gardening/green spaces • 55.8% Underground parking
Follow-up action has included ...	
<p>2020 Proposed building amenities for inclusive LGBTQ housing project, Draft (HDC Amenities Working Group)</p> <p>50 suites minimum</p> <p><i>Unit configuration and features</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One bedroom. • One bedroom plus den. • Two bedrooms. • Balconies, regular size preferred; Juliet balconies as a second option. • Individual suite temperature control. • Full kitchens. • In suite laundry hook-ups and space. • Roughed in oxygen connections (cost-dependent). <p><i>Common space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plenty of natural light. • Wide entrances and hallways for people with mobility issues and emergency services access. 	<p><i>Common space (continued) ...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handrails in hallways. • Two elevators (minimum). • Emergency generator. • Underground parking. • Surface parking for visitors with plug-ins. • Additional storage cages in the parkade. • Bike parking. • Guest suite. <p><i>Community space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garden - green space <p><i>Operational spaces</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative office • Space for health care support services (office) • Concierge/receptionist desk • Community/commercial kitchen • Maintenance equipment storage

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to Date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

4. What supports are people seeking?

Survey 2014 (128 respondents)	
<p>Reason for making a change in one's housing situation in senior years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 78.1% I could no longer live independently, without some type of support. • 21.1% I would prefer to live with other seniors. • 17.2% I would feel safer in a different housing arrangement than my present one. 	
Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize independence ... A place to transition from independence to aging in place to full care. • This LGBTQ community will allow community residents to age-in-place, age in the right place ... Aging in place with wrap-around care. • Graduated care ... a place with varying levels of care. • Model needs to include opportunities for varying levels of home care, medical care, and extended care up to 24/7 according to the needs of the residents. • This is best accomplished with pooled resources when dealing with care provided by government funding. • Options for models of support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95.2% Support services flexible to their needs important or very important <p>When asked to rank "amenities," top item was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 99.9% Escalating support services
Survey 2020 (199 respondents)	
<p>Total respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 68.5% Home care/health support services as needed 	<p>Responses from potential residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% Home care/health support services as needed
Follow-up steps have included ...	
2019	2020

<p>Housing Feasibility Study (completed by Communitas):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Providing home care services in a new seniors' residence requires a phased-in approach ... as the building evolves, care needs will increase. ● Alberta Health Services provides home care services on an individual basis and on a fee-for-service model ... services grow with changing health needs of residents. ● If number of hours needed exceeds AHS weekly maximum, private hire model could be incorporated into staff complement ... Home Care Service would provide a level of comfort and security needed in this type of community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Arranged Alberta Health presentation to HDC: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow, Seniors Housing Options, 2020 (PPT). ● Arranged Alberta Health Services presentation to HDC on seniors' health services (included in Robert Smith's PPT, Humble Beginnings): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Private rental (non-profit) ○ Cooperative (Co-housing within a cooperative) ○ Congregate ● See Seniors Housing Terms chart: Continuing Care System/Continuum from Home Living/Independent Living to Supportive Living to Facility Living (Alberta Seniors Communities and Housing Association, ASCHA). ● Need 20 units to provide resources for assisted living.
---	--

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to Date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

5. What types of construction did people identify?

Survey 2014 (129 respondents)	
[Not explored in this survey]	
Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
<p><i>Types of construction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repurposed schools ... Share an existing building. • Large stand-alone multi-floor complex or separate unit complex of varying levels or a combination of complex and separating housing units. • Dynamic innovative architecture. • Eco-friendly/carbon neutral. 	<p><i>Preference between two models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between two architectural designs shared with workshop participants, 40.9% chose Model A and 40.9% chose both model A and B. <p>Building A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four story or multiple level complex • 40 or more self-contained units • 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom, 2 bedroom • Amenities: including but not limited to common space with kitchen for functions and gatherings, “café,” library, games room, theatre, garden spaces, green spaces, courtyard, underground parking, etc. • Home and health care available as required for aging in place • Residential and support space for homeless LGBTQ2S youth. <p>Building B (Congregate living option)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four or more unrelated individuals occupy sleeping units in a building with shared access to cooking, laundry, or sanitary facilities. • Can contain self-contained and bedsitting rooms. • 10-12 private living spaces within a congregate living environment. • Bedsitting room, 1 bedroom, two bedroom plus den in an assisted living environment. • Support services geared to need as in “aging in place.”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenities including but not limited to common kitchen common dining, lounge, living space, garden, green space, atrium, outdoor privacy spaces, exercise and games rooms, recreation space, etc. • Residential and support space for homeless LGTQ2S youth.
Survey 2020 (199 respondents)	
[Not explored in this survey]	
Follow-up steps have included ...	
<p>2018/2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided Rockliff Pierzchajlo Kroman Architects with number of units (50) and unit configuration (1 bedrooms, 1 bedrooms plus den, 2 bedrooms) and a list of amenities. • Architects came back with designs for a smaller and a larger plot (16 stories – 40, 579 sq ft - and 7 stories – 42,700 sq ft) 	<p>2019</p> <p>Housing Feasibility Study (completed by Communitas). Study included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guiding principles; neighbourhood of preference; design program (units, unit configuration, and amenities); initial designs for smaller and larger sites. • Financial analysis – capital costs for two options, rental revenue, operating costs, mortgage capacity and equity required. • Affordability – given objective to create a mixed income community, identified supply (housing provider that will reduce overall capital cost) and demand side assistance (individual households). • PPT presentation identified possibility of purchase and renovation of an existing facility and possibility of purchase and conversion to residential.

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to Date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

6. What types of tenure did people identify?

Survey 2014 (128 respondents)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When asked their top three choices of potential future housing, staying in one’s own home, with supports, was the first choice of well over half the respondents. • About one-quarter of all 128 survey respondents chose seniors-directed cooperative or cohousing with access to services, specific to LGBTQ2S seniors. This option was the second choice of one-third of respondents, and the option most commonly chosen overall; almost four in five respondents (78.9%) made this option one of their top three. • Assisted/supported living was the first choice of very few, but was the second or third choice of more than half the respondents (54.7%). 	
Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
<p>Forms of tenure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A broad range of housing options ... the housing plans could include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rental units/space; ○ Direct ownership units/spaces; ○ Co-op units/spaces; ○ Co-housing units/spaces; ○ Congregate living units/spaces • Rental, Co-operative 	<p>Forms of tenure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% Rental option • 9.1% Continuing co-operative 9.1 [form of rental] • 13.6% Home ownership co-op 13.6 • 9.1% Ownership • 4.6% Life lease
Survey 2020 (199 respondents)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked about amount of rent people could afford to pay – responses included under “Affordability” below. 	
Follow-up steps have included ...	

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to Date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

7. What are the affordability considerations?

Survey 2014 (128 respondents)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost one-third of respondents reported their annual <i>personal</i> income (from all sources) as \$80,000 or more, and almost two-thirds of them reported \$40,000 or more; at the annual <i>household</i> income level, more than one-third reported it as \$100,000 more; almost two-thirds reported \$60,000 or more. • “The people who participated in the survey were largely well-resourced – White, middle class, and in good health. Recognizing that the fewer the resources individuals have coming into their senior years, in terms of income and social support, and the more compromised their health, the more limited the range of choices available. To reach beyond the dominant population will require time and strategies to be more inclusive.” 	
Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
<p>From the notes, the workshop discussions did not focus on affordability. However, HDC meeting notes, most of whom participated in the workshops, reflect considerations and concerns regarding affordability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern: cost of rental will be too high for most of our Pride seniors ... There are a lot of folks on basic seniors’ incomes. • Begin the conversation by determining basic income for seniors with only CPP, OAS, and supplements. Total approximately \$1,700 to \$1,750 per month ... With housing subsidies, possible rent to this level of income would be approximately \$510 monthly. • Costing in first report was based on all amenities and features. Some amenities could generate rental income from the community. • Need to set a target for total monthly housing costs, including rent. 	<p>Forms of tenure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% Rental option • 9.1% Continuing co-operative 9.1 [form of rental] • 13.6% Home ownership co-op 13.6 • 9.1% Ownership • 4.6% Life lease <p>Willingness to invest in a potential development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45.5% indicated they were unsure at this time • 27.3% indicated yes

Survey 2020 (199 respondents)	
<p>Total responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60% can pay less than \$1,400/month. • Of these, 30.3% are willing to pay \$1,000 or less and 29% between \$1,000 and \$1,400. • 64% would share the suite with a friend, partner, or spouse to enhance affordability. 	<p>Responses from potential residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60% can pay less than \$1,400/month. Of these ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 38.5% can pay \$1,000 or less ○ 21.2% between \$1,000 and \$1,400. • 17.3% could pay between \$1,400 and \$1,800. • One third can pay between \$1,400 and \$2,800. • 71% would share the suite with a friend, partner, or spouse to enhance affordability. • 64% of those who want to move in currently own their own home. • 34% rent their current accommodation.
Follow-up steps have included ...	
<p>2019</p> <p>Housing Feasibility Study (completed by Communitas). Study includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial analysis – capital costs for two options, rental revenue, operating costs, mortgage capacity and equity required. • Affordability – given objective to create a mixed income community, identified supply (housing provider that will reduce overall capital cost) and demand side assistance (individual households). 	

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

8. What are the considerations for location?

Survey 2014 (128 respondents)	
<p>[The survey asked what amenities people would want to have close by rather than specific neighbourhoods of preference.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The survey asked all respondents about the kinds of activities or places they would like to have near where they would live. Parks and recreation facilities were most common first choices, followed by shopping. • More respondents selected parks as their first choice, but more selected recreation facilities as one of their top three choices (43.8% across the top three). • Overall, arts and culture appears among respondents top three choices, for close to half of all respondents (45.3% across the top three choices). • Females chose parks as one of their top three favoured nearby places (45.8% vs 34.9% of males) • Females chose bus stops as one of their top three favoured nearby places (25.4% vs 14.2% of males) • Males chose health facilities as one of their top three favoured nearby places (22.2% vs 10.2% of females). 	
Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mature neighbourhood <p>Access to ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking trails • Transportation • Recreational facilities, swimming pool • Arts and culture <p>Considerations (from HDC members)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordability of building in Oliver vs. Garneau was the rationale for choosing Oliver over Garneau (guidance from Communitas). • Consider whether Oliver is a neighbourhood of preference for lesbian women. 	<p><i>Most popular geographic areas in order of preference:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oliver 77.3% • Garneau 76.2% • Glenora 52.3% • Highlands 33.3% • Central McDougall 33.3% • Bonnie Doon 28.6%

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to services, recreational facilities, shopping, and [public] transportation. • May need to compromise, depending on land availability. 	
Survey 2020 (199 respondents)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In preamble, informed participants of Oliver preference, based on 2018 survey. 	
Follow-up steps have included ...	
<p>2020</p> <p>Partnerships explored</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Right at Home Housing Society • Greater Edmonton Foundation • Artshab <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted a visual scan of Garneau properties. 	

EPSG Housing Development Committee
Learning from Engagement to date, 2014, 2018, and 2020

9. What are the considerations for governance?

Specific questions on governance have not been part of the surveys to date. However, people have commented on the importance of residents participating in decision-making. The “forms of tenure” open up varying options for resident engagement.

Survey 2014 (128 respondents)	
Three Workshops 2018 (30 participants)	Survey 2018 (22 respondents from the workshops)
Survey 2020 (199 respondents)	
Follow-up steps have included ...	