

Miniaci, Mario FIN:EX

From: Miniaci, Mario FIN:EX
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 4:52 PM
To: Menzies, Brian FIN:EX; Edwardson, Jamie GCPE:EX
Subject: Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver issues statement on foreign buyer tax

Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver issues statement on foreign buyer tax

- [News Releases](#)
 - [REBGV Statements](#)
- Monday, July 25, 2016

Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver President Dan Morrison issued the following statement on today's announcement:

"Housing affordability concerns all of us who live in the region. Implementing a new real estate tax, however, with just eight days' notice and no consultation with the professionals who serve home buyers and sellers every day needlessly injects uncertainty into the market.

"Government has had a long time to take action on the affordability issue, yet they decide to bring this new tax in over a long weekend, with no notice, and no time to prepare. It would have been prudent to seek consultation from the people most knowledgeable about the impact.

"To minimize short-term volatility in the market, we're calling on government to exempt real estate transactions that are in the process of closing from this new tax."

The real estate industry is a key economic driver in British Columbia. In 2015, 42,326 homes changed ownership in the Board's area, generating \$2.7 billion in economic spin-off activity and an estimated 19,000 jobs. The total dollar value of residential sales transacted through the MLS® system in Greater Vancouver totalled \$39 billion in 2015. The Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver is an association representing more than 12,800 REALTORS® and their companies. The Board provides a variety of member services, including the Multiple Listing Service®. For more information on real estate, statistics, and buying or selling a home, contact a local REALTOR® or visit www.rebgv.org.

Contact

Craig Munn, Manager, Communication
Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver
604.730.3146
cmunn@rebgv.org

Menzies, Brian FIN:EX

From: Menzies, Brian FIN:EX
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 2:14 PM
To: Cadario, Michele PREM:EX
Cc: Sweeney, Neil PREM:EX; Mentzelopoulos, Athana FIN:EX; Henderson, Kim N PREM:EX
Subject: FW: New Foreigners TAX

Early response from UDI

From: Jon Stovell [<mailto:jons@relianceproperties.ca>]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 2:00 PM
To: Chrystal, Neil
Cc: Menzies, Brian FIN:EX; Anne McMullin
Subject: Re: New Foreigners TAX

Thanks Niel.

Brian

UDI officially concurs with every aspect of Niel's letter below.

This is ill advised in the extreme and your governments failure to exempt pre-sales is a betrayal to our non residents willing to participate in good faith in our economy in what has been both a legal and arguably encouraged through other government policy.

Your consultations with industry as recently as last week when this was not even mentioned also have limited credibility at this point.

Kind regards.

Jon Stovell
UDI Chair.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 25, 2016, at 11:31 AM, Chrystal, Neil <nchrystal@polyhomes.com> wrote:

Brian,

Good morning Brian!

Neil Chrystal here from Polygon Homes. We met last week at the meeting we had with Minister de Jong and UDI.

I thought I would send you a quick note (personally, not as a member of UDI) to let you know how disappointed I am in the new tax on foreign buyers and I was hoping you might share my thoughts with Minister de Jong.

The new tax is wrong on two fronts;

- 1) The tax of 15% is excessive and a sure fire way to halt sales to foreign buyers in a market that was already slowing signs of fatigue and;
- 2) The fact that you did not provide a grandfathering provision for buyers of pre-sales homes is outrageous and sure to cause the new home industry a lot of issues moving forward.

While I was at first appreciative of the consultation meeting we had last week I feel that our industry has been somewhat blind-sided by the announcement of this new tax, given how extreme it is. I actually find it hard to believe that something so drastic wasn't discussed further with our industry and that our meeting was a bit of a waste of time, given that the policy was likely already determined.


I am sure that UDI will be consulting you with a formal industry position on the new tax but wanted to let you know how personally disappointed I am with the tax rate and rules applied to purchasers.

Anyhow, not meaning to dump on you but I am writing this email in a frustrated state of mind and your card happened to be sitting on my desk!

If you want to talk, I am happy to chat with you.

Regards,

Neil



POLYGON polyhomes.com
900 - 1333 West Broadway,
Vancouver, BC V6H 4C2

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the addressee. If you have received this email in error, please permanently delete this email and immediately notify the sender. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, alteration or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this email is strictly prohibited.

Menzies, Brian FIN:EX

From: Menzies, Brian FIN:EX
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 5:24 PM
To: Bhullar, Barinder PREM:EX
Subject: Fwd: New Foreigners TAX

From: Jon Stovell <jons@relianceproperties.ca>
Date: July 25, 2016 at 2:00:14 PM PDT
To: "Chrystal, Neil" <nchrystal@polyhomes.com>
Cc: "brian.menzies@gov.bc.ca" <brian.menzies@gov.bc.ca>, Anne McMullin <amcmullin@udi.org>
Subject: Re: New Foreigners TAX

Thanks Niel.

Brian

UDI officially concurs with every aspect of Niel's letter below.

This is ill advised in the extreme and your governments failure to exempt pre-sales is a betrayal to our non residents willing to participate in good faith in our economy in what has been both a legal and arguably encouraged through other government policy.

Your consultations with industry as recently as last week when this was not even mentioned also have limited credibility at this point.

Kind regards.

Jon Stovell
UDI Chair.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 25, 2016, at 11:31 AM, Chrystal, Neil <nchrystal@polyhomes.com> wrote:

Brian,

Good morning Brian!

Neil Chrystal here from Polygon Homes. We met last week at the meeting we had with Minister de Jong and UDI.

I thought I would send you a quick note (personally, not as a member of UDI) to let you know how disappointed I am in the new tax on foreign buyers and I was hoping you might share my thoughts with Minister de Jong.

The new tax is wrong on two fronts;

- 1) The tax of 15% is excessive and a sure fire way to halt sales to foreign buyers in a market that was already slowing signs of fatigue and;
- 2) The fact that you did not provide a grandfathering provision for buyers of pre-sales homes is outrageous and sure to cause the new home industry a lot of issues moving forward.

While I was at first appreciative of the consultation meeting we had last week I feel that our industry has been somewhat blind-sided by the announcement of this new tax, given how extreme it is. I actually find it hard to believe that something so drastic wasn't discussed further with our industry and that our meeting was a bit of a waste of time, given that the policy was likely already determined.

I am sure that UDI will be consulting you with a formal industry position on the new tax but wanted to let you know how personally disappointed I am with the tax rate and rules applied to purchasers.

Anyhow, not meaning to dump on you but I am writing this email in a frustrated state of mind and your card happened to be sitting on my desk!

If you want to talk, I am happy to chat with you.

Regards,

Neil



polyhomes.com
900 - 1333 West Broadway,
Vancouver, BC V6H 4C2

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the addressee. If you have received this email in error, please permanently delete this email and immediately notify the sender. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, alteration or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this email is strictly prohibited.

***Miscellaneous Statutes (Housing Priority Initiatives) Amendment Act,
2016***

[The House Leader calls for second reading of Bill 28
Miscellaneous Statutes (Housing Priority Initiatives) Amendment Act, 2016]

[The Speaker calls upon the Minister]

The Minister rises and moves:

...

MADAM SPEAKER,

I move that Bill 28 be read a second time now.

Madam Speaker

For quite a number of months now, there has been growing surprise, concern, and consternation about the rapid rise in the price of homes in certain regions of the province – primarily in Metro Vancouver, but also in the Capital Region and other cities.

There has been speculation – some of it informed, some of it less so – about the various factors underlying the continued and sustained rise in prices—particularly centred in Metro Vancouver.

Metro Vancouver is large and has a diverse economy – a regional GDP of more than \$100 billion. It is home to a diverse, educated and growing population – currently estimated at more than 2.5 million people and forecast to grow to almost 3 million in the next ten years.

In asking the reasonable question – what is driving the price of residential real estate ever higher? – we have been confronted with many further questions, both economic and social.

What is the role of demand ... the role of supply?...

Questions of correlation – did this happen and that happen at the same time?

Questions of causation – did this happen because of that?

The role of the flow of capital from outside our provincial and national borders?...

... whether and to what extent this flow of foreign capital is sufficient to drive a market as broad and diverse as that of Greater Vancouver?...

... are the recent price rises sustainable, and if not, what could the consequences be to families that borrowed to enter into this rapidly rising market?

We have also been confronted with questions that tend to challenge our notion of ourselves as a tolerant, welcoming people who value our interconnectedness and openness to the world, who respect the privacy of our neighbours and others, and who embrace a free-flowing, wide ranging modern society and dynamic economy.

Our province, our country, is increasingly connected through trade agreements and trade flows to the rest of the world.

Thirty years ago, our province and the city of Vancouver—we put ourselves on the world stage with Expo 86. We invited the world, and they came, they saw, and many probably fell in love with this place we call home – just as we did once.

Our government has worked since 2001 to build on our social, cultural and economic ties with the world that came to know us in that year and those that followed.

We have encouraged twinning relationships with communities across the Pacific; we have launched trade missions that created new opportunities and jobs; we have opened up new markets particularly for our forestry products, maritime, aerospace, and financial sectors; we made the world aware of us as Canada's Pacific Gateway, and through that we connected ourselves to the flow of global trade.

We further established our province as a green gem in the world's imagination with the drama and success of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games, at a time when so many economies around the world were beginning to flag and falter.

This is part of the story that saw B.C.'s economy stand as a safe harbour for investment through the tempests of the global economic slowdown, and helped us emerge from that economic crisis with now four straight balanced budgets, a triple-A credit rating from the three major rating agencies, and with an economy that is forecast to lead growth among provinces both this year and the next.

Since 2001, economic growth in BC has averaged 2.6 per cent annually, compared to 1.9 per cent in the rest of Canada.

Yes, we have a strong economy, we have strong migration numbers, people are moving here. Our population is growing. And a growing population looks for homes to live in. This, then, speaks to the problem of demand.

On the other side, in the face of economic growth and rising demand for homes, we have issues of supply.

But what is that supply? Sometimes when I talk to people about this, I feel they think almost entirely of single family homes, with a nice yard, maybe a garden, lots of space outside for kids to play, and lots of space inside too—because sometimes it rains in Vancouver.

And nobody can blame them for that. In the vast majority of cases, that's the experience they had growing up. And as good, hardworking parents, they want the same or better for their kids. That's fair – it's a common, human dream.

Yet one fact struck me early on in this entire discussion – there were in 2011 about one thousand **fewer** single-family homes in the Vancouver area than there were in 1991.

And since 1991, the population has risen by almost one million new people (from 1.6 million to 2.5 million in 2015).

Where do those one million new people live? Townhouses, condos, other styles of housing. The number of multi-family units doubled in the same period that single family homes fell by 1,000.

In the late-1980s, more than half the housing starts in the Vancouver area were single-detached homes. By 2015, only 22% of housing starts were single-detached homes. And so far this year, 19% of housing starts are single detached.

Based on the current trends, forecasters anticipate the next 10 years could see a further half-million people or more move to Metro Vancouver.

If we want to provide long term stability and affordability in the real estate market and help current and future local residents realize the dream of home ownership in our communities...

... we need to bring more homes to market, more quickly, in livable communities that are supported by efficient, and cost-effective, rapid-transit networks.

That's one of the reasons that with Budget 2016 we exempted newly built homes priced up to \$750,000 from the Property Transfer Tax. To create an incentive for builders to start homes at affordable prices.

So far, [July 14, 2016]

- 4,027 families have saved an average of \$7,698 on their newly built homes.
- Total savings to families: \$31,770,029
- 191 per week on average (21 weeks)
- 27 per day on average.

The existing First Time Buyers Program has helped more than 11,000 families buy their first home this year. [to July 14, 2016]

The cursory review of permitting and approvals that I released two weeks ago showed that an estimated 108,000 units of housing are currently somewhere in the development planning and approvals process of just six lower mainland local governments.

Even though housing starts are currently trending strongly above the historical average, there's more supply available if local governments can get those homes through their processes and onto the market.

There are steps that the Province can take to help with that, and we are willing and anxious to work with local governments to help speed that process.

But however much we want to get new homes onto the market, there are legitimate and appropriate local governance processes that need time, and local residents have a legitimate say.

At the current prices and levels of demand, there's more that needs to be done while we work to bring forward new supply if we are to help people afford to buy in the current market.

In short, there needs to be a short term answer on the demand side of the equation, while housing supply has a chance to catch up.

That brings us to the specific changes this government proposes in this bill.

Bill 28 creates new measures to help make home ownership more affordable, establishes a fund for market housing and rental initiatives, strengthens consumer protection, and gives the City of Vancouver the tools it requested to increase rental property supply.

First, to the Property Transfer Tax Act.

In Budget 2016, responding to the questions the public was asking about foreign ownership of residential property, I announced government would begin collecting data to identify foreign purchasers, and better understand whether—and to what extent—foreign capital was having an effect on residential real estate prices.

That data—still very early results—is showing some interesting figures. We now have 20 days' worth of data – From June 10 through to June 30.

For the period we could capture, there were:

- There were 19,383 residential property transactions in British Columbia
- 1,276 transactions involved foreign nationals, a rate of 6.6%
- The total investment by foreign nationals was \$1,024,031,118 representing 7.9% of the total investment
- Metro Vancouver accounted for 49.7% of the real estate transactions, and 73.3% of transactions by foreign buyers
- By value, Metro Vancouver accounted for a total \$8,815,699,993 worth of transactions; foreign purchasers accounted for \$885,393,373.

- The average investment by non-foreign buyers in Metro Vancouver was \$911,425, while the average investment by a foreign buyer was \$946,945.

This is not, from what we can tell, inconsistent with Toronto, for example, or many other major, world-class cities.

But the volume of capital, in the face of our economy's ability to meet that demand, appears to need further measures to help our local residents afford to realize their dream of owning a home.

Accordingly, Bill 28, proposes amendments to the Property Transfer Tax Act, that, effective August 2, 2016, impose an additional tax on residential properties where the transferee is a foreign purchaser.

The foreign purchaser is defined as foreign national, a trust where the trustee or a beneficiary is a foreign national, as well as certain corporations that are transferees.

The additional tax will be 15 per cent of the fair market value of the foreign entity's proportionate share of the residential property. For example, the tax on the purchase of a home valued at \$2 million will amount to an additional \$300,000.

We chose this rate in part as it reflects the rate other jurisdictions faced with similar circumstances have chosen. Singapore, for example, and Hong Kong, both apply a rate of 15% to residential property bought by foreign nationals.

The amendments will allow government to set the rate as low as 10% and as high as 20% of the property value by regulation.

This flexibility will allow government to adjust the tax rate depending on the needs of the market.

The additional tax will initially apply to property transfers located in the Greater Vancouver Regional District, excluding the lands of the Tsawwassen First Nation.

The amendments also allow for expanding or reducing the areas in which the tax applies, should that prove necessary.

Some will doubtless seek to probe loopholes in these provisions, and our provisions to prevent that can be explored in committee-stage debate.

For now, let me say that the amendments are backed up by a specific anti-avoidance rule. Transactions structured to avoid the tax, will be caught by the anti-avoidance rule and will be subject to the tax.

We are also establishing broad, six-year provisions for audit, additional penalties for those who seek to evade the tax, and the government's intent is to ensure sufficient new audit staff to enforce the tax.

Furthermore, we are proposing fines payable as a result of offences with respect to the additional tax as the amount of unpaid tax, with interest, plus \$200,000 for corporations and \$100,000 for individuals. The maximum liability for imprisonment, two years, remains unchanged.

Housing Priority Initiatives Fund

Madam speaker, as a second measure, the government is establishing a new Housing Priority Initiatives Fund for provincial housing, rental and shelter priority initiatives and programs. The fund will primarily receive a portion of revenues from the Property Transfer Tax.

Proposed amendments under the ***Special Accounts Appropriation and Control Act*** establish the new Housing Priority Initiatives special account within the Consolidated Revenue Fund, along with its operating rules and oversight.

The purpose of the Housing Priority Initiatives Fund is to provide a strategic central funding vehicle from which priority initiatives may be funded in respect of provincial housing and rental/shelter supply, and access and support programs and activities.

The fund is established with a starting balance of \$75 million, and it will primarily receive periodic transfers of Property Transfer Tax revenues as approved by Treasury Board.

This account is under the responsibility of the Minister of Finance. It has the authority to fund operating expenditures, capital investments, and loans and loan-guarantees related to supply of housing and rental housing, or other shelter, access and support programs and initiatives, subject to the specific prior approval of Treasury Board.

Real Estate Services Act Amendments

Madam Speaker, it's clearly important that we British Columbians should have the help they need to enter the market to buy homes. And when they're doing so, they need to know that the process will be fair, respectful, and that if they choose to engage professional support, that person will act in **the client's** best interests, not the best interests of the agent.

We saw earlier this year that, in the face of an extraordinarily strong real estate market, some licensees took the opportunity to put their own gain ahead of their clients', and sought to profit at the expense of regular, vulnerable people.

Some in the industry saw what was happening, but regrettably, they were too busy selling homes to act in the broader interest of their profession.

That, Madam Speaker, is the inherent challenge of self-regulation. And that is why the government has chosen to go beyond the recommendations of the independent report, and end self-regulation for real estate licensees.

Madame Speaker, under these changes, the government will appoint all members of the Real Estate Council board to ensure a focus on consumer protection for British Columbians.

Furthermore, the superintendent of real estate will assume all rule-making powers that were formerly held by the Real Estate Council. The Superintendent is also provided with broad powers, including the ability to oversee and direct the council.

Finally, the amendments implement recommendations to address the necessary improvements to the regulatory regime as identified by the Independent Advisory Group.

The amendments we are proposing would also substantially increase the fines for licensee misconduct from \$10,000 to \$250,000 for licensees, and from \$20,000 to \$500,000 for brokerages. This measure will ensure there is a serious deterrent to misconduct, particularly considering the value of commissions derived from the current market.

Licensees that contravene the Act, regulations, or rules will also be subject to the forfeiture of any commissions earned, and may be penalized for each contravention.

The vast majority of real estate licensees are honest, hardworking people who have had their reputations tarnished by a few unscrupulous actors.

These amendments will help protect consumers by providing an effective deterrence to misconduct and will adequately penalize those licensees that put their own interests ahead the interests of their clients.

Vancouver Charter

Finally, we come to the amendments that will enable the City of Vancouver to implement a stand-alone tax on vacant residential properties.

Vancouver is facing a record-low vacancy rate of 0.6%, which City Council feels is putting upward pressure on housing stock and contributing to unprecedented affordability issues.

This amendment seeks to respond to a lack of supply through interim measures that will give time for new supply to come on to the market.

When I met with Mayor Robertson two weeks ago, he spoke to both the need to take measures that create an incentive for new supply, while the longer term issues of encouraging development of rental accommodation could be addressed.

Vancouver's intent in applying a vacancy tax is to seek to increase the rental housing stock on the market

A recent City of Vancouver study suggested that there are nearly 11,000 empty homes in the city, 9,700 of which are condominiums and apartments.

The legislation enables but does not require Vancouver to impose a vacancy tax. If Vancouver chooses to do so, the legislation sets out key elements of the tax, but leaves the design details to Vancouver to determine and impose by bylaw.

The legislation balances flexibility in enabling Vancouver, while also providing enough certainty for the taxing authority to be legally valid.

In brief, the authority to tax applies only to residential land and improvements, and will not apply to properties otherwise exempt from property taxation.

Vancouver is limited to using monies received under this 'vacancy tax' for initiatives respecting affordable housing and administration of the tax.

Vancouver would be responsible for administration, implementation, collection and enforcement of the tax.

The proposed legislation enables a self-declaration approach; Vancouver may require information from property owners regarding the status of their residential property and seek verifying evidence as to whether it is vacant or occupied – and if such information is not provided, Vancouver has recourse, including considering the property to be vacant and taxable.

These changes to the Vancouver Charter are intended to help address housing affordability by enabling the City of Vancouver to implement a vacancy tax, should the City choose to do so.

There is still a great deal of work to be done for the city to establish the necessary means to levy, collect, administer and enforce this tax.

I know that other local governments that have similar concerns are looking with interest at Vancouver's approach.

I hope they will have the opportunity to learn from Vancouver's experience, and accordingly decide whether it's something they also wish to pursue.

Conclusion

Madam Speaker, the legislation today creates new measures to help make home ownership more affordable, establishes a fund for market housing and rental initiatives, strengthens consumer protection, and gives the City of Vancouver the tools it requested to increase rental property supply.

Owning a home should be accessible to families of middle-class British Columbians. And when they seek to purchase that home, they should be treated fairly and respectfully. And finally, those who seek to rent should also be able to find a suitable home.

The changes we are proposing today are about making sure that British Columbians can continue to live, work and raise their families in our communities.

MADAME SPEAKER, I MOVE SECOND READING OF BILL 28.

[THE MINISTER SITS]

[Bill is Debated]

[The Speaker Puts Motion and Announces The Result]

[Bill Read a Second Time]

[THE MINISTER RISES AND STATES:]

Madame Speaker, I move that the bill be referred to a committee of the whole house for consideration at the next sitting after today.

[THE MINISTER SITS]

[Speaker Puts Motion]

Feedback received from

- Steve H
- Sadaf M
-

Page 25 to/à Page 27

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.14