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INTRODUCTION

Affordable Housing is a priority of The City of Calgary (CoC) and is an integral part of complete communities in The City’s long-range vision for the future. Access to housing that is safe, adequate and affordable is critical in creating a great city for everyone. The need for affordable housing is on the rise in Calgary, as increasing numbers of households are not finding housing they can afford in the market. Given the importance of affordable housing and the magnitude of The City’s investment in it, research was needed to inform future affordable housing development.

As such, a Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) research report was undertaken in 2011 and 2012. It answered the question ‘who is in need of affordable housing?’ and gave some indication of ‘what types of affordable housing are deficient?’ To expand on this research, in the fall of 2012, housing preferences research was undertaken to better answer the questions ‘what type of housing and what locations (where) are preferred by those in need of affordable housing?’ Together these two pieces of research will inform the setting of goals regarding the number, type and location of affordable housing units to be delivered as part of the Community Affordable Housing Strategy and the Corporate Affordable Housing Strategy. These strategies will address the question of how and when affordable housing is to be delivered.

This report presents the findings of the second piece of research - housing preferences of low and moderate income Calgarians. In addition to informing the strategies above, it may also be used by the Calgary Housing Company (CHC) in its management and operation of affordable housing. While the purpose of the research is for use by the CoC and CHC, other developers and managers of affordable housing in Calgary would likely benefit from it, as would developers of market rental housing and entry-level ownership housing in Calgary.
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS CRUCIAL:** Non-market rental housing is essential for housing Calgarians that are more at risk for living in low-income and overpaying for housing, including Aboriginal peoples, families with children, persons with disabilities, seniors, and immigrants. Many of these vulnerable populations also face particular challenges in finding market housing.

**TOWNHOUSES ARE PREFERRED OVER HIGH RISES, EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES:** There is a higher preference to live in ground-oriented housing (e.g., townhouses and stacked townhouses), especially among Aboriginal peoples and respondents from households with children. Seniors and persons with disabilities are the exception, and have nearly equal preference for ground-oriented housing and high-rise buildings with elevators.

**ACCESS TO OUTDOOR SPACE IS FUNDAMENTAL:** Most of the survey respondents want shared on-site outdoor space in their multi-family housing development. They also ranked having access to a private yard and/or a balcony and living close to a park or green space as very important.

**LIVING VERY CLOSE TO PUBLIC TRANSIT AND A GROCERY STORE IS HIGHLY IMPORTANT:** Respondents want to live within 1 kilometre of both public transit and a grocery store. They also want to live within 7 kilometres of an employment centre, though not necessarily downtown. Living close to downtown was not a priority for most households.

---

1 Unless otherwise noted, any discussion in the main body of this report on “respondents” is about lower-income respondents, identified as those living in households with a gross annual income <=$50,000 (see Methodology for definition). Discussion on vulnerable populations includes sub-populations that are typically at a higher risk of living in low-income households and overpaying for housing. Usually this includes Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities, immigrants and seniors. It may also include single people aged 45-64, families with children and refugees, where data is available.
**LOWER-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS ARE MORE DEPENDENT ON PUBLIC TRANSIT:**
Lower-income households own fewer vehicles than moderate income households, and they are much more dependent on public transit (that is, they use it much more frequently).

**RESPONDENTS ARE DIVIDED ON PETS:** Only about half of the respondents wanted pets allowed in their housing development. Of those that want pets allowed, there is a preference for smaller pets.

**NO SMOKING:** The majority of respondents do not want smoking allowed in their housing development.

**DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT HOUSING NEEDS:** Some of the sub-populations have unique housing needs. Households with children have special safety and space concerns to consider when choosing their housing. Seniors and persons with disabilities want housing that is single-level and accessible.

**DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT HOUSING MANAGEMENT needs:** There are varying, and distinct, expectations regarding building management among the sub-populations surveyed (Aboriginal peoples, households with children, persons with disabilities, seniors and immigrants).
Box 1: Methodology

In 2012 a literature review was completed to identify existing research on the needs and preferences of lower and moderate income households. It was found that not much research had been done, and there was no information specific to Calgary. As such, primary research was undertaken 2012-2013 by the City of Calgary.

An online survey was developed and tested internally. The final survey is included in Appendix II. The survey was administered by the Office of Land Servicing and Housing (The City of Calgary) together with Community and Neighbourhood Services (The City of Calgary) using FluidSurvey. The online survey was live from mid-September 2012 through to early December 2012. The survey was promoted through posters distributed to community associations/service agencies and businesses, flyers distributed to CHC tenants, posting on Facebook and Twitter, email to community social workers, email to aldermanic liaisons and banner ads. Pre-loaded $50 grocery store gift cards were offered as an incentive to complete the survey, and were awarded to a few randomly selected individuals who completed the survey. A phone number was provided for individuals wishing to complete the survey over the phone, or have the survey translated into another language. Approximately 20 surveys were completed over the phone. No one requested a translator; however, many who chose to complete the survey over the phone did not speak English as a first language and benefitted from having the surveyor provide additional explanations.

Focus groups were held in the fall of 2012 to gather in depth information on six sub-populations: Aboriginal persons, persons with disabilities, families with children, immigrants and refugees, single adults aged 45-64 and seniors. Four standard questions were asked at each focus group (see Appendix III). Participation was encouraged by providing an honorarium, travel compensation, and light refreshments during the focus group. For the focus group for families with children, child care was provided. The focus groups were recorded and notes were taken. In early 2013 the focus group questions were sent out to a few service agencies to distribute to clients to capture additional responses from groups that were under-represented in the main focus groups – persons with physical disabilities and Aboriginal persons. Five responses from people with physical disabilities, and one response from an Aboriginal person were obtained this way.

The online surveys were analyzed using SPSS software (statistical analysis software used in the social sciences). The results for the sub-populations were tested for differences from the total sample using the Pearson Chi-Square test. The data was then exported to Microsoft Excel where a series of analyses were completed, including the creation of charts for inclusion in this report.

The focus group feedback was reviewed for common themes among participants. Key themes as well as participant’s top three criteria for choosing a place to live were identified. Continued next page...
Box 1: Methodology continued...
The data limitations of the online survey include:

- To enable people without internet access to participate (those using public computers), internet protocol (IP) address restrictions were not placed on the survey. As such, one person could have potentially filled out multiple surveys;
- The survey was available only in English; although the offer for a translate was provided.
- Some questions were left blank (perhaps because the respondent did not find a suitable option provided) (i.e. not every question has 564 responses);
- The answer categories for the income question were overlapping. This has implications for the lower-income profile as people with incomes of exactly $50,000 would have to choose between the $40,000-50,000 and $50,000-75,000 responses. This determined whether they were included in the ‘lower-income’ category for analysis.
- As with most surveys, the quality of the information relies on the accuracy and truthfulness of the respondents.

A total of 564 online surveys were completed. The survey was voluntary and the responses were not tested against the Calgary population, and cannot be used as being representative of the population. Additionally, the samples comprising each of the sub-populations cannot be extrapolated to the rest of those populations. There were a considerable number of responses, however, and strong trends emerged that can be used to approximate the needs and preferences of lower-income Calgarians, moderate income Calgarians, as well as the six sub-populations.

Considerations for future surveys of this type are:

- Make the survey shorter as many participants dropped out before completion;
- Format the question on household composition differently. This question was formatted as a string (a data field that can contain letters, numbers or characters), requiring intensive data cleaning that took many resources.
- Format the question on postal codes differently. Once again, a string format was used and would require intensive clean up if it is to be used for spatial analysis. This clean up has not yet been undertaken.

For the purposes of this analysis and report, “lower-income households” are those households reporting an annual household income of less than or equal to $50,000. This was defined using the most recent Federal Census data (2011 NHS), where 65% of area median income in Calgary is $52,816. 65% of area median income has been used by the City of Calgary’s Affordable Housing Division since 2002 as an indicator of low-income. As of October 2013, this household income would barely be adequate to rent a 2-bedroom apartment in Calgary without committing more than 30% of their income to housing.
Box 2: Who filled out the survey? What does our sample population look like?

- A total of 564 people filled out the online survey.
- All age groups were represented, with the most responses coming from 25-34 year olds (see Figure 1).
- Nearly three-quarters of the respondents were female.
- Several of the respondents self-identified as belonging to one or more of the following sub-populations: Aboriginal persons, persons with disabilities, seniors, immigrants and refugees (see Figure 2).
- About half of the respondents had at least one child living in the household, and 15% of respondents had at least one child under the age of four living in the household.
- Gross annual household income varied among respondents (see Figure 3).
- Over half (288) of the respondents were from lower-income households (see Methodology for definition).
- Persons with disabilities and Aboriginals were over-represented in the lowest income category; while seniors were over-represented in the highest income categories (see Figure 4).
- Household composition was different for the lower-income respondents than for the moderate income respondents. In lower-income households, there were more single adults (living alone or with roommates), as well as more households with children living. There were also significantly fewer households with 2 adults in a conjugal relationship.

![Figure 1 Age Range of Respondents](image-url)
Box 2 continued...

Figure 2 Sub-Populations

Figure 3 What is Your Gross Annual Household Income? All Respondents

Figure 4 What is Your Gross Annual Household Income? By Sub-population
As can be expected, the housing needs and preferences of households examined in this research were varied. It is evident that the respondents require a broad range of housing. Despite the variations, strong trends did emerge. This research is intended to identify those trends, to influence the development and management of affordable housing in Calgary. The main body of the report includes nine research highlights on these trends; a comprehensive analysis can be found in the appendices.

1. **Affordable Housing is Crucial:** Non-market rental housing is essential for housing Calgarians that are more at risk for living in low-income and overpaying for housing, including Aboriginal peoples, families, persons with disabilities, seniors, and immigrants. Many of these vulnerable populations also face particular challenges in finding market housing.

The majority of all of the respondents were renters (see Figure 5). 83% of the lower-income respondents were renting their home. Seniors were much more likely to own their home, and Aboriginal peoples and persons with disabilities were less likely to own their home (see Figure 5). Most of the respondents ideally wanted to own their own home. As such, affordable homeownership programs fill an important need in the housing spectrum, for those that qualify. To fill the gap for the many Calgarians that cannot afford homeownership, or do not prefer it, purpose-built rental housing remains essential.

When asked about their preference to rent or own, respondents from the vulnerable populations had a much higher preference to rent, both in the private market and in the subsidized market, compared with the rest of the respondents. However, many of the respondents from vulnerable populations were not finding affordable rent in the market, and over half (59%) were not happy with their current housing. Many of the lower-income respondents had moved previously for safety reasons and because of poor living conditions. Finding accessible units was also difficult for several of the low-income respondents. As Calgary’s population ages, it is expected that accessible units will likely become increasingly in demand.

The moderate income respondents were much more likely to live in a single-detached house than the lower-income respondents; the lower-income respondents were more likely to live in an apartment, row house or secondary suite (see Figure 6). There was significant variation in the type of housing that respondents currently live in (see Figure 7). For example, seniors were much more likely to live in a single detached home, while persons with disabilities, immigrants and Aboriginal peoples were much less likely to live in a single-detached house. Immigrants, households with children and Aboriginal peoples were much more likely to live in a row house. Persons with disabilities most commonly lived in a high rise apartment. Interestingly, no Aboriginal respondents were
living in units in the secondary rental market (e.g. condominiums that are rented privately, secondary suites), making purpose-built market rental ever more important for this population.

Many lower-income households were not aware that subsidized housing existed, and/or were unsure about how to make an application. Consideration should be given to increasing awareness of affordable housing and the application process.

Figure 5 What is Your Current Housing Arrangement?
Figure 6 What Form of Housing Do You Currently Live In? By Income
Figure 7 What Form of Housing Do You Currently Live In? By Subpopulation
2. TOWNHOUSES ARE PREFERRED OVER HIGH RISES, EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: There is a higher preference to live in ground-oriented housing (e.g., townhouses and stacked townhouses), especially among Aboriginals and households with children. Seniors and persons with disabilities are the exception, and have nearly equal preference for ground-oriented housing and high-rise buildings with elevators.

Overwhelmingly, when asked about multi-family housing preferences, respondents wanted to live in either a row house or a stacked townhouse\(^2\) (see Figure 8). This preference was particularly pronounced for households with children and Aboriginals (see Figure 9). In fact, none of the Aboriginal respondents selected the high rise apartment as their first choice. The factors driving the preference for ground-oriented housing were: having a private yard and privacy, having access to outdoor space and having an entrance directly from the street. Seniors and persons with disabilities had a nearly equal preference for ground-oriented housing and high-rise apartment buildings with an elevator. The factors driving the preference for the high-rise were accessibility (the presence of an elevator and one-level living) and safety.

![The Top Ranked Housing Form, Lower-Income Respondents](http://www.condolivingonline.com/calgary/articles/3248/stacking-up-against-tradition)

Figure 8 Which Form of Housing Do You Most Prefer? Lower-Income

\(^2\) A stacked townhouse is a housing form where units are organized over top of each other in a quasi-interlocking fashion that reaches a final building height of two to three storeys. [http://www.condolivingonline.com/calgary/articles/3248/stacking-up-against-tradition](http://www.condolivingonline.com/calgary/articles/3248/stacking-up-against-tradition)
**Figure 9 Which Form of Housing Do You Most Prefer? By Sub-population**

### 3. Access to Outdoor Space Is Fundamental: Most of the Survey Respondents Want Shared On-Site Outdoor Space in Their Multi-Family Housing Development. They Also Ranked Having Access to a Private Yard and/or a Balcony and Living Close to a Park or Green Space as Very Important.

Nearly 80% of the lower-income respondents wanted shared on-site outdoor space, such as a patio, terrace or courtyard, in their multi-family housing development. Having a community garden was also important for more than half of the respondents. Having a children’s play area was less important among all of the respondents, except for households with children - 73% of these households would like a children’s play area (indoor or outdoor) on site. Having an indoor community room was less important for all of the respondents.
When asked specifically what type of outdoor space they would like access to, more than half of the lower-income respondents wanted to live near a park. 45% of the respondents wanted a balcony and/or private yard. About a third of the respondents wanted to live near a children’s playground, and nearly 30% wanted to live on a street with mature trees. Of slightly less importance was having space for a flower or vegetable garden, having bike paths nearby and having a fenced area for pets.
4. **Living Very Close to Public Transit and a Grocery Store Is Highly Important:** Respondents want to live within 1 kilometre of both public transit and a grocery store. They also want to live within 7 kilometres of an employment centre, though not necessarily downtown. Living close to downtown was not a priority for most households.

Living within 1 kilometre of public transit and a grocery store was a priority for most of the respondents (see Table 1). Though 43% of the respondents chose living close to work as a priority, most of those would be willing to travel 7 km to work. 77% of the lower-income respondents did not rank living close to downtown in their top criteria for choosing a home, and in fact, some respondents cited a preference not to live close to downtown.

In addition to living close to public transit and a grocery store, households with children and immigrants also placed priority on living within 1 kilometre of a school or daycare.

In addition to living close to public transit and a grocery store, seniors and persons with disabilities also placed priority on living close to services (banking, medical, legal, etc). Living in high density mixed use transit oriented development (TOD) sites could be ideal for some seniors and persons with physical disabilities. A strategy to ensure grocery stores are developed at TOD sites would be beneficial, as would encouraging the tenancy of service providers such as medical centres and banks.

Among all of the respondents, there was a desire to live both in lower density residential neighbourhoods, as well as medium to high density mixed-use neighbourhoods.
Table 1 Which Destinations Would You Most Like to Live Close to and How Close?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Maximum Distance Willing to Travel (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Income Respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>School or Daycare</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>4.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>School or Daycare</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For those who said distance to work was important, respondents were equally willing to travel 2.5 km vs. 7 km
5. **LOWER-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS ARE MORE DEPENDENT ON PUBLIC TRANSIT**:

*Lower-income households own fewer vehicles than moderate income households, and they are much more dependent on public transit (that is, they use it much more frequently).*

The majority (60%) of the lower-income respondents owned one vehicle, and nearly 30% did not own a vehicle at all. On the other hand, nearly 40% of the moderate income respondents owned two vehicles (see Figure 10).

Very few of the respondents from the vulnerable populations owned two vehicles. A comparison of the vulnerable populations shows that persons with disabilities were less likely to own a vehicle, and seniors were more likely to own 2 vehicles (see Figure 11).

![Figure 10: How Many Cars Does Your Household Own? By Income](image-url)
Nearly 35% of the lower-income respondents used public transit to get to their everyday destinations, compared with 17% of the moderate income respondents. Immigrants and persons with disabilities were the highest users of public transit (see Figure 12). 42% of persons with disabilities used some form of public transit as their primary mode of transportation.
6. **RESPONDENTS ARE DIVIDED ON PETS:** *Only about half of the respondents wanted any pets allowed in their housing development. Of those that want pets allowed, there is a preference for smaller pets.*

Respondents were almost evenly divided on their preference for allowing pets in their housing development. 53% of the survey respondents want pets allowed in their housing development, while 26% do not want pets allowed and 21% have no preference (see Figure 13). Many respondents cited that pet policies should be strongly enforced in all developments. The majority of respondents that wanted pets allowed thought both cats and dogs should be allowed, though there was a preference for allowing cats (see Figure 14). There was also a preference that the largest pet should be 10 or 20 lbs (see Figure 15).

![Figure 13 What Type of Pet Policy Do You Prefer? Lower Income Respondents](image)
Figure 14 What Type of Pets Should be Allowed? Lower Income Respondents Who Prefer That Pets Are Allowed

Figure 15 What is the Size of the Largest Pet You Would Want to Keep in Your Home? Lower Income Respondents
7. **NO SMOKING**: The majority of respondents do not want smoking allowed in their housing development.

78% of the respondents did not want smoking allowed in a housing development they were moving in to. Only 8% of respondents wanted smoking allowed; the remaining 14% had no preference.

8. **DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT HOUSING NEEDS**: Some of the sub-populations have unique housing needs. Households with children have special safety and space concerns to consider when choosing their housing. Seniors and persons with disabilities want housing that is single-level and accessible.

Findings from the survey and the focus groups show that some of the sub-populations have some unique concerns related to their housing.

Households with children are concerned with the safety of their children; respondents cited that balconies, stairs (to access units as well as stairs within units), and proximity to parking and commercial space are worrisome for parents. Living next to commercial space is a concern because of the increased presence of strangers and vehicles, including delivery trucks. Proximity to parking is important because children may get loose in spaces where there are moving vehicles. Balconies and stairs are falling hazards for children.
For households with young children, proximity to parking is also important because parents need to carry groceries, along with children and their belongings (such as strollers) to their unit. This is made much more difficult if stairs are also present. Parents cannot make multiple trips and leave their children unattended, either in a vehicle or in a unit.

An additional issue that arose for households with children was that parents are concerned about the noise their children naturally create, and the tension of sharing walls/ceilings/floors with others in multi-family housing, particularly those neighbours below them.

Persons with physical disabilities and seniors are concerned with accessibility. Many of the respondents currently need, or predict that they will need, accessible or adaptable housing. People with physical disabilities, and many of the seniors, generally do not want to be housed in any unit or development where they are required to use stairs. They specified a preference to have zero-low maintenance private outdoor space (balcony, yard or patio) that is also accessible. Seniors and persons with disabilities also cited a need to have some additional space for special equipment and/or for people that provide temporary care in the home.

Despite their accessibility concerns, many of the persons with disabilities and seniors still had a preference for ground-oriented housing forms. To meet the needs and preferences of these seniors and persons with disabilities (i.e. ground-oriented, with a balcony), while at the same time meeting the needs and preferences of families (i.e. ground-oriented, minimal stairs, private yard), developers could explore the feasibility of building an alternate form of housing (eg. a flipped stacked townhouse type of development, with a single unit on top with a lift for seniors and persons with disabilities, and a townhouse below for households with children).
9. DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT HOUSING MANAGEMENT NEEDS: There are varying, and distinct, expectations regarding building management among some of the sub-populations surveyed (Aboriginals, households with children, persons with disabilities, single adults aged 45-64, seniors and immigrants).

While many of the sub-populations examined had much in common with each other and with the rest of the respondents, trends emerged, and became clear in the focus groups, that show they have some different needs and expectations in the management of their housing development. Organizations that manage and operate affordable housing should be aware of these unique needs and expectations, such as:

- Aboriginals indicated a need to accommodate for long-term guests, for smudging and for increased safety and security (like cameras) in their housing development.
- Immigrants indicated a need to receive more education on their rights and responsibilities as tenants.
- Seniors indicated a need for strict enforcement of rules and policies, along with taking measures that increased safety.
- Persons living with mental illness and developmental disabilities indicated a need for management to be educated and aware on their various conditions.
- Single adults indicated a need for a sense of community and security.
- Households with children indicated a need for taking extra measures to ensure the safety of their children (for example, installing locks on doors onto shared hallways that can be locked from the inside, and not having balconies and stairs). Households with children also want a bedroom for each of their children (regardless of occupancy standards) along with space for them to play (yard). Additionally, households with children indicated a need for creating physical boundaries like fences or hedges on private outdoor space, due to varying styles of child rearing and supervision.

Many of the sub-populations examined indicated a desire for increased involvement from building managers/landlords. For example, some respondents wanted building managers to generate more social opportunities for tenants. Some respondents wanted building managers to create an atmosphere of increased tolerance through education and awareness of special needs, including mental illness. Some respondents wanted building managers to educate tenants about their expectations on behaviour among tenants, beyond basic rules and policies. Examples cited include supervising children, taking household garbage out, containing odors and humidity, noise, proper care of and clean-up after pets, picking up litter, parking, and guests. Housing operators/managers could explore the feasibility of a ‘neighbour awareness campaign’ that identifies varying expectations for behaviour.
There was some evidence of conflicts between landlords and tenants, and therefore, building managers should endeavor to provide more information to tenants on their rights and responsibilities prior to granting them housing. Building managers should also be educated on the varying needs and expectations of different populations. Some respondents cited that building managers were insensitive.

Finally, single adults felt more at risk as they aged and that the income and asset limits used by Calgary Housing Company were perceived as unfair to their circumstances. Attendees at the focus groups also felt that costs associated with extenuating circumstances (such as special needs children) should be taken into account in eligibility criteria. It is recommended that CHC clarify eligibility criteria. Some requirements, such as those for social housing, are governed provincially. Improved communication regarding eligibility may lessen perceived unfairness.
Box 3: What does the current housing situation look like for our Respondents?

- Most of the respondents were not living in subsidized housing, nor were they on the waiting list for subsidized housing at the time of the survey. Only 34% of the lower-income respondents were receiving rent assistance or living in subsidized housing at the time of the survey.

- An examination of the lower-income respondents shows that the primary reasons they weren’t on a waiting list were: their income was too high and/or they didn’t qualify (e.g. assets too high), they weren’t aware that subsidized housing existed, they were unsure about how to make an application, they found affordable rent on the open market and they preferred not to live in subsidized housing (see Figure 16).

![Why aren’t you on a waiting list? Lower Income Respondents](image)

**Figure 16 Why Aren’t You on a Waiting List for Subsidized Housing? Lower-Income Respondents**

- While 14% of the lower-income respondents were living in a single-detached home at the time of the survey, 61% were living in a high rise apartment, a low rise walk-up apartment or a row house (townhouse) (see Figure 17). Statistically significantly more lower-income respondents were living in a high rise apartment, when compared with the moderate income respondents.

  - Further examination of the type of housing the respondents were living in shows significant variations among vulnerable populations (see Figure 7). For example, over 35% of the seniors were living in single-detached houses. Also, none of the Aboriginal respondents were living in a secondary suite. This could be a preference, or it could be that homeowners are choosing not to rent privately to certain populations so these types of units are not available to some groups.

*Continued next page...*
Box 3 continued...What does the current housing situation look like for our Respondents?

- Most of the respondents were renting their home at the time of the survey (see Figure 18).
- About 40% of all of the respondents were living in 2-bedroom homes. Compared with the moderate income households, more of the lower-income households were living in 1-bedroom homes, and many fewer were living in homes with 4 or more bedrooms (see Figure 19).
- The majority (87%) of respondents did not face challenges in their current home due to a disability or special need. Of those that did, most of the challenges were due to a physical disability or challenge. Many cited a problem with stairs specifically.
- While nearly 60% of the moderate-income respondents were happy with their housing, nearly 60% of the lower-income respondents wished they could move.
- The primary reasons for respondents’ last move were: to be closer to everyday destinations like work and school (30%), to move to a less expensive home (25%), and because of a change in family makeup (25%).
  - The lower-income respondents cited more often (compared with the moderate income respondents) that the reason for their last move was: to move into subsidized housing (19%), because of safety (including domestic violence) (9%) and because they needed a more accessible unit (6%).
  - Verbatim responses also showed that the lower-income respondents had less control over the decision to move, citing less that they moved because they bought a home of their own, and more that they moved because of poor living conditions and affordability issues.

Figure 17 What form of housing do you currently live in? Lower-Income Respondents

n=288
Box 3 continued...What does the current housing situation look like for our Respondents?

Figure 18 What is Your Current Housing Arrangement?

Figure 19 How Many Bedrooms Does Your Current Home Have?
Survey promotion began with a distribution of postcards to CHC residents. It also included distribution of posters to community centres, grocery stores and other key locations. Several weeks later, the survey was promoted through FaceBook, Twitter, and an email sent to Aldermanic Community Liaisons’ Distribution lists.
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## Affordable Housing Site Selection Analysis Criteria

### Non-Automotive Ownership Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Single Parent</th>
<th>Single Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>Y/N?</td>
<td>Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transit</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grocery store</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School or daycare</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (banking, medical, legal, etc.)</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or recreation centre</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and family</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post secondary institution</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Space**</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Automotive Ownership Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Single Parent</th>
<th>Single Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>Y/N?</td>
<td>Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transit</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grocery store</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School or daycare</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (banking, medical, legal, etc.)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or recreation centre</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and family</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post secondary institution</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Space*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 3 criteria are highlighted for each sub-group**

np=no preference  
n/a= data not available or not applicable  
* Tie for 3rd for families  
**Green space was not an option in survey, but it was given frequently in verbatim answers. Uptake of this amenity selection may have been higher if it were a choice, as evidenced by verbatim responses.
ABOUT THIS SURVEY
Your feedback will help The City of Calgary’s Office of Land Servicing and Housing to better understand the housing needs and preferences of low- and moderate-income Calgarians. The information collected will help with planning for affordable rental housing in Calgary. This survey takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. If you would prefer to complete this survey by phone, you can do so by calling 403-268-5493. At the end of the survey you can enter to win a $50 gift card.

TRANSLATION
To have this survey translated into another language, please call 403-268-5493.

FOIP STATEMENT
Your responses to this survey are strictly confidential and your privacy is protected. This information is being collected for research purposes and may inform future decision making at The City of Calgary. The information is collected under the Alberta Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, Section 33 (c) and protected by this Act. If you have any questions about this survey or how the information we are collecting will be used, you can contact Gail Sokolan at 403-268-5960.

DO YOU AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS SURVEY?
- Yes
- No

ELIGIBILITY
To make sure you are eligible to participate in this survey, we need to ask you a few qualifying questions. Remember, your answers will remain strictly confidential and are being collected for research purposes.
DO YOU LIVE IN CALGARY?
- Yes
- No

DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD WORK OR GO TO SCHOOL IN CALGARY?
- Yes
- No

PLEASE SELECT YOUR AGE RANGE:
- 0-17
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 or Above

WHAT IS YOUR GROSS ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME?
Gross annual income is the total yearly income before taxes from all household members aged 15 or older.
- Up to $89,999 per year
- $90,000 or more per year

ARE YOU CURRENTLY RECEIVING RENT ASSISTANCE OR LIVING IN SOCIAL OR SUBSIDIZED HOUSING?
- Yes, Calgary Housing Company (Cal Home Properties)
- Yes, another housing provider
- No
ARE YOU CURRENTLY ON THE WAITING LIST FOR SOCIAL OR SUBSIDIZED HOUSING?
- Yes, with Calgary Housing Company (Cal Home Properties)
- Yes, with another housing provider
- No

WHY AREN'T YOU ON A WAITING LIST?
Check all that apply.
- My income is too high/don't qualify
- Found affordable rent on the open market
- Not aware social or subsidized housing options existed
- Prefer not to live in social or subsidized housing
- Language barrier
- Unsure about how to make an application
- Difficulties during application process
- Other, please specify... ______________________

CURRENT HOUSING
The next few questions are about your current housing.

HOW MANY BEDROOMS DOES YOUR CURRENT HOME HAVE?
- 1 bedroom
- 2 bedrooms
- 3 bedrooms
- 4 bedrooms
- 5+ bedrooms

WHAT FORM OF HOUSING DO YOU CURRENTLY LIVE IN?
- High rise apartment (5 stories or more with an elevator)
- Low rise walk-up apartment (4 stories or less)
o Stacked townhouse (outdoor entrance and interior stairs, but not necessarily a private yard)
o Row house (townhouse)
o Semi-detached/duplex/triplex/ fourplex
o Single detached
o Secondary suite (basement suite, suite over a garage, etc.)
o Other, please specify... ______________________

DO YOU CURRENTLY RENT OR OWN YOUR HOME?
• Rent
• Own
• Living with family/friends
• Other, please specify... ______________________

IDEALLY, WOULD YOU PREFER TO RENT OR OWN A HOME?
• Rent
• Rent in subsidized or social housing
• Own
• Other, please specify... ______________________

DO YOU CURRENTLY FACE CHALLENGES IN YOUR HOME BECAUSE OF A DISABILITY OR SPECIAL NEED?
• Yes
• No
• Not sure

PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE CHALLENGES YOU FACE.
WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BEST DESCRIBES YOUR CURRENT HOUSING SITUATION?

- I am happy where I am
- I would prefer to move to a different home

THE LAST TIME YOU MOVED

Please answer the following questions based on your last move to a new home.

WHEN DID YOU LAST MOVE TO A NEW HOME?

- Within the past year
- 1 to 2 years ago
- 3 to 5 years ago
- 6 to 9 years ago
- 10 or more years ago

WHAT WERE THE PRIMARY REASONS FOR YOUR LAST MOVE TO A NEW HOME?

Select up to three.

- New home was closer to work, school, or other everyday destinations
- New home was less expensive
- New home was subsidized or social housing
- Change in relationship status or family makeup
- Moved to a retirement home or long term care facility
- Evicted/foreclosure
- Moving from a different country, province, or city/town
- Safety (includes domestic violence)
- Moved into a more accessible unit (to accommodate a disability or special need)
- Other, please specify... ______________________
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU MOVED IN THE PAST 3 YEARS?
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3 or more

HOUSING PREFERENCES
Now we’re going to ask you some questions about your housing preferences. To answer the following questions, please imagine you are moving to a new home.

OF THE FOLLOWING HOUSING FORMS, WHICH WOULD YOU MOST PREFER TO MOVE TO?
Seventeen storey apartment with an elevator:Three storey walk up apartment:Stacked townhouse:Rowhouse:Please rank these housing forms, with one being the most preferred and four being the least preferred.Drag the boxes on the left over to the right.

1 2 3 4
Seventeen storey apartment with an elevator
Three storey walk up apartment
Stacked townhouse (outdoor entrance, common landscaping)
Rowhouse

WHY DO YOU PREFER THE SEVENTEEN STOREY APARTMENT WITH AN ELEVATOR?
Choose all that apply.
- Sense of community
- Accessibility (presence of an elevator)
- Safety
- Easy maintenance
- One level living/no stairs
- Minimal yard work/outdoor upkeep
- Other, please specify... ______________________
WHY DO YOU PREFER THE THREE STOREY WALK UP APARTMENT?
Choose all that apply.
☐ Sense of community
☐ Safety
☐ Easy maintenance
☐ Minimal yard work/outdoor upkeep
☐ Fewer suites than bigger apartment buildings
☐ Other, please specify... ______________________

WHY DO YOU PREFER THE STACKED TOWNHOUSE?
Choose all that apply.
☐ Privacy
☐ Access to outdoor space
☐ Easy maintenance
☐ Entrance directly from the street
☐ Lack of yard work/outdoor upkeep
☐ Other, please specify... ______________________

WHY DO YOU PREFER THE ROWHOUSE?
Choose all that apply.
☐ Privacy
☐ Entrance directly from the street
☐ Private yard
☐ Other, please specify... ______________________

IMAGINE YOUR NEXT HOME IS IN A MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT (TOWNHOUSE COMPLEX, APARTMENT BUILDING, ETC.). WHAT TYPES OF COMMUNITY AMENITY SPACE WOULD YOU WANT TO HAVE ACCESS TO?
Select up to three.
WHAT TYPES OF OUTDOOR SPACE WOULD YOU WANT TO HAVE ACCESS TO AT A NEW HOME?
Select up to three.
☐ Parks nearby
☐ Bike path nearby
☐ Children's playground nearby
☐ Mature trees on street
☐ Courtyard
☐ Balcony
☐ Space for a flower/vegetable garden
☐ Fenced area for pets
☐ Private yard
☐ Other, please specify... ______________________

IN ORDER TO HAVE ACCESS TO PRIVATE OUTDOOR SPACE, YOU WOULD NEED TO PERFORM UPKEEP SUCH AS MOWING THE LAWN AND SHOVELING SNOW. WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO PERFORM THESE ACTIVITIES?
☐ Yes
☐ No

LOCATION PREFERENCES
Now we're going to ask you about your preferences regarding housing location.
WHAT AREA OF CALGARY DO YOU CURRENTLY LIVE IN?
Centre City: Quadrants:
- NE
- NW
- SE
- SW
- Centre City
- I don’t live in Calgary

ON A SCALE OF ONE TO FIVE, WITH ONE BEING VERY WILLING AND FIVE BEING VERY UNWILLING, HOW WILLING WOULD YOU BE TO MOVE TO A DIFFERENT AREA OF CALGARY?
- 1 (very willing)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (very unwilling)

WHICH AREA OF CALGARY WOULD YOU MOST PREFER TO LIVE IN?
PLEASE RANK YOUR PREFERENCES FROM ONE AS MOST PREFERRED TO FIVE AS LEAST PREFERRED.
Drag the boxes on the left over to the right.

1 2 3 4 5

NE  o o o o o
NW  o o o o o
SE  o o o o o
SW  o o o o o
Inner City  o o o o o
Would you be willing to pay 10% more for your housing costs to live in your preferred area of Calgary?

- Yes
- No

Which of the following neighbourhood types do you prefer?

- Low density development - mostly residential neighbourhood with predominantly single family homes
- Mid or high density development - mixed used neighbourhood with a variety of multi family homes and commercial space

Which destinations would you most like to live close to?

Please choose your top three destinations.

- Work
- Downtown
- School or daycare
- Grocery store
- Shopping
- Services (banking, medical, legal, etc.)
- Public transit
- Community or recreation centre
- Friends and family
- Post secondary institution, specify... ______________________
- Other, please specify... ______________________

You indicated you want to live close to work. How far would you be willing to live from this destination?

- Within 1km (10 minute walk)
- Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
- Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
○ No preference

You indicated you want to live close to downtown. How far would you be willing to live from this destination?
○ Within 1km (10 minute walk)
○ Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
○ Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
○ Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
○ No preference

You indicated you want to live close to a school or daycare. How far would you be willing to live from this destination?
○ Within 1km (10 minute walk)
○ Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
○ Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
○ Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
○ No preference

You indicated you want to live close to a grocery store. How far would you be willing to live from this destination?
○ Within 1km (10 minute walk)
○ Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
○ Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
○ Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
○ No preference

You indicated you want to live close to shopping. How far would you be willing to live from this destination?
Within 1km (10 minute walk)
Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
No preference

You indicated you want to live close to services (banking, medical, legal, etc.). How far would you be willing to live from this destination?

Within 1km (10 minute walk)
Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
No preference

You indicated you want to live close to public transit. How far would you be willing to live from this destination?

Within 1km (10 minute walk)
Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
No preference

You indicated you want to live close to a community or recreation centre. How far would you be willing to live from this destination?

Within 1km (10 minute walk)
Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
YOU INDICATED YOU WANT TO LIVE CLOSE TO FRIENDS AND FAMILY. HOW FAR WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO LIVE FROM THIS DESTINATION?

- Within 1km (10 minute walk)
- Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
- Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
- Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
- No preference

YOU INDICATED YOU WANT TO LIVE CLOSE TO A POST SECONDARY INSTITUTION. HOW FAR WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO LIVE FROM THIS DESTINATION?

- Within 1km (10 minute walk)
- Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
- Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
- Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
- No preference

YOU INDICATED YOU WANT TO LIVE CLOSE TO ANOTHER DESTINATION. HOW FAR WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO LIVE FROM THIS DESTINATION?

- Within 1km (10 minute walk)
- Within 2.5 kms (30 minute walk, 10 minute bike ride or transit trip, 5 minute drive)
- Within 7 km (20 minute bike ride or transit trip, 10 minute drive)
- Within 15 km (40 minute bike ride or transit trip, 20 minute drive)
- No preference

TRANSPORTATION
We’d like to know more about your transportation habits.

**How many cars does your household currently have?**
- 0
- 1
- 2

**Would you be willing to use public, on-street parking for your second car?**
- Yes
- No

**Would you prefer to live within walking or cycling distance of some of the destinations you need to get to most often, like work, shopping, parks, schools, and transit stops?**
- Yes
- No
- Not a concern for me

**What mode of transportation do you mainly use to get to your every day destinations?**

If you use more than one mode of transportation, please indicate the one you use most frequently.
- Drive (or passenger in a private car)
- Taxi
- Take public transit
- Handi-bus/Access Calgary
- Cycle
- Walk
- Other, please specify... ______________________
DO YOU CURRENTLY COMMUTE TO SOME OR ALL OF YOUR EVERYDAY DESTINATIONS BY BICYCLE?
- Yes
- No

A BIKE SHARE PROVIDES BICYCLES FOR SHORT TERM USE TO COMPLETE EVERYDAY TRIPS. WOULD YOU USE SUCH A SERVICE IF IT WAS AVAILABLE AT OR NEAR YOUR HOME?
- Yes, frequently (at least once per week)
- Yes, occasionally
- No

IS TRAVEL DISTANCE (COST AND TIME SPENT) A DECIDING FACTOR FOR YOU WHEN CHOOSING WHERE TO LIVE?
- Yes, a significant factor
- Somewhat significant
- Not now, but it will be if gasoline costs go up
- No, not at all
- Don't know

HOW OFTEN DO YOU HAVE VISITORS TO YOUR HOME WHO REQUIRE PARKING?
- Every day
- A few times a week
- A few times a month
- A few times a year
- Never
Now we're going to ask you about your preferences regarding rules and policies sometimes in place in multi-family dwellings.

What pet policy would you prefer in a housing development you were moving into?
- Pets allowed
- No pets allowed
- No preference

What types of pets would you want to be permitted in a housing development you were moving into?
Check all that apply.
- Dogs
- Cats
- Other, please specify... ______________________
- No preference

What is the size of the largest pet you would want to keep in your home?
- 5kg/10lbs
- 10kg/20lbs
- 25kg/50lbs
- More than 25kg/50lbs
- I do not have a pet

What smoking policy would you prefer in a housing development you were moving into?
- Non-smoking
- Smoking
TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY, WE NEED TO COLLECT SOME INFORMATION ABOUT YOU.
Remember, all of your responses are confidential and will only be used for research purposes.

HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD?
Adults living in a conjugal relationship (for one couple, indicate 2 people)
Individual adults (not living in a conjugal relationship)
Girls aged 5-18
Boys aged 5-18
Children aged 4 and under

WHAT IS YOUR GROSS ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME?
Select the option that best reflects your total yearly income before taxes from all household members aged 15 or older.
  o Under $20,000
  o $20,000 - $30,000
  o $30,000 - $40,000
  o $40,000 - $50,000
  o $50,000 - $75,000
  o $75,000 - $90,000
  o Prefer Not to Answer

WHAT ARE THE FIRST THREE DIGITS OF YOUR POSTAL CODE?
PLEASE SELECT YOUR GENDER:

- Male
- Female
- __________________________
- Prefer not to answer

DO YOU OR ANY OF THE OTHER INDIVIDUALS IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CURRENTLY SELF-IDENTIFY AS BEING PART OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POPULATIONS?

Check all that apply.

- Aboriginal/First Nations
- Immigrant
- Persons with disabilities
- Senior
- Refugee

DID YOU OR ANY MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD IMMIGRATE TO CANADA WITHIN THE LAST 5 YEARS?

- Yes
- No

HOW DID YOU FIND OUT ABOUT THIS SURVEY?

Check all that apply.

- Postcard
- Poster
- Twitter
- Facebook
- calgary.ca
- Friend/family
☐ Community organization
☐ Other, please specify... ______________________

**WE WILL ALSO BE CONDUCTING FOCUS GROUPS TO GATHER MORE IN-DEPTH FEEDBACK RELATED TO HOUSING PREFERENCES. WOULD YOU LIKE TO BE CONTACTED BY EMAIL OR PHONE AT A LATER DATE WITH AN INVITATION TO A FOCUS GROUP?**

The information collected will only be used to share information about our upcoming focus groups.

☐ Yes
☐ No

**WHAT IS YOUR NAME?**

____________________

**WHAT IS YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS?**

____________________

**WHAT IS YOUR PHONE NUMBER?**

____________________

**WOULD YOU PREFER TO PARTICIPATE IN A DAYTIME OR EVENING FOCUS GROUP?**

☐ Daytime
☐ Evening
☐ No preference
IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE ENTERED IN A DRAW TO WIN A $50 GIFT CARD, PLEASE ENTER YOUR TELEPHONE NUMBER OR EMAIL ADDRESS BELOW.

The information collected will only be used to contact the prize draw winners.

NAME


TELEPHONE NUMBER


EMAIL ADDRESS


APPENDIX III

Affordable Housing Preferences Focus Group Questions

The facilitator and note taker introduced themselves and reviewed the agenda, the role of the Affordable Housing Section, the purpose of the focus groups and the ground rules. Participants introduced themselves to the group.

Participants were asked to write down their **top three criteria** for choosing a place to live. These criteria were kept private until the end of the focus group.

**Question 1:** Participants were asked to discuss the characteristics of their ideal home.

**Question 2:** participants were asked to discuss what they would be willing to compromise on and what is non-negotiable for them when it comes to housing

**Question 3:** participants were asked to indicate the unique housing needs and preferences of their subpopulation (people with disabilities)

Miscellaneous Ideas were collected.

Closing comments were given.

Participants then reviewed the top 3 criteria they had written down before the focus group and discussed what their top criteria would be now.

After each focus group the facilitator and note taker analysed the results thematically and identified the group’s top 3 criteria as per the discussion, as well as unique considerations.

Affordable Housing Preferences Email Questions

1. Please list the characteristics of your ideal home.
2. What would you be willing to compromise on when it comes to housing? And what is non-negotiable for you when it comes to housing?
3. In your opinion, what are the unique housing needs and preferences of persons with disabilities?
4. What are your top 3 criteria for choosing a place to live?
5. Is your gross annual household income greater than $90,000/year?
6. Please select your age range: 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+
7. How many people live in your household, including you? And, are there children (under 18 years) living in your household?