



# Corporate NO: C001

# Report COUNCIL DATE: January 13, 2003

<b>COUNCIL-IN-COMMITTEE</b>			
<b>TO:</b>	<b>Mayor &amp; Council</b>	<b>DATE:</b>	<b>January 9, 2003</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	<b>General Manager, Planning &amp; Development</b>	<b>FILE:</b>	<b>4815-20 (Affordable Housing)</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>Framework of Activities in Support of the Social Well Being of the City's Residents</b>		

## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Development Department recommends that Council:

1. Receive this report as information;
2. Endorse the activities listed in Appendix I as the policy framework for the City's on-going involvement in support of the social well being of the City's residents;
3. Continue to provide funding assistance for housing only through the City's Home Ownership Assistance Program and continue to insist that the senior levels of government take on the full responsibilities of their social mandate and provide funding to meet the social housing needs of Surrey's residents, particularly in non-ownership forms of housing and accommodation; and
4. Consider, as part of the 2003 annual budgeting process, expanding the Social Planner role in the Planning and Development Department from a half time position to a full time position with the additional time being primarily dedicated to:
  - research and policy development with a view to implementing a broader range of crime prevention measures in conjunction with planning for and approval and construction of new growth

and development within the City; and

- acting as a "champion" of the social needs of the City's residents by monitoring opportunities and by liaising with appropriate community groups and government agencies to motivate these various agencies to act upon the social needs and interests of the City's residents, in a coordinated and timely manner.

## INTENT

The purpose of this report is to summarize the current framework of activities, with which the City is involved in an on-going basis to assist in ensuring the social well being of the City's residents, to seek Council endorsement of this framework as a policy and to make specific recommendations regarding the use of the City's resources as they relate to the social well being of the City's residents.

## BACKGROUND

As the Provincial government continues to rationalize the services and programs that it delivers, a process that it commenced soon after the most recent provincial government election, the Province is choosing not to be involved, to the same extent as before, in addressing the social (health, housing, social assistance, etc.) needs of the residents of the Province, including those residing in the City of Surrey. This shift in Provincial government policy is resulting in more and more pressure being brought to bear on local governments, including the City of Surrey, to become more involved in the funding and delivery of social services for the local community. Since this pressure is expected to continue and will probably increase, it is important that Council consider and clearly define in the form of a policy framework, the limits of the City's mandate in relation to social programs and services.

## DISCUSSION

The responsibilities and related authorities of the Federal and Provincial levels of government are enunciated in the *The Constitution of Canada*. Unlike the senior levels of government, local governments derive their authority from Provincial governments through legislation that defers some of the authority of the Provincial government to the

local level of government. In the Province of British Columbia, this legislation is primarily contained within the *Local Government Act*. The authority of local governments, as contained in the *Local Government Act*, can be divided into three primary components; these being:

5. The authority to regulate certain specific activities within the boundaries of the City;
6. The authority to deliver certain services on behalf of, or for the citizens of, the City; and
7. The authority to collect revenues by certain specific means to support the work associated with 1 and 2.

The *Local Government Act* (and its predecessor the *Municipal Act*) is structured so as to strike a reasonable balance between the programs and services for which local governments are responsible and the revenue sources available to local governments to support the on-going delivery of these programs and services. Any change in the model for the delivery of government-based programs and services in the Province, or in Canada, that shifts responsibilities from one level of government to another, must also recognize the need for a concomitant shift in resources/funding sources in support of the services or programs being shifted. For example, in Ontario during the mid-1990s a restructuring of responsibilities occurred between the Provincial government and local governments at which time the mandate of local governments was expanded to include responsibility for ambulance services and social assistance/welfare. When this change in mandate was implemented, the Ontario Provincial government expanded the resources available

to local government by transferring the entire amount of the school property taxes to local governments across the Province as a new on-going source of revenue. In Surrey, such a transfer would amount to approximately \$125 million (based on 2002 property tax collection figures), approximately doubling the amount that the City currently collects in property taxes.

A newspaper article is attached as Appendix II. This article was published in the Vancouver Sun on October 4, 2002 and addresses the issue of the responsibility of local governments, in comparison to the senior levels of government, in the area of delivering social services.

It is noted that one of the principles that the British Columbia Provincial government has established as a basis for the *Community Charter* (proposed to replace the *Local Government Act*, in due course) is that there would be no direct or indirect down-loading of Provincial responsibilities to local government, without a corresponding transfer of a revenue stream to local government in sufficient amount to cover the full costs of any such down-loaded responsibilities.

Based on *The Constitution of Canada* and the *Local Government Act*, the Federal and Provincial governments in Canada are responsible for the delivery of social programs and services to the citizens of Canada and the respective Provinces in Canada. These services include health, welfare, social assistance, housing, etc. The mandate of local governments, in relation to social program and service delivery, is very limited. This is also reflected in the sources and magnitude of revenues available to local governments, relative to the more senior governments in Canada. From the perspective of revenues, the City of Surrey has an annual budget of approximately \$280 million (\$800 per capita, based on the current City population of 350,000), which includes all sources of revenue available to the City. By comparison, the Province collects taxes (income, sales, liquor, cigarette, gasoline, etc.), fees and charges that total approximately \$22 billion (\$6000 per capita based on the current Provincial population), while the Federal government collects taxes (income, gasoline, liquor, cigarette, etc.), fees and charges that total approximately \$180 billion (\$5600 per capita based on the current population of Canada). Based on these figures, it is evident that the Provincial and Federal governments have significantly greater resources than the City, on a per capita basis, to deliver social programs and services that are correctly positioned as part of their overall mandate.

Despite the fact that the mandate of the local governments relative to the delivery of social programs and services is very limited, the City of Surrey is already involved in a meaningful way in a relatively broad range of activities associated with ensuring the social well being of it's citizens. The mandate of the City and the activities associated with this mandate can be divided into three principal categories. These are:

8. Being a "champion" of the social needs of the City's citizens and residents before the senior levels of government for them to address;
9. Exercising the authority granted under the *Local Government Act* in relation to areas of jurisdiction such as land use regulation and development approval to facilitate, where appropriate, the implementation and delivery of social programs and services to the City's residents by the senior levels of government and other agencies; and
10. Being directly involved in a limited range of activities that are focussed on the social well being of the City's citizens.

The attached Appendix I, entitled "Framework for City of Surrey Activities Aimed at Ensuring the Social Well-Being of Surrey's Citizens" documents in detail these activities with which the City of Surrey is involved on an on-going basis. The following Table 1 provides a simplified overview of the information contained in Appendix I.

Table 1: OVERVIEW OF APPENDIX I INFORMATION
---

<b>Department (Principal contact)</b>	<b>Activities that Support the Social Well-Being of the Community</b>	<b>Estimate of Staff (FTE)</b>
Parks, Recreation and Culture Department  (Laurie Cavan, Manager, Community & Leisure Services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children pre-school, afternoon recreation and day camp programs</li> <li>• Community and public art programs</li> <li>• Community development</li> <li>• Community volunteer programs</li> <li>• Cultural facilities and programs</li> <li>• Emergency social services program (disaster response)</li> <li>• Heritage facilities and services - document community life</li> <li>• Leisure access program</li> <li>• Multicultural initiatives and training</li> <li>• Recreation resources for persons with disabilities</li> <li>• Seniors centers and programs</li> <li>• Youth centers and programs</li> <li>• Youth employment and volunteer programs</li> </ul>	<hr style="width: 20%; margin: auto;"/> 31.0
Surrey RCMP – Crime Prevention Programs  (Corporal Terry Kopan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blockwatch</li> <li>• CPTED training and certification</li> <li>• Crime prevention services</li> <li>• District Integrated Service Teams</li> <li>• Diversity Management Unit</li> <li>• School liaison program</li> <li>• Victim services</li> <li>• Volunteer management and opportunities</li> <li>• Youth intervention program</li> </ul>	<hr style="width: 20%; margin: auto;"/> 18.0
Planning and Development Department  (Barbara Beblo, Sr. Planner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable Home Ownership Program</li> <li>• Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) policies and guidelines</li> <li>• Heritage Commission and Social Planning Committee, staff support</li> <li>• Heritage register and heritage preservation by-laws</li> <li>• Policies, zoning by-law and neighbourhood concept plan provisions</li> <li>• Population census/demographic analysis, and community profiles</li> </ul>	<hr style="width: 20%; margin: auto;"/> 2.0
By-law Enforcement  (John Sherstone, Mgr., By-laws)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By-law services and programs</li> </ul>	0.2
Economic Development  (Linda Hepner, Mgr.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Development Services</li> </ul>	0.2

Engineering Department (Dave Mihalech, Mgr, Realty)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lease of City-owned land to community groups</li> </ul>	0.3
Finance, Tech and H.R Dept. (Suzanne Fillion, Mgr, Budgets)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Grants Program</li> </ul>	0.2
Surrey Public Library, (Beth Barlow, Mgr)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Connections Web pages</li> <li>Multicultural language programs and resources</li> </ul>	0.2
Council Initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clean, Active and Safe City Campaigns</li> <li>Drug and Crime Taskforce</li> <li>Joint Family Court Committee</li> <li>Public Safety Committee</li> <li>Safe and Clean City Committee</li> <li>Stop! Child and Youth Exploitation Taskforce</li> </ul>	
	<b>Full-time equivalent employees</b>	<b>52</b>

Based on the information in Appendix I, it is evident that the City of Surrey is involved in the delivery of a significant and meaningful program of activities focussed on the social well being of the City's residents. It is also evident that the City is committing a relatively significant amount of resources to these activities, conservatively estimated to include the equivalent of approximately **50+** full time employees. In addition, the City continues to present its social service needs to the senior levels of government when such opportunities are available and continues to insist that the senior governments take on the full responsibility of their social mandate and deliver a full range of social services and programs to meet the needs of the City's residents. **The framework of activities and services documented in Appendix I not only fully satisfies, but also, in some areas, exceeds the City's responsibilities relative to its legislated mandate in relation to the area of social services.**

It is recommended that Council formally endorse the activities listed in Appendix I as the framework for the City's on-going involvement in support of the social well being of the City's residents.

### **Specific City Activities Requiring Special Comment**

#### **Housing**

The City has a policy framework and current role in the area of affordable housing. The City's housing policy and available funding is focussed on encouraging and expanding the opportunities for Surrey's residents to become homeowners. A separate report on this matter will be provided to Council at the same meeting as this report is being considered. However, some comments on the issue of housing should be included in this report for the sake of completeness.

The City has an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund that has a current value of approximately \$7.5 million. This fund was generated during the period from 1993 to 1997 when, based on a Council-adopted policy, residential developers were required to designate at least 20% of the residential dwelling units in each project as affordable housing units or make a contribution of \$750 for each dwelling unit to the Affordable Housing Fund. Almost all residential developers during that time period chose to make the \$750 per unit contribution. Council rescinded this policy in 1997 and directed staff to develop a policy and action plan for using the accumulated funds (the "Fund") to encourage home ownership in the City. Such a policy was developed by staff and adopted by Council in July 1998. Council focussed on using the Fund to encourage home ownership in the City, due to the fact that home ownership acts to empower

people and supports the building of strong and cohesive communities.

Non-ownership forms of affordable or social housing is an area where the City is facing increasing pressures to become involved as a funding partner. As mentioned earlier in this report, almost all forms of government-delivered social assistance, including the provision of subsidized housing, falls under the mandate and jurisdiction of the Federal and Provincial governments. This is also reflected in the revenues of the respective levels of government. The Provincial and Federal government each collect revenues per capita that are approximately seven to eight times the per capita revenues of local governments in British Columbia, including the City of Surrey.

The Federal and Provincial governments are currently attempting to stretch the funding that they have available for housing by offering "matching grants" through various programs for affordable rental housing projects and other non-ownership forms of social housing. This is intended to encourage not-for-profit and private sector organizations to raise funding from other sources for implementing subsidized housing projects. The Supporting Community Partnership Initiative (SCPI), also commonly referenced as the "Skippy" program, is one such initiative of the Federal government in the area of housing. The initiative, a three-year funding program focussed on mitigating homelessness in Canada, required eligible cities/regions to prepare a community based strategy to reduce and eliminate homelessness and upon which funding proposals would be evaluated. In 2001 the Greater Vancouver Regional District Homelessness Steering Committee completed a Regional Homelessness Plan and over the past three years, has made recommendations on approximately \$25 million in funding for homelessness related research and housing projects throughout the region. Projects eligible for funding under the SCPI program are those that:

- Directly respond to the needs of homeless persons in ways such as emergency shelters and transition homes, as well as homelessness-related studies; and
- Require at least 50% of the project's funding from other partners (i.e. municipalities, Provincial governments or community groups).

The Federal government recently indicated that the SCPI program would be extended beyond its initial three-year period, which ends in March 2003. However, the amount of funding and the extended period have not yet been specified. Funding for the second phase of the SCPI program is expected to target construction or renovation of second stage or transition housing projects.

As fallout from this "matching grant" approach to providing "social" housing by the Federal and Provincial governments, local governments, including the City of Surrey, are being targeted by not-for-profit organizations as potential funding partners. Recent requests from the Crescent Housing Society for a waiver of DCCs and from the Phoenix House for "seed money" for an addiction recovery house, are examples of this fallout.

It should be recognized that any funding that the City of Surrey provides towards "social" housing is by default a "down loading" of the responsibilities of senior governments which is not in the long term best interests of the City or its citizens. Rather, the City should be demanding that the Provincial and Federal governments take on the full responsibility of their social service mandate and provide funding to meet the social housing needs in Surrey, particularly in non-ownership forms of housing and accommodation.

On this basis, it is recommended that the City not provide funding assistance for any non-ownership forms of subsidized housing within the City, but rather continue to take actions to insist that the senior levels of government take on their full responsibilities in the area of social housing and related social programs relative to the needs of the Surrey's residents.

### **Crime Prevention/Public Safety**

The City is responsible, in partnership with the Provincial and Federal governments, for addressing crime and

enhancing crime prevention and public safety within the City of Surrey. Although, by most measures, the City has been dealing effectively with the delivery of services in these areas, surveys of the City's citizens suggest that these areas should remain a high priority in relation to the use of any discretionary resources available for augmenting City services.

The City continues to grow at a high rate that at present is approaching 1000 new residents per month. Although not a perfect correlation, there is a positive relationship between growth in the City's population and the need for resources associated with dealing with crime, crime prevention and public safety services. On this basis, the City has been expanding the number of uniformed officers in the Surrey RCMP detachment annually. However, it is also recognized that there are opportunities for addressing crime prevention and public safety more proactively as part of the process of planning for growth. An example of this is the application of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles that are regularly applied by the City's Planning and Development Department staff during the review of land development applications of all types. Although this is a start toward dealing with crime prevention and public safety proactively as part of the process of planning for growth, there are other "planning-related" opportunities for enhancing crime prevention. With appropriate research, policy development and implementation it is expected that the City could benefit significantly. Appropriate design and implementation of new land development in the City can prevent serious crime problems from developing. It is worth noting that prevention of a problem is almost always much less costly than developing a cure after a problem has developed.

On this basis, it is recommended that Council consider, as part of the 2003 annual budget process, expanding the Social Planner position from a half time position to a full time position with the extra time being dedicated primarily to:

- research and policy development with a view to implementing a broader range of crime prevention measures in conjunction with planning, approval and construction of new growth and development within the City; and
- "championing" the social needs of the City's residents by monitoring opportunities and through liaising with appropriate community, not-for-profit and government agencies to motivate these various agencies to act upon the social needs and interests of the City's residents in a coordinated and timely manner.

## CONCLUSION

Although the mandate for the delivery of social programs and services to the City's residents falls almost entirely with the Federal and Provincial governments, the City has been involved in a range of on-going activities in support of the social well-being of the City's citizens, as summarized in Appendix I. It is recommended that Council formally endorse the activities listed in Appendix I as the framework for the City's on-going support of the social well being of the City's citizens. It is further recommended that the City continue to provide financial assistance for housing only through the City's Home Ownership Assistance Program and continue to insist that the senior levels of government take on the full responsibilities of their social service mandate and provide funding to meet the social housing needs of Surrey's residents, particularly in non-ownership forms of housing and accommodation. The City should only become involved as a funding partner in non-ownership forms of subsidized housing if the Provincial and/or Federal governments transfer a sufficient and perpetual new revenue stream to the City as the platform for undertaking such funding on a sustainable basis over time. It is further recommended that Council consider, as part of the 2003 annual budget process, expanding the Social Planning function within the Planning and Development Department from "half of a full time" planner position to a "full time" planner position and that the additional time be allocated to:

- research and policy development with a view to augmenting the City's policies and tools related to implementing crime prevention measures in conjunction with planning for and the approval and construction of new growth and development within the City; and
- being a "champion" of the social needs of the City's residents by monitoring opportunities and through

liaising with appropriate community, not-for-profit and government agencies to motivate these agencies to act upon the social needs and interests of the City's residents in a coordinated and timely manner.

Murray Dinwoodie  
General Manager  
Planning and Development

MDD/kms/saw

Appendix I - Framework for City of Surrey Activities Aimed at Ensuring the Social Well-Being of Surrey's Citizens

Appendix II – Newspaper Article from the October 4, 2002 Edition of the Vancouver Sun

v:\wp-docs\admin\03data\01091010.bb.doc

SAW 1/13/03 9:05