



## SENIOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE



July 16, 2010

A meeting of the Senior's Advisory Committee was held on Friday, July 16, 2010, at 9:30am in Committee Room 2, Third Floor, Vancouver City Hall.

**PRESENT:**

Chris Morrisey - Chair  
Dena Dawson - Vice Chair  
Allen Blakey  
Grace Balbutin  
Alice Choi  
Dellie Lidyard  
Virginia McDade  
Colleen McGuinness (Recorder)

**ABSENT:**

Thomas Brunker  
Sylvia Gurstein (Leave of Absence)  
Henry Lee  
Eva Wadolna (Leave of Absence)

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Neil Carley, Engineering Services

### **Adoption of Agenda**

The Agenda was adopted as distributed.

### **Attendance**

Leaves of absence were approved for [enter names of members].

### **Approval of Minutes**

The Minutes of the June 18<sup>th</sup> meeting were presented with the amendment that Milinda Schulz had been in attendance. It was also pointed out that a hyphen was not necessary in the word subcommittee.

The minutes were approved as amended.

*Note from City Clerk's Office: it is not City Clerk's practice to include non-members and guests in the attendance list.*

### **CORRESPONDENCE FOLDER - no items**

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Postponed until later in the meeting.

### 1. City of Vancouver Paper on Seniors

Chris Morrissey introduced Carol Ann Young from the Social Policy section of the Social Planning Department. Carol Ann began her briefing with some background information about the origins of the Department's work on seniors' issues. The purpose was to identify and focus attention on issues for seniors.

The growing population of seniors presents the City of Vancouver an opportunity to shape the city and for the community to be "senior's friendly".

The background papers that were prepared consist of a data analysis that did not involve any community consultation. Social Planning now has two documents that will be circulated to the committee. One is a "Fact Sheet" that will be circulated to community centres, health centres and other public areas for information. The "Main Report" is a statistical resource document for community groups and others looking for a current database of information about seniors in Vancouver that includes reference to diversity and immigration.

The material gathered on seniors is intended to provide other City departments with the data to broaden staff knowledge and guide them in their decision making within their specific spheres of influence.

Carol Ann mentioned that the department's work is currently focused on a "child and youth friendly" city.

Chris stated that SAC is working towards an "age friendly city" and that features that make a city "age friendly" also make it "child and family friendly".

Committee members stated that they would like the opportunity to have in-put into the material on the Fact Sheet. Carol Ann agreed to raise this matter with the Department head and get back to the committee through Neil Carley. It was specifically noted that the fact sheet does not identify housing as a matter of high importance, which is a serious omission. A re-working of the fact sheet material would also allow for reference to "age friendly".

Social Planning is intending to release the background paper very soon and the "fact sheet" is scheduled for release in October or November.

There was general agreement that the City of Vancouver needs a policy framework on seniors and seniors' issues.

The Social Policy group within Social Planning asked for advice on how to reach all the neighbourhood links and advice about how to build their networks.

It was agreed that Neil would circulate the fact sheet and document to all committee members with instructions for comments to Chris by Friday, July 23<sup>rd</sup>. A group, consisting of the Chris, Jill, Dellie, Virginia and Colleen will meet the following week to review the comments and discuss the modifications that might be suggested to the Social Planning Dept.

**2. Subcommittee Reports**

*a. Transportation Committee*

No report

*b. Housing Subcommittee did not meet*

Although there was no Housing subcommittee report there was discussion about a housing issue

It was noted that there are currently 14 City sites for housing and yet none of these have been presented to either the SAC or the Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee (PWDC) for review. Neil was asked to get details about the sites and the current status of the projects.

Discussion took place about the SAC input, on a regular bases, as proposed projects proceed through the development process.

Neil was asked to investigate what the SAC role is in the review of developments. It was also suggested that perhaps someone from the Planning Department be invited to attend and brief the committee.

*c. Virtual Village*

Although this subcommittee was set up to review the virtual village concept as it related to one particular project, it would seem that there are a number of reasons why this concept should be examined in detail.

Reductions in the services provided by Coastal Health means that community members could work collectively to provide services and increase the current services to certain individuals.

Colleen agreed to get the best Canadian links from Eva Wadolna, as she is an expert in this field. This will form the bases of the committee research and start the discussion.

It was noted that there is no appeal process for home support and so appeals are seldom acknowledged or changed.

**3. Liaison to the Persons with Disability Committee**

No report.

**4. Confirmation of draft letter re: Safer**

Committee members were asked to respond directly to Chris

5. Other Business

a. Pension reform meeting

Chris asked for anyone who had been at the meeting to share what they had learned. Members reported that the meeting informed the audience that the only reforms will affect those who are not currently receiving the benefits. Future needs were the only focus and as they affected union members

It was agreed that Chris should prepare a letter to Beverly Pitman.

b. *Election of chair*

Postponed to the September meeting.

c. *Business cards*

Under consideration by staff.

*Next meeting*

Date: September 17, 2010  
Time: 9:30 am  
Location: City Business Centre, Second Floor, City Hall

The Committee adjourned at 11:30am.

\* \* \* \* \*

HOUSING – as we voiced at the meeting, we believe there needs to be a separate section on housing. To achieve this we have removed 2 facts from Economic Security and put them under Housing

Only 68% of Vancouver . . . from economic SECURITY to HOUSING  
Based on 2010 data . . . from economic SECURITY to HOUSING

There are only 13 wholly government assisted living facilities in Vancouver How many beds??  
Market rent is not affordable – There are long wait list for subsidized housing and the SAFE R program

There are no mandatory building standard requirements to enable ageing-in-place

## HEALTH

INTRODUCTION: RE-WORDED.

It is expected that the future seniors population will live longer and fare better overall, however this will also mean an increase in chronic health conditions, dementia and mobility issues.  
Last bullet – end with “lack of culturally appropriate care” (Remove reference to housing as it is now in the Housing section.)

?relevance of 1995 – 96 data? Worth including? Not Vancouver Specific and old

## TRANSPORTATION

Remove bullet one – re. Abuse from transportation

Add to HEALTH with the following change:

Seniors can be victims of emotional, physical and sexual abuse by spouses, children and caregivers. 8% of seniors interviewed in a 1994 provincial study acknowledged that they had experienced financial abuse. All forms of abuse have a significant impact on health.

DIVERSITY – We like this section. In the the interest of freeing a little space –

Collapse bullets 1 &2 into the following:

51% OF ALL SENIORS IN Greater Vancouver are immigrants with 25.9% BEING OF A visible MINORITY COMPARED TO 13.4% in BC and 7.2% in the rest of Canada.

Bullet on “Older immigrants . . . period, may be vulnerable as a result.

*We understand that the audience of the sheet and the larger document is researchers, planners, grant writers etc. Providing fact is useful, however, we are left concerned and wondering, why City of Vancouver Planning has not made recommendations. Our concern is how the City is going to respond in concrete ways to the realities that the facts present. We believe that a next step is critical, and that it is incumbent upon the city to respond.*