# **Attachment 4: Summary of Resident and Property Owner Survey Data**

#### Overview

The City of Toronto sought feedback from members of the public and residents, as well as property owners, operators, managers, and superintendents about the state of temperature regulations in Toronto and recent thermal comfort in their living spaces. Respondents were also asked about the feasibility of implementing measures that maintain indoor air temperatures throughout the year.

Feedback was collected through two surveys (one for residents and one for owners or managers). The surveys were anonymous, voluntary, and respondents could choose to not answer any of the questions.

The survey was shared through a mailing list of property owners, property managers and tenant associations. It was also promoted via the ML&S Monitor which provides Councillor offices with sample content to promote in their specific newsletters and was disseminated through two networks operated through Social Development, Finance and Administration (SDFA's) Community Cluster Coordination Plan to reach critical community agencies. The surveys were promoted on social media and received 60,539 impressions, and the dedicated City webpage received 2,019 views.

#### Respondents

- There were 578 respondents who completed the resident survey:
  - o 89% were renters, and most either live alone (38%), or with a spouse or partner (39%).
  - Most respondents lived in an apartment (79%), and 60% of all apartment dwellers reported that they lived in high-rise apartments.
- There were 182 respondents who completed the property owner or manager survey.
  - 60% were property owners or operators, 37% were property managers,
    3% were superintendents or had 'other' roles.
  - 82% of buildings represented were private, 13% were not-for-profit, 3% public and 2% other.
  - 90% of buildings were registered with RentSafe, while 10% were not.
  - 74% said that their building did not have a Hot Weather Plan, mostly due to insufficient staffing and insufficient space on site to accommodate elements of a hot weather plan.
  - Buildings were of varied sizes:

1-3	4-6	7-9	10-16	17-40	> 40
storeys	storeys	storeys	storeys	storeys	storeys
25%	21%	10%	23%	19%	2%

Attachments to Establishing a Framework to Address Excessive Indoor Temperatures in Leased Residential Premises

Attachment 4: Summary of Resident and Property Owner Survey Data

0-5	50 51-	-100 101-	200 201-30	00 301-40	00 401-500	> 500
uni	ts ur	nits uni	ts units	units	units	units
369	% 19	9% 209	% 13%	7%	3%	2%

# **Access to Air Conditioning**

#### Resident Survey Outcomes

- 63% of respondents reported having an AC in their dwelling unit, 37% did not have an AC.
- Of those without AC, 15% did not have the ability install a unit, or were unsure if they could (10%). Many also said they would not be able to install (47%) or maintain/operate an AC (50%) if they did have one.
- Where residents had an in-unit AC, the top three types were central air conditioning (33%), window air conditioning (17%) and portable air conditioning (13%). Even with an AC, 44% reported that a challenge with maintaining a comfortable indoor temperature was that their AC did not operate optimally.
- Out of renters, 61% of respondents said that electricity was not included in rent and 36% said it was.

#### Property Owner/Manager Survey Outcomes

- In terms of non-AC indoor temperature control, 92% of respondents said they had windows that can be opened and 16% had ceiling fans. For heating, 31% had radiators and 23% had baseboard heaters.
- Renter responses showed that 40% of owners allow tenants to install either window or portable ACs.

## **Cooling Rooms**

#### Resident Survey Outcomes

 When asked about support for a central cooling room in a building, 73% of residents considered it to be essential or high priority.

#### Property Owner/Manager Survey Outcomes

- 55% of respondents reported not having a designated cooling room in the building.
- 52% of property owners surveyed were supportive or strongly supportive of a proposed cooling room requirement, but.
- 64% of respondents noted that the cost of building (or maintaining) a cooling room would pose a significant barrier to complying with a cooling room requirement.

## **Indoor Maximum Temperature Threshold and Date Range Changes**

Attachments to Establishing a Framework to Address Excessive Indoor Temperatures in Leased Residential Premises

Attachment 4: Summary of Resident and Property Owner Survey Data

## Resident Survey Outcomes

- When asked about their experience of their indoor temperature between June 2 and September 14, responses were mixed:
  - Many respondents (42%) noted that during the Spring shoulder season, the AC was off when it was needed sometimes (4-6 days a week) or always (7 days a week).
  - 48% said that during the spring shoulder season, the heat was on when it was not needed either sometimes or always, while 41% said this happened seldom or never, and 10% were unsure.
  - During the Fall shoulder season, 40% felt that the AC was off when it was needed most of the week (4-7 days), which was similar to those who said that they felt that the heat was on when it was not needed (44%) most of the week.
- When asked If residents would support all leased residential premises be required to maintain a maximum indoor temperature of 26°C, the majority of respondents said they were strongly supportive or supportive (88%), with 8% saying they were unsupportive or strongly unsupportive
- In terms of existing City regulations that maintain comfortable indoor air temperatures, responses varied depending on the amendment options presented (i.e. the season and the policy approach):

Chapter 629, Property Standards				
No change	12%			
Move the date in June	Earlier 37%			
	Later 1%			
Move the date in	Earlier 2%			
September	Later 30%			
No dates, but an outdoor	Indoor 48%			
or indoor temperature	Outdoor			
threshold	52%			

Chapter 497, Heating				
No change	16%			
Move the date in June	Earlier 20%			
	Later 2%			
Move the date in	Earlier 2%			
September	Later 24%			
No dates, but an outdoor	Indoor 46%			
or indoor temperature	Outdoor 49%			
threshold				

# Property Owner Owners/Manager Survey Outcomes

- The majority (76%) of property owners and managers said they would be strongly unsupportive (58%) or unsupportive (18%) of a measure to require leased residential premises to maintain a maximum indoor temperature of no more than 26°C. 16% said they would be supportive or strongly supportive.
- When asked about challenges property owners or managers face with maintaining indoor air temperatures during a heat event, the most popular response was the impact of procuring and installing cooling systems or units on the building's electrical infrastructure (82%), as well as the cost of procuring and operating cooling systems (54%).

Attachments to Establishing a Framework to Address Excessive Indoor Temperatures in Leased Residential Premises

Attachment 4: Summary of Resident and Property Owner Survey Data

- When asked to describe the challenges associated with maintaining indoor air temperature during a heat event, cost concerns and building limitations were most commonly cited.
  - Cost concerns largely discussed the expenses associated with maintaining or upgrading cooling systems, and not having enough staff to either support tenants with their own installations, or the "manpower to make the necessary upgrades"
  - Building limitations were cited by 42 respondents, who stated that older buildings were not designed to "take the electrical load of cooling units" and "maintain proper indoor temperature".
- With regards to resources to help maintain a maximum temperature, the most popular response was funding: to retrofit (92%), procure and install ACs (92%), and offset operating costs (81%).
- 73% of owners/managers expressed that if a maximum indoor temperature were to be required, a reasonable implementation timeline would be over 5 years.
- 46% of property managers said the current date range should be maintained for a minimum temperature, while 29% also said the September date should be moved later and 30% said the June date should be moved earlier. 13% thought that there should be no date range.
- In general, property managers are unsupportive or strongly unsupportive (57%) of the date range being removed and maintaining a minimum temperature of 21°C year-round.
- Property managers stated that the biggest challenges to maintaining indoor temperatures during shoulder seasons were the different temperature preferences of tenants (54%), aging buildings (43%), and variability of temperature between units (40%). Some (40%) also said they had no issues maintaining indoor temperatures.