

RESEARCH REPORT



Municipal Initiatives in Affordable Housing



CMHC—HOME TO CANADIANS

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has been Canada's national housing agency for more than 60 years.

Together with other housing stakeholders, we help ensure that Canada maintains one of the best housing systems in the world. We are committed to helping Canadians access a wide choice of quality, affordable homes, while making vibrant, healthy communities and cities a reality across the country.

For more information, visit our website at **www.cmhc.ca**

You can also reach us by phone at 1-800-668-2642
or by fax at 1-800-245-9274.

Outside Canada call 613-748-2003 or fax to 613-748-2016.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation supports the Government of Canada policy on access to information for people with disabilities. If you wish to obtain this publication in alternative formats, call 1-800-668-2642.

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVES IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

A report prepared by

DEBORAH KRAUS

for the

CANADIAN HOUSING AND RENEWAL ASSOCIATION

for

CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

May 1993

Canada

ABSTRACT

This report documents initiatives undertaken by Canadian municipalities. Its goal is to encourage other municipalities across the country to adopt some of the new ideas and approaches described herein about affordable housing.

The report is divided into three parts. The first part introduces the study, surveys the material and reviews the summary of findings. The second part contains 69 detailed fact sheets about municipal initiatives undertaken by 34 municipalities across Canada. The report organizes the fact sheets into the following twelve categories:

- Homelessness;
- Community and Economic Development;
- Sustainable Development;
- Intensification;
- Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing;
- Regulations: Administration and Approval Process;
- Partnerships;
- Land and Financing for New Development;
- Housing for the Elderly and Special Needs Groups;
- Community Health and Safety;
- Home Ownership; and
- Housing Information and Referral Services.

The third part of this report contains bibliographies of recent publications from Canada and the United States on the municipal role in affordable housing.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose

This report documents innovative initiatives in affordable housing undertaken by Canadian municipalities. Its purpose is to encourage other municipalities across the country to adopt some of the new ideas and approaches described herein about affordable housing.

Methodology

This report is as inclusive and representative of Canadian municipalities as possible. The reports authors contacted more than 75 municipalities across Canada and documented 69 initiatives from 34 municipalities.

Literature Review

The literature review examines how municipalities are addressing current issues in housing policy with the goal of providing useful ideas and information to housing and planning professionals.

The review surveys recent publications in Canada and the US about municipal participation in the supply and maintenance of affordable housing, community and economic development, sustainable development, community safety, and regulatory reform. The Literature review also surveys French language literature on the same subjects.

Municipal Housing Initiatives

The initiatives are documented in 69 fact sheets organized into twelve categories. The following summary highlights the findings.

1. Homelessness

More municipalities, including smaller communities, are addressing homelessness. There is a growing recognition that although the need for housing is the most critical issue, the issue of striving for increased employment through job training also is important. Creating housing for the homeless by providing opportunities for street people to develop job skills and earn income could bring significant economic benefits to the municipalities. Developing community awareness among the homeless that leads them to seize opportunities to address their own needs, is important to the success of municipal housing initiatives.

2. Community and Economic Development

Municipalities increasingly recognize the link between housing and community and economic development. For the purpose of this report, economic development has two complementary aspects: affordable housing initiatives create jobs in the construction and related industries; and increasing the supply of affordable housing attracts investment and encourages companies to locate in the host communities.

Municipalities and non-profit housing groups can support employment training by making space available in their buildings to community-based organizations.

3. Sustainable Development

Some municipalities are developing policies and strategies to promote sustainable development and to protect the environment within new subdivisions. There is also increasing interest in developing higher density communities that meet the dual goals of sustainable development and affordable housing.

4. Intensification

Municipalities are hoping to obtain more affordable housing through better use of existing serviced land and buildings. New approaches include permitting and encouraging secondary suites in existing buildings and in new subdivisions, housing above shops and on main streets, and converting non-residential space to residential. Some municipalities offer financial incentives through property tax credits, grants based on the increase in property tax assessment resulting from infill development, and tax exemptions to encourage residential intensification.

Several municipalities have received grants under the Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) Program to study opportunities for residential intensification and to look for ways to facilitate infill housing on small lots through housing design and zoning.

5. Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing

Several municipalities now provide subsidies to preserve their existing housing stock and revitalize older neighbourhoods. Better building inspection programs ensure that rooming houses maintain minimum standards of health and safety. Compensating tenants for temporary relocation costs caused by renovations improves the revitalization process.

6. Regulations: Administration and Approval Process

Many municipalities are searching for ways to expedite the planning approval process. Proposals have been submitted under the ACT Program to examine the use of computer systems, consolidate application forms, fast-track applications for affordable housing, and introduce "one-stop shopping" for

residential and renovation permits.

Several municipalities use mediation to reduce the number and cost of appeal hearings. Some offer evening service. Others give priority to multi-family rental housing projects.

7. Partnerships

Partnerships are emerging as a key strategy in meeting housing needs. Municipalities increasingly lead in creating planning and advisory committees. All the major players in the community, including senior levels of government, the private sector and community-based groups, work together on these committees to address housing issues. There is growing recognition that housing belongs in a wider context with jobs, health, safety and environmental issues.

Another partnership approach involves municipalities bringing together funding from a variety of sources to produce affordable housing. This report documents non-profit housing projects that were able to combine Rent Supplement assistance with: land, grants or other funding from various levels of government including such agencies as Employment and Immigration Canada, and Corrections Services Canada; and funding from community groups.

8. Land and Financing for New Development

Many municipalities facilitate the development of non-profit housing. Some provide loans to non-profit housing groups to help them secure sites. Others donate land, or subsidize development by leasing or selling sites at below-market rates. Other municipalities ensure an adequate supply of affordable land through land banking, through rezoning land from industrial to residential use, or through by-laws that require developers to make land available in new developments for affordable or non-profit housing. In some cases, municipalities require developers to contribute to the stock of affordable housing by building affordable units themselves, or by making a financial contribution to a municipal fund.

9. Housing for the Elderly and Special Needs Groups

Many municipalities want to provide appropriate housing for the elderly and special needs groups, and interest in garden suites for seniors is prevalent. However, many municipalities are still investigating mechanisms for ensuring that only seniors use these garden suites, and only on a temporary basis.

One new approach is an equity housing project specifically geared to seniors (55 or older) who are "asset rich, but income poor." Another approach is a supportive home living option whereby a family living in one half of a semi-detached house is paid to provide varying levels of care for one or more seniors living in the other half.

10. Community Health and Safety

Municipalities increasingly recognize that the design of housing and communities greatly affects safety. Some municipalities use the "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" approach in which the Police Department reviews plans for new developments. Some municipalities address urban safety and security issues through Safe Housing/Safe City Committees.

11. Home Ownership

Municipalities increasingly are involved in encouraging home ownership for households with low and modest incomes. Alternative forms of affordable housing that are gaining in popularity are manufactured housing, and the Habitat for Humanity model. The latter model allows low income home owners to contribute sweat equity instead of a conventional down payment toward the construction of a new home.

12. Housing Information and Referral Services

Some municipalities offer housing registries, home sharing programs, and housing information services. These services help people gain access to affordable housing, provide information about landlord and tenant matters, offer housing alternatives such as home sharing, and refer people to other service agencies in the community.

Conclusions

Canadian municipalities support affordable housing in various ways across the country. The variety of responses reflects particular needs and circumstances in different communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report would not have been possible without the assistance of many people deserving of recognition.

CMHC commissioned this report, and it was completed under the direction of **Robert Crawford** and **Brian Davidson**. Their astute direction and editorial input are gratefully acknowledged.

The **Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA)** Housing Initiatives Project Management Committee supervised the preparation of this report. I would like to thank Committee members **Bill Ashton**, **Judy Forrest**, and **Kaye Melliship** for their help. Special thanks to Committee Chairperson, **Luba Serge**, for her guidance, advice, support and patience which were invaluable in shaping this report. Thanks also to the Board of Directors of CHRA, other members and staff who provided comments and helped identify municipal initiatives. In particular, thanks to **Ivy France**, Chair of CHRA's Research and Policy Committee.

I would like to thank **Peter Aterman** for his valuable assistance in documenting municipal housing initiatives in Quebec and reviewing the French language literature.

I would also like to acknowledge the many municipal, provincial and private sector representatives who gave so generously of their time in helping to document municipal initiatives in affordable housing.

The literature review would not have been possible without the co-operation of the staff of the University of **British Columbia Fine Arts Library**. I am very grateful to them for their help.

The staff of **Klein, Lyons** in Vancouver provided much needed administrative and logistical support, and I would especially like to thank **Sophie Thomas** and **Doreen Cramer**.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my husband **Mark Lyons** for his unflagging support, and my son **Joshua** for his timely naps.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1 OVERVIEW OF MUNICIPAL INITIATIVES IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Purpose	1
1.2	Organization of this report	1
2.	METHODOLOGY	2
2.1	Selection of the municipalities contacted	2
2.2	Data collection	2
2.3	Content	2
3.	MUNICIPAL HOUSING INITIATIVES	4
3.1	Summary of findings	11
4.	LITERATURE REVIEW	11
4.1	Overview	11
4.2	Discussion	12
5.	CONCLUSIONS	15

PART II MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

Description of Categories
Fact sheets

PART 111 BIBLIOGRAPHIES

An Annotated Bibliography of Canadian Literature
Bibliography of Recent Literature from the United States

APPENDICES

Appendix "A" - Index of Initiatives Included in the 1990 Report,
entitled the Municipal Role in the Supply and Maintenance of Low
Cost Housing: A Review of Canadian Initiatives

Appendix "B" - Initiatives by Province and Municipality

PART 1

OVERVIEW OF MUNICIPAL INITIATIVES IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVES IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

This report documents innovative initiatives in affordable housing undertaken by Canadian municipalities. Its purpose is to encourage other municipalities across the country to adopt some of the new ideas and approaches described herein about affordable housing.

This report updates a study published in 1990 entitled "The Municipal Role in the Supply and Maintenance of Low Cost Housing: A Review of Canadian Initiatives". That report was prepared for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) by the Centre for Human Settlements at the University of British Columbia.

The range of initiatives documented in this report is wider than in the previous study. New areas that are addressed include homelessness, community and economic development, sustainable development, community safety, and affordable home ownership.

The preparation of this report has been as inclusive and representative as possible. More than 75 municipalities across Canada were contacted, including large and small, urban and rural communities. Sixty-nine initiatives have been documented from 34 municipalities in nine of the twelve provinces and territories.

The literature review provides an overview of recent publications on the municipal role in the supply and maintenance of affordable housing in Canada and the United States. It addresses areas covered in the fact sheets and includes a review of French language literature.

1.2 Organization of this report

The report is divided into three main parts. The first part introduces the study and provides an overview of the initiatives and the literature review. The second part contains the fact sheets. The third part contains the bibliographies. Appendix "A" is an index of the initiatives included in the 1990 Report. This index briefly describes each project and lists its current status. The index gives reasons for a project having ended and references documentation in this report for projects that are

still active. Appendix "B" is a list of all of the initiatives by Province and Municipality.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Selection of the municipalities contacted

CHRA helped to determine which municipalities would be contacted. CHRA used its broad network of volunteers from across the country to ensure that municipalities in all of the provinces and territories would be approached. Members of the CHRA Board of Directors also provided guidance as to which municipalities are active in affordable housing.

The researchers also contacted the housing and municipal affairs ministries in the provinces and territories for their suggestions. In British Columbia and Saskatchewan, the local municipal associations provided assistance. The municipalities contacted, therefore, constitute a good representation of municipal activity in affordable housing across Canada.

2.2 Data collection

Documenting the municipal housing initiatives involved updating the projects described in the 1990 report. Researchers contacted the persons identified in that report and asked for both updates to previous projects and for assistance in identifying new initiatives. Researchers obtained information by telephone in some cases, while in other cases, the contact person sent updated fact sheets to the researchers. In all cases, revised fact sheets were sent to the municipalities for their approval.

The researchers also contacted municipalities which had been identified as potential sites of new projects. Most municipalities gave information verbally on the telephone although some did send in written fact sheets. In all cases, the fact sheets used in this report were sent to the municipalities for verification of the data.

2.3 Content

In deciding which initiatives to include in this report two main criteria were applied. The first was "innovation" and the second was "municipal involvement".

"Innovation" was defined as new initiatives, as well as initiatives that were modified to fit the needs of a particular community. As the study progressed, it was clear that there were many grey areas in this definition. For example, initiatives

that are current in large urban centres (such as those for the homeless) are perhaps not new. However, when the same initiative is applied in a small town there is an aspect of innovation that reflects a change in the perception of housing problems.

The regional differences in Canada also became evident during the course of this study. In a number of cases, housing experts in one part of the country found that certain initiatives were commonplace, whereas in other regions they represented a new approach.

The goal of this report is to share ideas. Thus where there was doubt about the degree of innovation, the researchers erred on the side of inclusion rather than exclusion.

The second criterion was that the initiative must have some degree of municipal involvement to be included in this report. In most cases, the municipality took the lead role. In a few initiatives, another level of government or a community-based organization took the lead and the municipal role was one of facilitation or support.

Municipal projects that deliver federal or provincial housing programs generally have not been included in this report unless the municipalities added new or unique aspects.

The report focuses on affordable housing. Affordable housing means maximizing funds for social housing, providing housing for groups such as the homeless or seniors. It also means initiatives to increase home ownership among less affluent households and the protection of the existing stock of low cost housing. Sustainable development initiatives that increase densities should result in lower cost housing in the short and long term.

Many municipalities operate similar affordable housing projects. In this situation, the initiative is documented once, and the other municipalities are noted under the heading "Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere".

The initiatives are documented in fact sheets. These fact sheets are organized into the following twelve categories:

- Homelessness;
- Community and Economic Development;
- Sustainable Development;
- Intensification;
- Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing;
- Regulations: Municipal Administration and the Approval Process;
- Partnerships;

- Land and Financing for New Development;
- Housing for the Elderly and Special Needs Groups;
- Community Health and Safety;
- Home Ownership; and
- Housing Information and Referral Services;

3. MUNICIPAL HOUSING INITIATIVES

3.1 Summary of findings

A review of the initiatives shows the variety of ways that municipalities are involved in supporting the development of affordable housing. The review also demonstrates how the roles assumed by individual municipalities vary considerably across the country. There are differences by province, by size of municipality and by their urban or rural nature. Some differences also may be caused by the legislative framework that defines the authority under which municipalities operate.

A number of themes have emerged from the ways that municipalities have responded to the particular set of circumstances or problems present within their communities.

3.1.1 Homelessness

More municipalities are becoming involved in addressing homelessness, and it is no longer seen as an issue in just large urban centres. For example, smaller municipalities such as Fort McMurray, Alberta, (a community of 35,000 people), are providing emergency shelters and are looking at ways to provide permanent housing for the homeless.

Although the need for housing is the most critical issue facing the homeless, there is also growing recognition of a corresponding need for employment and job training. This link between housing and employment needs is illustrated by the examples from Street City #2 in Toronto and the Downtown Community Development Project in Victoria. Community development is important because it involves creating good relationships among people who will be living together in newly developed housing. Community development also creates opportunities for homeless people to identify their needs, and develop and implement solutions.

3.1.2 Community and Economic Development

The recognition of the link between housing and economic development has led a number of municipalities to promote

affordable housing as a way of generating jobs. The supply of affordable housing is also seen as a prerequisite to attracting investment and encouraging companies to locate in their communities. This is true in large municipalities such as the City of Toronto, as well as in small communities such as Shediac, New Brunswick.

The example from Calgary demonstrates that, by making space available in their buildings, municipalities and non-profit housing groups can play a supportive role in providing employment training opportunities.

Cape Dorset, Northwest Territories provides an example of community development where local municipalities are engaged in a planning process with senior levels of government to assume a greater role in all areas of government, including housing. It is felt that this approach will make the best use of resources in the community, streamline the delivery of services, and increase accountability at the local level.

3.1.3 Sustainable Development

Sustainable development is a relatively new concept for municipalities. A number of municipalities are in the process of addressing this issue in their planning policies. The City of Waterloo has an Environment First Policy to encourage sustainable development, and has developed strategies to protect the environment when new subdivisions are developed.

The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton has adopted alternative development standards to create compact communities. Area municipalities are encouraged to apply these standards in suitable areas. The City of Gloucester has approved a draft plan of subdivision to develop 165 units using these alternative standards.

City Living in Ottawa has developed a "compact" or intense community in accordance with sustainable development principles. In other areas, private developers are beginning to approach municipalities with plans for more intense suburban developments.

Other levels of government are also initiating sustainable development activities and are working with municipalities. For example, the Green House project in the City of Waterloo describes work being done in conjunction with the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources to encourage the development of new technologies in housing.

3.1.4 Intensification

Municipalities across the country are serious about intensification, and are looking at different ways to make better use of existing serviced land and buildings to produce more affordable housing. This report documents a number of approaches that encourage the creation of secondary suites in existing buildings and in new subdivisions, housing above shops and on main streets, and the conversion of non-residential space to residential.

Several municipalities have received grants under the Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) Program to study opportunities for residential intensification. Municipalities are looking at changes to zoning by-laws to facilitate infill housing on small lots, especially through housing design.

Some municipalities offer financial incentives to promote residential intensification. For example, Quebec City provides a subsidy and tax credit to encourage the development of housing on vacant land in the City core, and the conversion of non-residential (or partially non-residential) buildings to residential use. Quebec City also plans to spend about \$400,000 on public relations and communications to encourage people to move downtown. The City of Saint John, New Brunswick provides a grant to encourage housing through infill development. The grant is equivalent to 15% of the increase in property tax assessment resulting from development. The City of Regina is considering a similar tax exemption program.

3.1.5 Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing

Municipalities are working to preserve their existing housing stock and revitalize older neighbourhoods. Quebec City provides subsidies for the rehabilitation of single family homes and rental housing in the central core of the City. Quebec also operates a building inspection program to ensure that rooming houses are maintained at minimum standards of health and safety and additionally provides a subsidy for major renovation costs. The City of Edmonton has undertaken a pro-active and co-ordinated approach to inspect properties and ensure that they are upgraded to minimum standards of health and safety.

Montreal has a program to purchase and renovate older housing, and then to transfer the buildings to a co-op or non-profit housing organization. Montreal also provides compensation to tenants for costs incurred as a result of temporary relocation during renovations.

Winnipeg used to offer a number of rehabilitation programs (documented in the 1990 report), but these came to an end when the Core Area Initiative Program ceased in 1991. The City now

undertakes community improvement initiatives through the Manitoba/Winnipeg Community Revitalization Program which is funded on a 50/50 basis with the Province.

3.1.6 Regulations: Administration and Approval Process

This report documents three different approaches being used by municipalities to expedite the planning approval process. These include mediation as a way to reduce the number and cost of appeal hearings in Kitchener, Toronto and Nepean, offering a building permit service in the evenings in Toronto, and giving priority to multi-family rental housing projects in Surrey.

Many municipalities are searching for ways to improve their administration and approval processes under the Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) Program. Municipalities have submitted proposals to examine ways of streamlining the process by using computer systems, consolidating application forms, fast-tracking applications for affordable housing, and having "one-stop shopping" for residential and renovation permits.

3.1.7 Partnerships

Partnerships are emerging as a key strategy in addressing housing needs. Municipalities increasingly are leaders in organizing planning and advisory committees. All the major players in the community, including the senior levels of government, the private sector and community-based groups work together on these committees. The Edmonton Joint Planning Committee on Housing is an example.

The Housing Opportunity Centre in Peel is an example of a formal partnership agreement between the Province and a municipality on an agenda to provide affordable housing. In addition, most of the activities of the Centre are done in partnership with appropriate organizations including community groups.

A second type of partnership, one with community groups, is leading to a recognition of the need to take a holistic approach. This means considering housing in the context of jobs, health, safety, and environmental issues. Municipalities are encouraging partnerships that include people and organizations from different departments and backgrounds. A growing number of Healthy Cities/Communities projects across the country address a variety of issues, including housing.

A third type, funding partnerships, involves bringing together a number of funding sources to produce affordable housing. The initiatives from New Brunswick provide some examples. Non-profit organizations were able to build housing with Rent Supplement

assistance because land was donated or grants were provided by the Province and municipalities, community groups contributed funding, and the sponsoring group worked with another agency such as Employment and Immigration Canada. The garden suite initiative in Chatham involved Corrections Services Canada, municipal support to change zoning regulations, training of the inmates by the New Brunswick Community College, and funding through the Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program.

3.1.8 Land and Financing for New Development

Many municipalities facilitate the development of non-profit housing under Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Programs. Some provide loans to non-profit housing groups to help them secure sites. Others donate land or subsidize development by leasing or selling sites at below-market rates. Another approach is to ensure that there is an adequate supply of affordable land through the use of land banking, rezoning land from industrial to residential use, or through zoning by-laws that require developers to make land available in new developments for affordable or non-profit housing. Some municipalities in British Columbia require developers to build units and contribute them to the stock of affordable housing or to make a financial contribution to a municipal fund.

At one time, Halifax and Dartmouth developed housing outside the Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program by providing capital grants up-front with additional funding through the Rent Supplement Program. Now they and other municipalities lack sufficient financial resources to continue this approach.

The Province of New Brunswick has been particularly creative in working with municipalities to make the best use of limited and declining allocations. Since nearly two rent supplement units can be produced for the same cost as one non-profit housing unit, the Province has funding for some non-profit units to be diverted to rent supplement units. Municipalities contribute land or provide grants to make these projects viable. In addition, the Province allocated 55 rent supplement units to 3 joint venture projects, and encouraged the developers to build an additional 87 affordable market housing units. This strategy enabled the Province to produce 204 affordable housing units instead of the original 88 units allocated by CMHC.

3.1.9 Housing for the Elderly and Special Needs Groups

Housing for the elderly and special needs groups is a growing concern for many municipalities across the country.

Interest in garden suites for seniors is prevalent, particularly

in Alberta and New Brunswick. However, many municipalities are still investigating possible mechanisms to ensure that units are used only for seniors, and only on a temporary basis. In Fredericton, an agreement regarding the use of the unit is registered on title to the host property. The Interchurch Housing Society in King's County in Nova Scotia recently received an ACT grant and is working with local municipalities to develop legislation that will address this issue.

Municipalities are also looking for other ways to provide housing for seniors. The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Development Corporation (MTHDC) is building its first seniors equity housing project that is specifically geared to seniors (55 or older) who are "asset rich, but income poor." In Cape Breton County, New Dawn Enterprises offers a supportive home living option in semi-detached houses where the family living in one half of the house is paid to provide varying levels of care for one or more seniors living in the other half.

Residential facilities that provide for group living, such as shelters or group homes, often encounter difficulty in obtaining rezonings. Therefore, the City of Prince George, B.C. has a policy that one lot in new plans of a subdivision should be zoned for a group residence.

3.1.10 Community Health and Safety

The fact sheet "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" from Vancouver documents how the design of housing and communities can have a great impact on safety. A number of municipalities have addressed this issue by establishing Safe Housing/Safe City Committees and one fact sheet reports on the Housing and Safety Program from Montreal. An initiative by the City of Ottawa describes how property standards by-laws can ensure that tenants are provided with vital services such as heat, electricity and water.

3.1.11 Home Ownership

More municipalities are facilitating home ownership for households with low and modest incomes. In some cases the goal of ownership is combined with other objectives - to use vacant city properties, or to encourage people to move to the inner city. There is growing interest in using alternative forms of housing to provide more affordable developments. The manufactured housing subdivision in Fredericton is a good example of how this can be done. The Habitat for Humanity model, where home owners contribute sweat equity to their new home instead of a conventional down payment, is also gaining in popularity. Municipalities have supported this initiative by providing land

and Habitat for Humanity operates in 16 municipalities across the country now, compared to 5 in 1990.

3.1.12 Housing Information and Referral Services

Several municipalities across the country address housing needs by funding housing registries, home sharing programs, and housing information services. These services help people gain access to affordable housing, provide information about landlord and tenant matters, offer housing alternatives such as home sharing, and refer people to other service agencies in the community. Housing registries and home sharing programs help to make better use of the existing housing stock by increasing the number of people per dwelling.

These services are community-based and generally are designed to respond to local needs. Program evaluations have concluded that the services are very helpful. The agencies have received numerous letters of support from their clients. The biggest problem facing these agencies is the constant uncertainty about their funding.

4. LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1 Overview

The literature review set out in Part 3 of the report includes a selection of recent publications on municipally-related housing issues. These publications provide useful ideas and information to housing and planning professionals.

The publications address the following topics: the municipal role in the supply and maintenance of affordable housing; community and economic development; sustainable development; community safety; and regulatory reform/intensification. Similar categories were used to organize the municipal initiatives fact sheets.

The Canadian literature, which is annotated, is separated from the American literature, which is not.

Most of the publications address the municipal role in housing. Others have been included because they may assist municipalities in developing new initiatives.

4.2 Discussion

The literature review highlights current issues in housing policy and illustrates ways that municipalities address these issues.

The reports also provide ideas about roles for municipalities providing affordable housing. A discussion of the literature by topic area follows.

4.2.1 The Municipal Role in the Supply and Maintenance of Affordable Housing

Literature from Ontario focuses on provincial policies which provide direction on what should be the municipal role in housing. One example is the Land Use Planning for Housing Policy Statement (1989) that requires municipalities to establish planning policies to ensure that 25 percent of new residential units will be affordable. Consultation Counts: Taking Action on a Housing Framework for Ontario outlines new directions for the government based on an extensive consultation process. These directions include municipal participation on a Housing Advisory Committee, exploration of a "block funding" approach that would enable municipalities to implement different types of housing programs, and a cooperative approach to make surplus sites available for affordable housing. The literature includes municipal positions and reactions, including a housing strategy developed by the Regional Municipality of Hamilton Wentworth, and a study commissioned by the City of Toronto on inclusionary zoning.

In the Province of Quebec, municipal initiatives have focused on home ownership, encouraging people to live downtown, and revitalizing the city core. The literature review reflects these interests. Reports are included on home ownership initiatives, such as Operation 20,000 and Operation 10,000 from Montreal, the municipal role in the production of market housing, building renewal programs in Quebec City, and strategies for urban renewal in neighbourhoods experiencing decline.

In British Columbia, the Provincial Commission on Housing Options recently released its report to provide new directions in housing. This report includes 57 recommendations, several of which address the municipal role in housing. Some specific issues include the creation of secondary suites, the introduction of inclusionary zoning, leasing land at below market rates, issuing debentures to raise revenue for affordable housing, and establishing reserve funds for housing.

4.2.2 Community and Economic Development

The literature review documents two reports on the relationship between housing programs and employment. The Co-operative Housing Association of Ontario reports that the construction of 1,000 new co-op housing units is estimated to generate 2,210 person-years of employment. The other report is from the

Conference Board of Canada regarding the economic impact of the Canadian Home Ownership Stimulation Plan and the Canadian Home Renovation Plan.

The case study from Fort Good Hope in the Northwest Territories describes how the delivery of a housing program by the municipality played a role in community development. The report on the St. Lawrence Neighbourhood shows the importance of an open planning process in the development of large projects undertaken by a municipality.

The scarcity of literature suggests that housing is seldom considered as a factor in community and economic development.

4.2.3 Sustainable Development

The literature review demonstrates that sustainable development is emerging as an issue of major importance. Recent publications provide guidance to municipalities interested in developing such initiatives. The book by Bill Ashton and David Bruce provides 20 examples of sustainable housing in Canada and over 100 initiatives. Virginia MacLaren's comprehensive report for the Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research (ICURR) documents how some of Canada's larger municipalities are implementing sustainable urban development. Mark Roseland's book could offer practical assistance in this field to municipalities.

The reports from Hamilton-Wentworth and the Peterborough area are examples of strategies for creating sustainable municipalities. The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton has produced guidelines for alternative development standards that will be of interest to municipalities wishing to promote more compact developments.

4.2.4 Community Safety

This section reviews reports on crime prevention activities in residential communities. One report documents the Environmental Design and Management (EDM) approach that focuses on the need to modify both the design and management of residential environments in order to prevent crime. There is also a report on the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) approach. Municipalities are beginning to plan for safer cities, and the literature review includes a number of useful publications from the Safe City Committee in Toronto and the Safer City Task Force in Vancouver.

4.2.5 Regulatory Reform/Intensification

The literature review includes several reports on garden suite pilot projects undertaken in Alberta and Ontario. Reports from Alberta provide preliminary and interim assessments of a pilot project. There are also reports on municipal issues implicit in implementing a garden suite program, including the potential demand for such housing. Two reports document the perspectives of the provincial and municipal governments respectively on a garden suite pilot project in the municipality of Ottawa-Carleton in Ontario.

Other reports of interest include proceedings of the symposium on housing in the Greater Toronto Area by 2021. These proceedings focus on redevelopment and intensification of larger urban sites within the city, and examine low-cost housing developments in Montreal that have drawn on the Grow Home concept, a housing intensification strategy from the City of Hamilton, and a study on the economic feasibility of providing housing on main streets in Metropolitan Toronto.

The literature review contains a background paper on regulatory reform issues related to the Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) Program. The CMHC, CHRA, the Canadian Home Builders' Association (CHBA) and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) sponsored this program to stimulate innovative regulatory reform activities in housing and urban development. ACT has generated case studies of regulatory reform initiatives and a fact sheet is available on each project.

5. CONCLUSIONS

There is an interesting link between the literature review and the initiatives that have been documented.

In some cases, reports are being written to evaluate existing initiatives, as is the case with the garden suite pilot projects in Alberta and Ontario. In other cases, reports are being written to stimulate the development of new initiatives. For example, this report could only document a few initiatives for sustainable development at a time when many municipalities are starting to address this issue. Much additional information has been published or is being written about sustainable development that should help municipalities to develop local strategies.

In the case of community and economic development, the literature review indicates that housing has often been overlooked as a way to achieve economic development. Innovation in this area usually arises from attempts to reduce homelessness where the connection between housing and training/employment opportunities is evident. Community development has been an important part of the process.

Several municipalities are using the property tax system to provide affordable housing. For example, Quebec City provides a subsidy and tax credit to encourage the development of housing on vacant land in the city core. Saint John, New Brunswick provides a grant equivalent to 15 percent of the increase in property tax assessment resulting from infill development. The City of Regina plans to provide tax exemptions to encourage infill development. The City of Montreal provides tax rebates of up to \$10,000 for first time home-buyers to stimulate the construction of new housing. These expenditures create spin-off benefits, such as encouraging the development of housing on vacant land, making better use of the existing infrastructure, revitalizing neighbourhoods, and providing employment opportunities and other economic benefits.

The degree of municipal involvement in supporting the development of affordable housing varies across the country. Municipalities generally have responded to particular needs and circumstances in their communities. Leadership has also been a factor in determining the municipal role. Most innovative approaches and actions have been taken where municipalities have a strong commitment to housing, or where individual members of councils have pushed for housing issues to be addressed.

The initiatives reviewed in this report demonstrate that partnerships are emerging as a key strategy in meeting housing needs. Municipalities increasingly are the leaders in forming partnerships with community-based agencies. They also lead in adopting a holistic approach where housing issues are addressed in a wider context along with jobs, health, safety, and environmental issues. This approach will be increasingly necessary as shrinking financial resources force municipalities to be even more creative.

PART 11

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

CONTENTS

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

PAGE

I. HOMELESSNESS

1. Homeless Initiative Fund, City of Toronto, Ontario
2. Homeless Initiatives Spearheaded by Mayor's office, City of Toronto, Ontario
3. Singles Housing Opportunity Program, City of Toronto, Ontario
4. Shelter for the Homeless, City of Fort McMurray, Alberta
5. Street City #2, City of Toronto, Ontario
6. Street Enterprise Centre, 761 Queen Street West, City of Toronto, Ontario
7. Downtown Community Development Project, City of Victoria, British Columbia

II. COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

8. Housing and Community Economic Development, Shediac, New Brunswick
9. Housing and Economic Development Strategy, City of Toronto, Ontario
10. The Municipal Role and Community Development, Hamlet of Cape Dorset, Northwest Territories
11. Community Store, Schizophrenia Society of Alberta, City of Calgary, Alberta

III. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

12. Alternative Development Standards, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, Ontario
13. Thorncliffe Village, City of Ottawa, Ontario
14. Environment First Policy, City of Waterloo, Ontario
15. Waterloo Region Green Home, City of Waterloo, Ontario

IV. INTENSIFICATION

16. Secondary Suite Program, City of Vancouver, British Columbia
17. Lincoln Park Townhouse Projects with Secondary Suites, City of Calgary, Alberta
18. Home Planning Advisory Service, City of Toronto, Ontario
19. House Conversion Program, City of Victoria, British Columbia
20. Housing Above Shops, City of Vancouver, British Columbia
21. Subsidy Program for New or Recycled Buildings, Quebec City, Quebec
22. Downtown Conversion Loan Program, City of Kingston, Ontario

V. COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

23. Manitoba/Winnipeg Community Revitalization Program, City of Winnipeg, Manitoba
24. Municipal Housing Rehabilitation Program, Quebec City, Quebec
25. Municipal Rooming House Rehabilitation Program, Quebec City, Quebec
26. Acquisition of Rental Housing, City of Montreal, Quebec
27. Preservation By-Law, City of Montreal, Quebec
28. Safe Housing Committee, City of Edmonton, Alberta
29. Aid to Tenants, City of Montreal, Quebec

VI. REGULATIONS: ADMINISTRATION\ APPROVAL PROCESS

30. Mediation Pilot Project, City of Kitchener, Ontario
31. Evening Building Permit Service, City of Toronto, Ontario
32. Rental Housing Fast Tracking Policy, District of Surrey, British Columbia

VII. PARTNERSHIPS

33. Edmonton Joint Planning Committee on Housing, City of Edmonton, Alberta
34. Housing Opportunity Centre, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario
35. Healthy Cities Project, City of Toronto, Ontario
36. Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc., City of Saint John, New Brunswick
37. Canada Employment and Immigration and Housing, Village of Bath, New Brunswick
38. Inmates Build Garden Suites, Town of Chatham, New Brunswick
39. Joint Ventures in Housing, City of Ottawa, Ontario
40. Community/Municipal Partnerships for Supportive Housing, City of Ottawa, Ontario

VIII. LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

41. Immigrant Investor Program, City of Calgary, Alberta
42. Acquisition of the York Hotel, City of Calgary, Alberta
43. Employee Housing Service Charge, Resort Municipality of Whistler, British Columbia
44. Affordable Housing Statutory Reserve Fund, City of Richmond, British Columbia
45. Bridge Financing Fund, Metropolitan Toronto, Ontario
46. Up Front Capital Funding for Crystal Heights Co-op, City of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
47. Income Mix Zoning (20% Core Need Policy), City of Vancouver, British Columbia
48. New Communities in Industrial Areas, City of Vancouver,

- British Columbia
- 49. Operation Habiter Montreal, City of Montreal, Quebec
 - 50. VLC Properties Ltd., City of Vancouver, British Columbia
 - 51. Land Bank Program, City of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
 - 52. Long Term Land Leases, District of North Vancouver, British Columbia

IX. HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

- 53. Design Guidelines for Adaptable Housing Units, City of Burnaby, British Columbia
- 54. Supportive Home Living for Seniors on a former Canadian Radar Base, Cape Breton County, Nova Scotia
- 55. Glenmaple Seniors Equity Housing Project, Metropolitan Toronto, Ontario
- 56. Garden Suites, City of Lethbridge and County of Parkland, Alberta
- 57. Beswick House for People with AIDS, City of Calgary, Alberta
- 58. Zoning for Group Homes in New Subdivisions, City of Prince George, British Columbia

X. COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY

- 59. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, City of Vancouver, British Columbia
- 60. Housing and Safety Program, City of Montreal, Quebec
- 61. Provision of Vital Services by Landlords, City of Ottawa, Ontario

XI. HOME OWNERSHIP

- 62. Home Ownership Equity Participation Program, City of Windsor, Ontario
- 63. Manufactured Housing Subdivision, City of Fredericton, New Brunswick
- 64. Habitat for Humanity, City of Winnipeg, Manitoba
- 65. Homeownership Assistance Program, City of Montreal, Quebec
- 66. Divided Co-Ownership Program, City of Montreal, Quebec

XII. HOUSING INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICES

- 67. Housing Registries Office, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, Ontario
- 68. Homesharing Program, Metropolitan Toronto, Ontario
- 69. Regional Housing Information Service, Regional Municipality Ottawa-Carleton, Ontario

DESCRIPTION OF CATEGORIES

The municipal housing initiatives documented in fact sheets are organized into twelve categories. These are described below. In a number of cases, the initiatives could fall under several different categories. For example, an initiative that is included under the category of "Homelessness" might also address partnerships and financing for new development. Secondary issues such as these are noted under the heading "Sub-Category" on the fact sheets.

1. Homelessness (7)

Initiatives in this category include developing new housing for the homeless, assisting homeless people to gain access to existing housing and other services, and community and economic development activities targeting the homeless.

2. Community and Economic Development (4)

Several municipalities encourage affordable housing as a means to create jobs and attract investment. Examples include developing marketing strategies, providing physical space in a building where residents can earn an income and learn new skills, and a community development approach where municipalities in the Northwest Territories are working with the government to assume a greater role in housing and the provision of other community services.

3. Sustainable Development (4)

This category includes initiatives in new residential developments and building with new construction methods that support sustainable development. These initiatives promote the development of housing in a manner consistent with supporting environmental objectives. Fact sheets document initiatives aimed at making better use of land and natural resources through zoning and new technologies.

4. Intensification (7)

Initiatives in this category are mainly designed to make better use of buildings to create more affordable housing units. Examples include secondary suites in existing buildings, secondary suites in new subdivisions, housing above shops, and the conversion of non-residential space to

residential use.

5. Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing (7)

This category includes initiatives aimed at community improvement and maintaining the existing supply of affordable housing. These include providing funding to improve neighbourhoods and rehabilitate or preserve the existing housing stock, a more pro-active and co-ordinated approach to inspections, and minimizing the impact of major renovations on tenants.

6. Regulations: Administration/Approval Process (3)

The examples in this category document municipal initiatives to expedite the planning and approval process by reducing the number of appeal hearings before the Ontario Municipal Board through mediation, improving service to the public for residential renovation permits by extending the hours of business, and fast-tracking development applications for affordable housing.

7. Partnerships (8)

Initiatives in this category document different types of partnerships, including co-ordinating committees and creative financial partnership arrangements. Joint ventures with the private sector are documented, as well as partnerships between municipalities and community groups.

8. Land and Financing for New Development (12)

This category documents several ways in which municipalities have provided financial assistance for the development of new housing. Examples include direct up-front capital grants, loans to non-profit groups to help them secure sites, assuring a supply of affordable land, making land available at below-market prices, and requirements for developments to include new affordable units or make a financial contribution.

9. Housing for the Elderly and Special Needs Groups (6)

Initiatives in this category document design guidelines for adaptable units, an option for supportive home living, a seniors equity housing project, garden suites, a group home for people with AIDS, and zoning for group homes in new subdivisions.

10. Community Health and Safety (3)

New ways to improve health and safety conditions in housing is the focus of this category. A number of municipalities

have established Safe Housing/City Committees. Crime prevention through environmental design is another approach. Safety is also addressed through the provision of vital services to tenants, such as heat, electricity and water.

11. Home Ownership (5)

Municipalities are promoting and facilitating home ownership in a variety of ways, such as through the provision of land, property tax credits, encouraging alternative forms of housing, and sweat equity.

12. Housing Information and Referral Services (3)

Initiatives in this category document the municipal role in housing registries, home sharing programs, and information services which help people gain access to existing accommodation.

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#1 HOMELESSNESS

HOMELESS INITIATIVE FUND CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Category:

Homelessness

Description:

Homeless Initiative Fund was developed in consultation with community groups to fund activities that will assist homeless people. Funding is provided to help homeless people or people at risk of becoming homeless to access or maintain housing or related services. The project is aimed at developing long-term solutions.

Priority is given to proposals that provide access to new or existing housing-related services for homeless people, including:

- Activities in community-based agencies including staff positions and self-help initiatives;
- Operating and/or limited capital funding for existing homeless initiatives; and
- Projects not funded by other city grants or outside programs.

The following projects were funded following a proposal call:

- Agencies working with homeless youth were funded to provide one-stop shopping information and outreach for homeless youth who have difficulty accessing housing. The purpose is to talk to young people about how to approach a landlord, and their rights and obligations as tenants.

- An ethno-cultural agency was funded to provide workshops for refugee women and children about housing issues.
- Drop-in centres were funded to hire one staff person to work towards getting core funding.
- A community economic development project for homeless people was funded to develop a street enterprise centre to ensure that community economic projects would obtain the necessary business and marketing skills to succeed. The centre is geared to providing user friendly advice to hard-to-employ people, and will be staffed by homeless people.
- A \$105,000 grant was provided to a community health centre operated by a Native Group to keep a street patrol operating. The street patrol helps people who are on the street by giving them soup or coffee and offering to link them to services.

Responsible Agency:

City of Toronto Department of Housing.

Impetus:

This initiative resulted from a series of meetings co-ordinated by the Housing Department with community-based agencies that work with the homeless.

Goals:

The goals are to fund initiatives aimed at long-term solutions to homelessness.

Years of Operation:

This initiative began in 1992.

Cost:

The City of Toronto provides funding in the amount of \$250,000.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

None.

Other Partners:

Community agencies working with the homeless.

Problems Encountered:

Too early to say.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced;

None.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None identified.

Formal Evaluation

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

None yet.

People Served:

The homeless.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Commitment by the municipality to address homelessness and to provide funding.

Contact Person:

Simon Liston
Policy and Programs Division,
City of Toronto Housing
Department,
20 Adelaide Street East,
Toronto, Ontario M5C 2T6
Tel: (416) 392-0602
Fax: (416) 392-0560

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

2 -HOMELESSNESS

HOMELESS INITIATIVES SPEARHEADED BY MAYOR'S OFFICE CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Category:

Homelessness

Description:

The Mayor's Office has spearheaded a number of initiatives aimed at homeless street people who are not gaining access to existing services for the homeless. The following are three main activities aimed at addressing short-term needs:

Overnight Drop-in Centre for the Homeless - This initiative is a pilot project for an overnight drop-in centre to enable homeless people who do not use the hostel system to have a safe, clean and supportive place to go at night. People coming to the drop-in are offered a warm, comfortable place to rest; soup, sandwiches and hot drinks; and bathing and laundry facilities. No beds are provided as this is not a place to sleep.

The drop-in centre will be open 2 nights per week for 10 hours per night, until the end of April 1993. Approximately 90-100 people use the drop-in each night. As many as 125 people have used the drop-in centre on extremely cold nights.

Street Patrol Program - The City of Toronto provided funding to expand the services of the Street Patrol Program operated by a non-profit health centre, Anishnawbe Health Toronto. This program is part of Toronto's strategy to assist street people in gaining access to medical and other health services. The Street Patrol operates with 4 staff, 2 vans and more than 140 volunteers who go out 7 nights per week to search out people on the streets. They offer sandwiches, coffee, soup, blankets, referrals to appropriate resources, and they see approximately 80-120 street people per night.

Information System - The Homeless Information System was established to provide a "one-stop shopping" information and referral service to

help street people and groups who serve the homeless. The system furnishes useful information about hostels (who has vacant beds), and where to get services. The intent is to provide user-friendly information, and to be staffed by homeless people.

The information required by homeless people ranges from emergency advice and advocacy to assistance in seeking support to deal with longer term needs. Often there is an urgent need to know where shelter vacancies exist, where to get crisis psychiatric help, where a refugee can obtain translation assistance, or where the mobile service units are at any given time.

The telephone information system provides 24 hour service through a 1-800 number.

Responsible Agency:

City of Toronto, co-ordinated by the Mayor's Office.

Impetus:

The Mayor held a series of meetings with community-based groups who serve the homeless and identified gaps in services.

In March 1992, City Council established a Mayor's Committee to develop a comprehensive approach to the issue of homelessness. Approximately 45-50 people attended information sessions in April and May, 1992. While it was recognized that the ultimate goal is to provide permanent housing, there is an immediate need to provide interim shelter.

Goals:

To address the gaps in short-term services available for the homeless.

Years of Operation:

The initiatives began in 1993.

Cost:

The City of Toronto has budgeted \$250,000 for these initiatives.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

None.

Other Partners:

Participants on the Mayor's Committee on Homeless Street People, including representatives of the Faith Community, Business, Non-Profit Housing providers, the homeless, Street City, Day Drop-In Centres, the Roomers' Association, the Anishnawbe Health Centre, the Housing Department, the Medical Officer of Health, the Co-Chair of the Alternative Housing Subcommittee, and the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation.

Problems Encountered:

None to date.

Number of Units Assisted or**Produced:**

Not applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating**Elsewhere:**

Montreal offered an overnight drop-in centre which experienced many problems and was closed.

Formal Evaluation:

The overnight drop-in centre was evaluated.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Reaction has been very favourable to all the initiatives.

People Served:

The homeless.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Political support and commitment by the municipality to address homelessness and to provide funding. Another critical factor is the involvement of homeless people to determine what is needed and to develop initiatives.

Contact Person

Denise Cole

Special Assistant to the Mayor,
Mayor's Office,

City Hall,

Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2

Tel: (416) 392-7001

Fax: (416) 392-0026

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#3 -HOMELESSNESS

SINGLE HOUSING OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Category:
Homelessness

Description:

The Singles Housing Opportunity Program (SHOP) is designed to create permanent, supportive housing for single people who are being forced out of the housing market by rising costs or who are already homeless. Properties and projects are owned, developed, and renovated if necessary by the City's Non-Profit Housing Corporation. The projects are wholly or partly managed by community-based agencies under a management contract. Tenants are subsidized as required.

Most units are located in houses scattered through the city or in clustered apartments in larger non-profit buildings. Site selection and renovations are co-ordinated by the City's Non-Profit Housing Corporation. Properties do not usually require rezoning or other land use approvals, but there are some exceptions. Community-based agencies must meet program criteria and have an approved management plan before a property will be made available for their use.

"Enhanced" or "facilitative" management systems are used to both support tenants and involve them in the management of the project. "Enhanced management" is a personal and property management technique to assist individuals to participate in the design, development and management of their housing. The SHOP group provides a staff person to help the residents run their own housing and become independent and self-reliant. Households are shared (collective), with residents living together as a family or in self-contained units in larger complexes.

Responsible Agency:
City of Toronto Department of

Housing and Non-profit Housing Corporation. A SHOP committee co-ordinates the implementation and management of the program.

Impetus:

In 1987, the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, the Province of Ontario created a one-time program known as Project 3000. It was intended to develop housing for the most disadvantaged who had been ineligible under the existing Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program. Nearly 12,000 unit applications were made and the Province was eager to renew the interest demonstrated in the project. In 1988, the Ministry introduced a 5 year program to allocate 30,000 nonprofit units and the Mayor of Toronto sponsored an initiative under this program.

Goals:

The goal of the program is to provide permanent rent-geared-to-income housing for the single working poor, single welfare recipients and for homeless individuals. The intention is to produce integrated housing; to use enhanced, participatory management; and to utilize small groupings either in individual houses or within larger projects. There was a target of 200 units by March 1991.

Years of Operation:

The City of Toronto Non-Profit Housing Corporation approved the program on October 25, 1988.

Cost:

The operating costs for the houses are in the range of \$10,000 - \$16,000 per year, which is the difference between the economic and RGI rent. This total includes all administrative costs. Rent covers about \$2,000 of this.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

Current projects under SHOP are funded by the Provincial Ministry of Housing under its "Homes Now" Program. Capital funding is provided by Ontario Housing Corporation from Canada Pension Plan funds, and operating subsidies covering the difference between RGI rent revenue and approved operating costs are also provided by the Ministry of Housing. The Provincial government provides "enhanced management" funding which facilitates SHOP groups to make shared housing possible for special needs residents. A staff position was funded by the Ministry of Housing under the Provincial-Municipal Agreement on Housing. Future projects are expected to be funded by the Ministry of Housing under the new non-profit housing initiative entitled the Jobs Ontario Homes Program.

Other Partners:

Community groups wishing to provide housing for their clients.

Problems Encountered:

The innovative nature of the program accounted for a slow start-up. There was also an issue over fire safety requirements for houses occupied by single persons forming a single housekeeping unit and living together as a family. The final resolution was to have lower fire safety requirements than would apply to a rooming house, but greater than would apply to a single family house. It was necessary to create a staff position to assist with marketing and group development. Where residents are sharing living space, facilitative management is necessary, and this should be done by the community group responsible for the project.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Nineteen occupied houses, developed with 11 different community groups, currently represent a total of 97 units. In partnership with another 4 groups, 4 more houses are under construction. These will produce 43 new units.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None identified.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

School attendance and marks have improved for students who have been able to access housing. Elderly women who have moved into supportive housing do not go to the hospital as frequently. Rental arrears are low and there is a low vacancy loss.

People Served:

All residents are RGI, and almost all are in deep core need. The program serves people with a variety of different backgrounds who would otherwise be homeless, including refugees, Native Canadians, people with AIDS, or who are HIV positive, recovering alcoholics, seniors with care needs, youth who have been in high support programs, former wards of the Children's Aid Society, and homeless people with mental health problems.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The City, municipal non-profit housing corporation and community groups need to work together as partners. The municipal non-profit has skills in development and property management. The clients of community groups need housing and supports to be able to live independently, but lack the experience in developing housing. Community development skills are necessary, along with a commitment to provide supportive housing.

Non-profit housing programs funded by senior levels of government are necessary. This initiative works well in heterogeneous communities to help avoid problems with community resistance.

Training in conflict resolution and preventative maintenance is advised.

Contact Person:

Simon Liston
SHOP Co-ordinator,
Policy and Programs Division,
City of Toronto Housing Department,
20 Adelaide Street East,
Toronto, Ontario M5C 2T6
Tel: (416) 392-0602
Fax: (416) 392-0560

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#4 -HOMELESSNESS

SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS, CITY OF FORT McMURRAY, ALB.

Sub-Category:

Partnerships or Financing

Description:

In February 1993, the Salvation Army opened an 8-bed shelter for homeless people in Fort McMurray, a city with a population of about 35,000 people.

Operating funding was provided for a six-month trial period by the municipality, Salvation Army, two oil companies (Suncor and Syncrude), and general donations from the public. The Government of Alberta's Department of Social Services is providing funding for operating costs and salaries to hire people in receipt of social assistance to work at the shelter.

The local church donated the facility and is renting it out for a nominal fee. Volunteer members of the Salvation Army did the necessary renovations.

The City played a key role in facilitating the development of the shelter and in obtaining the necessary permits and approvals. Their endorsement and support were key in securing funds from the oil companies.

During the first three months of operation, the Salvation Army will assess the need for the shelter and will then go back to the municipality to discuss funding for a permanent facility. The shelter is open 24 hours a day. It offers a shower, some food and coffee, and a clean bed. A drop-in centre operates during the day and offers some social activities.

Responsible Agency:

The Salvation Army is responsible for operating the shelter.

Impetus:

The need for a shelter was first identified in 1990 following the death of a homeless person from exposure. An informal study found

that about 30 people were homeless. In July 1992, following discussions about the extent of need and the definition of homelessness, City Council directed staff to take action, and city staff began working with the Salvation Army.

Goals:

To provide shelter to people in need.

To determine the extent of homelessness and housing needs.

Years of Operation:

The shelter opened in February 1993.

Cost:

The shelter will cost \$57,500 to operate over a six-month trial period. Funding came from the following sources:

- \$5,000 from the City of Fort McMurray;
- \$3,500 from the Salvation Army;
- \$35,000 from the Government of Alberta Department of Social Services;
- \$12,500 from Suncor and Syncrude; and
- \$1,500 from general donations from the public.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Government of Alberta Department of Social Services provided \$35,000 for operating costs and salaries to hire people in receipt of social assistance to work at the shelter.

Other Partners:

The Salvation Army.

Problems Encountered:

It was difficult to find a site. The first site selected was in a residential neighbourhood, but the neighbours were opposed.

**Number of Units Assisted or
Produced:**

The shelter has 12 beds, but could

accommodate at least 16 more people
on cots and mattresses, if
necessary.

**Similar Initiatives Operating
Elsewhere:**

There are many homeless shelters in
large urban municipalities.

Formal Evaluation:

None yet.

**Reaction by Tenants, Community or
Participants:**

The residents appreciate the
shelter.

People Served:

Homeless people.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

There is a need for a broad range of
support from the community and
organizations. A facilitator is
also necessary to smooth the way for
development and obtain the necessary
permits and approvals.

Contact Persons:

Joe Bath
Superintendent,
Family and Community Support
Services,
City of Fort McMurray,
909 Franklin Avenue,
Fort McMurray, Alberta T9H 2K4
Tel: (403) 743-7912
Fax: (403) 743-7025

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#5 -HOMELESSNESS

STREET CITY #2,
CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Community and Economic Development

Description:

The City of Toronto is working with the Homes First Society, a community-based non-profit housing corporation in the City of Toronto, to produce permanent housing for men and women currently living on the street.

The City of Toronto has provided a 3-storey vacant warehouse and will provide \$500,000 to clean up the building and the site. They will lease the building for 35 years to Homes First at a minimal rent.

Homes First is undertaking a community development process to develop this project. They are meeting with people who are homeless and with agencies who work with homeless people to develop design options for the building.

This project will also include an economic development strategy to create jobs and provide training for homeless people in designing and building the housing. It is expected that there will be two separate construction crews, one for men and one for women. These people will work with others who have technical and community development skills.

Responsible Agency:

The Homes First Society.

Impetus:

This is the second housing project produced under the Street City model by the Homes First Society for homeless people. The first project was successful and the former Mayor of Toronto, Arthur Eggleton, helped to secure a second site.

Goals:

To provide housing using a community development model;
To create employment; and

To provide job training.

Years of Operation:

Homes First began working with the City to find a site in 1991. They are currently negotiating the terms of the lease and developing a community and economic development strategy. It is expected that the clean up of the site will begin in May, 1993 and that the building will be ready for occupancy before winter, 1994.

Cost:

The capital budget is approximately \$4.7 million for building and site acquisition, rehabilitation and conversion. The organizational expense will be five percent of the development costs.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The project will be funded by the Ministry of Housing.

Other Partners:

This project involves Homes First, the Ministry of Housing, City of Toronto, community-based agencies that work with the homeless, and the homeless.

A resource group of stakeholders meets on a regular basis to direct the project and solve problems that may arise.

Problems Encountered:

It has taken a great deal of time to secure the necessary funding.

Community agencies that are participating have very limited resources and are not able to contribute as much time as they would like.

There was concern that the community would oppose this development. To avoid this problem, the City put through an official plan amendment and deemed the site a public work.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

The building will be able to provide housing for up to 90 people.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Street City at 393 Front Street East, Toronto.

Formal Evaluation:

The first Street City project at 393 Front Street was evaluated by the Phillips Group. The report was very positive and found that the community development model used had been effective. The report also noted that men had been more involved in the development process than women, and that it took longer for the women to develop a sense of ownership of the project. Some women's groups supported the project because it had been able to provide housing for women that were hard-to-house. Other groups felt that a mixed gender community was not safe for women.

It is expected that Street City #2 will also be formally evaluated.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Those who are involved in developing Street City #2 are very enthusiastic.

People Served:

Homeless people living on the street.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Strong community development skills, a commitment to the community development process, and the ability to trust people to make their own decisions and live with them.

Developing primary forums for community development such as town councils to run the project and raise new ideas or grievances.

Contact Persons:

Gloria Galant,
Homes First Society,
761 Queen Street W, 3rd Floor,
Toronto, Ontario M6J 1G1
Tel: (416) 362-9274
Fax: (416) 362-4946

Rick Cicccarelli, Planner,
Planning and Development Department,
18th Floor, East Tower,
New City Hall,
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2
Tel: (416) 392-0414
Fax: (416) 392-0797

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#6 -HOMELESSNESS

STREET ENTERPRISE CENTRE
761 QUEEN STREET WEST
CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Community and Economic Development

Description:

The Street Enterprise Centre was established to provide consulting expertise and business advice for community economic enterprises involving homeless people. For example, the Centre will provide advice on creating a business plan, developing a marketing strategy, and bookkeeping. A mentor system will team up participants with people from the private sector. The Centre will gather information in the community and translate the material into simple English.

The Centre will work with a community agency that will be responsible for providing pre-employment training to the participants. The Centre will focus solely on the business aspect.

The Centre is staffed by former homeless people.

Some examples of community economic development projects include a courier service, a service to clean buildings, and a bicycle repair shop.

Permanent self-contained housing for people moving out of the Street City project (393 Front Street East) will be provided on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors.

Responsible Agency:

Homes First Society, a community-based non-profit housing corporation in the City of Toronto.

Impetus:

Agencies involved with community economic development projects identified a lack of business skills as the main reason why a number of these enterprises failed. It was felt that the following services were needed:

- pre-employment training to potential employees to assist in job-readiness;
- business advice and training to prepare feasibility studies, business plans and marketing strategies; and
- assistance to help people identify new business opportunities.

Goals:

To ensure that small businesses involving homeless people have the business skills to develop feasible community economic ventures.

Years of Operation:

This initiative was first funded in 1992. Staff were hired in 1993.

Cost:

A global budget is currently being developed. The City of Toronto has provided \$30,000 for start-up costs, and is expected to provide an additional \$650,000 to develop the community space on the site.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

Funding from the Ontario Ministry of Housing is being sought to fund the housing units.

Other Partners:

The United Church, which owns the property, will provide a 50 year lease at cost.

Community groups that will operate out of 761 Queen Street West such as Beat the Street, an organization that works with youth; Anishnawbe Street Patrol; Seeds of Hope, which helps people find employment and raise funds; Fresh Start, a cleaning business for psychiatric survivors;

and Maggie's, which provides street outreach and education for prostitutes.

Problems Encountered:

It was difficult to obtain funding to develop the space. Initiatives in economic development have been very male dominated. A women's community economic development network has been started to develop projects for women.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

An allocation is being sought for 33 housing units.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None identified.

Formal Evaluation:

None yet, but it is expected that an evaluation will be conducted in the future.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Reaction has been mostly positive. Some concerns have been raised about creating a bureaucracy and about developing an infrastructure that meets the needs of the community and those providing funding.

People Served:

Homeless people.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The agenda must be set by the street community and they must be part of the organization responsible for the initiative.

Contact Persons:

Gloria Galant,
Homes First Society,
761 Queen Street West, 3rd Floor,
Toronto, Ontario M6J 1G1
Tel: (416) 362-9274
Fax: (416) 362-4946

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#7 -HOMELESSNESS

DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, CITY OF VICTORIA, B.C.

Sub-Category:

Community and Economic Development

Description:

The City of Victoria initiated a community development process to address the issue of homelessness with funding from the B.C. Healthy Communities Initiative Fund. One result was the establishment of the Victoria Street Community Association (VSCA). The VSCA received funding from the B.C. Ministry of Social Services to hire street people to find ways of meeting their needs. One full-time co-ordinator was hired for community development.

The VSCA is undertaking two major initiatives:

1. Creating housing; and
 2. Undertaking an employment project for homeless people.
1. The building committee mostly includes homeless people. A few architects also volunteered to participate. The committee's first choice for housing is bachelor apartments with private kitchens and bathrooms. The ideal building would comprise 20-35 units. Residents would be a community of people with shared interests who would manage the building. The committee investigated opportunities to obtain such housing and found a motel with 16 furnished bachelor apartments. Funding was eventually made available by the B.C. government to purchase this motel, which the VSCA will manage. Members of the VSCA will be hired to work on the expected renovations. The VSCA is also considering developing two additional projects.

2. The Street Works Project is an employment initiative for street people receiving welfare. Street people were hired to run the office. They were responsible for registering with Revenue Canada and learned how to do bookkeeping and payroll. Jobs were tailored to fit the people instead of making the people fit the jobs. There is recognition of the need for job training and skills development.

The Street Works initiative has hired street people for the following projects:

- Twelve people were hired to conduct a housing survey of 200-250 homeless people (about 50 percent of the homeless population) to document their housing conditions and specify what type of housing they would like. Staff will receive training on data entry and report writing. This report is scheduled for completion in April 1993.
- Four people were hired to organize a conference, Street Meet 1993, for low income people to discuss housing, welfare and employment issues.
- There is interest in pursuing other economic development projects such as starting a restaurant for street people. This would give street people an opportunity to learn how to run a restaurant and also a place where they could purchase meals.

In October 1992, the VSCA helped to set up a housing registry and hire a housing outreach worker. This outreach worker counsels homeless people on a one-to-one basis to help them find housing. The outreach worker serves as the link between the landlord and the homeless person. The registry also employs two people who receive social assistance to provide support on a half time basis. This approach has been very successful. Approximately 14 native street people who normally slept outside have been housed.

Responsible Agency:

The Social Planning Division of the City of Victoria Planning Department.

Impetus:

There was a growing observable need in the community to address homelessness. The City decided to involve homeless people in the planning and decision-making process about their issues and initiated a community development process in February 1992.

Goals:

To develop solutions to homelessness and to include street people in the process.

Years of Operation:

The City initiated this community development process in February 1992. The Victoria Street Community Association was incorporated in July 1992.

Cost:

The City received \$20,000 for the initial community development process from the Healthy Community Initiatives Fund, Health Promotion Branch of the B.C. Ministry of Health in February 1992. The Street Works project received \$42,000 from the B.C. Ministry of Social Services in September 1992 and an additional \$5,000 to hire homeless people to organize the Street Meet conference. In September 1992, the City of Victoria contributed \$30,000 to continue supporting community development. An additional \$15,000 was provided by the Ministry of Health from the Healthy Community Initiatives Fund for 1993.

In October 1992, the Ministry of Social Services provided \$45,000 to staff the Housing Outreach project and the Ministry of Health provided \$42,000 to cover the expenses of this project.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
The Provincial government provided funding and support as noted above.

Other Partners:
None.

Problems Encountered:

More resources and funding are necessary to create communities that would successfully support and house homeless people. There is resistance from some professionals and service providers to include street people in the decision making process.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

The Victoria Street Community Association will manage 16 units of housing converted from a motel. It is working with a Native Housing group to develop an 8-bed residence for native street people.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
None identified.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
Approximately 65 street people attended the most recent VSCA meeting, and interest is growing.

People Served:
Homeless street people.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Widespread support from government and community groups.

Contact Persons:
Janet Rabinovitch, Social Planning Consultant,
Downtown Community Development Project,
City of Victoria,
1 Centennial Square,
Victoria, B.C. V8W 1P6
Tel: (604) 386-2347
Fax: (604) 361-0386

Bruce Wallis, Co-ordinator, VSCA,
#203-620 View Street,
Victoria, B.C. V8W 1V7
Tel: (604) 386-2347

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#8 - COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOWN OF SHEDIAC, NEW BRUNSWICK

Category:

Community and Economic Development

Description:

The Town of Shediac (population of 5,000) has developed a strategy to increase residential development activity. This strategy is part of the Town's overall objective of promoting economic development.

The Town recognizes that the availability of housing can attract new residents and provide more economic opportunities. At the same time, to assure residential development, the Town must bring about greater employment opportunities so that Shediac residents need not move away to earn a living.

The residential strategy addresses issues relating to: rental accommodation, housing for the elderly, day care, wheelchair accessible and other special housing needs, historic sites, housing conditions, downtown housing, and incentives for residential development.

The main element of the strategy is a marketing campaign. This campaign promotes the town as a good place to live and work with all the amenities that would exist in a larger urban centre. The Town also created the position of Director of Municipal Development to assume responsibility for housing, economic and tourism development; recreational programming; and marketing. The marketing strategy includes the following:

- a) Identifying target groups, such as employees in the surrounding area, young families, senior citizens, and pre-retirees;
- b) Developing a municipal profile that advertises the residential capacity and business opportunities;

- c) Carrying out promotional campaigns and preparing and distributing brochures;
- d) Advertising in newspapers, magazines, on radio and television, and on billboards;
- e) Attracting prospective residential developers by dealing with them on a one-to-one basis;
- f) Entering into a partnership strategy with the South-East Economic Commission. This partnership includes an arrangement where the Commission makes the Town aware of visitors and potential businesses and the Town provides a tour of residential and business areas to encourage a move to Shediac; and
- g) Using Government funding (federal, provincial, municipal) where available.

Three other elements of the housing development strategy are:

Subdivision Standards - The Town is increasing subdivision standards to require developers to be responsible for curbing and paving the streets and is looking at ways to encourage developers to create larger lots. The Town recognizes that these measures will increase the price of lots. However, since the Town cannot compete with prices of unserviced lots in rural areas, it has decided to aim its marketing towards high quality serviced lots.

Frontage fees and Local Improvement By-Law Projects - The Town's frontage fees, as allowed by its local improvement project by-law are a strong incentive for development. An entire street can be serviced and

the Town will decide how to allocate the costs. Because developers will be charged a fee, they have an incentive to market their vacant lots.

Industrial and Institutional Development - The Town plans to expand its industrial base and is aiming to be a designated public service centre for government decentralization. This would create more local employment to keep young people in the community and attract outside workers.

The most important aspect of the Town's strategy is the ongoing monitoring by the municipal plan committee. This committee meets regularly to ensure that the proposed objectives and actions are still relevant, to identify opportunities, and to ensure that the action plan is current and actively implemented.

Responsible Agency:
The Director of Municipal Development.

Impetus:

In January 1987, a committee chaired by councillor Bernard Gautreau, was named by council to prepare a new municipal development plan for the Town. The committee held close to forty meetings including five public meetings on several subjects before a plan was presented by council to the public in 1988. The plan was adopted on April 24, 1989.

The main goal of the plan was to increase the population of the Town of Shediac. All policies and proposals relate directly or indirectly to this goal.

Goals:
To promote economic development in Shediac by increasing residential development.

Years of Operation:
The Town adopted a new municipal development plan in April 1989.

Cost:
The Municipal Development Department Budget for 1993 is \$116,670. A portion is for the residential strategy.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None directly related to the residential strategy. However, the Town will assist developers in applying for available grants such as the ACT Program.

Other Partners:
All the departments work together and with the Planning Commission to implement this plan.

Problems Encountered:
More staff and more funding would help achieve greater results. The recession has had an impact on the economy and housing starts, but even so, the housing stock has increased dramatically.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Since 1989, an average of 18 new single family homes per year were built in Shediac, which is relatively high for the area. In 1992, 66 multi-family units were produced, compared to 3 and 10 units in previous years. In the 1980s, an average of 16 new residences were built per year in Shediac.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
None identified.

Formal Evaluation:
Nothing formal. Ongoing monitoring.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
Reaction has been mostly positive. The business community is very supportive and most members of the community feel that the investment by the Town in the strategy is worth the effort.

People Served:
Most of the housing produced is affordable rental accommodation for households with low and middle incomes, including young families and retired seniors.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
The following are necessary:

- A good plan and commitment to enact it;
- Ongoing assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of

the plan - what is effective
and what isn't; and

- Monitoring and following up on
action plans.

Contact Persons:

Anne Martin-Belanger,
Director of Municipal Development,
Town of Shediac,
P.O. Box 969,
Shediac, New Brunswick E0A 3G0 Tel:
(506) 532-2421
Fax: (506) 532-6156

Armand G. Robichaud, Director,
Beaubassin Planning Commission,
C.P. 459,
31 Chemin St. Andre,
Cap-Pele, New Brunswick
E0A 1J0
Tel: (506) 577-4391
Fax: (506) 577-4393

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#9 - COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Economic Development
Residential Intensification

Description:

The City of Toronto has developed an economic development strategy to promote economic development and encourage companies to move to Toronto. As part of this strategy, the City actively encourages the development of housing in the downtown area.

The Economic Development Division assists developers in cutting red tape. It makes them aware of all the requirements early in the process so they are not surprised later. If a Department is holding up the project, the Division will try to use its influence to speed things up.

The City of Toronto has adopted an aggressive residential intensification policy which is mutually supportive of its economic development strategy. The housing objectives include the provision of 45,000 new dwelling units between 1991 and 2001, 35,000 of which should be located within the central area.

Initiatives to implement these targets include providing incentives to develop mixed use residential projects within predominantly commercial areas in the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law. The maximum density permitted for commercial development is lower than that permitted for mixed use development in many districts of the City, including the downtown Financial District.

The City conducted a survey of corporate executives to determine what factors are important to them when considering a location for their business. Respondents specifically noted the importance of a favourable downtown housing market for themselves and their employees.

Responsible Agency:

The Economic Development Division of the Planning and Development Department of the City of Toronto.

Impetus:

The City began to encourage more residential and mixed use development in the inner City in 1976 to better meet the housing needs of the population, to encourage a more active and diversified downtown area, and to reduce the need for commuting to downtown office jobs. Following the recession of 1981-82, the City embarked on an active economic development strategy to encourage more investment and strengthen the local economy.

The availability of housing in the downtown area is seen as a key factor in attracting new business to Toronto and promoting economic development for the following reasons:

- In making decisions about where to locate a business, corporate executives want to ensure that there is affordable housing.
- Having people live downtown supports retail and other types of business.
- Companies like the idea of people living near their jobs as this ensures that there will be a nearby labour pool.
- Crime is another factor considered by potential investors, and it is believed that a high residential population downtown means a lower crime rate.

Goals:

To attract investment and hold on to the employment base in the city.

Years of Operation:

This activity began during the 1980s.

Cost:

The 1993 budget for this initiative is \$1.5 million.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Province of Ontario provides \$10,000 per year and literature and materials through the Small Business Development Office of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade.

Other Partners:

The City works with the Metropolitan Toronto Economic Development Office and the Metropolitan Toronto Board of Trade. The Toronto Economic Development Corporation (TEDCO) is an arms-length corporation established by the City to develop and implement economic development projects.

Problems Encountered:

High municipal and provincial taxes.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Approximately 40,000 units have been produced in the City of Toronto since 1976, 25,500 of which are located downtown.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The business community and residents support this initiative.

People Served:

People in the City of Toronto.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

There must be a market for commercial opportunities, quality of life downtown, and safe streets.

Contact Persons:

Peter Tomlinson, Director,
Economic Development Division,
Planning and Development Dept.,

City of Toronto,
100 Queen Street West, 2nd Floor,
City Hall,
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2
Tel: (416) 392-7987
Fax: (416) 392-0675

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#10 - COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

THE MUNICIPAL ROLE AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT HAMLET OF CAPE DORSET, N.W.T.

Sub-Category:

Community Development
Municipal Role in Housing

Description:

The government of the Northwest Territories has begun a community development initiative to enable municipalities in the Northwest Territories to assume greater responsibility in all areas of government, including housing.

The Hamlet of Cape Dorset has expressed interest in this initiative and has begun meeting with representatives from the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation (NTHC). The municipality is seeking information about various housing programs and will then submit a proposal on the role it wishes to assume in delivering these programs. The NTHC will work with the municipality to help them achieve their goals.

The Hamlet of Cape Dorset is also interested in assuming responsibility for other services currently delivered by the NWT government, including social services, public works and economic development. The municipality is working with the Community Transfer Working Group of the Department of Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs to address these issues.

Responsible Agency:

The Hamlet of Cape Dorset, the Community Development Division of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation, and the Community Transfer Working Group in the Department of Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs.

Impetus:

The government of the Northwest Territories wants to eliminate duplication and streamline the delivery of services. It also wants to increase power and accountability at the local level.

The Hamlet of Cape Dorset wishes to assume greater responsibility for government programs for a number of reasons:

- It wants the community to be able to take responsibility for its own decisions and have local accountability.
- This initiative would enable the municipality to co-ordinate policy on a variety of issues. For example, there is interest in integrating housing programs with social programs.
- Assets and resources in the community are divided among the various levels of government and different departments. In a community this small (1,100 people), this makes inefficient use of the limited labour pool. For example, the municipality, the Department of Public Works, and the local housing association each have maintenance staffs. The municipality believes it would be more efficient to bring all these people together in one department as this would allow for specialization in plumbing, electrical work or carpentry. The municipality could also provide co-ordinated training programs.
- The municipality is interested in assuming responsibility for the local housing association, which currently delivers housing programs in the community.

Goals:

Increase power and accountability at the community level, make

communities more responsible for themselves, and give the local community control over decisions, programs and issues that affect their lives.

Years of Operation:

This initiative began in June 1992. The municipality is in the process of deciding what its role should be and determining its potential areas of decision-making with CMHC and the NTHC.

Cost:

Not known.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Community Development Division of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation (NTHC) and the Community Transfer Working Group in the Department of Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs are responsible for this initiative. The Federal Government is not involved except indirectly through funding of NTHC delivered federal housing programs.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

Labour issues will need to be addressed. Some people will be concerned about their jobs and the status of their Departments.

Number of Units Assisted or

Produced:

Not applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The Village of Fort Simpson, Town of Norman Wells, Community Council of Fort Good Hope, Hamlet of Sanikiluaq, and Town of Hay River, Northwest Territories are also considering the opportunities under this initiative.

Formal Evaluation:

None to date as the initiative has not been implemented.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The community is very supportive of this initiative. The municipality conducted a telephone survey, and the reaction was to go ahead. It is also recognized that this initiative will take a great deal of effort.

People Served:

Members of the community.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Attitude that allows for flexibility, experimentation and trust. Compromise between all levels of government, co-operation from the unions, and consistency in how the policy is implemented.

Contact Persons:

Chuck Gilhuly, Senior Administrative Officer, Municipality of Cape Dorset,
P.O. Box 30,
Cape Dorset, Northwest Territories
X0A 0C0
Tel: (819) 897-8943
Fax: (819) 897-8030

David Kravitz, Director, Community Development Division,
Northwest Territories Housing Corporation,
P.O. Box 2100,
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2P6
Tel: (403) 920-6550
Fax: (403) 920-8024

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#11 - COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY STORE, SCHIZOPHRENIA SOCIETY OF ALBERTA CITY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA

Sub-Category:

Employment Training for People with Schizophrenia

Description:

In late 1991, the Schizophrenia Society of Alberta (SSA) approached the City of Calgary Land and Housing Department with a proposal to lease space on the main floor of Bridgeland Place, a 17-storey, 210-unit apartment building operated by Calhome Properties Ltd. (CHPL), the City of Calgary's non-profit housing corporation. Bridgeland Place provides housing for a mix of lower income families, single persons and seniors. It is located in the inner city, three blocks from the Calgary General Hospital which operates several out-patient programs for persons with schizophrenia.

The main floor of the project houses a city-run day care centre. The remaining space, approximately 84 square meters (900 square feet), was vacant. A convenience store had been located in this space when the building was first constructed. However, it had not been used for the past 20 years. The SSA proposed using the space to develop a convenience store and a thrift store. The City of Calgary supported this proposal, and Chapter members now operate the store on a volunteer basis and involve individuals suffering from schizophrenia both in the operation of the store and in the rehabilitation of thrift items.

Responsible Agency:

The Schizophrenia Society of Alberta.

Impetus:

The SSA was concerned that employment opportunities for those suffering from schizophrenia focused on sheltered workshops which isolated participants from mainstream society and "real life" expectations in the job market. With the increased policy emphasis on de-institutionalization, it was

felt that the stores could meet multiple goals, including contributing funds to support the Society and helping to support a Chair in Research on Schizophrenia at the University of Calgary.

Goals:

This initiative is intended to provide employment training opportunities for people with schizophrenia and raise funds for the SSA. The thrift store operation sells inexpensive clothing, toys and household furnishings which is a benefit to the low income families in the complex. The convenience store, which sells basics such as milk, bread, etc., is also a benefit to residents who would otherwise need to walk four blocks uphill to the nearest convenience store.

Years of Operation:

The store opened in the Winter of 1993.

Cost:

The costs for developing the store, including planning and land use approvals, were assumed by the SSA. The Society also pays a monthly rent of \$300 to the Land and Housing Department.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

Residents of the building receive federal and provincial subsidies through the Public Housing Program.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

Members of the community were very supportive at a meeting which was held to explain the project. The only objections expressed were by other convenience store owners in the area who felt their businesses would be adversely affected.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Not applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
None identified.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
Tenants of the project and the adjacent neighbourhood have been supportive as they both buy from the convenience and thrift stores and donate items to the thrift store. The thrift store acts somewhat as a community recycling project. Product suppliers such as the dairy have donated equipment to the convenience store and offer many "specials". Co-operative arrangements have been set up with other agencies. As an example, the thrift store has donated clothing to agencies working with street people.

People Served:
Tenants of the project, community residents, and persons with schizophrenia.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
A social agency with committed staff and volunteer resources which is willing to interact with tenants and other community agencies. Space within an existing social housing project.

Contact Persons:
Jim Anderson, Housing Manager, The City of Calgary,
Land and Housing Department #8052,
P.O. Box 2100, Station M,
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5
Tel: (403) 268-1455
Fax: (403) 268-1948

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

12 -SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:
Zoning

Description:

The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton has adopted guidelines for alternative development standards that could generate significant cost-savings in the production of housing, create more compact development, and make better use of land and other resources.

The Standards are intended to satisfy a number of municipal objectives including making housing more affordable, making more efficient and cost-effective use of public infrastructure, and protecting agricultural and natural resource lands.

Two proposed plans of subdivision were redesigned to analyze the potential cost-savings as a result of the Standards. Comparisons between current and proposed standards for rights of way, lot sizes, trenching, and curbs, generated the following results: 64-84% more units could be accommodated using the new standards, with a potential costs savings of \$7,760 - \$12,500 per housing unit.

The following standards were reviewed:

Right-of-way widths of 20 metres for local residential streets were examined against the minimum requirements for utility and service placement, snow removal and storage, parking, and emergency access. The alternative standard provides for a 16 metre right-of-way, based on an 8 metre pavement width. This meets minimum standards for emergency access and for the safe placement of utilities and services with room to accommodate tree planting. No sidewalks are included and parking would be limited to only one side of the road.

Lot dimensions were reviewed in

response to the significant costs associated with large lot developments characteristic of residential subdivisions of the 1980s. As recently as 1990, single family development accounted for 75% of all residential land consumed in Ottawa-Carleton. In recognition of the appeal of single family housing to consumers, the typical 12 x 30 metre lot was reviewed to determine the feasibility of reducing the requirements for frontage, depth and yards. The alternative standard proposes a reduced lot of 7.9 x 23 metres, which can accommodate a modest sized house (120 sq.m) with a garage, if desired. Driveways are twinned to allow for on-street parking, maximum snow storage, and street furniture, such as hydrants and transformers. A similar review was undertaken of townhouse lots and a 27% reduction in the lot size was proposed, from a 6 x 30 metre lot to a 5.5 x 23 metre lot.

House-to-house separation, or the distance between front doors was considered as another significant parameter. Current standards generate a separation distance of 32-38 metres, based on 6-9 metre front yard requirements and a 20 metre right-of-way. The alternative standards reduce the front yard to 3 metres and the right-of-way to 16 metres, thereby reducing the separation distance from 32-38 metres to 22 metres. This still meets the minimum requirements for safety, privacy, parking and snow storage.

Other standards were examined to further reduce the costs of development. It was determined that trenching for water, sewer, and stormwater lines could be made more cost-efficient by replacing trenches for individual housing units with a Y-shaped trench to serve 2 units.

Eliminating curbs was suggested as an additional cost saving measure, with the added environmental benefit of slowing the stormwater run-off by

percolating through the grass instead of channelization on the pavement.

Responsible Agency:

The Planning Department of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Impetus:

As part of the process of developing Regional housing policies to implement the Provincial Policy Statement on Housing, the Planning Department formed a committee including planners from the area municipalities, representatives of the Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association and the Provincial Ministries of Housing and Municipal Affairs. At the request of the building industry, the consultation process was extended to utility companies and municipal engineering departments to review urban development standards. The Regional Working Committee on Alternative Urban Development Standards was established in January, 1991, and included representatives from the home building industry, utility companies and regional and municipal engineering and planning departments.

Goals:

To reduce the cost of housing by increasing the industry's ability to generate more housing per hectare and to promote more compact development.

Compact development can minimize public costs by making better use of existing infrastructure such as roadways and sewers, support efforts to preserve agricultural land, and foster liveable cities by making walking, cycling and public transit more attractive alternatives to the private automobile.

Years of Operation:

The Regional Working Committee on Alternative Urban Development Standards was established in January 1991. The committee published a discussion paper in September 1991. A design symposium was hosted by the

Region to examine the standards proposed and to explore design alternatives for small lot

development based on the proposed standards. A written report was published in June 1992. In August 1992, Regional Council adopted the report as general guidelines which area municipalities are encouraged to apply in areas they identify as suitable.

The Region has now entered into an agreement with the City of Gloucester and Minto Developments to enter into a pilot project to implement the alternative standards. A draft plan of subdivision for 165 semi detached and freehold townhouse units received draft approval in March 1993.

Cost:

Approximately \$125,000 was spent to develop and implement the alternative development standards, including management of a pilot project.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Region received grants of \$80,000 from the Ontario Ministry of Housing (through the Partners in Housing Program) and \$20,000 from the Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) program, which is jointly sponsored by CMHC, FCM, CHBA and CHRA.

Other Partners:

The Regional Working Committee on Alternative Urban Development Standards included representatives from the home building industry, utility companies and regional and municipal engineering and planning departments.

Problems Encountered:

The Ministry of Transportation expressed concerns about the right-of-way widths. Municipal engineers were concerned about the effects of the alternative standards on the costs of snow removal. In order to address these issues, the Region undertook a study which demonstrated that townhouse sites using the alternative standards could require one additional trucking each winter. This would increase the cost of snow removal by \$13 per unit. However,

this increased cost is expected to be offset by the cost savings for maintaining urban roads and sanitary and storm sewer services in a compact community.

Some questions have been raised about whether the smaller lots and reduced private space will create a demand for more parks.

The alternative standards do not provide for sidewalks. If there is a demand for sidewalks, it would be difficult to provide them.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

The City of Gloucester has approved a draft plan of subdivision for Minto Developments to develop 165 units using the alternative standards.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

This study did not identify other municipalities that have undertaken a comprehensive review of their development standards. In municipalities such as Oakville and Brampton Ontario, developers have approached the municipality with plans to develop compact communities.

Formal Evaluation:

The project in the City of Gloucester will be monitored over a five year period to test the performance of the new standards.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

In a market survey conducted by the Region, members of the public indicated considerable interest in housing on smaller lots at affordable prices.

People Served:

Households looking for housing at an affordable price.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

This initiative requires the strong endorsement and participation by all the key players in the development process, including municipal engineers, planners, developers, architects, utility companies and members of Council. It requires a commitment to careful planning and co-operation and a willingness to

work together.

Contact Persons:

Marni Cappe or Sylvie Grenier,
Planning Department,
Regional Municipality of Ottawa-
Carleton,
Ottawa-Carleton Centre,
111 Lisgar Street,
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2L7
Tel: (613) 560-2053
Fax: (613) 560-6006

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#13 -SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

THORNCLIFFE VILLAGE CITY OF OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Sub-Category: Partnerships

Description:

In 1990, The City of Ottawa's non-profit housing corporation, City Living, and Domicile Developments Inc. formed a partnership to develop an old quarry site of approximately 15 acres (6 hectares) for housing. They created a new corporation called Thorncliffe Village Inc., which was the vehicle used to service and develop the site for sale.

When servicing was complete, land for 234 units was sold back to City Living, which in turn kept one block and leased the remainder to two non-profit housing producers. The remaining blocks, totalling approximately 110 townhouse lots, were targeted for sale to private developers for the development of affordable townhomes.

The partnership held a number of attractions for City Living:

- the cost and risk associated with servicing the site would be shared by the two partners;
- Domicile was an experienced producer of non-profit housing with a good track record;
- the efficiency created by developing the land together would allow the majority of the site to be developed as family ground-oriented housing;
- it would provide an opportunity to demonstrate alternative development standards by promoting a "compact" urban development; and
- integration of market and non-profit housing would demonstrate that non-profit

housing need not look different or stick out in well designed and planned communities.

The partnership arrangement helped expedite the development process. By acting through a separate corporation, City Living was able to avoid the more traditional bureaucratic process. Domicile brought its private sector experience and development know-how. City Living had the skills to work with the city and regional governments, who adopted a flexible approach in applying their normal standards in order to promote planning innovations. City Living was able to access funds from the Government of Ontario to help with site development. Being part of a separate legal entity gave City Living access to bank loans, which were used to fund part of the servicing costs.

The intense development made more efficient use of the land. Frontages for the market housing units were reduced from 5 to 6 meters to 4 and 4.5 meters. Lots are less deep than average, and some streets are narrower than average. This enabled the development to achieve a high unit yield with ground-oriented family units.

Regulations and practices regarding road widths and location of buried utilities were modified so that Thorncliffe Village could be a compact, sustainable and affordable community.

Responsible Agency:

Thorncliffe Village Inc., which involved a 60/40 partnership between City Living and Domicile Developments Inc.

Impetus:

Domicile owned a portion of the site and had plans to build 38 single

family homes. By the end of 1989, their project was faltering. Proposals to service the site and build an access road to a main city street were snarled in red tape. Servicing costs were too high because of the rocky terrain.

In 1988, City Living was developing plans to build affordable housing on a portion of the quarry. When it received the engineering reports estimating the costs of servicing the site, it was clear that the only type of housing City Living could afford to build there would be high-rise.

The partnership arrangement and plan to build a compact, sustainable community enabled City Living to build ground-oriented units suitable for families with children.

Goals:

Increase the supply of affordable housing for rent and ownership by developing an abandoned stone quarry.

Promote sustainable development by building a compact community that makes use of existing urban infrastructure.

Provide non-profit housing in ground-oriented family style dwellings.

Use allocations from the provincially funded Homes Now non-profit housing program to leverage the construction of affordable market housing.

Demonstrate a well-integrated non-profit and market housing community.

Years of Operation:

Both Domicile and City Living were developing plans for the site in 1988. It took 2 years from the signing of the partnership until new residents moved into the non-profit housing in the early summer of 1992.

Cost:

It cost \$3.2 million for servicing, including building an access road and linking the site to city sewer and water systems as well as building internal roadways and a park. Of this amount, Domicile contributed \$1.2 million and City

Living contributed \$2 million.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Ontario Ministry of Housing provided \$875,000 to City Living. This was in accordance with a provision of the 1988 City of Ottawa and Province of Ontario Agreement for Provincial/Municipal Housing Co-operation wherein the Province agreed to share in the costs to bring new developments on stream where land would be made available for affordable housing.

Other Partners:

Glenn Haddrell Co-op and Community works Non-Profit Housing Corporation created more social housing, and Domicile arranged another co-venture with a group of private developers from Cornwall, Octor Homes. Thorncliffe Village Inc. is currently negotiating with other private sector developers to purchase the remaining lots.

Problems Encountered:

The compact development made it difficult to comply with city and Regional regulations as well as guidelines followed by private utility providers regarding road widths and the placement of sewer, water and utility hook-ups to individual homes. The engineering department was not in the practice of allowing service pipes and wires to be laid under driveways where they would be difficult to dig up for repairs. City planners and Thorncliffe owners wanted to make sure trees were planted on the remaining street frontages. After some study, city engineers and utility companies permitted the utilities to be buried under the driveways.

It took a long time to draw up the co-venture agreement. Next time the partners would establish the ground rules before beginning work on a written agreement.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

345 units, including 111 affordably-priced homes for private ownership and 234 units of subsidized housing.

Of these 234 units, the Glenn Haddrell Housing Co-operative produced 85 stacked townhouse units.

Communityworks Non-Profit Housing produced 68 units in an apartment building and 20 stacked townhouse units. City Living produced 61 stacked townhouse units for rent-geared-to-income tenants.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Fonteneau project in Montreal.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

This development demonstrated the growing consumer willingness to accept smaller lots and higher urban densities for the opportunity to own a quality-built home in an attractive community setting.

It also demonstrated that if non-profit housing is well designed and integrated into a mixed development, social housing has no impact on its marketability or value.

People Served:

People with mixed income, including a substantial percentage of people with low incomes. Some units were specially modified for the Ottawa Valley Autistic Homes Society.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

A willingness to work together.

Contact Persons:

Sharon Chisholm,
Manager,
Project Planning Division,
Department of Housing and Property,
300-11 Holland Avenue,
Ottawa, Ontario K1Y 4T2
Tel: (613) 564-8465
Fax: (613) 564-8558

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#14 -SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ENVIRONMENT FIRST POLICY CITY OF WATERLOO, ONTARIO

Category:

Sustainable Development

Description:

In May 1991, the City of Waterloo adopted an Environment First Policy. The policy states that the City of Waterloo is committed to assessing potential environmental impacts in all City services and programs as part of decision making and encouraging staff to take actions that are within their legal abilities to optimize environmental benefit.

In 1990 alone, the City undertook 91 environmental initiatives in the following areas:

- energy and water conservation;
- reduction of pesticide and road salt use;
- new park and open space design and naturalization planting system;
- trees and woodlot protection;
- recycling and composting;
- watercourse rehabilitation and watershed planning;
- public and business community awareness;
- environmental approaches to subdivision design;
- environmentally-friendly city operation practices; and
- hiring of staff to work on environmental issues.

Many of these initiatives continue to be implemented and new projects are being developed on an ongoing basis. Several environmental approaches to subdivision design have been introduced and are noted below.

Environmental Site Planning: All new developments in the City will be required, where possible, to:

- increase plantings to improve area micro-climate and air filtration;
- reduce hard surfacing;
- preserve existing trees and shrubs;

- accommodate outdoor recycling facilities; and
- provide water infiltration and low maintenance landscaping.

Subdivision Cistern Design and Implementation Program:

An existing pilot project requires the installation of cisterns for up to 20% of new subdivision lots. The purpose is to assess the feasibility of incorporating cisterns in new subdivisions as a municipal water conservation measure and as a way to provide a non-potable water source for residential lawn watering, vehicle washing etc.

Subdivision Grading, Erosion Control and Planting Plans:

In all new subdivision development applications the owner must submit plans to the City regarding tree saving, landscaping, planting, subdivision grading, and storm water management and erosion control.

Another initiative undertaken as a result of the Environment First Policy was a study of the Laurel Creek Watershed. One of the issues addressed was future land use development scenarios and how they interact with the natural environment. One of the key findings was the need to integrate watershed planning with land use planning. The recommendations from the study were used during the updating of the Official Plan Policy framework to guide the land use planning system.

Responsible Agency:

City of Waterloo Council and all staff. The main contact is the Manager of Landscape & Environmental Services in the Community Services Department.

Impetus:

July 28, 1989, the Mayor initiated a municipal "Think Tank" to address environmental concerns in Waterloo.

The objective was to produce a series of practical working strategies to enhance, protect and manage the natural environment in areas over which the City has some control.

At that session, a set of strategies was developed. In order to implement these strategies, it was believed that potential environmental impacts and considerations should be fully addressed at the same time as other development approval considerations in the planning and decision making process (eg. social, financial and engineering). This philosophy became known as the "Environment First" approach.

In February 1991, another "Think Tank" was held to assess the 1990 experience of the Environment First approach. It was felt that, although many successful projects had been achieved, there was a need to more clearly define the original intent of the policy. This definition would enable the community to better understand what level of expectation could be placed on the City relative to local environmental enhancement, protection and management. As well, the City would be better able to inform the community of its environmental commitment. Based on this input it was recommended that Council adopt the Environment First Policy.

Goals:

To implement actions that enhance, manage and protect the natural environment in Waterloo.

To encourage sustainable development by balancing environmental protection with well-planned and managed growth.

Years of Operation:

The City of Waterloo adopted an "Environment First" approach in 1989 and adopted an ongoing "Environment First" Policy in May 1991.

Cost:

It is difficult to separate specific costs for this program because environmental considerations are integrated in all city services. However, some funding has been set

aside for specific projects. For example, the City has allocated \$50,000 to purchase environmentally sensitive lands and \$5,000 per year to undertake Neighbourhood Environmental projects.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
Ministries of Natural Resources and Environment, and Environment Canada.

Other Partners:

Grand River Conservation Authority, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the private sector, and citizens groups.

Problems Encountered:

In reality, it is challenging to apply the policy to all decision making processes. It is also difficult at this time to evaluate the pros and cons in weighing development versus environmental concerns.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Not applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

City of Kitchener, Strategic Plan for the Environment. The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth has adopted recommendations in a report entitled, Implementing Vision 2020, Detailed Strategies and Actions Creating a Sustainable Region. Staff are preparing an implementation plan to be available in the Summer, 1993.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Generally positive. Requests for additional environmental initiatives are ongoing.

People Served:

The community and Council of the City of Waterloo.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

- a formal policy;
- a supportive Council;
- an enthusiastic and committed staff and community;
- staff and community education if everyone is to embrace the policy;

- capital funding; and
- partnerships between the City,
the private sector, academics
and other government agencies.

Contact Persons:

Barb Magee,
Manager of Landscape and Environment
Services,
Department of Community Services,
City of Waterloo,
P.O. Box 337,
Waterloo, Ontario N2J 4A8
Tel: (519) 747-8766
Fax: (519) 747-8792

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#15 -SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

WATERLOO REGION GREEN HOME CITY OF WATERLOO, ONTARIO

Category:

Sustainable Development

Description:

The City of Waterloo is participating in the Advanced Houses Program to develop the Waterloo Region Green Home.

The Green Home demonstrates what can be done to develop sustainable housing and reduce the impact of housing on the environment. It is a single-family detached raised bungalow of 234 square metres (2,518 square feet), including a finished basement. The design minimizes exposed surface area but maximizes the use of interior space to increase energy efficiency and reduce the amount of construction material. Some of the innovative features include:

- 300mm truss wall system with recycled cellulose insulation;
- innovative pre-fabricated thin concrete foundation panels;
- solar hot water system with photovoltaic pump, and high-efficiency natural gas water boiler for back-up;
- prototype combination gas furnace/heat recovery ventilator;
- "free cooling" using cistern water through a fan-coil;
- 2-litre extra-low flush toilet for 85% water reduction;
- prototype sealed-combustion gas stove; and
- a very aggressive waste management plan.

Responsible Agency:

The Waterloo Region Green Home is a joint venture of the Kitchener-Waterloo Home Builders' Association and Enermodal Engineering Limited.

The City of Waterloo participates on the steering committee of the major sponsors to ensure that the goals of the project are met.

Impetus:

The Advance Houses Program is part of the federal government's commitment to the environment under its Green Plan. The City of Waterloo wanted to participate in this program as part of its Environment First Policy and commitment to sustainable development.

Goals:

To develop new technologies and demonstrate that new homes can be built and operated in a manner that has significantly less impact on the environment. Specific goals are to:

- Reduce total house energy consumption by 70%;
- Reduce total house water use by 70%;
- Build with at least 50% recycled materials;
- Not use ozone-depleting CFCs in either construction materials or equipment;
- Avoid sending construction waste to the landfill; and
- Be affordable to middle income households.

Years of Operation:

The house will be complete in April 1993.

Cost:

The project will demonstrate cost-effective technologies to the home building industry and the home buying public.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
The Green Home is part of the

Advanced Houses Program delivered by the Canadian Centre for Mineral and Energy Technology (CANMET), the research and development arm of Energy, Mines and Resources, Canada, in partnership with the Canadian Home Builders' Association.

Other Partners:

Other project sponsors include the City of Waterloo, Bank of Montreal, Ontario Hydro, Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy, Ontario Ministry of Housing, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, and Union Gas Ltd.

Many firms in the Region of Waterloo area donated time and materials to complete the construction of the Green Home.

Problems Encountered:

None.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

One home in Waterloo.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Nine other Advanced Houses are being built in Charlottetown, P.E.I.; Hamilton, Ontario; Ottawa, Ontario; Montreal, Quebec; Laval, Quebec; New Bedford, Nova Scotia; Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; Surrey, B.C.; and Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Formal Evaluation:

A detailed monitoring system has been designed for the house to measure the energy and water use. The house is being monitored for two years. During the first year, (1993), the house will be open to the public. During the second year, the house will be occupied.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Members of the community are interested.

People Served:

The general public, home builders, renovators, manufacturers, architects, engineers and building scientists around the world will benefit.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Willingness for all the interested parties to work together.

Contact Persons:

Ian Cook, President,
K-W Home Builders' Association,
c/o Waterloo Region Green Home,
169 Lexington Court,
Waterloo, Ontario N2J 4R4
Tel: (519) 746-6244
Fax: (519) 746-4027

John Kokko,
c/o Waterloo Region Green Home,
Enermodal Engineering Limited, 368
Phillip Street,
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 5J1
Tel: (519) 884-6421
Fax: (519) 884-0103

Tim Mayo,
Program Manager,
Advanced Houses Program,
Energy, Mines and Resources,
580 Booth Street,
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E4
Tel: (613) 996-3089
Fax: (613) 996-9416

Anthony Krimmer,
Manager of Inspection Services,
City of Waterloo Building Division,
100 Regional Street South,
Waterloo, Ontario N2J 4A8
Tel: (519) 747-8793
Fax: (519) 747-8792

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#16 - INTENSIFICATION

SECONDARY SUITE PROGRAM CITY OF VANCOUVER, B.C.

Sub-Category:

Zoning

Description:

Approximately 47% of the single family (RS-1) neighbourhoods in Vancouver were rezoned to RS-1S which permits a secondary suite. The remaining neighbourhoods will remain RS-1, allowing the phasing out of illegal suites or the creation of family suites. All such suites are subject to minimum ceiling height, parking and minimum safety upgrading requirements. The following definitions apply:

Suite: A self-contained dwelling unit containing cooking facilities and a full bathroom;

Phase-Out Suite: (in RS-1 and RS-1S Zoned Districts) A suite existing before October 22, 1986 which may be approved for a maximum period of ten years.

Family Suite: (in RS-1 Zoned Districts) A suite occupied by parents, grandparents, children or grandchildren of the head of the household or a full time support person such as a nanny or nurse.

Permanent Suite: (in RS-1S Zoned Districts) A suite approved for the life of the building which may be allowed in a new house designed to have a secondary suite, or an existing house.

In 1990, the Vancouver City Savings Credit Union (VanCity) began to offer a home improvement loan package to complement the City of Vancouver's Secondary Suite initiative. Home improvement loans are available to homeowners in RS-1S zoned areas and for construction which conforms to the City of Vancouver permanent secondary suite specifications. Qualified applicants have a choice of two options: a VanCity Creditline at a rate of prime minus 1/2% on a minimum of \$3,000 for the initial year of the loan (where regular interest rates apply after the first year); or a conventional VanCity

second mortgage at first mortgage rates (upon renewal, second mortgage rates apply). The loan package is not available to home owners applying for phase-out suites or in other areas of the City where the zoning does not permit secondary units.

Responsible Agency:

City of Vancouver Planning, and Permits and Licenses Departments.

Impetus:

Beginning in 1986, Vancouver City Council decided to address the secondary suite issue. Zoning by-laws did not reflect the reality of use.

The Zoning By-Law was changed to restrict second kitchens in a single family dwelling. Council also wanted either to change the zoning, change the use, or find a compromise. Beginning with a pilot project, the Planning Department went through a process of consultation in all neighbourhoods. Neighbourhoods were given a choice to either have the zoning remain RS-1, which would not permit secondary suites, or have the neighbourhood rezoned to permit one secondary suite in each house. In areas where more than 50% of people who responded to the survey were in favour of rezoning, this happened. In total, 47% of all RS-1 single family neighbourhoods were rezoned to permit secondary suites.

Goals:

The Secondary Suite Program was designed to legalize existingsuites and to simplify and encourage the installation of new suites in areas where the majority of residents wanted suites. It was also designed to phase out suites in the remaining areas. The purpose of the program is to ensure that all suites meet the minimum safety standards and off-street parking requirements.

Years of Operation:

The process of zoning changes and neighbourhood reviews began in 1986 and ended in December 1992. In 1989, the Permits and Licenses Department began accepting applications for secondary suites.

Cost:

The costs of this program are absorbed within existing Department budgets.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:

VanCity operates the Home Improvement Loan Package.

Problems Encountered:

There is a tremendous number of illegal suites (estimated between 20,000-26,000), and some of these suites have been in existence for a very long time. Both homeowners and tenants are resistant to having any changes made to their housing. Purchasers of new homes are often unaware that the secondary suite is not legal. In addition, homeowners may not be able to afford to upgrade their illegal suites.

There has been limited take-up of the VanCity home improvement loan program. Between 10-12 people have applied for a loan and between 2-6 people received funding. Possible explanations are that:

- homeowners are more interested in maintaining temporary "phase-out" suites instead of creating "permanent" suites;
- homeowners are leaving their illegal suites the way they are;
- the terms of the loan may not be sufficiently attractive to interest people in a loan; and
- people wishing to put in a secondary suite may not need a loan.

Significantly lower interest rates for the loan, or some grant portion might make the program more attractive.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

As of September 1992:

- 81 new houses were built with a legal suite;
- 31 new suites were built in existing houses;
- 18 family suites were created;
- 266 existing suites were legalized; and
- 1,304 suites were upgraded to meet the "phase-out" requirements.

It is estimated that very few affordable illegal units have been taken off the market as a result of this initiative.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Secondary suites have been permitted throughout St. John's and Mount Pearl, Newfoundland for many years.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

No reaction or feedback to date.

People Served:

No data.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Federal or Provincial funding would assist in creating additional secondary suites. Average per unit costs are low, and are estimated below:

To upgrade an existing unit to create a phase-out suite (10 years)
\$200 - \$1,500;

To upgrade an existing suite to create a permanent suite \$5,500 - \$6,000;

To create a new permanent suite (unfinished basement) \$14,000 - \$20,000; and

To create a new permanent suite (unfinished basement, house raised)
\$18,000 - \$25,000.

Contact Person:

Paul Teichroeb, Administrator,
Secondary Suite Program,
Permits and Licenses Department,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver, B.C. V5Y 1V4
Tel: (604) 873-7946
Fax: (604) 873-7100

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#17 - INTENSIFICATION

LINCOLN PARK TOWNHOUSE PROJECTS WITH SECONDARY SUITES CITY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA

Sub-Category:

Secondary Suites in New Townhouse Subdivision and Zoning

Description:

The Lincoln Park project is an 84 unit townhouse project developed on a suburban site of 1.4 hectares. The project includes traditional 3 bedroom townhouses with one bedroom accessory apartments on the ground floor or basement. These units are suitable for occupancy by a single person or single parent with one child. Future stages of the project may include the incorporation of units for adults with multiple disabilities who require 24-hour resident care.

The project is street oriented, and the only internal roadway system is a lane which runs through the centre of the site. A large village green has been planned on the inside perimeter of the project and the units will have generous private back yards.

Responsible Agency:

Calhome Properties Ltd., the City of Calgary's Non-Profit Housing Corporation.

Impetus:

Alberta Municipal Affairs estimated that there were approximately 17,000 low income single persons in Calgary who could not find suitable affordable rental housing in the Calgary market. This need was further confirmed by social agencies. The Lincoln Park project responds to this group as well as to low income family households.

Goals:

The project is intended to provide increased rental housing for both low income single person and family households. The lower level units increase the project capacity at a modest incremental capital cost.

Years of Operation:

The project will be constructed and available for occupancy by the Summer of 1993.

Cost:

The project cost \$3.6 million to acquire the land and build the townhouses. The secondary suites cost \$800,000 which was provided by the City of Calgary from funds re-allocated from Provincial transfers for Transportation project budgets.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The federal and provincial governments contributed \$3.6 million under the Non-Profit Housing Program.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

Municipal planning regulations have had difficulty addressing new household forms such as secondary suites. There has also been political resistance to the notion of higher densities in both the inner and outer suburbs.

There were neighbourhood concerns that tenants would park on the street. Calhome Properties Ltd. was required to provide a second entrance in the rear for the accessory apartments to make it more convenient and to encourage tenants to park behind the house.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

The first stage of the project will produce 84 units. Half of these will be traditional townhouses and the other 42 units will be accessory one bedroom units.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

A subdivision in Kelowna B.C. was built a few years ago in which some of the homes contained secondary suites. All the homes sold quickly.

Formal Evaluation:

No formal evaluation component has been built into the project. However, because the development is a prototype as a housing densification strategy, the Housing Division and CHPL will closely monitor its impact and operation.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The project is located close to several institutional uses including a community college and small group homes for the disabled. Meetings were held with area community associations to discuss their comments on the project and no objections were expressed. One interest adjacent to the project, a church group developing an upper end housing project for seniors, objected to the project and filed an appeal to the Development Appeal Board.

People Served:

Approximately 250 people will be housed in this project. The family housing units, which were supported through Federal and Provincial funds, will be rented on a geared-to-income basis. The housing for single persons will also be rented on a geared-to-income basis.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

It is important to have an extensive community consultation process.

Contact Persons:

Jim Anderson,
Housing Manager,
The City of Calgary,
Land and Housing Department #8052,
P.O. Box 2100, Station M,
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5
Tel: (403)268-1455
Fax: (403)268-1948

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#18 - INTENSIFICATION

HOME PLANNING ADVISORY SERVICE CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Zoning, Accessory Apartments

Description:

The Home Planning Advisory Service (HPAS) was created to assist homeowners who are interested in creating an apartment in their homes by providing advice and information on zoning, building code requirements, design ideas, drawing plans, and finding a tenant. It operates as a one-stop information centre by acting as a link between City of Toronto residents and the various municipal departments involved in the conversion process.

The HPAS has prepared a booklet, entitled "A Step By Step Guide to Adding A Rental Apartment In Your Home", which it sends out to each client. The HPAS also distributes other information on the Landlord and Tenant Act and architects' drawings which provide ideas on how to divide up a typical Toronto house into two or three apartments.

These materials are available in a number of different languages including Chinese, French, Italian, Portuguese, Punjabi, Tamil and Vietnamese. They will soon also be translated into Spanish and Greek.

The HPAS advertises their services in the newspaper and inserts the program brochure in the municipal water bill.

Responsible Agency:

City of Toronto Housing Department.

Impetus:

Intensification was one issue addressed by the Mayor's Task Force on Affordable Housing. On November 23, 1987 the Mayor released a report entitled "Proposals for Housing Action Plan", and a major theme of this report was increasing the rental supply through more efficient use of the established housing stock.

Goals:

To increase the supply of rental housing through the more efficient use of the established housing stock.

Years of Operation:

The Home Planning Advisory Service commenced operations in September 1988.

Cost:

The budget for 1993 is \$78,624.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Ontario Ministry of Housing provides funding in the amount of \$35,000 through the Partners in Housing Program.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

The economic climate has resulted in homeowners being reluctant and hesitant to create apartments in their homes because of the costs involved and fears that they will be unable to rent the units. Also, interest began to taper off when the Province ended the Convert-to-Rent Program which provided a \$7,000 interest free loan for conversions.

The by-law requirements regarding gross floor area and ceiling height requirements were too strict and prevented people from proceeding. However, changes were made to remove some of these constraints. For example, ceiling height requirements were reduced from 7 feet to 6 feet 5 inches.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

In 1991-92, the HPAS assisted with the creation of 53 affordable housing units and the legalization of 3 accessory apartments. 175 new

units have been created since the beginning of the program, and most of these received funding through the Convert-to-Rent program.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
London and Windsor.

Formal Evaluation:
Semi-annual and annual reports are submitted to the Ministry of Housing and an annual report is submitted to Council.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
Reaction to the program has been positive. Creating an additional unit is usually more expensive than people initially expect.
People Served:
During 1991-91, the HPAS provided 510 new clients with information on the conversion process. The majority of these clients (75%) were homeowners who were interested in creating an apartment by using extra space in their home. The remaining 25% were primarily non-owner occupied homeowners (those who were creating their first apartment, but not in the home they live in) and landlords (those who were creating their second or third apartment).

Conditions Necessary for Success:
More lenient zoning and occupancy by-laws, a straight-forward approval process, and financial incentives from the provincial or municipal governments to cover conversion costs.

Contact Persons:
Jean Yong,
Home Planning Advisory Officer,
City of Toronto Housing Department,
20 Adelaide Street East,
Toronto, Ontario M5C 2T6
Tel: (416) 392-0680
Fax: (416) 392-0560

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#19 - INTENSIFICATION

HOUSE CONVERSION PROGRAM CITY OF VICTORIA, B.C.

Sub-Category:
Zoning

Description:

Through provisions in its zoning by-law, the City of Victoria permits duplex conversion of single family houses in areas zoned R1-B (single detached dwelling). Conversion to multiple dwellings and rest homes is also permitted. Currently, much of the residential area in the City is zoned R1-B. Duplexing is permitted subject to a number of requirements including on-site parking, building size, landscaping and exterior modifications. Although the zoning had been in place for many years, City officials were uncertain if the public was generally aware of these provisions. In 1990, the City decided to provide the public with more information about the opportunities for house conversion by developing a brochure outlining the policy and explaining associated requirements. About 2,000 brochures were picked up. Since then, there has been a marked increase in conversion activity. Thirty-eight permits for conversions were issued in 1992 compared to 27 in 1991, and 18 in 1980.

Responsible Agency:
The City of Victoria administers the zoning by-law.

Impetus:
As an old city, Victoria has a legacy of large pre-Depression heritage houses. Since the post-war period, the City of Victoria has permitted the conversion of these houses in single family zones as-of-right through the zoning regulations.

Goals:
The goal of the policy is threefold. First, in a maturing city, intensification is one way of facilitating the creation of

additional dwelling units in established neighbourhoods. Secondly, the policy is a way of maintaining the character of single family neighbourhoods, while at the same time allowing its aging stock of quality housing to adapt to changing social and economic conditions. Third, the policy ensures conservation of the City's extensive inventory of heritage houses. This latter objective is evident in the requirements restricting exterior modifications in single family districts.

Years of Operation:
The duplex conversion provisions appeared in Victoria's first zoning by-law in 1956. The most recent amendment to the by-law regarding residential conversion took place in 1984 when it was modified to allow suites in houses built before 1970. Before then, duplex conversion was only permitted in single family areas with houses built before 1931.

Cost:
No additional costs have been identified by the City as a consequence of this initiative.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:
None.

Problems Encountered:
The process has been relatively problem-free since 1984 when standards regarding what was a proper conversion were clarified.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
In 1988, 10 percent of the City's housing units (approximately 3,800 units) were located in converted

houses. According to A Review of the Rental Housing Shortage in the City of Victoria (1988), there is continued potential for up to 1,500 additional units through duplex conversions.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The City of London has a program of zoning amendments and design advice to stimulate the construction of new single family homes which are made-to-convert into multi-unit dwellings.

Formal Evaluation:

None since 1984. At that time, it was found that the zoning by-law needed to be clarified.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

None.

People Served:

Housing for people with a full range of incomes is provided. Some units provide luxury accommodation. Other units, particularly on large suburban lots, where there are basement units above ground, provide affordable housing well suited for single parents with children.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Participants need to be reasonable and to create units in harmony with the objectives of the neighbourhood. There needs to be a balance between providing affordable housing, and maintaining relations with neighbours. Issues of concern will vary among municipalities. Some communities may worry about green space, others will focus on maintaining the architectural character of the neighbourhood.

Contact Person:

Doug Koch,
Deputy Director of Planning,
City of Victoria,
No. 1 Centennial Square,
Victoria, B.C. V8W 1P6
Tel: (604) 361-0283
Fax: (604) 361-0386

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#20 - INTENSIFICATION

HOUSING ABOVE SHOPS CITY OF VANCOUVER, B.C.

Sub-Category:

Zoning

Description:

City Council amended the Commercial District schedules (C-1, C-2 and C-3A) to remove disincentives to building housing above neighbourhood shops. Previously, residential space was calculated at 2.5 times that of commercial space in floor space calculations. This initiative removed this constraint from the Zoning Schedule so that residential space is calculated at the same rate as commercial space. Residential uses are now conditional uses in these districts, not outright uses. This was done because staff felt they needed to maintain some control over the design and liveability of the units as noise and other design difficulties are associated with these sites. Parking requirements were not relaxed in these areas, as studies have shown that people still own cars regardless of where they live.

Responsible Agency:

City of Vancouver Planning
Department.

Impetus:

A planning department report entitled Vancouver's Housing Supply noted that Vancouver's housing problems could be attributed, in part, to a shortage of housing capacity (land zoned for housing). The problem existed primarily outside the downtown core and particularly in high demand areas on the west side of the City. Building housing above shops was seen as one of few opportunities to build new housing without demolishing existing housing.

Goals:

The goal of the housing above shops initiative is to increase housing capacity and choice in existing neighbourhoods, where new housing

will have minimal disruption on those neighbourhoods. Another related goal is to extend capacity in areas adjacent to public transit.

Years of Operation:

The amendments to the By-law took place in June 1989.

Cost:

None.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

None.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

Many of the development permit applications received had significant design problems. Property owners submitted projects geared to the highest maximum density. City planners spent a great deal of time addressing this issue. The City hired a consultant to develop design guidelines and is in the final stage of adopting them. These guidelines have the following goals:

- reduce the impacts of the new housing on neighbouring residential areas;
- improve the liveability for residents of the new units; and
- ensure that the development makes a positive contribution to the streetscape along these commercial arterials.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Approximately 50 development permit applications have been received since the amendments came into effect. In the C-1 and C-2 areas 500 units have been approved or completed, and another 500 units are in process. The increased capacity

generated by the amendments is estimated to be approximately 5,000 units in C-2 districts and approximately 500 units in C-1 districts.

453, West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver, B.C. V5Y 1V4
Tel: (604) 873-7397
Fax: (604) 873-7060

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The City of Toronto is revising its zoning by-law and has a program entitled "Neighbours on Main Streets" to intensify housing development on some of the principle arterial roads in the City. This includes the conversion of all or part of existing buildings to residential use and adding to existing buildings, either above, to create additional storeys, or behind to create additional floor space. The City of Mount Pearl, Newfoundland has received an ACT grant to identify opportunities for residential intensification. This study will address increased density and mixed use intensification on main streets, as well as smaller lots, and an increase in townhouses and apartments at a scale sensitive to existing dwellings.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The City is planning a public forum to solicit comments on the C-1 and C-2 guidelines and there will subsequently be a formal public hearing.

People Served:

Most of the housing produced will be condominiums. These should be more affordable than other units in a prime location.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

- Neighbourhoods with pedestrian oriented commercial streets;
- Demand for housing in mixed use developments;
- Good design; and
- Willingness of developers to take on the challenge.

Contact Persons:

Harv Weidner, Community Planner,
City of Vancouver Planning
Department,

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#21 - INTENSIFICATION

SUBSIDY PROGRAM FOR NEW OR RECYCLED BUILDINGS QUEBEC CITY, QUEBEC

Sub-Category:

Community Improvement

Description:

Quebec City is engaged in revitalizing its core area, and to this end has designed a variety of incentives for encouraging residence in the downtown area (zone prioritaire de redeveloppement). This program provides a combination of subsidies and tax credits for the creation of new housing in the core. It is available for housing units built on vacant land and for non-residential (or partially non-residential) buildings converted to residential use. The subsidy equals 30% of costs, up to a maximum of \$150,000 per building in the case of new construction, and \$200,000 per building in the case of conversion. After completion, the project is eligible for an assessment tax credit of 100% of the value added to the property for three years.

Responsible Agency:

City of Quebec.

Impetus:

The program grew out of building recycling programs set up in the 1980s. Quebec's building stock is fairly old and is thus well suited to this kind of initiative. This is particularly true for the downtown area, and the program was conceived of as part of a more comprehensive strategy aimed at revitalizing the city centre.

Goals:

To stimulate production of new housing in the central area of the city and encourage the use of more of the existing building stock for residential purposes.

Years of Operation:

The program commenced operation in 1992, but evolved from a program that operated in the middle of the 1980s.

Cost:

The City allocated \$950,000 to the program in 1992, yet only \$66,000 of that was used. The remaining \$884,000 will be carried over into the 1993 budget, which will total \$1,884,000.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

None.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

It is too early to tell.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Only three buildings were assisted under the program in 1992. It is hoped that 10 to 15 will be assisted in 1993.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The Housing through Infill Development (HID) program in the City of Fredericton, New Brunswick was established to encourage the development of privately funded housing in specific older urban areas of the City in order to contribute to their revitalization and provide alternative residential opportunities. The City provides a grant equivalent to 15% of the increase in property tax assessment resulting from the development.

The City of Regina is developing an Inner City Housing Stimulation Strategy. A municipal property tax exemption program is being considered as one element of this strategy.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The program has not been operating long enough to assess the reaction.

People Served:

The program is designed for building renovation and does not target any specific groups.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The success of this kind of program depends heavily on adequate subsidies. It also depends on builders, developers, the building stock and available land.

Contact Person:

Section Gestion des Programmes,
Ville de Quebec,
Service de l'urbanisme,
2, Rue des Jardins
C.P. 700, Haute-Ville,
Quebec, Que., G1R 4S9
Tel: (418) 691-6022
Fax: (418) 691-6161

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#22 - INTENSIFICATION

DOWNTOWN CONVERSION LOAN PROGRAM CITY OF KINGSTON, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:
Financing

Description:

This program offers a loan of up to \$15,000 per dwelling unit to convert vacant commercial space to residential use. The money was originally drawn from a \$250,000 fund allocated to the program from the City's Municipal Incentives Grant Funds. It is loaned at 8% interest and is secured by a lien registered against the title to the property. The applicant can only receive funds for a maximum of two units and must meet the following criteria:

- The dwelling units to be created must be located in the central business district as defined in the official plan of the City of Kingston planning area.
- The dwelling units must be located on the second floor or higher unless otherwise authorized by the Loan Approval Committee.
- No loan may exceed the actual cost of required work.
- All plans must be approved by the chief building official and the City of Kingston Loans Committee for the purpose of reviewing the design plans submitted by the applicant.

Responsible Agency:

Committee of Council (City of Kingston Loans Committee).

Impetus:

In response to a provincial Downtown Revitalization Program, the City of Kingston completed a Commercial Opportunity Study in 1978. This study strongly recommended that the City adopt policies designed to provide additional residential units in the downtown core. This might be achieved by renovation of existing vacant and substantially

underutilized spaces on the second and third floors of buildings in the central business district.

Goals:

The initial goal was 5 to 10 units per year.

Years of Operation:

In August 1981, a by-law was passed by which the low interest loan program was enacted.

Cost:

The revolving loan fund of \$250,000 is replenished by capital and interest when the loans are repaid. To cover administration costs, the City treasurer deducts from the Municipal Incentive Grant funds \$600 for the first unit and \$75 for each additional unit created. The program is considered to be cost effective because it creates residential units through adaptive re-use more economically than through new construction and because it generates assessment rates higher than those in vacant commercial space.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:
None.

Problems Encountered:

The existing zoning in the central business district did not permit existing buildings to be converted for residential uses without the provision of front, side and rear yards and maximum percentage of lot coverage. City Council had to pass a by-law amendment to allow this type of conversion. Existing regulations further required that for any existing buildings which are being converted to residential use

on upper floors, a minimum amount of amenity area and play space must be provided. The built up nature of the downtown area made it difficult for property owners to provide the required space, which resulted in numerous applications to the Committee of Adjustment to either reduce or delete the amenity area and play space. In 1987, Council passed a by-law amending the regulations for the area targeted for the program to delete the requirements for amenity area and play space.

The same issues arose over the residential parking standards required by the zoning by-law. To address this issue, a cash-in-lieu of parking policy was suggested. Funds collected by this levy would be set aside to assist the City to purchase land for parking purposes in the future. First it was determined that the municipality had the enabling authority to impose such a program. Then, much discussion concerning an appropriate and fair levy occurred. In March 1989, Council passed another by-law which established criteria for deciding applications for exemption from the parking requirement in the central business district. The exemption will be a site specific agreement which requires \$1,500 for each parking space below the number which would have been required under the by-law.

Another problem with converting second and third floor commercial space to residential use is that units are not accessible for disabled people. In most cases, access is by stairways, as few of these buildings have elevators.

There has not been much interest in the program lately because of the low mortgage rates available on the private market. When private lending rates were higher, there was much more interest in the program.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

As of December 1992, 38 apartments were funded under the program. Since the program funds a maximum of two units per landlord, and in many cases, the landlord has created 4-10 units in the vacant space available,

the total number of units created is more than 38.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

St. Catharines, Ontario. Vancouver has implemented zoning changes to permit construction of residential units "above shops" on major city streets, and Toronto has a similar program entitled "Neighbours on Main Streets".

Formal Evaluation: None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Landlords have not experienced any vacancies in the residential units since they were created. If the landlord had not converted the second and third floors of commercial space to residential, it is likely that the entire building would have been vacant as there are several commercial vacancies in Kingston at this time. The location is convenient for tenants as amenities are close by and they don't need a car.

People Served:

Mostly students attending Queen's University, and people working in the downtown core area.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

This initiative would work in municipalities with vacant office space in low rise buildings. When landlords are unable to find commercial tenants, they may be interested in converting the commercial space to residential use.

When the economy is poor, stores may keep smaller inventory, thereby freeing up space on the second and third floors.

If municipalities wish to encourage the conversion of second and third floors of commercial space to residential use, they will need to introduce an incentive program.

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#23 -COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

MANITOBA/WINNIPEG COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PROGRAM CITY OF WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

Sub-Category:

Community Revitalization

Description:

The Manitoba/Winnipeg Community Revitalization Program is designed to facilitate the improvement of living conditions, (including social, physical and environmental) in older deteriorating but potentially stable and predominantly residential neighbourhoods in Winnipeg.

The City of Winnipeg designates specific areas to receive the funding, based on criteria including:

- population loss in the area;
- the area is at least 50% residential and is composed predominantly of low and moderate income families;
- the area contains high-need groups experiencing economic and social problems;
- the area contains a high proportion of housing stock built prior to 1950, significant amounts of which are in poor condition;
- there is a deterioration or deficiency in municipal services;
- there is a deterioration or deficiency in public community and recreational services and centres; and
- the area is expected to remain stable in terms of residential land use and density.

Community participation is an important aspect of this initiative. Once a neighbourhood has been designated to receive funding, the City will establish an office in the

area and will facilitate the establishment of a resident advisory committee. Members of this committee are elected by the residents of the neighbourhood at open general meetings that have been advertised throughout the designated area. The Committee acts as a consultant to city staff responsible for delivering the program and has a key role in developing the community revitalization strategy. The Committee is also responsible for:

- ensuring that development projects fit the aspirations of the neighbourhood at large;
- soliciting ideas from the residents of the area concerning problems, issues and needs that could be addressed through the program;
- consulting with residents on projects that will affect them;
- holding at least one general public meeting each year to report on past accomplishments and to present plans for the following year; and
- presenting the community revitalization strategy to the residents of the area.

The community revitalization strategy identifies the elements in the community which require improvement; potential capital projects and preliminary costs that will be funded under the program; and potential sources of complementary funding required to deal effectively with these elements.

Items eligible to receive funding under the program include:

1. Administration - not to exceed 20% of the total program budget.
2. Citizen participation - \$25,000 - \$50,000 for promotional literature, surveys, printing of documents, public meetings, and resident committee meetings.
3. Municipal services - not to exceed 30% of the total project cost (with a minimum expenditure of 10%).
4. Community Facilities - for capital costs of construction and/or renovation of community service facilities including recreational facilities or grounds, parks, playgrounds, community centres, day care centres, senior citizen centres, and libraries etc.
5. Land acquisition - to be used for municipal services, community facilities, and low and medium density housing to provide affordable housing for low and moderate income families.

Other eligible costs may include landscaping to buffer residential areas from commercial or industrial land uses, or special projects designed to enhance the community image, neighbourhood services or amenities.

Responsible Agency:
The City of Winnipeg Planning Department.

Impetus:
None identified.

Goals:
Promote diverse projects and initiatives that protect and improve the physical condition, infrastructure and natural environment of Winnipeg's older deteriorating but potentially stable, low and moderate income residential neighbourhoods.

Improve neighbourhood services, community facilities, and municipal infrastructure.

Encourage the rehabilitation of existing housing stock and the development of infill housing units, through private/public investment.

Encourage area residents to participate in local planning and neighbourhood development, to ensure that development projects fit the aspirations of the neighbourhood at large.

Years of Operation:
This program began in 1985.

Cost:
The total budget for this program from 1985 - 1991 was \$11.8 million. The allocated budget for 1992-1996 is \$10.5 for a program total of \$22.3 million.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
This program is cost-shared on a 50-50 basis by the City of Winnipeg and Province of Manitoba.

Other Partners:
Some development projects involve the participation of community agencies.

Problems Encountered:
None to date. It would be useful to have complementary programs to fund social programs and address the social needs of the community.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Eight neighbourhoods will have benefitted from this program. Since 1985, this program has assisted in the development of 121 units of housing in the City by subsidizing land costs. Of these units, 49 were for seniors and 72 were for families.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
None identified.

Formal Evaluation:
A formal evaluation of this program was undertaken in December, 1990. The evaluation was quite favourable and stated that "overall, the Manitoba/Winnipeg Community Revitalization Program represents a needed and effective resource in the process of stabilizing and regenerating Winnipeg's older

residential neighbourhoods". Based on this evaluation, the City and Province refined the program guidelines and entered into a second five year program.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Reaction from the community has been positive.

People Served:

Members of the community in the designated areas.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Co-operation between all levels of government for funding;

Eligible neighbourhoods;

Participation by residents;

Co-operation from all civic departments, other government departments, and local agencies and groups;

A commitment from staff to work long hours, especially in the evening; and

Willingness from groups with funding from other sources to focus on the neighbourhoods at the same time in order to pool resources.

Contact Persons:

Neil Kowlessar, Manager,
Community Programs Division,
City of Winnipeg Planning
Department,
Room 400, 395 Main Street,
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 3E1
Tel: (204) 986-5257
Fax: (204) 942-2008

Don Gannon, Manager,
Neighbourhood Programs Branch, Room
400 - 395 Main Street,
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 3E1
Tel: (204) 986-5179

Pat Moses, Community Planning
Officer,
Manitoba Urban Affairs,
302-258 Portage Avenue,
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 0B6
Tel: (204) 945-4610
Fax: (204) 945-1249

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#24 - COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

MUNICIPAL HOUSING REHABILITATION PROGRAM, QUEBEC CITY, QUEBEC

Sub-Category: Financing

Description

Single family homes and rental units are eligible for a City sponsored home rehabilitation subsidy. The subsidy is calculated according to the size of the unit and costs incurred. It provides 50% of costs above a given threshold to a maximum of \$10,000 for a unit with two or three bedrooms. For homeowners, the subsidy decreases by one dollar for every two dollars of household income above \$50,000. The funds can be used in conjunction with the provincial/federal renovation subsidy program PARCQ, the provincial renovation program PRIL, or independently. The program is intended to assist major rehabilitation efforts. Major rehabilitation is defined as a project costing over \$5,000 for homes and \$10,000 for rental units, and generally consisting of structural, electrical, plumbing or other substantial repairs. The program is available in the designated central core of the City (zone prioritaire de redeveloppement), where the demand is most pronounced. No rent restrictions apply after rehabilitation.

Responsible Agency: City of Quebec.

Impetus:

The City initiated the Housing Rehabilitation Program in order to provide substantial financial assistance for major rehabilitation projects. Quebec City is characterised by a large stock of older housing units in need of repair which are, on average, more costly to rehabilitate than units elsewhere because of their age and density.

Goals:

The program is designed to preserve the stock of affordable housing by assisting major rehabilitation projects to be economically viable. For rental units, the subsidy is intended to assist in ensuring that rents are affordable following rehabilitation.

Years of Operation:

The program has been operating since 1989. However, the City has been involved in several federal, provincial, or municipal renovation subsidy programs since the 1970s.

Cost:

The City invested \$3,287,000 in the program in 1992 and has \$3,527,000 available for 1993. Funding for the program is raised through municipal bond issues.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

There is no direct provincial or federal government involvement in this initiative. However, where appropriate, the subsidy can be used to complement PRIL, the provincial renovation assistance program, or PARCQ, which is for properties inhabited by their owners.

Other Partners: None.

Problems Encountered: None to date.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

In 1992, 300 rental units and 24 owned units received assistance under the program. It is expected that in 1993 these figures will be 300 and 130 respectively.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
City of Montreal, Municipal
Renovation Subsidy Program.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community, or Participants:
The program's popularity can be judged by the fact that it has been operating in various forms over a very long period. There is clearly no need to increase the level of subsidization but to increase the overall budget.

People Served:
The program is aimed at a general clientele, with more favourable conditions for those in the downtown area.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
The crucial component of the program is its financing, which must be suited to heavy demand. The program also requires prompt and efficient service.

Contact Person:
Section Gestion des Programmes,
Ville de Quebec,
Service de l'urbanisme
C.P. 700, Haute-Ville,
Quebec, Que., G1R 4S9
Tel: (418) 691-6022
Fax: (418) 691-6161

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#25 - COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

MUNICIPAL ROOMING HOUSE REHABILITATION PROGRAM, QUEBEC CITY, QUEBEC

Sub-Category:

Financing, Health and Safety

Description:

The City of Quebec operates a special building inspection program to ensure that rooming houses maintain minimum standards for the health and safety of their occupants. To assist in achieving this goal, the City offers a maximum subsidy of \$4,000 per unit for major renovation costs up to a maximum of \$100,000 per rooming house. Installation of automatic sprinklers or alarm transmission systems are mandatory to qualify for the program. Costs associated with these devices are eligible for subsidy through this program. All rooming houses in the City are eligible for the subsidy provided need is demonstrated. No rent restrictions apply after rehabilitation.

Responsible Agency:

City of Quebec.

Impetus:

Quebec City has approximately 2,000 rooming house units located in 200 rooming houses. The issue of rooming house safety was brought to public attention in 1987 when a series of fires resulted in several deaths. The City began safety inspections in order to identify major safety hazards and actions needed to bring rooming house accommodation up to City building standards.

Goals:

To encourage rooming house owners to renovate their properties rather than replace or convert an existing rooming house to other uses.

Years of Operation:

The program commenced operation in July 1988.

Cost:

The City allocated \$730,000 to the program in 1992, yet only \$65,000 or that was used. The remaining \$665,000 will be carried over into the 1993 budget.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

There is no direct provincial or federal involvement in the program, although the subsidy can apply in conjunction with PRIL.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

None.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Approximately 55 units per year have been assisted under the program over the past three years. The number anticipated for 1993 is 150.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

City of Montreal, Municipal Subsidy Program for the Restoration of Rooming Houses and the Conversion of Buildings into Rooming Houses.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community and Participants:

The reaction to the program has generally been positive.

People Served:

Rooming house clientele and owners.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The program must be coordinated with a strong housing inspection program in a carrot-and-stick fashion. Furthermore, it must be fairly generous.

Contact Person:

Section Gestion des Programmes,
Ville de Quebec,
Service de l'urbanisme,
2, Rue des Jardins,
C.P. 700, Haute-Ville,
Quebec, Que., G1R 4S9
Tel: (418) 691-6022
Fax: (418) 691-6161

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#26 -COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

ACQUISITION OF RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAM CITY OF MONTREAL, QUEBEC

Sub-Category:
Financing

Description:

The City of Montreal, through the Societe d'habitation et de developpement de Montreal (SHDM), bought 2,739 housing units between 1989 and 1992. The units are renovated (1,560 completed so far) and then transferred. According to a recent study, there are approximately 50,000 units in Montreal in need of renovation, of which at least one third are found in walk-ups. The program targets these buildings and 90% of the units acquired so far are in walk-ups.

The structure of the program has evolved over time. Initially, the City contributed \$75 per month per unit, over a ten year period, to cover the downpayment as well as 90% of recognised renovation costs (City and Provincial subsidies). The program was subsequently modified, and the City's contribution now averages \$125 and varies according to need. Fifty percent of eligible renovation costs are subsidized.

Once renovation has been finished, the project is transferred to a co-operative or a non-profit organization. By the end of 1993, it is anticipated that 1,100 units will be managed by co-ops and 1,300 by non-profit organization, of which some will be eventually transformed into co-ops.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Montreal, Societe d'habitation et de developpement de Montreal (SHDM).

Impetus:

In its housing policy document entitled *Habiter Montreal* (1989), the City of Montreal articulated two broad goals:

- a) to enable a larger number of Montrealers to become individual or collective homeowners; and
- b) to enable Montrealers to enjoy good quality housing at an affordable price.

Recognizing that it must play a leading role in attaining these goals, the City of Montreal developed the following five municipal strategies:

- 1) Facilitate individual and collective home ownership;
- 2) Encourage the growth of the housing stock;
- 3) Increase the number of social housing units;
- 4) Preserve and improve the existing housing stock; and
- 5) Avoid the displacement of residents from their building or neighbourhood.

This initiative to purchase, renovate and sell post-war apartment buildings is one of the programs to flow from the City's strategies.

Goals:

The program responds to both of the broad goals stated in *Habiter Montreal* by addressing three of the five strategies:

- facilitating individual and collective home ownership (by selling the buildings back to the tenants as co-operatives and non-profit housing associations);
- preserving and improving the existing housing stock (by renovating buildings in need of major repairs); and

- avoiding the displacement of residents (by renovating the building hand in hand with the tenants).

Years of Operation:

This program began in the fall of 1989 and is expected to last at least another five to ten years.

Cost:

The total cost incurred by this program is \$116 million. The City's share is approximately \$20 million (for downpayments) and \$23 million in renovation subsidies. The province's share for renovations is around \$14 million.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The province is involved through its rental unit renovation program (PRIL).

Other Partners:

The non-profit and co-operative housing sector.

Problems Encountered:

The major problem at the moment is linked to financial constraints by the City of Montreal.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

By the end of 1992, 2,739 units had been acquired.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None Identified.

Formal Evaluation:

An evaluation is currently underway and will be completed at the end of 1993.

Reaction by Tenants, Community and Participants:

Reaction is generally very favourable. Neighbourhoods where the program operates are often dilapidated and sometimes experience social problems (e.g. drugs). The program is thus seen as an important contribution to neighbourhood revitalisation.

Wherever possible, initiatives are co-ordinated with community groups. In certain cases, SHDM responds to specific requests from neighbourhood groups.

People Served:

A clientele study undertaken in 1991 showed that 64% of resident households were families, of which 52% had children. More than half of household heads were born outside Canada, 91% of whom were from "new immigrant" countries. Almost seven out of ten households had an annual income of less than \$20,000.

Conditions necessary for Success:

The most important element is the municipal commitment to such a program. The City contribution for downpayment and renovation subsidies are critical. The program functions well as a "counter-cyclical" measure. The depressed state of Montreal's real estate market currently allows purchases at favourable prices. The program also draws on community and professional resources that are important to its success.

Contact Person:

M. Guy Desautels,
Directeur, Programmes,
Societe d'habitation et de
developpement de Montreal (SHDM),
1055, boul. Rene-Levesque Est, 8e
etage,
Montreal, Quebec H2L 4S5
Tel: (514) 872-8387
Fax: (514) 872-1895

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#27 - COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

PRESERVATION BY-LAW CITY OF MONTREAL, QUEBEC

Sub-Category:

Preservation of Existing Housing
Regulations
Financing

Description:

The purpose of this initiative is to gain greater control over the existing housing stock in Montreal and to preserve the City's older properties.

There are two components to this initiative. The first component is intended to ensure that the housing stock is not lost due to demolition or conversion. In April 1990, the former Demolition By-law was replaced by the more extensive Preservation By-law (Reglement relatif a la protection du patrimoine immobilier). The latter controls not only the demolition of residential buildings (as did the previous by-law) but also the conversion of residential to non-residential uses, and the demolition of non-residential structures.

The second component of this initiative involves a financial guarantee on the part of developers. The guarantee was originally intended to raise money from developers who demolished housing, and to channel it into existing affordable housing programs. For the moment, however, the new law only requires developers to make a deposit or guarantee to the City which is forfeited if demolition is not followed by new construction. The development climate in the City has changed considerably since the law was first put in place. There is now comparatively little demolition occurring in the City, and that which does occur involves projects so small as to prohibit

demanding compensation from their owners.

Responsible Agency:

The Module des Permits of the Service de l'habitation et du developpement urbain collects and evaluates demolition applications.

Impetus:

Montreal has a considerable stock of older rental housing and a large number of low-income tenants. Since the demolition or conversion of low cost housing to other uses creates a wide range of negative impacts for tenants (particularly the elderly and low-income tenants who have limited resources to deal with relocation), an initiative was developed to address some of these impacts.

Goals:

To maintain the housing stock by discouraging demolition and, in cases where demolition is desirable, by replacing demolished structures with housing of comparable affordability.

Years of Operation:

The Preservation By-law has been in effect since April 1990.

Cost:

Administrative costs are absorbed internally.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

None.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

None.

**Number of Units Assisted or
Produced:**

In 1992, 217 residential units in
the City were demolished or
transformed.

**Similar Initiatives Operating
Elsewhere:**

None identified.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

**Reaction by Tenants, Community or
Participants:**

Not applicable.

People Served:

The initiative is a regulatory
mechanism which is aimed at the
building stock, and thus does not
serve a specific clientele.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

By exacting a deposit from
developers who are accorded
demolition permits, the City ensures
a fairly high rate of
reconstruction.

Contact Person:

Gabriel Deschambault,
Service de l'habitation et du
developpement urbain Module des
Permits,
810 Saint-Antoine Est.,
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1A6
Tel: (514) 872-4192
Fax: (514) 872-3567

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#28 - COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

SAFE HOUSING COMMITTEE CITY OF EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Sub-Category:

Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing and Health and Safety Standards

Description:

The City of Edmonton has established a Safe Housing Committee to undertake a co-ordinated and pro-active approach to the inspection of multiple occupancy housing.

Members of the committee include inspectors from a number of different departments, including:

- Edmonton Power;
- Finance (Licensing);
- Planning and Development (Building Inspectors and Development Control);
- Board of Health; and
- Fire Department

The Offices of the Commissioner of Housing and City Solicitor are represented as well.

The committee is involved in two main activities:

- inspecting multiple occupancy housing; and
- developing a guideline to establish minimum standards of health and safety.

The committee began its work by inspecting 21 properties, which were mostly rooming house stock and other low rentals in the inner city. It found many deficiencies in the buildings, and these deficiencies crossed several departmental boundaries.

The committee plans to inspect all multiple properties on a neighbourhood by neighbourhood basis, by 1997.

The Safe Housing Committee developed a strategy, on a pilot basis, to assist tenants who would be required to relocate. At the same time as the

committee sent a landlord a notice to evict, they sent a copy to the tenants and to local housing agencies. They asked an agency to visit the tenants and offer help, and they produced an information brochure in 4 languages. This pilot project concluded in September 1992, but Council has agreed that the committee should contract with one or more agencies to work with tenants who may be required to move.

In doing its work, the committee found that the various pieces of relevant legislation were confusing. They prepared a draft guideline to establish minimum standards of health and safety, and have received an ACT grant to do a demonstration project to test the guideline.

Responsible Agency:

The Office of the Commissioner of Housing, which is part of the Planning and Development Department. This office was established in March 1992.

Impetus:

The City found that conducting inspections on a complaint basis did not result in improvements to substandard housing. A need and demand study prepared in 1990 by a committee of Provincial, City and community-based agencies showed an estimated 2,200 households were living in substandard housing. There was concern that people living in such housing were at a high risk of health and safety problems.

The Fire Department conducted a sample survey of 126 properties in the inner city and found that about 25% of them were in very bad condition.

The Safe Housing Committee decided to develop a renovation guideline because if they were to enforce the letter of existing codes, the results would be too onerous and expensive. Landlords would close the buildings, and this would reduce the affordable housing stock. The committee wanted to develop a fair and reasonable approach that would give landlord some options.

Goals:

To ensure that multiple occupancy rental housing is upgraded to minimum standards of health and safety, and to maintain this affordable rental housing stock.

To develop a clear, understandable and workable renovation guideline that will establish minimum standards of health and safety.

Years of Operation:

The Safe Housing Committee was formally established February 21, 1992.

Cost:

There is no separate budget for this committee. Council allocated existing staff to participate, and the costs are being absorbed within existing departmental budgets. However, there are plans to hire a committee co-ordinator at an additional cost.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The City received \$20,000 from CMHC through the ACT program to test the guideline. The Provincial Government is represented on the advisory committee for the ACT project through the Alberta Labour Buildings Standards Branch and Alberta Municipal Affairs.

Other Partners:

The Edmonton Home Builders' Association, Alberta Association of Architects, and a representative from the community are also on the advisory committee for the ACT project.

Problems Encountered:

Some properties will need to be shut down and some tenants will be forced to move.

The Provincial government requires municipalities to follow the Alberta Building Code. The City has found that it is difficult to apply the Code to existing buildings. The City would like the authority to create a by-law requiring adherence to their guideline, and they would like to require compliance with the guideline as a condition of getting a business license.

The City must address how to fund the increased level of service.

Landlords are concerned about how they will be able to finance the work required to upgrade their buildings. Tenants will not be able to afford increased rents. Many of them receive social assistance, and the Provincial government has lowered the allowance for single people who are employable. At the same time, costs to operate the buildings are increasing.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

A need and demand study for the City of Edmonton estimated that approximately 2,200 units are in substandard condition in the inner city.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Montreal has a systematic inspection program that targets specific areas of the City, in addition to responding to specific complaints.

Formal Evaluation:

A formal evaluation of the Safe Housing Committee was conducted in August 1992. The City agreed:

- that the Safe Housing Committee should continue;
- that the committee should be reasonable in applying the regulations;
- that the committee should develop a renovation guideline and apply for the ACT grant (received);
- that there was a need to provide relocation assistance for tenants; and
- that the committee should search for program assistance (like RRAP) to assist landlords in upgrading their properties.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The community wanted the city to take action and supports this initiative.

Reaction from the landlords is mixed. They appreciate being able to get a complete picture of the work that the city will require them to do, and they find this process more fair. They also appreciate the flexible approach being taken by the city. On the other hand, they are concerned about the costs of doing the work. Landlords have demonstrated a willingness to work with the city. Two properties were condemned and the owners have asked what they need to do to re-open and bring the properties up to minimum standards.

Tenants appreciated the assistance with relocating.

People Served:

Primarily households with low incomes.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Political will by Council to support the co-ordinated and pro-active approach. Need to adopt a flexible approach and attitude in applying the regulations. It is important to consider broad policy objectives, and get the "big picture". It is important for different departments to work together. A program similar to RRAP would assist landlords to upgrade their buildings.

Contact Persons:

Dennis Freeman, Senior Planner,
Office of the Commissioner of
Housing,
#1001, 10th Floor Centennial
Building,
10015 - 103 Avenue,,
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H1
Tel: (403) 496-6026
Fax: (403) 496-6011

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#29 - COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

AID TO TENANTS CITY OF MONTREAL, QUEBEC

Sub-Category: Financing

Description:

The City of Montreal will pay compensation to cover any increase in rent during temporary relocation due to subsidized renovations and cover the expenses of moving out and back (including costs like telephone hook-up). Indemnities represent 100% of costs incurred. The City also provides assistance in finding temporary accommodation for affected parties and ensures that landlords, tenants and roomers are well informed concerning the process.

This program operates within the framework of renovation programs run by the City and the Province. Each level of government has separate eligibility criteria and subsidy schedules, but they deliver the programs together in order to minimize red tape. While the provincial government makes some provisions for tenants who have to move, most costs are absorbed by the City.

Responsible Agency:

City of Montreal, Service de l'habitation et du développement urbain.

Impetus:

This program developed from the City's recognition that, in the past, most subsidies have benefited buildings rather than the people living in them. Major renovation work can have a negative impact on tenants who either have to relocate temporarily or move permanently.

Goals:

The City wants to encourage renovations, especially in the case of rooming houses, while protecting tenants and roomers. Residents of

affected buildings are already partially protected from excessive rent increases due to renovation (since renovation can only take place if 50% of tenants agree to any anticipated increase), but this measure grants them more control by reducing the negative effects of temporary displacement by covering related costs. The City also uses the Aid to Tenants Program to open up lines of communication between landlord and tenant or roomer, and to furnish support and information about temporary accommodation to tenants forced to move during subsidized renovations.

Years of Operation:

February 1989 to present.

Cost:

Combined Provincial and municipal subsidies for renovation amounted to over \$30 million a year for the last two years. The amount spent on relocation and moving costs for temporary displacements is typically in the area of \$1 million per year. In addition, the program employs a staff of four people to assist affected residents in such tasks as finding temporary accommodation.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

While established as an initiative of the City of Montreal, the program works within the context of much larger municipal and Provincial renovation subsidy programs.

Other Partners:

The City works with various groups, such as co-ops, tenants' groups and owners' associations.

Problems Encountered:

None.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

In 1992, 3,085 households were assisted, of which 613 were roomers. The number anticipated for 1993 is 2,502.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None identified.

Formal Evaluation:

A study of a pilot project that was completed over a two year period was made in October 1990.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The program was set up in close consultation with rental groups in the City and has been received positively.

People Served:

The program is targeted largely to households with low incomes.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The key attributes of successfully establishing a program like this are working together with housing coalitions who work on behalf of better rental conditions, and ensuring that those most affected understand how it works.

Contact Person:

Marcel Tanguay,
Surintendant,
Service de l'habitation et du
developpement urbain,
Module de l'habitation - Division
renovation,
330 Saint-Paul Est.,
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1H2
Tel: (514) 872-2887
Fax: (514) 872-3883

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#30 -REGULATIONS: ADMINISTRATION\ APPROVAL PROCESS

MEDIATION PILOT PROJECT CITY OF KITCHENER, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:
Approval Process
Zoning

Description:

In April 1993, the City of Kitchener began participating in a one year pilot project to assist in reducing the number and cost of appeal hearings before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). The Cities of Nepean and Toronto are also participating in this pilot project.

The pilot will provide an informal information exchange between the parties to the appeal, facilitated by a knowledgeable, neutral mediator, to see if the objections can be resolved without a full OMB hearing.

Parties to OMB appeals will meet with an experienced mediator to:

- briefly review the case;
- clarify the reasons for Council's decision;
- clarify the objections;
- determine to what extent these objections can be resolved locally; and
- clarify the options for proceeding.

To avoid delay, the mediation occurs simultaneously with the submission of the OMB application.

For mediation to occur, all formal objectors must personally attend the initial mediation session. Legal and technical advisors may also attend. To proceed further with the mediation process, the parties must agree to do so. The consent of the Provincial Pilot Coordinator is also necessary to ensure resources are available.

The mediation is not a formal hearing and has no statutory status before the OMB. It is conducted on an information basis and "without prejudice". This means that a

settlement may still require confirmation by the OMB, or may require reference back to the municipality, or, in the absence of a settlement, a subsequent hearing would be conducted "de novo" by the OMB without reference to any previous proceedings. Statutory processes that currently prevail when informal dispute resolution is attempted will continue to prevail under this pilot project.

The role of the mediator is to facilitate the clarification and exchange of information and attempt at settlement, but it is not to establish the merits of the case or the legal grounds for appeal.

A successful conclusion to the mediation can result in the parties agreeing to a settlement, the objections being withdrawn, or the issues being narrowed for future determination.

The mediation process involves the following steps:

- a) Once a municipal land use decision is made, an objector may file a Notice of Appeal to the OMB, with the municipality.
- b) At the same time as the municipality processes the Notice of Appeal, the municipality will provide a copy of the case file to the Provincial Pilot Coordinator in the Provincial Facilitator's Office.
- c) The Provincial Pilot Coordinator will review the case, assign a mediator, and ensure the time and place for the mediation is scheduled.

- d) At the conclusion of the mediation, the mediator will file a brief report to the Provincial Pilot Coordinator, and if desired by the parties, will prepare an outline of the issues settled and those remaining for the OMB. Upon the signature of all parties, this will be forwarded to the OMB.
- e) The Provincial Pilot Coordinator will review the report and facilitate the appropriate subsequent steps in conjunction with legal staff, as necessary.

Mediators must have mediation experience, knowledge of land use planning in Ontario, and be available during and outside office hours as necessary.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Kitchener Department of Planning and Development, and the Office of the Provincial Facilitator.

Impetus:

The mandate of the Office of the Provincial Facilitator is to address problem areas in the planning process.

It can take at least 12 months to obtain a hearing before the OMB. This pilot is an attempt to look at the process before appeals are lodged, and if they are lodged, how to speed them up.

It is believed that not all objections to municipal land use decisions need to go through lengthy appeal proceedings. Some may be resolved through mediation. Others can be streamlined and expedited. This would increase the level of satisfaction, and save both the appellant and the government considerable time and money, particularly in site specific cases such as minor variances decided by a Committee of Adjustment, or decisions by Council regarding site specific rezonings, site plan controls and plans of subdivision.

Goals:

- a) Expedite the planning approvals process;

- b) Help the OMB reduce its back log. It is hoped that approximately 30% of cases can be resolved through mediation.
- c) See if this approach is cost-effective for municipalities on an ongoing basis.
- d) Test the potential of regularizing an interim step in the resolution of land use disputes which are conventionally settled at the Ontario Municipal Board. It is felt that an interim step will give parties the opportunity to air their differences, clarify the issues, and if possible, resolve or narrow them in order to contribute to a reduction in the workload of the OMB.
- e) Increase client satisfaction, and save time and ultimately reduce development costs.

Years of Operation:

This pilot project is intended to run for one year, commencing April 1, 1993.

Cost:

The municipality is contributing staff time and meeting space for the mediations. The Provincial Government is contributing staff resources and a total of \$80,000 for the fees and expenses of the mediators. Approximately \$15,000 is expected to be used in Kitchener. (The rest would be used in Nepean and Toronto).

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The provincial government, through the office of the Provincial Facilitator, will provide the following services:

- secretariat support for ongoing meetings of the working group and the Advisory Group;
- space, program and secretariat support for the office of the pilot coordinator;
- funding up to \$80,000 for the fees and expenses of 5 mediators;

- selection and orientation of the mediators;
- monitoring and evaluation support, in conjunction with the participating municipalities; and
- production of the pilot project reports.

Other Partners:
None.

Problems Encountered:
None to date.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Not applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
Nepean and Toronto, Ontario are also participating in this pilot project.

Formal Evaluation:
The Provincial coordinator, the Provincial facilitator's Office and Municipal Working Group will develop an evaluation plan. Monitoring procedures will be available for implementation at the start of the pilot project. It is expected that the evaluation will focus on the following areas:

- the number, types of cases, length of time, outcomes, number of parties, and number of "no shows";
- the effect that mediation had on time, cost, and scope of the dispute;
- reasons for success or failure of the mediation;
- policy conclusions that can be drawn at the end of the pilot period and what policy changes might be appropriate;
- procedural conclusions that can be drawn at the end of the pilot period and what procedural changes might be appropriate; and
- the reaction of the OMB.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Feedback from municipal council and the development industry has been very supportive.

People Served:
Not applicable.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Not yet known.

Contact Persons:
Carla Ladd,
Department of Planning and Development,
City of Kitchener,
P.O. Box 1118,
22 Frederick Street,
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4G7
Tel: (519)741-2325
Fax: (519)741-2624

Sue Corke/Beate Bowron,
Office of the Provincial Facilitator,
Urban Economics Development Secretariat,
Ministry of Municipal Affairs, 777 Bay Street, 12th floor,
Toronto, Ontario M5G 2E5
Tel: (416) 585-6745
Fax: (416) 585-7411

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#31 -REGULATIONS: ADMINISTRATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS

EVENING BUILDING PERMIT SERVICE CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Category:

Regulations: Administration/Approval Process

Description:

The Department of Buildings and Inspections offers service in the evenings for construction permits for low density residential buildings (one and two family homes) and for related plumbing permits for additions and alterations. Permits for simple matters can be issued on the spot (assuming the requisite drawings have been supplied) if all other approvals have already been obtained or are not required.

In the past, applicants were advised to arrive between 4:30 and 5 p.m. to sign in. To prevent the advantage from going to those who could afford to line up ahead of time, names were drawn by lot to establish the order of service. In 1993, continuous service is offered on Tuesdays until 8:00 p.m. on a first-come, first-served basis.

Responsible Agency:

Department of Buildings and Inspections, City of Toronto

Impetus:

Regular daytime service to obtain building permits is available on a first-come, first-served basis. This favours developers and architects who are prepared to send someone to wait in line. Home owners are often unable to come downtown during the day, especially if they face a long wait. Service to home owners during the day was improved in 1992 with the addition of a second counter specifically for 1 and 2 family projects with more permits being issued over the counter.

Goals:

The initiative provides convenient, fair building permit service for one- and two-family home renovations requiring no other approvals. It

offers relief to the system of applications since a permit can be issued on the spot.

Years of Operation:

The program has been in operation since 1976.

Cost:

Additional costs are incurred by the City when staff are paid time-and-a-half for evening hours worked. However, staff are encouraged to take time off in lieu of the evening hours worked.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:
None.

Problems Encountered:

Staff and clients sometimes find the process stressful. Inexperienced clients may have unrealistic expectations about what they or the staff can accomplish on the spot. Staff must deal immediately with clients' frustrations in a close environment. They no longer have the usual extended process to distance or diminish confrontation.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

In 1992, a total number of 8,674 permits were issued for one and two family homes. The evening building permit service issued 1,008 of these permits. An additional 567 permits were issued on the spot on weekdays. Figures will vary from year to year depending on renovation trends and economic conditions. The numbers refer to the total number of permits issued and are not restricted to affordable housing.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
Other Metro municipalities have similar services on different scales depending on the demand.

Formal Evaluation:
Reviews have determined that this initiative will be maintained as a vital service to clients.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
This service generally has been highly utilized by clients.

People Served:
A mix of home owners and professionals hired by home owners.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Flexibility to allow staff to take time off in lieu of the evening hours worked instead of over-time salaries.

Contact Person:
Judi Aizer-McBurney
Supervisor, Plan Examination,
Department of Buildings and
Inspections,
Toronto City Hall,
Main Floor, West Tower
100 Queen St. West
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2
Tel: (416) 392-7539
Fax: (416) 392-0721

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#32 -REGULATIONS: ADMINISTRATION\ APPROVAL PROCESS

RENTAL HOUSING FAST TRACKING POLICY DISTRICT OF SURREY, B.C.

Category

Regulations: Administration/Approval Process

Description:

In 1989, Surrey Municipal Council passed a policy designed to fast track the approval of non-strata (non-condominium) rental multi-family housing projects. Where rezoning is required, the developer must apply to use the priority process by informing the Planning and Development Department.

Fast tracking is achieved as the project will be specially flagged and will receive priority over other files in all stages of the municipality's development review process.

Surrey has reduced its overall rezoning application processing time from 18 to 9 months.

Responsible Agency:

The District of Surrey is responsible for developing and implementing this initiative. At this point, no additional staff have been required to implement this initiative.

Impetus:

Surrey participated in the provincial government's Development Incentive Grant Program whereby municipalities like Surrey with low vacancy rates received grants to facilitate the development of new rental housing. (The Development Incentive Grant Program ended on March 31, 1990).

Goals:

The main goal of the policy is to provide developers with an incentive to produce multiple unit rental accommodation, including all social housing, in Surrey. This is to be accomplished by bringing rental and social housing on stream faster and

possibly at less cost than would be the casethrough the regular approval process.

Years of Operation:

Council passed the policy to fast track on October 23, 1989. The procedures to be used for priority processing were approved March 5, 1990.

Cost:

No additional costs have been incurred to implement the initiative.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

None.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

Concerns are frequently expressed by developers about the restriction to rental for an indefinite period of time. They would prefer that the restriction be limited to a specific period, for example, 10 years.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

The City received applications for rezonings for a total of 454 units under this program.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The City of Vancouver has a similar policy for social and affordable housing. Toronto offers evening plan checking and development approvals designed to facilitate residential renovation and other development applications.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
None identified.

People Served:
Not applicable.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Find a process that works for your municipality. It is important to have the commitment of all the departments involved, including planning and engineering.

Contact Person:
How Yin Leung, Manager,
Long Range Planning Division,
Planning and Development Services
Department,
District of Surrey,
14245-56th Avenue,
Surrey, B.C. V3X 3A2
Tel: (604) 591-4308
Fax: (604) 591-2507

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#33 - PARTNERSHIPS

EDMONTON JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE ON HOUSING CITY OF EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Category:
Partnerships

Description:

The Edmonton Joint Planning Committee on Housing (EJPCOH) was formed in 1990. The Mayor of Edmonton and the Minister of Alberta Municipal Affairs agreed to work together to prepare a short and long-term action plan to address the housing and related needs of low-income and special needs households in Edmonton.

In 1991, the Committee recommended a short-term plan which included funding for seven housing project proposals consisting of 100 rooms/units and non-housing support services for a range of high need client groups in the inner-city.

The Committee convened a strategic planning session to develop a long-term plan. A working committee concluded that instead of a single long-term plan, there was a need to establish an on-going inter-jurisdictional process of housing and support services planning to identify priority needs and to allocate resources to meet these needs in a concerted and co-ordinated manner. As a result, a strategic process for the overall operation of the Committee was developed, consisting of a Mission Statement to prepare an annual three-year plan, and a set of Goals and Objectives. On this basis the working committee prepared the EJPCOH's first long-term plan, "The Three-Year Plan for Housing in Edmonton's Inner-City 1992-1994".

All parties agreed to broad principles for joint action, including the need for diverse, durable and long-term solutions; the removal of obstacles that impede the efficient provision of housing; and continuing all-sector partnerships to assemble the required resources and to resolve conflicts arising

from differing values on housing ends/means relationships. Outputs of the long-term planning process include:

- a) Addressing housing needs using the traditional Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program, supplemented by Provincial non-housing subsidies, and recommending which projects should receive allocations; and
- b) Developing "Housing Initiatives" to address housing needs outside the Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program. Of the 44 specific housing initiatives in the 1992-94 Plan, 9 were recommended as high priority. These included developing methods to enable landlords to upgrade substandard rooming house accommodation, and providing increased support to community-based agencies to provide outreach support for persons at risk of homelessness.

Responsible Agency:

Ten agencies are represented on the EJPCOH:

- Alberta Family and Social Services;
- Alberta Health (Mental Health Division and Home Care/Community Long-Term Care);
- Alberta Municipal Affairs (Housing Programs Division);
- Alberta Solicitor General;
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation;
- City of Edmonton (Office of the Commissioner of Housing);
- Edmonton Coalition on Homelessness (which represents approximately 30 community-based housing agencies);
- the Edmonton Housing Authority;

- the Greater Edmonton Foundation; and
- the City of Edmonton Non-Profit Housing Corporation.

Impetus:

In May 1990, a committee of representatives of Provincial, City and community agencies completed the "Edmonton Inner-City Housing Need and Demand Study," a comprehensive assessment of the housing and support service needs of low-income and special needs households in the City, with a focus on 43 inner-city neighbourhoods. Major findings included:

- 38,000 (1 in 5) households in the City pay 30% or more of their incomes on housing while earning incomes of \$30,000 or less.
- 21,000 of these households are tenants who earn \$10,000 per year or less, and 14,000 live in the inner-city neighbourhoods.
- 2,200 households live in inner-city accommodation that is either overcrowded or is in poor physical condition.
- 800 persons in the inner-city are in immediate need of more appropriate and affordable housing and support services. These people include low-income single men and women (many with mental health histories) victims of family violence with and without children, homeless youth, immigrants and persons with physical and mental disabilities.

Goals:

The Mission of the EJPCOH is "to create an on-going three-year plan for the provision and maintenance of adequate and affordable housing in Edmonton, focusing on the needs of the inner-city." Six goals have been approved as follows:

1. Develop initiatives to meet the identified needs of the "Edmonton Inner-City Housing

Need and Demand Study," with emphasis on permanent, secure housing.

2. Co-ordinate and integrate related intergovernmental, interdepartmental and non-profit organizations, policies, programs and budget processes.
3. Ensure input and involvement of the community and private sector in the development and implementation of plans and initiatives.
4. Encourage stabilization of the homeless.
5. Prevent at risk groups from becoming homeless.
6. Evaluate and adjust the Three-Year Plan.

Years of Operation:

The 1992-94 Plan was recommended for approval by the EJPCOH in November, 1991, endorsed by the Minister of Alberta Municipal Affairs in December, 1991 and supported by Edmonton City Council in February, 1992.

Cost:

The EJPCOH has no separate budget. Implementation of the Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives is funded from the operating budgets of the participating agencies.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

In December 1992, 12 of the 22 members of the EJPCOH were senior representatives of four Alberta Government Departments. One member is the Provincial Director/Branch Manager of CMHC. The Committee is currently chaired by the Assistant Deputy Minister, Housing Programs Division, Alberta Municipal Affairs.

EJPCOH has recommended Federal/Provincial funding for 387 units/rooms under the Non-Profit Housing Program. A total of \$10.8 million in capital funding and \$3.5 million in annual operating subsidies involving 242 units/rooms have been approved by the Federal and Alberta Governments since May 1992.

Other Partners:

See list of agencies participating on the EJPCOH.

Problems Encountered:

Completing work on 9 priority Housing Initiatives included in the 1992-94 Plan by the end of 1992-93 proved overly ambitious. Other problems encountered include difficulties in holding land from design stage to construction start, unclear client group definitions and project terms of reference, inappropriate community consultation, difficulties in securing non-profit subsidy funding commitments and high land and project costs.

Notwithstanding these problems, the EJPCOH has enabled many issues to be recognized more quickly and solutions developed more appropriately than if the parties were acting independently of each other.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

242 units/rooms were approved in 1991/92 and 1992/93.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Calgary, Alberta (Calgary Housing Committee), and Regina and Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan.

The City of Saskatoon established a Social Housing Advisory Committee in 1989 following extensive consultation with several government agencies and other external organizations. The terms of reference for the Committee are to:

- Monitor and advise the City on the distribution and availability of existing social housing in Saskatoon.
- Provide advice to the City on the present and future needs in Saskatoon for social housing units and on the ways and means by which the City can facilitate the meeting of these needs.
- Make recommendations on issues and initiatives that the City should be taking to improve the distribution and availability of affordable

housing for residents of Saskatoon.

- Facilitate the co-ordination and co-operation of various agencies and organizations in Saskatoon who are interested in improving the provision of social housing.

Representatives on the Committee include:

- the Saskatoon Housing Authority,
- Saskatchewan Housing Corporation,
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation,
- Saskatchewan Department of Social Services,
- Saskatoon Home Builders Association,
- City of Saskatoon Planning Department,
- Saskatoon Community Health Unit,
- Saskatchewan Interagency Committee for the Homeless, and
- selected non-profit agencies on a rotational basis.

In addition, one member of City Council, a member of a local native housing agency, and the president of one of the community/neighbourhoods where major housing problems have been identified participate on the Committee.

Some of the more recent activities of the Social Housing Advisory Committee include:

- looking at new initiatives at the municipal level that would support social housing;
- developing a relationship with Habitat for Humanity; and
- looking at ways to improve substandard housing in the community by making the inspection process more effective.

In 1993, the Committee plans to produce a newsletter to promote communication with community groups.

Formal Evaluation:

It was decided that it would be difficult to evaluate a three-year plan at the end of its first year of implementation. An evaluation will be undertaken in 1993.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Where tenants have been placed, the response has been very positive.

People Served:

Over 90% of the 242 units/rooms approved to date have been targeted for the 6 "very high priority housing need neighbourhoods." All of these units have been targeted to the highest priority client groups in proportion to the incidence of need of these groups in the inner-city, as identified in the Inner-City Housing Need and Demand Study. These include low-income singles and childless couples and families, (some with members who have mental and physical disabilities), singles with chronic psychiatric disorders, abused women, inner-city seniors in need of supportive housing and youth in need of emergency and transitional housing.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Willingness to work in partnership with other agencies and different interests, values, problem definitions and methods to respond to defined problems. Political commitment to the benefits to all parties of joint, versus traditional, housing project and initiatives planning, and budget allocation.

Contact Person:

Daryl Kreuzer, Senior Housing Officer,
Office of the Commissioner of Housing,
City of Edmonton,
#1001, Centennial Building,
10015-103 Avenue,
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H1
Tel: (403) 496-6027
Fax: (403) 496-6011

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#34 - PARTNERSHIPS

HOUSING OPPORTUNITY CENTRE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Education

Homeownership

Description:

The Housing Opportunity Centre (HOC) was established by the Region of Peel in 1990 as a vehicle to implement a number of activities that support the provision of affordable housing in Peel.

All the initiatives undertaken by the HOC are carried out in partnership with other groups, including members of the community and other levels of government as appropriate. These initiatives are described below:

Property Values Case Study: An Analysis of the Effect of Non-Profit Housing on Neighbouring Residential Property Values (June, 1992)

A Steering Committee was established to study the effect of non-profit housing on neighbouring property values in Peel Region. A communications strategy was developed and is currently being implemented to distribute the results of the study throughout the Region, as appropriate.

Affordable Housing Education Package/Communication Strategy

An Affordable Housing Education Committee was established to create an education package to increase community awareness and understanding of affordable housing. "Affordable housing" refers to either rental or ownership housing funded and built by the private sector, or funded through a government program. Six focus groups were held with local ratepayers and one focus group was held with Peel residents seeking affordable housing. Information from the focus groups was used as the basis for the education package.

A three-piece package was completed in December, 1992, consisting of a 16-minute video, a 1-minute trade show vignette and a poster. A Communication Sub-Committee is developing and implementing a comprehensive distribution strategy to ensure that the information is accessible to Peel residents and others. This will include direct contact with many organizations such as local school boards, libraries, ratepayers' associations, developers and builders, business associations, community-based groups and the media.

Affordable Homeownership Demonstration Project

The HOC is responsible for issuing a proposal call to seek out innovative ideas for an affordable ownership development to be built on a specific parcel of land in Peel Region. The intent is to enter into a partnership with appropriate organizations to design, build and sell an affordable product to moderate income households in the Region. It is anticipated that a variety of barriers to affordable ownership housing will be addressed during the course of this project.

House Forms and Densities Study (Greater Toronto Area)

The HOC was requested by the Ministries of Municipal Affairs and Housing to co-ordinate a Steering Committee to conduct a Greater Toronto Area (GTA)-based study related to the Province's Land Use Planning for Housing Policy Statement. The goal is to provide examples of built form and densities using private market house prices and rents referred to in the Housing Policy Statement. A presentation package is to be prepared based on

the results of the study for distribution throughout the GTA.

The Steering Committee hired a consulting consortium in January, 1993 and expects to receive the presentation package in mid-1993.

Revolving Loan or Grant Fund

The HOC administers a \$200,000 revolving loan/grant fund to provide short-term, low-interest loans and grants in support of innovative affordable housing initiatives in Peel. This funding is available to not-for-profit developers attempting to provide affordable housing outside existing Ministry of Housing programs.

Responsible Agency:

The Regional Municipality of Peel Housing Department.

Impetus:

In August, 1990 the Region of Peel and the Ministry of Housing signed a Joint Housing Action Agenda. This agreement represents a joint commitment to encourage the provision of affordable housing in Peel. It is complementary to other activities underway in the Region to implement the Province of Ontario's Land Use Planning for Housing Policy Statement.

The HOC was established by the Region of Peel to implement a number of activities agreed to in the Joint Housing Action Agenda.

Goals:

To facilitate, support and promote affordable housing initiatives in Peel Region;

To develop a strong community-based approach toward the provision of affordable housing;

To encourage and support a cooperative environment which will foster partnerships between the non-profit and private sector housing developers and community groups to provide affordable housing; and

To work with relevant groups towards the implementation of the Land Use Planning for Housing Policy Statement.

Years of Operation:

The HOC began operation on January 2, 1991.

Cost:

The HOC operating budget is \$80,000 per annum. Additional project budgets are as follows:

- Property Values Case Study - \$25,000;
- Affordable Housing Education Package - \$40,000;
- House Forms/Densities Study (GTA) - \$50,000;
- Revolving Loan/Grant Fund - \$200,000 (approx.)

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The operation of the HOC is cost-shared by the Ontario Ministry of Housing through the Partners in Housing Program and the Region of Peel on a 50/50 basis. Specific projects being undertaken through the HOC are funded solely through the Provincial Partners in Housing Program.

The HOC Affordable Housing Education Committee received a \$1,000 case study award in 1992 through the Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) Program funded by CMHC in recognition of its comprehensive public consultation process.

Other Partners:

A major focus of the HOC's activities is the creation of partnerships to complete the projects within its mandate. A Steering Committee is created and co-ordinated for each project. Representatives on these committees vary, depending on the nature of the work. In each case, committee membership is as broadly-based as possible.

Examples of organizations which have participated, or are participating are:

- Local/Regional Planning Departments;
- Office of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA);
- Toronto (includes Caledon), Mississauga and Brampton Real Estate Boards;
- Ontario Real Estate Association;

- Urban Development Institute;
 - Ontario Home Builders' Association;
 - Greater Toronto Home Builders' Association;
 - Access to Permanent Housing Committee;
 - Peel Social Planning Council;
 - local municipal politicians;
 - local ratepayers' associations; and
 - staff from the Ministries of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- provincial and local levels of government;
 - activities should address concerns of local residents;
 - willingness of various organizations to enter into partnerships with the HOC to undertake projects; and
 - effective communication strategies for products developed.

Problems Encountered:

None to date.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

None yet.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None noted.

Contact Persons:

Ivy France, Housing Facilitator,
Peel Housing Opportunity Centre,
Regional Municipality of Peel
Housing Department,
199 County Court Boulevard,
Brampton, Ontario L6W 4P3
Tel: (416) 791-7800 loc. 2660 Fax:
(416) 796-0972

Formal Evaluation:

The operation of the HOC is evaluated through Tri-Annual Work Objectives provided to Regional Council and regular reporting to the Ministry of Housing. Evaluations of specific projects will be undertaken through the Steering Committee structures. To date, no evaluations have been completed.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Tenants have been involved in the work of the HOC directly as volunteer participants in a focus group related to affordable housing issues and concerns, and in a video. They were indirectly involved when they were represented by community-based organizations who were members of the Affordable Housing Education Committee. The general reaction has been positive.

The ratepayers who were involved in the Affordable Housing Education Committee have reacted positively both to the process and the final product that was created by the Education Committee.

People Served:

No information yet.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

- activities being undertaken must focus on priorities of

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#35 - PARTNERSHIPS

HEALTHY CITIES PROJECT CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Homelessness/Community and Economic Development

Description:

The Healthy Cities Project in the City of Toronto includes an office of 6 people. They work with other municipal departments on a number of issues within the City's jurisdiction.

The Project Office mandate is to work strategically; not to duplicate the work of others, but to help facilitate a process that brings all the key players together. They also work with people in the community to give them better access to the decision makers.

Housing is one of the areas being addressed by the Healthy Cities Project. The office facilitated a meeting of groups with an interest in housing, including developers, planners, non-profit housing groups and co-ops, and homeless people. This group suggested that they look at the issue of homelessness, and what the City could do about it. They prepared a report, entitled "Homeless not Helpless" which outlined the priorities of people who are homeless. In preparing the report, the Healthy Cities Project funded discussion groups in drop-in centres to find out what homeless people wanted.

The Healthy Cities Project is now following up on some of the recommendations in the report, which focused on the issue of community and economic development. They are involved in three housing initiatives:

- a) Participating on a committee of residents who live in Street City (a non-profit housing project for street people) to help them obtain services and assistance from the City.

- b) Participating on a resource committee with a number of potential residents, Provincial and municipal staff to help plan a second Street City housing project. One of the issues is the need for space for community economic development projects to provide work opportunities for people who live in the housing and other homeless people.
- c) Involved in the development of the City's Official Plan to ensure that there is consultation with neighbourhoods and that new housing includes social and recreational space.

Responsible Agency:

The Healthy Cities Project reports to a committee of all the Department Heads in the City of Toronto.

Impetus:

The City of Toronto participated in an international conference in 1986 on Healthy Cities. In 1989 City Council adopted a report that included recommendations for making the city more livable in the year 2000. The recommendations addressed a number of issues including social justice, poverty, housing and medical health.

Goals:

To encourage cities and other levels of government to collaborate to keep cities livable, and to change the way that governments work with community groups and individuals.

The Healthy Cities Project in the City of Toronto has three main focuses:

- Environmental sustainability;
- Social equity; and
- Community empowerment.

Years of Operation:
The office opened in 1990.

Cost:
The operating budget for the Healthy Cities Project is \$450,000 per year.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:
All municipal departments and community groups. The Street City project involves the Provincial Government, three municipal departments, including Planning, Health and Housing, community agencies that work with homeless people, and homeless people.

Problems Encountered:
It is difficult to meet all the demands for service within the budget.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Not applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
There are over 1,000 Healthy Cities/Communities Projects operating across the country and around the world. Many of them address housing issues.

The Healthy Communities Project in the Capital Region (Victoria, B.C.) has a Housing Task Force committed to supporting strategies and actions that maintain and increase the supply of secure, affordable, accessible and appropriate housing throughout the Capital Regional District. The Task Force completed the following projects in 1992: submission to the Provincial Government to fund a Regional Housing Registry; preparation of information brochures on non-profit housing for seniors, families and disabled persons in the Capital Region; and completion of an Accessible Housing Study.

Formal Evaluation:
There is no formal evaluation. An interim report is scheduled for the summer, 1993.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
The project has received positive feedback from the groups they work with, and the office is being asked to participate in more activities.

People Served:
People in the City of Toronto.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Receptive municipal government, a bureaucracy that is willing to change the way they operate, and a close working relationship with community groups.

Contact Persons:
Meg Shields,
Community Health Officer,
Healthy Cities Project,
20 Dundas Street West, #1036,
Toronto, Ontario M5G 2C2
Tel: (416) 392-0523
Fax: (416) 392-0089

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#36 - PARTNERSHIPS

SAINT JOHN NON-PROFIT HOUSING INC. CITY OF SAINT JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK

Sub-Category: Financing

Description:

The Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc. developed 24 housing units on land owned by the Provincial Government. The units were developed outside the non-profit housing program. A number of partners worked together to make the project financially feasible. The Province provided the land, which was unserviced, free of charge. (The cost of extending the municipal services to the site was close to the value of the land. These costs are included in the development costs and were partially funded by a Provincial Grant of \$40,000). The Province also provided funding through the Provincial Rent Supplement Program for 18 units. Because the rents were guaranteed for 35 years, this helped the Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc. obtain financing.

The municipality provided a grant of \$104,000 through its Housing through Infill Development (HID) Program. The purpose of this program is to encourage housing in older parts of Saint John. The grant is equal to 15% of the increase in property tax assessment resulting from the project. The municipality played a key role in co-ordinating the project.

The Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc. contributed \$200,000 of its own equity, and the Rotary Club of Saint John contributed \$100,000.

Long-term debenture funding is to be arranged through the Municipal Borrowing Board.

Responsible Agency:

The Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc. The Provincial Government through the Department of Municipalities, Culture and Housing provides funding for the Rent Supplement units.

Impetus:

A local development company, who was

also a distributor for a manufactured housing company, was interested in undertaking a project in the City. The Province promotes joint ventures as an alternative to traditional methods of providing non-profit housing and also had owned a site in the City's North End for nearly 20 years. Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc. had a positive track record and also had access to their own financial resources. Current non-profit housing allocations were insufficient to permit the project to proceed under that program.

Goals:

To develop 24 affordable housing units.

Years of Operation:

The project was fully rented in March 1993. Once the construction phase of the project began, development proceeded very quickly because the project was built through modular construction. Construction agreements were signed in September 1992, and households began moving into the units just before Christmas.

Cost:

The total cost of the project was \$1.1 million including the City's Housing through Infill Development grant of \$104,000. The Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc. contributed equity in the amount of about \$200,000. Debenture financing will be arranged for \$750,000

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Province donated the land and provided funding for 18 rent supplement units up to an average market rent of \$460. The Province also provided a grant of \$40,000 to reduce the costs of servicing the site.

Other Partners:

The Rotary Club of Saint John contributed \$100,000.

Problems Encountered:

This was the non-profit's first experience building a project through modular construction. This building technique offers less flexibility in design as there are certain limits in height and depth. It is also more difficult to make last minute changes. The knowledge and experience gathered would decrease these problems with future projects. There were opportunities to improve upon the original design as the non-profit was able to benefit from the bulk buying power of the company building the modular units.

Lenders required CMHC mortgage insurance or a guarantee from the City of Saint John even though a substantial amount of equity was provided. Only one lender responded from the fourteen who were requested to submit proposals to provide first mortgage financing.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

24 units for families, seniors and non-elderly seniors. The Province hopes to interest the private sector in developing another 32 units for seniors on the site.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Similar funding partnership arrangements using rent supplement assistance instead of the non-profit housing program have been undertaken in Fredericton, Moncton and the Village of Atholville. In Fredericton, the private sector will provide 72 seniors units. The city wrote down the cost of land and the Province will fund 30 units through the Federal/Provincial Rent Supplement program. In Moncton the private sector will produce 60 seniors units, 20 of which will receive Federal/Provincial Rent Supplement Assistance. In Atholville, a private developer built a 37 unit seniors complex. Twenty of the units will receive Provincial Rent Supplement Assistance. The Village donated the

land, reduced municipal taxes, and is subsidizing the costs of water, sewer and snow removal services.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

All the units are occupied.

People Served:

Households renting the 18 Rent Supplement units are in core need and pay 30% of their income to rent. The other 6 families pay market rents.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Need for all the players to work together as partners. The nonprofit housing corporation must make the funding work when developing through this type of partnership and financing arrangement. No extra subsidy is available from the other levels of government.

Contact Persons:

Bill Todd, General Manager,
Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc.
and Director, Housing and Property
Management,
City of Saint John,
P.O. Box 1971,
Saint John, New Brunswick
E2L 4L1
Tel: (506) 658-2856
Fax: (506) 658-2837

Walter Waite,
Director of Non-Profit Housing,
Department of Municipalities,
Culture and Housing,
P.O. Box 6000,
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1
Tel: (506) 453-7450
Fax: (506) 457-4991

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#37 - PARTNERSHIPS

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION CANADA AND HOUSING VILLAGE OF BATH, NEW BRUNSWICK

Sub-Category:

Financing/Employment

Description:

The Lions Club in the Village of Bath, the Bath Non-Profit Housing Corporation, the Village of Bath (population of 900) and the Province worked together to develop 10 units for low income seniors households.

The group also obtained funding from Employment and Immigration Canada (EIC) through the Canada Works Program established under s.25 of the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission Act. This program makes funding available to train people in receipt of U.I. benefits. Participants in the training program receive a salary instead of U.I. benefits. This salary is paid by EIC. Unemployment Insurance benefits will resume when the training program has been completed.

By combining these funding sources, the non-profit housing corporation was able to reduce its mortgage requirements from \$690,835 to \$445,000.

Responsible Agency:

Bath Non-Profit Housing Inc.

Impetus:

There was a long waiting list for seniors' housing, and a shortage of unit allocations under the non-profit housing program. The Lions Club approached the Province to try to find a way to produce affordable housing in the area.

Goals:

To provide housing in an area not served by the non-profit housing program, and to provide employment.

Years of Operation:

Seniors moved into the project early in 1992.

Cost:

The total cost of this project was \$690,835. However, by combining the funding sources, the final mortgage was \$445,000.

The municipality provided \$30,000 cash and donated the land valued at \$35,000.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Province provided \$50,000 through the Regional Development Corporation which provides funding to stimulate development in various regions of the Province. The Province also provided funding through the Provincial Rent Supplement Program.

Employment and Immigration Canada provided \$5,000 for materials, and \$128,400 to pay for labour.

Other Partners:

The Lions Club took the initiative to get this project developed. They managed the process and co-ordinated all the funding. They also provided furnishings for the building.

Problems Encountered:

Productivity was low because of the lack of skilled labour. It took time to train the people in receipt of U.I. benefits. There was some criticism about taking work away from skilled contractors. But the project would not have proceeded at all without the EIC component.

It required a great deal of work to manage the process and keep within the budget.

The group was required to pay for mortgage insurance and add the premium to the loan amount. It was felt that the Federal Government should have waived the mortgage insurance premium.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
10 units.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Similar initiatives are operating in **Lamaque**, where 10 units were developed with funding from CEIC and the Provincial Rent Supplement Program. In **Lac Baker** 10 units were developed with funding from EIC and a combination of funding for 6 units under the F/P non-profit housing program and 4 units under the Provincial Rent Supplement Program. Other communities are interested in following the same approach to develop affordable housing.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
Reaction from the community was very positive.

People Served:
10 seniors in core need.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
It is necessary to have a non-profit housing group that is committed, knows the people in the community, and is willing to co-ordinate all the components and players involved.

Careful attention must be paid to keeping within the budget.

There is a need for funding through the Employment and Immigration Canada.

Contact Persons:
Mike Blanchard,
President, Bath Non-Profit Housing Corp.,
P.O. Box 70,
Bath, New Brunswick
E0J 1E0
Tel: (506) 278-5213

Walter Waite,
Director of Non-Profit Housing,
Department of Municipalities,
Culture and Housing,
P.O. Box 6000,
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1
Tel: (506) 453-7450
Fax: (506) 457-4991

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#38 - PARTNERSHIPS

INMATES BUILD GARDEN SUITES TOWN OF CHATHAM, N.B.

Sub-Category:

Financing/Training/Employment/Community Development

Description:

The Town of Chatham, Chatham Non-Profit Housing Inc., Province of New Brunswick and Corrections Services Canada are working together to provide garden suites for low income seniors in need of light support.

Garden suites are being built by inmates in a nearby federal maximum security penitentiary in Renous.

The initiative employs 10 inmates participating in the penitentiary's woodworking program.

The Provincial Government delivers all required materials. They inspect the home regularly to ensure that it is being built according to government standards.

The Chatham Non-Profit Housing Inc. purchases the materials through a chattel mortgage. They will acquire the unit under the Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program.

The Town of Chatham changed their zoning by-laws to permit garden suites in their municipality. Their support enabled this initiative to proceed.

Responsible Agency:

Chatham Non-Profit Housing Inc. (the municipal non-profit housing corporation) will own and manage the garden suite. Corrections Canada and the New Brunswick Community College are responsible for the training program and for producing the units.

Impetus:

The penitentiary identified a need for creating employment opportunities for the inmates. They approached the provincial government, and the municipal

governments and municipal non-profit housing corporations in Chatham and Newcastle.

There was a need for seniors' housing in Chatham, and insufficient funding to build a non-profit housing project.

This initiative enabled a garden suite to be produced within the maximum unit price (MUP) of \$49,500 for Chatham. If the unit had been built by a modular home company, the cost would have been above MUP.

Goals:

The goals were to:

- give inmates practical experience and training in building a home so that when they leave the penitentiary they will have a trade;
- improve the image of inmates in the community; and
- provide affordable housing for seniors.

Years of Operation:

The first unit was installed in Chatham in March 1993.

Cost:

The budget for the garden suite is \$49,000, which will be funded through the F/P Non-Profit Housing Program.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Province and CMHC through the Federal-Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program.

Other Partners:

The New Brunswick Community College provides the woodworking program for the penitentiary. Corrections Canada supplies the labour.

Problems Encountered:

A new door at the vocational department had to be constructed so that the home can be removed when it is completed.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

To date, one unit has been produced for the Town of Chatham.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The Town of Newcastle, which is also near the federal penitentiary in Renous, changed its zoning by-laws to permit garden suites. They will receive the second unit being produced by the inmates.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Reaction by the community and in the media has been very positive. There was some concern that the modular home industry would object to this method of producing garden suites. This did not happen. It was understood that the intent is not to mass produce homes, but to provide inmates with an opportunity to increase their chances of successfully reintegrating into society, while spending their time inside in a constructive way.

The inmates are happy to have the opportunity to get practical experience, and learn first hand how to build a home. It helps build self-esteem to do practical work, and to provide housing for elderly people in the nearby communities.

People Served:

Seniors in core need and in need of a wheelchair accessible unit.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Federal penitentiary nearby, agency willing to work with the inmates and teach them how to build garden suites, and a willing community.

Contact Persons:

Marie Anne Hachey,
Manager, Chatham Non-Profit Housing Inc.,
P.O. Box 309, Chatham,
New Brunswick E1N 3A7
Tel: (506) 778-9562

Fax: (506) 773-6040

Walter Waite, Director of Non-Profit Housing,
Department of Municipalities,
Culture and Housing,
P.O. Box 6000, Fredericton, New Brunswick E3B 5H1
Tel: (506) 453-7450
Fax: (506) 457-4991

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#39 - PARTNERSHIPS

JOINT VENTURES IN HOUSING CITY OF OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:
Financing

Description:

The Joint Ventures initiative involves establishing a partnership between the City and an external participant(s) usually in the form of a legally binding agreement associated with a real estate development project. Joint ventures refer to direct proactive City involvement in negotiating agreements, financial packaging, equity contributions, property management and ownership. Both the City and the external participant(s) share in the risks and benefits of a real estate project.

The resources and leverages that can be "packaged" into a joint venture will vary from project to project. The package may consist of land, innovative financing, existing government programs, municipal servicing, construction and project management, or planning incentives and approvals. Opportunities and constraints of joint ventures consist of prevailing market conditions and financial constraints, site and location restrictions, planning regulations and specific goals of the City/external participants.

The joint venture program and related affordable housing objectives were part of the Province/City Housing Agreement approved by City Council on May 20, 1988 which required an equal cost-sharing in equity contributions to projects subject to appropriate approvals. The City and the Ministry of Housing made financial contributions to joint ventures with the private sector and/or non-profit and co-operative housing groups for affordable housing. Specific

expenditures were determined on a project-by-project basis.

The Provincial/City Housing Agreement ended in 1991, and since then, the initiative has been funded solely by the City.

Responsible Agency:
City of Ottawa, Department of Housing.

Impetus:

In 1988, City Council authorized the Department of Housing and Property to negotiate joint ventures with the private sector to provide affordable housing through innovative financial mechanisms. Joint ventures can be suitable for complex projects that require public involvement and resources to lever or to attract private investment and that target a particular need or policy objective. The fundamental principle underlying a joint venture is that a public or policy goal related to increasing the affordable housing supply would not be achieved in a specific project without a public-private partnership of resources and expertise or would be obtained, but at higher costs. A joint venture can provide the mechanism for bridging the gap between economic and market rents. From the developer's perspective, a joint venture may reduce risks or increase development opportunities.

Goals:

The general goal is to provide more affordable housing to the residents of Ottawa. Specific goals include:

- expanding opportunities and choice of housing to address needs or "gaps" not met by

- either the private market or social housing programs;
- achieving other worthwhile public goals such as community revitalization and mixed use developments in selected locations;
- creating potential revenue to invest in other housing initiatives;
- promoting positive public-private partnerships and relations;
- developing alternative viable approaches to the delivery of affordable housing; and
- providing a mechanism for achieving the 25% affordability target in the Province-City Housing Agreement with respect to the moderate cost market housing.

Years of Operation:
May 1988 to present.

Cost:
The City of Ottawa contributed \$2.0 million in 1988, \$1.0 million in 1989, 1990 and 1991, and \$1.85 million in 1992 to a joint venture capital account.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
As noted above, the joint ventures are written into the Province-City Housing Agreement. The Province contributed \$1.0 million in 1988/89 and \$2.0 million in 1989/90 to joint venture initiatives. The Province matched City contributions subject to certain approvals and appropriations.

Other Partners:
The private sector.

Problems Encountered:
Joint ventures can be complex and time consuming. Each project has unique opportunities and problems. It is important that commitment and momentum are maintained. Goals and principles need to be clearly articulated at the beginning of a joint venture, particularly as they relate to public and private sector interests.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Two projects have been completed to

date: 312 Cumberland with 82 units, and Thorncliffe Village with 347 units.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver.

Formal Evaluation:
The City has not evaluated the joint venture concept. A tenant satisfaction survey was conducted at the City's first joint venture project.

CHRA evaluated joint ventures in its report A Review of Joint Ventures, Public/Private Housing Partnerships in Action, produced in August, 1991. (See literature review).

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
The tenant satisfaction survey found that the arrangement whereby City Living selected and leased units to tenants, and the private sector partner provided property management services was somewhat confusing to tenants who tended to contact City Living for all tenancy related issues. Concerns were raised by tenants about the level of service being provided by the private sector partner. These were brought to City Living's attention. City Living then became involved in negotiations with the private sector partner on behalf of the tenants, which was very time consuming.

Although there was no problem in renting the market units at the original rent, there has been a very high turnover rate. An exit survey should provide some insight into this problem.

People Served:
312 Cumberland includes 42 market rent units and 42 social housing units. Thorncliffe includes 347 units, 113 affordably priced for private ownership and 234 social housing units. All the social housing units are 100% RGI.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Joint venture agreements vary considerably and require a good deal of time to negotiate. The municipality must be willing to

devote staff time and resources to this process. Land contribution is generally required as well.

Contact Person:
Director, Housing Program Delivery,
Department of Housing:
City Living,
City of Ottawa,
11 Holland Avenue, 4th floor,
Ottawa, Ontario K1Y 4T2
Tel: (613) 564-8445
Fax: (613) 564-8558

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#40 - PARTNERSHIPS

COMMUNITY/MUNICIPAL PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUPPORTIVE HOUSING CITY OF OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Category: Partnerships

Description:

City Living is the City of Ottawa's non-profit housing corporation. It is responsible for all areas of management in City Living housing developments. Through the Housing Program Delivery Branch of the Department of Housing and City Living, arrangements are made to collaborate with non-profit organizations providing support services to clients. These arrangements permit use of City Living's development, management, and maintenance expertise in providing the "bricks and mortar" element of housing, while appropriate agencies supply support services needed by tenants.

The program covers a range of options for support service agencies:

- At one end of the spectrum, an agency may pay market rent for one unit in a regular City Living project and use it to house its clients. The lease in this situation is close to a standard residential lease in the name of the agency.
- A middle option involves an agency in the block-lease of a small project or the lease of a series of scattered units. The agency is responsible for all tenant-related property management, including Rent Geared to Income (RGI) rent calculation (with assistance from City Living where necessary).
- At the other end, an agency may lease a project developed

by City Living with significant design input from the agency and take responsibility for day-to-day maintenance as well as tenant-related management.

A pilot project modifying the agency lease model to move towards direct tenant leasing for tenants in need of support services was implemented in October 1992. In these cases, the tenants have separate agreements with City Living and Canadian Mental Health Association/Regional Case Management Services for housing and support services.

Where an agency leases a whole project or a significant portion of a project, the budget is split to reflect the distribution of responsibilities between City Living and the support service agency. City Living is responsible for all links with the Ministry of Housing and for negotiation of a budget.

The support service agency is *responsible for obtaining its own funding for the support service element of its operation, although the Housing Program Delivery Branch can assist in negotiations with appropriate Ministries, especially where a project is under development and may benefit from inter-ministerial cooperation.

To date, the fullest development of the program has been in connection with an International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (IYSH) project that houses low income singles from the emergency shelters. This project, which opened in January 1989, required the creation of a new agency (Options Bytown) in

cooperation with a number of local groups serving the proposed tenant population.

The City of Ottawa Department of Housing also has one full-time permanent staff position to provide third sector assistance and to support community-based, non-profit housing organizations. This involves the following:

1. maintaining links between the City and community-based, non-profit housing groups as well as support service agencies with an active interest in housing for their special needs clients;
2. directing groups requiring development assistance to appropriate community resources and providing special assistance where needed;
3. long-term leasing of City land to non-profit housing groups; and
4. developing partnership arrangements between City Living and support service agencies.

This program emphasises providing assistance to special needs groups wishing to develop non-profit housing, while retaining a general advisory role in terms of directing groups to available community resources, and to continuing the administration of the land lease program.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Ottawa's non-profit housing corporation, City Living.

Impetus:

The current program is the extension of a long standing City Living practice of renting units in regular social housing projects to social service providers who wished to operate small group homes. New directions in provincial policy, including the extension of eligibility for RGI to singles with psychiatric disability (1986) and to all singles and childless couples (1988) and the improvement of interministerial cooperation after 1987, made development of a more comprehensive program appropriate.

Goals:

The program aims to provide assistance to support service agencies who may not wish to expend energy and time on the direct development of housing, and to those who wish to achieve full integration for their clients in regular social housing projects. As well, the program meets City Living's objectives by housing tenants with support who could not otherwise be housed appropriately in City Living's stock.

Years of Operation:

City Living has been renting units in regular projects to agencies since 1979. The program has been actively pursued since 1986 with the development of City Living's first designated special needs project. It is expected that the program will continue indefinitely.

Cost:

Individual project costs are met through senior government housing and social service programs. Staff costs for development of links with support service agencies and of partnership arrangements are met by the City of Ottawa through its 100% funding of the "Third Sector Liaison Officer" position.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The program has been implemented entirely in projects receiving housing program funding from the Province of Ontario or under federal or provincial cost-shared programs. Partner agencies generally use some charitable as well as senior government funding. One operated entirely on charitable funding for a period of over two years before receiving financial support from the provincial government.

Other Partners:

Non-profit organizations providing support services to clients.

Problems Encountered:

One project sponsored with a particular partner agency presented major management problems after the agency withdrew from the arrangement. Physical conversion to self-contained units proved necessary to resolve these problems. This situation arose at the inception of the extension of the

program beyond the use of regular units in regular projects. Policy now requires that project unit designs be acceptable to City Living management unless there are firm, long term guarantees of use by the agency or, if altered to meet agency needs, the agency agrees to incur the costs of restoring the premises to the original configuration if no other group can be found to take the unit "as is" within a predetermined period (1992).

The process of negotiation for operating budgets, where these are shared, is complex.

Some difficulty occurs in ensuring that front-line staff in both City Living and the partner agencies are aware of the different responsibilities which apply.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

There are a total of 212 units (313 bedrooms) leased to special needs organizations. 76 of these units are leased in scattered locations in City Living projects.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None identified.

Formal Evaluation:

An evaluation report on Options Bytown is being finalized.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Generally positive. Agency lease tenants have been successfully integrated into communities.

People Served:

Currently 16 different agencies providing services for a variety of special needs groups, including developmentally handicapped, multiply disabled, teen mothers, head injured, youth with behaviour disorders, alcohol and drug rehabilitation, low income singles, victims of family violence. All units are provided on an RGI basis, almost exclusively to occupants in receipt of social assistance.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Co-operation between the municipal non-profit housing corp. (or other non-profit housing providers) and

the service providers. Staff position to co-ordinate and provide leadership and assistance.

Contact Person:

Third Sector Liaison Officer,
City of Ottawa Dept. of Housing:
City Living,
11 Holland Avenue,
Ottawa, Ontario K1Y 4T2
Tel: (613) 564-8490
Fax: (613) 564-8558

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#41 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

IMMIGRANT INVESTOR PROGRAM CITY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA

Category:

Land and Financing for New Development

Description:

The Immigrant Investor Program is a component of the Federal Government's Business Immigration Program. This program allows persons to invest in Canada to help them to qualify for landed immigrant status. Investors must invest at least \$250,000 to be eligible. The program requires that investors' money be invested for five years.

In 1992, on a one time only basis, the program was directed to investment in housing initiatives. The Government of Alberta committed itself to participate in the program on the basis that rental housing would be created and that 20% of the units would be available to low income families and persons with disabilities.

Several land development companies approached the City of Calgary to determine if City-owned land could be used for the program. Council approved this arrangement subject to its final review of any business arrangements that were negotiated. The private company selected by the Province to develop a proposal, APEX Land Corporation, proposed to create rental projects on land leased from the Cities of Calgary and Edmonton on the basis of including a 30% social housing component. The City of Calgary established the following conditions:

- all development costs would be paid by the investor fund;
- projects would be operated by a private property management company, but persons on the waiting list of Calhome Properties Ltd. (CHPL), the City's non-profit housing corporation, would have access to the social housing units;

- rent revenue would cover all operating costs;
- the housing projects would pay a 3.5% interest cost to the investors;
- the City could acquire the project after five years for an amount equal to the investor's initial investment less an accumulated "profit". If the City acquires the projects, they would be operated as non-profit housing by CHPL. If the City does not exercise its option to purchase, the investors would be required to purchase the land at an agreed value.

APEX is responsible for marketing a \$35 million proposal to offshore investors with the intent of developing 400-500 rental units in Calgary and Edmonton. Projects will be developed on several small sites to allow for maximum flexibility. Some projects could be 100% social housing; others would have a smaller component of social housing. This allows for flexibility in housing forms, including town houses, coach houses and apartments.

Responsible Agency:

This is a collaborative effort between the City of Calgary and APEX Land Corporation.

Impetus:

Limited government funds are available to support the broad range of social housing initiatives that are required to meet demand.

This partnership holds the potential for new social housing to be developed in Alberta's two major cities with no direct government subsidy. Although the private

rental market has softened somewhat in the last year in Calgary, much of this housing is still not affordable to those in core housing need.

This program will make use of land in the City's inventory which has been difficult to market.

The program was seen as an instrument which could create local construction jobs, promote a "Buy Alberta" component and create new social housing without government subsidy.

Goals:

This initiative is intended to encourage the development of an increased number of rental units with a social housing component.

Years of Operation:

APEX was selected in Spring 1992. It is expected that the development offering will be marketed during 1993 so that project development could begin in late 1993.

Cost:

The cost of this initiative will be assumed by APEX through its co-ordination of a \$35 million real estate proposal to offshore investors.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The Immigrant Investor Program is a component of the Federal Government's Business Immigration Program. The Government of Alberta co-ordinated the selection process for the program.

Other Partners:

APEX Land Corporation.

Problems Encountered:

At this stage, the program is dependent on the efforts and success that APEX has in marketing its offering. Future stages of development will require the negotiation of a more detailed business arrangement with the City of Calgary and will be dependent on Council approval.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

It is expected that 400-500 units will be brought on to the market in Calgary and Edmonton in a variety of suburban and inner city locations.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The use of the Immigrant Investors Program for residential investment was made available on a one time basis only. This initiative is unique because of the land leasing and potential buy back arrangement with the City of Calgary and CHPL.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

There has been no community involvement at this stage. City Council supported the arrangement because of its potential to bring more social housing units into the Calgary market with no direct government subsidy.

People Served:

Rental market and social housing candidates.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The investment package must be successfully marketed to offshore investors and ongoing Council support for the business arrangement is required.

Contact Persons:

Jim Anderson, Manager,
Housing Division,
Land and Housing Department,
800 Macleod Trail S.E.,
P.O. Box 2100,
Postal Station M,
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5
Tel: (403) 268-1455
Fax: (403) 268-1948

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#42 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

ACQUISITION OF THE YORK HOTEL CITY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA

Sub-Category:
Homelessness

Description:

Calhome Properties Ltd. (CHPL), the City of Calgary's non-profit housing corporation, used Federal and Provincial housing funds to acquire a downtown hotel property for the purpose of converting it to permanent housing for low income single persons.

The York Hotel had been a prominent fixture in the eastern downtown section of the city since 1929. It included commercial uses such as a beer parlour with nude dancing, karioke bar, restaurant, smoke shop, barber and pawnbroker. In addition, the Hotel housed several long term tenants in rooms equipped with kitchen facilities. The area around the Hotel is considered by the Police Department to be the crime centre of Calgary.

CHPL funded the capital costs to purchase the commercial space outside the non-profit housing program with its own resources. Possible future uses for the commercial component include the development of a medical clinic or a restaurant which combines job re-training for former street persons.

Responsible Agency:

Calhome Property Ltd. and the Housing Division of the Land and Housing Department of the City of Calgary.

Impetus:

The idea of acquiring a downtown property for the purpose of conversion to a project for low income singles had been actively pursued by the staff for about one year. It was felt that a suitable property could be acquired and converted for residential use at a modest price. In 1992, Alberta Municipal Affairs had estimated that approximately 17,000 low income single persons in Calgary were in

core need for whom few social housing initiatives had been developed. The long waiting lists at social agencies further confirmed that this population group was having difficulty finding suitable alternatives in the private rental market.

The development of housing for low income persons was also consistent with the City's policy of encouraging more downtown housing and the need to support persons with special needs. It also responded to the concern of the Downtown Business Revitalization Zone group that some improvements were needed in this area of the City.

Goals:

The primary goal of the York Hotel project is to provide rental housing for low income single persons who wish to live downtown. The project is not a shelter or a drop-in. It has been developed on the basis of providing permanent housing for persons who are capable of living independently with or without support services.

In recognition that some residents may experience difficulty in living independently, CHPL's Tenant Assistance Officer (TAO), a professional social worker, is available for short term counselling and assistance. In addition, the TAO will work with resident floor monitors and the resident manager to ensure that the project is well managed and that persons with support needs are assisted.

Years of Operation:

The project began operating in December 1992, during which time renovations were undertaken and prospective tenants were interviewed. It is expected that the project will be fully occupied by June 1993.

residential space to contribute to the affordable rental housing stock in the community, either directly through construction of new affordable units, or indirectly, through payment of charges to be used to produce new low cost housing.

Years of Operation:

The by-law was enacted early in 1991.

Cost:

Building costs are expected to be \$100 per square foot buildable for new projects with 20% rent equity provided by employers in order to achieve monthly rentals of \$1.10 per square foot.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The by-law was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs prior to Council adoption.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

Originally, the by-law grouped commercial and industrial use together. Concern was expressed by those wishing to develop land for industrial use that the employee generation formula did not reflect the number of employees they would hire. Industrial uses would hire fewer employees than other commercial uses on a floor space basis. The municipality amended the formula so that industrial developments would be required to provide housing for 1 employee per 250 square metres developed, instead of 1 employee per 50 square metres required for commercial space.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

No new units have been produced yet. New development projects are on hold pending financing. However, before the by-law was enacted, a major resort development completed in 1990 provided units to house 600 employees, and another new Whistler development proposed to create units to house 180 employees.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

In developing the proposed by-law, staff reviewed the Resident

Generation Scale used in Aspen Colorado. Banff, Alberta is presently investigating a similar scheme.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Developers of land for industrial use had concerns which were addressed. (See problems encountered).

People Served:

Employees.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Work with the private sector (UDI) to assist developers in following through. Housing groups who will be able to develop and manage the housing units. There must be private development activity.

Contact Persons:

Caroline Hicks, Planner,
Municipality of Whistler,
P.O. Box 35,
Whistler, B.C. V0N 1B0
Tel: (604) 688-6018
Fax: (604) 932-6734

Craig MacKenzie, Executive Director,
Whistler Valley Housing Society,
P.O. Box 35,
Whistler, B.C. V0N 1B0
Tel: (604) 938-3270
Fax: (604) 932-3755

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#43 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

EMPLOYEE HOUSING SERVICE CHARGE RESORT MUNICIPALITY OF WHISTLER, B.C.

Sub-Category:

Housing and Economic Development

Description:

The Resort Municipality of Whistler has implemented an Employee Housing Service Charge By-law. This by-law requires all new development to contribute to the stock of affordable housing. It is hoped that larger developers will build new employee units and that smaller developers will either contribute to an affordable housing fund or participate in new projects developed by the Whistler Valley Housing Society.

The by-law applies an "employee generation formula" to establish employee bed unit requirements for each new development. It is based on the number of guest rooms in the case of commercial accommodation, and on gross floor area in the case of other commercial or industrial uses. The bed unit requirement can be met by developers in one of three ways:

- provision of new employee housing units subject to a control mechanism restricting use to employee housing;
- a one-time cash payment based on bed units required; and
- acquisition of rent equities (pre-paid rent equivalent to 20% of rent per unit) in proposed employee housing projects. In this case, the employer pays 20% of the costs of developing the unit and maintains some control over the units. For example, employers could ensure that the units are used by only their employees.

Specific details concerning how the funds generated by the second and third options will be used to build affordable housing, such as the financial structure, affordable rent levels, and provision of land, are not yet finalized. It is anticipated that the municipality, through Whistler Valley Housing Society (a non-profit housing society), or its own housing corporation, will be directly involved.

All new residential, commercial and industrial developments are subject to the by-law as are projects involving substantial replacement or renovation of existing buildings. Recreational uses and employee housing units are exempt from the by-law.

Responsible Agency:

Municipality of Whistler, Whistler Valley Housing Society and W. V. Housing Corporation, a municipally-owned housing corporation.

Impetus:

Recent expansion in hotel, condominium and commercial development in Whistler has placed tremendous pressure on the price of land. Private developers are not building affordable housing to accommodate short, mid or long-term employees. There is a severe shortage of affordable housing for employees.

Goals:

Council wishes to promote self-sufficiency in employee housing for each new development. The by-law requires private developers of commercial, industrial and

Cost:

The budget to acquire and upgrade the building was \$1.6 million. The cost of new construction for the same number of units in Calgary would have been approximately \$11 million. The cost to purchase an existing similar residential building would have been approximately \$4.6 million. Units will be delivered at a cost of \$12,000 per unit.

Costs associated with the non-residential component of the project (\$265,000) are being assumed by CHPL.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
\$1,600,000 was provided under the Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program.

Other Partners:
None.

Problems Encountered:

Since 1990, it has been the practice of the Alberta Government to assign social housing dollars to new construction projects serving designated groups of special needs or disabled persons. This project is not targeted to any designated need group (i.e. street youth, recovering alcoholics). Rather, it is broadly targeted to low income persons capable of living independently. Where residents have special needs, it is expected that these needs will be addressed by the relevant social agency. The fact that the project was neither disability-specific nor developed on the basis of additional support services being in place was a source of concern initially by the Provincial Government and some downtown social agencies.

The allocation of federal and provincial funds did not apply to the commercial component of the project. Costs will be recovered through commercial rents.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

This project will provide a total of 133 self-contained units.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Several major cities have comparable

single room occupancy units in the downtown core. This project is unique because CHPL also has the challenge of co-ordinating the commercial component of the project. This commercial component must be self-supporting and complementary to the residential part of the project.

Formal Evaluation:

As part of its approval of the project, Alberta Municipal Affairs decided that a monitoring committee composed of other downtown social agencies should be established to ensure that the social needs of residents are addressed. In addition, the Tenant Assistance Officer will closely monitor the internal operation and management of the project.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

There has been significant interest expressed in the project by single people on the CHPL waiting list as well as the client lists of shelter agencies active in the downtown area. A key interest group in the core, the Downtown Revitalization Zone Committee, actively supported the proposal. Council also supported the acquisition of the York Hotel for conversion to housing for low income single persons.

People Served:

Low income single person households, including those who may require social support services, who wish to live downtown.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

A screening process to ensure that applicants are interested in living independently, and close liaison with social agencies downtown to ensure that persons referred from their waiting lists will have access to the support services they require for independent living.

Contact Persons:

Jim Anderson, Housing Manager, The City of Calgary,
Land and Housing Department #8052,
P.O. Box 2100, Station M,
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5
Tel: (403) 268-1455
Fax: (403) 268-1948

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#44 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

AFFORDABLE HOUSING STATUTORY RESERVE FUND CITY OF RICHMOND, B.C.

Category:

Land and Financing For New Development

Description:

In December 1989, Richmond Council adopted a broad range of goals, priorities, and actions as part of an affordable housing strategy. One action was the establishment of a reserve fund under provisions of Section 378 of the Municipal Act, to be known as the "Affordable Housing Statutory Reserve Fund". Funds for this initiative are obtained from individual developers of market housing in Richmond who require rezoning. The initiative is based on the principle that the beneficiaries of urban growth should contribute to the social and economic costs of growth. Developers are encouraged to provide affordable housing on site. Alternatively, senior Planning Department staff negotiate a "gift" contribution to the fund from the developer. There is no one formula for the amount of "gift". The arrangement is flexible, and is supported with policy from the Richmond Council. As of August 1992, \$1.5 million had been contributed to the fund. A complementary program, the Ground-lease Program, has been established to direct the acquired funds. The Municipality will purchase lands with the funds, ask for proposals from groups who are able to organize funds and build affordable housing, receive and evaluate these proposals, and then lease the land with stipulations to ensure that the housing units will remain affordable and that they are not subject to market trends. Richmond staff are continuing to develop the technical aspects of the program. Periodic reviews and evaluations will be undertaken.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Richmond, through the Planning Department.

Impetus:

Like all greater Vancouver municipalities, Richmond has recently been experiencing rapid economic growth. The consequences of this growth are escalating land values leading to difficulties in the provision of low and moderate cost housing and rental accommodation, as well as redevelopment and conversion pressure on existing, older affordable stock. The Planning Department has been working on an Affordable Housing Strategy since the fall of 1989. One of the components of the strategy is an Affordable Housing Statutory Reserve Fund.

Goals:

The main goal of this initiative is to encourage the provision of a variety of housing types and tenure options for Richmond residents. This initiative also aims to provide an innovative and expeditious method of raising funds for affordable housing in Richmond.

Years of Operation:

The Affordable Housing Statutory Reserve Fund was established by the Council of the Corporation of Richmond on December 18, 1989.

Cost:

None.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

None.

Other Partners:

This initiative involves working with private developers, and groups wishing to develop affordable housing.

Problems Encountered:

None to date.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

One 48 unit nonprofit project has been developed on land purchased with Affordable Housing Reserve Funds and leased for development under the Federal/Provincial Non-Profit Housing Program. This project is being managed by the Greater Vancouver Housing Corp.

Several lots have also been purchased with monies from the fund and will be made available for the development of affordable housing.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

In January, 1993, the District of Surrey, B.C. established an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund to be used for assisted affordable housing projects. To generate revenue, 5% of net proceeds from the sales of municipal lands will be directed toward this fund. The 20% affordable housing policy may also provide revenue where developers exercise a cash-in-lieu option. The fund will be used for land banking, asset acquisition and improvement, joint venture development and affordable housing innovations, and "purchase" of Municipal sites allocated for affordable housing.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

None.

People Served:

All the units in the 48 unit non-profit development are for households in core need. There are 36 family units and 12 seniors' units.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

Good economic conditions with significant development activity makes it more economically feasible for developers to provide a

financial contribution.

Contact Person:

Carolyn Morrison,
Social Planner,
City of Richmond,
6911 No. 3 Road,
Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2C1
Tel: (604) 276-4220
Fax: (604) 276-4177

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#45 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

BRIDGE FINANCING FUND METROPOLITAN TORONTO, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:
Partnerships

Description:

This is a loan fund for Metropolitan Toronto area not-for-profit housing agencies. The fund has access to \$10 million. This is a revolving fund which re-lends money as other loans are repaid. The monies are to be used to bridge the gap in time between the identification and acquisition of a suitable housing site, and the securing of permanent financing. It is not meant to be a source of interim financing or of financing during the construction period. The loans from the fund cannot be longer than one year in term. Instead of interest on the loan, the Fund charges a two-part administration fee comprised of a \$500 sum for file opening and a charge of \$5.00 per \$1,000 per month that the loan is outstanding (for a maximum of twelve months). Loans will not be increased during their term to reflect any escalation in the appraised value of the property.

The Housing Development Corporation takes ownership of the property in trust. It also enters an agreement to cover the loan's terms and conditions. If, due to unavoidable circumstances, an extension of the loan's term is needed, then the borrowing agency has two options. It can pay interest to Metro at the average rate of return that Metro receives on its investment of current funds, or it can make another arrangement to discharge the loan. The loan, the administration fee, and any interest that may be due to Metro are paid when the first advance made from the permanent financing or mortgage is arranged by the agency.

Responsible Agency:

Metropolitan Toronto Housing Development Corporation. The Housing Development Corporation's Financial Operations Sub-Committee manages the Fund.

Impetus:

The fund was initiated as part of Metro Toronto's contribution to the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless.

Goals:

To simplify the acquisition of sites for development by not-for-profit housing groups. The fund would do this by financing the purchase of sites or by providing down payments to acquire options before the receipt of all approvals necessary to secure permanent financing.

Years of Operation:

The fund was initiated in 1988.

Cost:

To April 30, 1990, \$17,700,000 has been loaned.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:

Community based not-for-profit housing agencies.

Problems Encountered:

Slow approvals by the provincial Ministry of Housing.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

This loan program has facilitated the development of approximately 25 projects, with 650 affordable housing units. Most will be rental apartments.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Following introduction of the fund in 1988, the Province of Ontario created a loan guarantee fund, and the Peel Non-Profit Housing Corporation introduced a bridge loan fund. The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton introduced a \$5 million revolving fund to purchase land for non-profit housing in 1991.

The City of Montreal has a fund jointly administered by FISHA-FICHIM.

Formal Evaluation:

A formal evaluation may be undertaken in 1994.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Relatively good. Sixteen groups have accessed loans from the fund.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

To minimize the risk to the fund, it is important to evaluate the projects seeking funding to assess whether the project is likely to get developed. It is important to assess if the budgets are realistic.

Groups should be asked to provide regular reports on the status of their project.

Contact Person:

Bob Dryden,
Director of Housing Development,
Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company
Limited,
20 York Mills Road,
North York, Ontario M2P 2C2
Tel: (416) 392-3723
Fax: (416) 392-3037

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#46 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

UP FRONT CAPITAL FUNDING FOR CRYSTAL HEIGHTS CO-OP CITY OF DARTMOUTH, NOVA SCOTIA

Category:

Land and Financing for New Development

Description:

The Crystal Heights Co-op is a 6 unit development in the Pinecrest/Highfield Park area of the City of Dartmouth. This area is perceived to have many social problems, and has been targeted for neighbourhood improvement. The project involved the renovation of an older apartment building.

Funding to acquire and rehabilitate the property was provided by the City of Dartmouth through an up front capital grant of \$131,000 which was sufficient to reduce economic rents to market rent levels. Funding from the Federal/Provincial Rent Supplement Program is used to cover the difference between geared-to-income and market rents.

An agreement between the city and the co-op requires the co-op to fund replacement reserves, to submit annual operating budgets to the city for review, and to maintain and manage the project efficiently.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Dartmouth Housing Department and Crystal Heights Co-op.

Impetus:

This project was developed in an area of the city that was perceived to have many social problems. Buildings are poorly maintained, rents are low, and many of the units are vacant.

The City wanted to renovate an apartment building where it was felt that the housing was in poor repair. They wanted to demonstrate what could be done in the area and how buildings could be improved.

Goals:

To develop a project to demonstrate

how housing in this neighbourhood could be upgraded and renovated, and to provide stability of tenure for the residents.

Years of Operation:

The project was developed in 1989-90.

Cost:

The total capital cost was \$285,000. The city provided a grant of \$131,000 and the balance \$154,000 was financed through a conventional first mortgage.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The project receives assistance through the Federal/Provincial Rent Supplement Program for all 6 units. The Province's agreement to provide this assistance was necessary to secure the financing.

Other Partners:

Crystal Heights Co-op.

Problems Encountered:

None.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Six units were produced.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The City of Dartmouth has funded similar developments in the past. They are not planning to fund similar projects in the near future because of limited resources. The City of Halifax has also funded similar projects.

Formal Evaluation:

An annual review of the project is required by the agreement with the City.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The project is quite stable with low

turnover. It also provided stability for half the tenants who occupied the building before it was renovated.

People Served:

The project provides housing for 6 households with low incomes who pay rents geared to their income.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

It is necessary to have an up front capital grant that will be sufficient to bring economic rents down to market levels. Rent supplement assistance will also be necessary in areas where the amount of rent that can be charged is not enough for the project to break even (For example, where people have low incomes, or rent levels are depressed).

To help ensure resident satisfaction it is important that some of the improvements to the building are visible, and not just structural.

Contact Persons:

Legal Department,
City of Dartmouth,
P.O. Box 817,
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
B2Y 3Z3
Tel: (902) 464-2572
Fax: (902) 464-2907

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#47 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

INCOME MIX ZONING (20% CORE NEED POLICY) CITY OF VANCOUVER, B.C.

Sub-Category: Zoning

Description:

For each of several major redevelopment projects occurring in Vancouver, City Council has established a policy that a minimum of 20% of the base density dwelling units to be built must be available to households in core need (those which spend more than 30% of their gross income on a suitable dwelling unit). In addition, 50% of these units are to be directed to households with young children. The City also wants non-market housing to be widely dispersed and integrated into each neighbourhood while recognizing that diversity will vary by area based upon site characteristics.

When drafting the zoning (a site-specific Comprehensive Development District) for the redevelopment projects, the City of Vancouver Housing and Properties Department is translating the policy initiative into an implementable requirement. In the north shore of False Creek, for instance, the developer is conveying air space parcels to the City at a price such that the City will not have to subsidize the projects in order for them to work within senior government Maximum Unit Prices for social housing. As the City will have ownership, it will be able to control phasing of non-market development within the constraints of prevailing funding programs and unit allocations.

Complex legal agreements were developed to ensure that the air and ground parcels will be created and delivered. The sub-area rezonings in the form of comprehensive development districts will reflect the core-need requirements in their by-laws and will identify sites.

City staff have worked with the developers of the projects to ensure that the sites of the 20% core-need units are in suitable locations with respect to the overall development schemes. However, the projects are at various stages of development. It has yet to be determined what the phasing of the non-market units will be and, most importantly, whether senior government non-market housing programs will be reinforced so as to enable the income mix targets to be reached.

Responsible Agency:
City of Vancouver Housing and Properties Department.

Impetus:

In the late 1980s, a range of large scale private urban redevelopment projects were being planned in downtown Vancouver. These include: the redevelopment of the 204-acre Expo 86 site on the north shore of False Creek (including land and water lots); the redevelopment of Coal Harbour on Burrard Inlet, which includes the 82-acre Marathon Lands, and the 22-acre Bayshore site; and the redevelopment of the 9.19-acre Station/Lafarge site in East False Creek.

Due to current land economics, the market, left to its own, would supply housing for only higher income groups in these projects. However, the City of Vancouver believes that social housing should be available throughout the City and in new inner city neighbourhoods. These objectives had been achieved on City owned major projects developed in the 1970s and 80s, such as the south shore of False Creek. Separate policies for each project were therefore established stating

that 20% of the dwelling units built should be available to core-needy households with 50% of these households being families with children.

Goals:

To provide an assured land supply for social housing and to encourage the creation of balanced communities and housing opportunities for residents with differing income ranges.

Years of Operation:

City staff have been working on this initiative since 1988. City Council passed motions supporting this initiative in 1989 and 1990 for all three major redevelopments and associated sites. In addition, this policy now applies to all major development projects in the City.

Cost:

The City will contribute \$7.50 per buildable square foot (adjusted by C.P.I.) towards the land costs as it will receive freehold title and will be leasing the sites for 60 year terms.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

This initiative is dependant upon senior government non-profit housing programs for unit allocations.

Other Partners:

Private developers.

Problems Encountered:

This initiative has required a considerable amount of time and effort by City staff.

It is also dependant upon senior government non-profit housing programs for funding, which has given rise to a number of concerns. It is estimated that this policy will make available 10-15 years worth of social housing sites with a capacity for 2,500 units. This will create a demand for non-profit housing units which will lead to competition with other groups and sites in existing neighbourhoods for scarce unit allocations.

If allocations under the federal/provincial non-profit housing program continue to decline, the funds may not be available to deliver these units during the

construction period for these projects. Land could sit vacant for a number of years before non-market units are constructed.

A separate concern is that the mix of 80% condo and 20% core need housing may result in a polarized community.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

It is estimated that 10-15 years worth of social housing sites will soon be available and that a capacity of 2,500 units will be created with the rezoning of the major projects that have been approved or are currently underway.

A total of 74 units have been completed and another 72 units are under construction. In addition, the City has produced 84 units under the same 20% policy on lands it is developing with a further 110 units under construction.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The District of Surrey, B.C. has introduced a 20% policy where developers will be requested to provide an affordable housing contribution (up to 20% of the proposed units, if residential), or land-or-cash-in-lieu. Developers may propose arrangements that include providing mixes of assisted affordable housing (for households in core need), market affordable housing, equity co-op arrangements and other innovations.

This policy applies when there is rezoning for "Special Projects", including multi-family, industrial, commercial, or single family developments, when one or a combination of the following conditions prevail:

- a) where a policy change (e.g., Official Community Plan amendment) is being sought;
- b) where the proposal is complex;
- c) where the developer requests special treatment (including bonusing);
- d) where the site is in a strategic location (e.g. town centre);
- e) where the project by itself or in combination with similar projects nearby will have a

significant impact on the need for a range of housing for different income groups.

At the provincial level, the Province of Ontario's Policy Statement on Land Use Planning for Housing requires municipalities to establish appropriate planning policies and standards which will enable 25% of new residential units resulting from new residential development and residential intensification to be "affordable housing". Affordable housing is defined as that which meets the housing needs of the lowest 60% of the income distribution in a region.

Formal Evaluation:

In January, 1992, Council considered a report that reviewed the 20% policy. Following that, 2 workshops were held with the development community, the non-profit housing sector, and the federal and provincial governments to discuss the issues raised by this policy.

The workshops concluded that:

- A mix of incomes should be maintained, but a broader mix could be considered. Dimensions other than income, such as age, family status, and disability should be factors;
- Major projects should not be the only developments required to provide or contribute to social housing;
- Greater flexibility is desirable. The policy should permit a range of solutions to address various housing issues and needs; and
- The supply of multi-unit zoned land needed to be increased.

Council considered a report in April 1993, and adopted the following approach:

1. Nonprofit housing will remain the preferred vehicle for providing housing under the 20% policy.
2. The City will be open to alternative non-market housing options that would create a

mix of housing for particular core-need sites having regard to housing need, neighbourhood mix, amenities and services.

3. As an option of last resort, Council will consider cash-in-lieu for social housing on a site-by-site basis, if an acceptable non-market housing program is not available, and if an acceptable off-site social housing program or project is identified.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
See above.

People Served:
Households in core need, particularly households with young children.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Non-profit unit allocations from senior governments; and

A strong development market and large scale redevelopment projects where rezoning will generate a sufficiently large surplus to enable the City to exact social housing and leave the project viable.

Contact Persons:
Cameron Gray, Deputy Manager,
Real Estate and Housing Division,
City of Vancouver Housing and
Properties Dept.,
City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver, B.C. V5Y 1V4
Tel: (604) 873-7207
Fax: (604) 873-7064

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#48 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

NEW COMMUNITIES IN INDUSTRIAL AREAS CITY OF VANCOUVER, B.C.

Sub-Category:

Intensification and Zoning

Description:

The New Communities in Industrial Areas initiative is one component of a three-pronged approach that the City of Vancouver is developing to increase housing capacity. The other two components are designated neighbourhood centres and housing above shops in commercial zones. This particular initiative developed out of a comprehensive review of the nature, role and future of industry in Vancouver. The study, "Industry in Vancouver" (1989), raised some significant implications of industrial change in Vancouver including:

- a growing surplus of land zoned for primary industry;
- an increasing mismatch between zoning regulations and the kinds of industry likely to remain or to be attracted here; and
- a gradual relocation of primary industry to suburban areas.

The transformation of Vancouver from industrial to "post-industrial" city, the rise of Pacific Rim investment, and the change in industrial technologies are factors which presented the City with the opportunity of space for much needed housing. The Planning Department has identified under-utilized industrial land throughout Vancouver available immediately for new uses in small isolated industrial areas where primary industry is diminishing and where accessibility for goods movement is limited. It also identified additional industrial areas to release on a slightly longer time-scale, and suitable areas to retain for long-

term industrial use. Linked to this initiative is the complementary aim of conducting research and developing recommendations on the nature and requirements of industrial uses which are important to retain within Vancouver's boundaries for economic reasons.

Following the identification of appropriate industrial lands for housing, the Planning Department developed a process and work program to establish the New Communities. The Arbutus Industrial Lands and the Joyce/Vaness sites are now in the advanced planning stages. Both sites will be developed for medium to high density housing.

Responsible Agency:

City of Vancouver Planning Department.

Impetus:

The City of Vancouver Planning Department reviewed existing housing capacity by area of the city and compared this capacity to projected demand for housing over the next 15 years. The findings overwhelmingly pointed to the fact that housing capacity must be increased to cope with existing and projected demand.

Goals:

The main goal is to add housing capacity and choice in areas where the new housing will have minimal disruption on existing communities. A related goal is to ensure that specific industries do not experience the negative impact of this policy change.

Years of Operation:

1990 to present.

Cost:
None, apart from Planning Department staff time.

Vancouver, B.C. V5Y 1V4
Tel: (604) 873-7684
Fax: (604) 873-7060

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Harv Weidner,
Community Planner,
Planning Department,
City of Vancouver,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver, B.C. V5Y 1V4
Tel: (604) 873-7397
Fax: (604) 873-7060

Other Partners:
None identified.

Problems Encountered:
Community acceptance was a problem in one area. In meeting with neighbourhood groups, it is important to have a draft set of plans. It is also important to discuss the economic impacts of the development, and the demands for services and amenities that will result from the development, including schools and parks. Another issue in proceeding with development is how services and amenities will be provided and paid for.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
At this time, roughly 300 acres of industrial land have been identified as suitable to consider for residential use. Approximately 13,000 apartment-style dwelling units could be accommodated on this land.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
None identified.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
None.

People Served:
This initiative will provide housing for a range of income groups, including some non-profit housing. The particular mix in each development will reflect the mix in the entire city.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Support from the surrounding neighbourhoods.

Contact Persons:
Christina De Marco,
Planning Department,
City of Vancouver,
453 West 12th Avenue,

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#49 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

OPERATION HABITER MONTREAL CITY OF MONTREAL, QUEBEC

Sub-Category:
Partnerships

Description:

This is a comprehensive program covering aspects of land, financing, joint ventures, and property taxation. It allocates land from the municipal land bank for residential development, promotes partnerships between the City and the private and non-profit sectors, and implements a land financing structure which allows developers to delay the principal payment on the land until the housing is sold. The City may also undertake joint ventures with various groups, especially through para-municipal non-profit groups such as the Societe d'habitation et de developpement de Montreal (SHDM) or the Societe immobiliere du patrimoine architectural de Montreal (SIMPA).

Municipal involvement may include production of affordable housing in downtown Montreal and also mixed use and other innovative projects, including demonstration projects.

Rather than directly constructing housing, the City makes municipal land available at market or below market prices to housing developers who, in return, build projects in compliance with a development program prepared by the City. For each property in the land bank, the City prepares a development program based on a clientele study and an evaluation of the development potential of the land. The development program includes identification of target groups, and development of architectural design criteria and specific requirements. Land is allotted at a predetermined price to the best project submitted for tender.

Responsible Agency:

City of Montreal, Service de l'habitation et du developpement urbain (SHDU).

Impetus:

The City has been faced with a number of housing related problems since 1960. These include a shrinking population, a decrease in residential construction, and a reduction in the number of families with children. In 1979 the City launched a program called "Operation 20,000 Logements" to address these problems. The program required changes in the late 1980s and has now been replaced with Operation Habiter Montreal.

Goals:

The City hopes to meet several goals with the implementation of this comprehensive program. They include:

- promoting residential development suitable for a mix of household types, particularly families with children;
- encouraging high quality design and construction;
- encouraging people, particularly families with children, to live in the City proper, thus reversing the trend of migration to the surrounding suburbs; and
- stemming the population decrease which has been occurring in the City.

Years of Operation:

Operation Habiter Montreal was

initiated in the beginning of 1990. It entered its second phase in 1993 and will continue to operate for at least another two years.

Cost:

The program is technically self-financing. Most lots are sold at market value.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

This operates in conjunction with provincial and federal non-profit programs as well as with the municipal Homeownership Assistance Program.

Other Partners:

The projects sometimes involve working with contractors, architects and urban planners in the private sector, as well as with co-ops and non-profit organizations.

Problems Encountered:

One problem faced is the lack of suitable land for residential construction in the City's land bank.

Similar Initiatives Operating

Elsewhere:

None identified.

Formal Evaluation:

Studies of this program have been undertaken. (See literature review).

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Judging by the involvement of the private sector, the reaction to the program has been very good. Most calls for tenders have produced numerous submissions.

People Served:

The program's primary purpose is to stimulate housing construction and make use of available land. As a result, it does not target a specific social group, even though individual projects may be conceived for specific clientele.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The program is comparatively complex, and this demands efforts in diverse areas. Each project requires preparation of a market study to identify the development potential of the land - and this in turn depends on understanding

potential clientele. It is also necessary to offer attractive financing for development and to encourage innovation among partners, since the latter may not be accustomed to working within the framework of such a program.

Contact Person:

Fabien Cournoyer, Surintendant,
Service de l'habitation et du
developpement urbain Module
habitation - developpement,
330, rue Saint-Paul Est,
Montral, Quebec H2Y 1H2
Tel: (514) 872-2848
Fax: (514) 872-3883

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#50 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

VLC PROPERTIES LTD.
CITY OF VANCOUVER, B.C.

Sub-Category: Partnerships

Description:

VLC Properties Ltd. builds multi-family residential housing on City land on a long term (80 year) lease arrangement. Initially, VLC was granted options to lease nine parcels of City land. In exchange for the land lease, the company agrees to maintain the units as rental accommodation for the term of the lease and to limit annual rent increases to the CPI or CPI plus 2% when a unit is vacated. First priority for the units is given to tenants who have been evicted due to the demolition or condominium conversion of their unit. Rates are generally be in the range of \$1.20 per square foot and will vary depending on the type of construction, project size, and location. There are no special guarantees with respect to zoning approvals for the sites. In recognition of the union pension fund participation, the company uses union labour to build the projects.

Responsible Agency:

Originally, Vancouver City Council helped to establish this private for-profit development firm and owned an 8% interest through a City-owned company called Vancouver Civic Development Corporation. Most of the initial capitalization of the firm came from union pension funds. The City has since sold its shares in the company. The Company is now 100% owned by B.C. union pension funds.

Impetus:

For several years, it has been uneconomical to build rental housing in Vancouver. In the late 1980s, this resulted in a serious rental housing shortage. Demand was extremely high, and vacancy rates had consistently fallen below 1%.

In 1987, Vancouver City Council instructed staff to work with pension funds to establish a vehicle for a partnership in the development of City-owned lands. In May 1989, Council approved the formation of VLC Properties Ltd. as a way of increasing the supply of non-subsidized rental housing.

Goals:

The social objective is to create a minimum of 1,200 new, affordable, secure rental housing units. The company's economic objective is to earn an appropriate long term rate of return for shareholders.

Years of Operation:

The decision to proceed with this rental supply program was made in mid-1989 and the company was incorporated on May 26, 1989.

Cost:

The Vancouver Civic Development Corporation originally invested \$2 million in VLC Properties Ltd. In its capacity as property owner, the City is entitled to rental payments for land leases. In the short term, it is expected that the City will forego land lease payments as the lease provides for payments only in years where there is a positive cash flow. Over the long term, the City expects to receive lease payments due to inflation-linked rental increases. A City Manager's Report dated August 11, 1989 stated that, in the opinion of the City Manager and the Director of Finance, the lease payments should result in a reasonable long term financial return to the City in accordance with the market value of the lands.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
VLC qualifies for a mortgage subsidy

under the British Columbia Rental Supply Program. This provincial program, which was initiated in 1989, reduces the mortgage interest rate on an approved project to as low as 8% for a maximum of five years. To qualify, a project must remain in the rental stock for at least five years. VLC also expects to qualify some units (25%) in its early projects for tenants assistance through the B.C. Rent Supplement Program.

Other Partners:

B.C. union pension funds and the other shareholders.

Problems Encountered:

The company's ability to meet its unit targets will depend in part upon the availability and condition of City land. The company is pursuing other opportunities to build rental and for-sale housing on private lands acquired by the company, as well as on larger sites through joint venture arrangements with other developers.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Construction has been completed on 455 units in 7 projects. An additional 330 units are under construction.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The City of Montreal, through Operation Habiter Montreal (see Fact Sheet #49), will provide assistance to private housing developers. The City of Ottawa also participates in several different types of public and private partnerships.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The units are fully leased. Community acceptance has been good.

People Served:

All the tenants pay market rents.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The terms of the lease with the municipality are key. To be able to provide rental housing that is affordable, the developer must obtain land at a reasonable value

with a land lease.

Contact Persons:

David Podmore, President,
VLC Properties Ltd.,
9th Floor, 1190 Hornby Street,
Vancouver, B.C., V6Z 2K5
Tel: (604) 688-9460
Fax: (604) 688-6882

Cameron Gray, Deputy Manager,
Real Estate and Housing Division,
City of Vancouver Housing and
Properties Dept.,
City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver, B.C., V5Y 1V4
Tel: (604) 873-7207
Fax: (604) 873-7064

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#51 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

LAND BANK PROGRAM CITY OF SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN

Category:

Land and Financing for New Development

Description:

The City uses the Land Bank Program to affect residential land prices and to reduce the potential for speculation on city wide properties through the number of lots it has for sale, the timing of land servicing, and the terms of sale, such as building requirements. The Land Bank controls approximately 40% of the serviced land in the City of Saskatoon.

The Land Bank sells its land to the private and non-profit sector at market rates regardless of the type of housing planned. Groups wishing to develop low cost housing pay the same prices as market developers (subsidies are available through other City programs). Theoretically, these groups benefit from the positive impacts of the Land Bank as it stabilizes the price of land in the market.

The City attempts to keep a lot inventory of 50% of one year's lot demand. 1993 prices for a fifty foot frontage single family lot start at under \$20,000. Similar savings are found with multifamily land which starts as low as \$90,000 per acre.

Responsible Agency:

The Land Bank is operated by the City's Land Department. The Department manages, plans, directs and controls the City's land development activity and land acquisitions. The strategy for operating the Land Bank is developed through the Land Bank Committee. Policy for the Land Bank is set by City Council.

Impetus:

The Land Bank Program was developed

because the City wished to affect residential land prices and ensure that an ongoing supply of land existed.

The original opportunity to develop a land banking program was presented with large scale tax delinquencies which occurred in the 1930s and 1940s.

Goals:

The main goals of the Land Bank are to keep residential prices reasonable and stable, to prevent speculation in the land market, and to ensure an ongoing supply of land for all types of housing operations. By controlling a major share of the market, the City is able to stabilize growth and prevent leapfrogging of undeveloped areas.

Years of Operation:

The City has operated a Land Bank since 1954. The Land Bank began with over 2,500 acres of land acquired in the 1930s and 1940s through tax delinquency. Over 5,000 acres of raw land is available for development of all types including residential. This inventory should allow the City Land Bank to maintain its 40% market share for the next 20 years.

Cost:

The Land Department is self-funding with a staff of four.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The City has purchased over 3,000 acres in partnership with the federal and provincial governments. The land is purchased from the partnership and developed as needed.

Other Partners:

All land is now purchased by the city and there are no partnerships in the city land holdings.

Problems Encountered:

Recent poor economic conditions in both Saskatchewan and Saskatoon have limited the need for the Land Bank to affect residential land market conditions. Saskatchewan's population has declined, resulting in reduced housing starts and serious financial difficulties for local contractors and developers. Consequently, the private land market has become extremely vulnerable, and municipal government activities through the Land Bank have been curtailed. The City has reduced servicing lots on its Land Bank properties and is instead relying on the development of private land in order to ensure that private developers do not withdraw from Saskatoon. The City is using its current inventory to ensure that affordable lots and associated housing are available in Saskatoon.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Red Deer and Medicine Hat, Alberta.

Formal Evaluation:

An internal audit is scheduled for 1993-94.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

None.

People served:

All persons.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

None identified.

Contact Persons:

Stan Peakman, P.Eng.,
Manager, Land Department,
City of Saskatoon,
222 - 3rd Avenue North,
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7J 0J5
Tel: (306) 975-3279
Fax: (306) 975-2891

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#52 -LAND AND FINANCING FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

LONG TERM LAND LEASES DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER, B.C.

Sub-Category:

Equity Housing Co-operative

Description:

The District of North Vancouver enters into long term land leases with non-profit and cooperative housing sponsors on a case by case basis. Leases are generally for a 60 year period at a cost of 75% of free-hold market value. This applies to municipal lands that Council has designated for affordable housing.

Municipal land leases are being used in the development of a seniors' equity co-op, an equity co-op for families, and a co-op under the Federal Co-operative Housing Program.

Responsible Agency:

The District of North Vancouver Land Agent. At times, the District's Social Planning Department is also involved.

Impetus:

The municipality wanted to designate sites for affordable housing projects, and leasing land has the following advantages:

- The municipality retains ownership of the land;
- The non-profit housing society can use the land for a 60 year period; and
- Providing the land at 75% of market reduces the cost of the housing.

Goals:

To provide an ongoing supply of land for affordable housing.

Years of Operation:

The municipality first started using lease arrangements in 1985.

Cost:

There are no direct budgetary costs associated with this practice.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

One non-profit housing co-op was funded by CMHC under the Co-operative Housing Program. An equity project being developed on leased land received \$20,000 from the Province of British Columbia to help develop the initial proposal.

Other Partners:

Non-profit and co-operative housing organizations developing the land.

Problems Encountered:

One important issue that needed to be addressed in the lease agreement for the equity co-op was how to accommodate the different interests if the project should happen to fail. For example, the municipality wanted to ensure that the land would continue to be used for affordable housing. The financial institution wanted to ensure that the mortgage would be paid.

It was agreed that if the co-op fails, the municipality and the developer will have 18 months to find a non-profit use for the building. After that time, the financial institution will be able to market the building for other purposes, such as rental housing or condominiums.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

50 units are currently being developed under the Federal Co-operative Housing Program, 54 units are being developed as a seniors' equity co-op, and 6 units are being developed as an equity co-op for families.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

A number of municipalities in B.C. including the City of North Vancouver and the City of Vancouver make municipal lands available to non-profit housing groups on similar

terms. In certain cases, the City of Vancouver will provide a 40 year lease at 50% of freehold market value if that is necessary for the project to proceed.

Formal Evaluation:

The District of North Vancouver plans to undertake a formal review of the land lease process.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

There has been very favourable support from the community.

People Served:

This depends on the specific nature of the project. The equity projects will serve households with some equity. However, it is expected that these projects will become more affordable over time. Members of the equity co-op purchase shares in the building. When they sell, they sell their share to the co-op. The value of the shares will be based on the cost of living index and it is expected the price of housing will increase at a faster rate.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

A supply of land and willingness of local governments to participate.

Contact Persons:

Mark Bostwick,
Social Planner,
Social Planning Department,
District of North Vancouver,
P.O. Box 86218,
North Vancouver V7L 4K1
Tel: (604) 987-7131
Fax: (604) 984-8664

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#53 -HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR ADAPTABLE HOUSING UNITS CITY OF BURNABY, B.C.

Category:

Housing for the Elderly and Other Special Groups

Description:

The City of Burnaby has developed draft design guidelines to assist developers in Burnaby to incorporate adaptable features in residential developments.

The adaptable housing units are not specifically intended for occupants with physical disabilities. They are designed so that they can be modified easily and relatively cheaply if the occupant's abilities decline or if units are later occupied by a person with disabilities.

The units are wheelchair accessible and have both fixed and adjustable features that allow fixtures to be added, adjusted or removed as necessary to accommodate the needs of persons whether or not they are disabled.

Such housing could accommodate tenants who acquire a permanent or temporary disability, older people who want to continue living in their homes, and disabled persons who wish to live independently or with a non-disabled spouse or attendant.

The fixed accessible features make each adaptable unit usable by disabled people without undertaking structural changes such as building ramps, moving walls, or widening doors. Some of the main fixed accessible features of an adaptable dwelling are:

- site planning that minimizes grade changes;
- wide doors;
- no steps at entrances;
- low mounted switches and controls;
- levers and other easy to use handles;
- most rooms along an accessible route;

- clear floor space in entrance area, bathroom, bedrooms and kitchen for turning wheelchair; and
- accessible route to and throughout all spaces in the building including parking, lobby, laundry room, decks, and common areas.

The adjustable features noted below allow an adaptable housing unit to be easily modified to meet the needs of both disabled and non-disabled occupants. These include:

- removable base cabinets installed in knee spaces under kitchen and bathroom sinks;
- segments of counters that can be adjusted from a standard height to a lower height;
- reinforced wall areas so grab bars can be attached at the bathtub, shower, and toilet areas as needed.

These fixed and adjustable features eliminate the special or different appearance associated with dedicated wheelchair units and make the unit equally marketable to people who do not require features that are intended for people with disabilities.

The draft guidelines reflect the basic principles of adaptable housing, and current standards for accessibility contained in the B.C. Building Code and other reference materials on barrier-free design. They set a minimum standard for the following items:

- paths of travel;
- doors;
- manoeuvring space at doors;
- corridor widths;
- floor surfaces;
- controls and outlets;
- alarms;

- windows;
- kitchens;
- bathrooms;
- bedrooms;
- base cabinets (kitchen and bathrooms);
- clothes storage;
- laundry facilities;
- living areas;
- multiple level units;
- outdoor living areas; and
- notice of adaptable features.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Burnaby Planning and Building Department.

Impetus:

In recognition of National Access Awareness Week in 1988, the City of Burnaby established the Burnaby Access Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee identifies barriers to services and facilities and advises the municipality on ways to improve access for persons with disabilities.

In 1989 Council adopted a policy to encourage the voluntary provision of adaptable housing units in multi-family developments in Burnaby.

Staff were authorized to work with developers through the rezoning and preliminary plan approval process to encourage the voluntary provision of 5% of units in private multiple family developments in Burnaby's four town centres to be adaptable to meet the needs of persons with disabilities.

The municipality identified a need to develop design guidelines to guide developers in the consideration of adaptable housing design features.

Goals:

To meet the increasing demand for accessible housing for persons with disabilities as a result of the aging population and de-institutionalization. Seniors are seeking to remain in an independent environment as long as possible. With de-institutionalization and an emphasis on the integration of persons with disabilities into the "mainstream" community, an increasing number of these persons will seek appropriate accommodation within the community.

To enable people who suddenly or gradually become disabled, to remain in their homes.

To expand options for integration of persons with disabilities into the community by providing a variety of housing types at different locations in the City.

To help meet Burnaby's existing and future needs for housing that is suitable for persons with disabilities.

Years of Operation:

Council received a report presenting draft design guidelines for adaptable housing units in February, 1993. This report and the draft guidelines have been distributed to the development and architectural community, disabled persons advisory/advocacy groups, and other government regulators for review and comment.

Cost:

Some builders have said that the adaptable units do not cost more to build than other units. Others have said that these units cost between 5-10% more.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

In developing the guideline, the municipality referred to the "British Columbia Building Code 1992", "The Section 3.7 Handbook: Building Requirements for Persons with Disabilities Including Illustrations and Commentary", prepared by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, and "Housing Choices for Canadians with Disabilities", from CMHC.

Other Partners:

Residents of Burnaby who are disabled, representatives of disabled persons' organizations, developers, and architects.

Problems Encountered:

Incorporating guidelines for adaptable housing units into traditional building practices.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Two developments in Burnaby are undertaking the voluntary provision of adaptable features in their market housing projects for 5% (a

total of 6) units. In the Brambles Co-op development 17 of the 35 units are adaptable.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None identified.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

A final version of the draft guidelines, which is expected to be submitted to City Council in May 1993, will include a summary of comments from developers, architects, disabled persons advisory and advocacy groups, and other government agencies.

People Served:

Seniors, people who are disabled, and the potentially disabled population.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The municipality should enlist the support of the development community at the outset.

Contact Persons:

Lou Pelletier,
Social Planner,
City of Burnaby Planning and
Building Department,
4949 Canada Way,
Burnaby, B.C. V5G 1M2
Tel: (604) 294-7219
Fax: (604) 294-7220

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#54 -HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

Sub-Category:

Housing for the Elderly

Description:

In December 1991, New Dawn Enterprises Ltd., a non-profit community development corporation in Cape Breton County, acquired an 88 acre site of a former Canadian Radar Base to provide a supportive home living option for seniors, and to generate employment in the area. The Canadian Armed Forces transferred ownership of the base to the municipality of Cape Breton (for \$1), and the municipality transferred it to New Dawn Enterprises. The base included approximately 60 semi-detached houses as well as 50 other buildings.

Home Living Limited, a subsidiary of New Dawn Enterprises, contracts with a family to live in one side of the house, and to care for the seniors who live in the other side. Families are paid a per diem.

Up to 3 seniors live in the other side of the house. The seniors rent the units from Home Living Limited.

There are three classifications of care. In the first level of care, the family will provide meals, wash the laundry, and clean the rooms. In the second level, the family provides some additional assistance with bathing and walking. At the third level of care, the family may assist the senior in getting out of bed, providing special meals, monitoring medication, and using the toilet.

Seniors are charged from \$1,100 to \$1,400 per month for rent, food and other services, depending on the level of care provided. About half the seniors pay these costs themselves. The other half receive assistance through the Department of Social Services.

SUPPORTIVE HOME LIVING FOR SENIORS ON A FORMER CANADIAN RADAR CAPE BRETON COUNTY, NOVA SCOTIA

New Dawn Enterprises refurbished the housing, and constructed doorways to provide access between the two homes.

Each senior has his/her own bedroom. They also have kitchen facilities to prepare light snacks.

Responsible Agency:

Home Living Limited, which is a subsidiary of New Dawn Enterprises.

Impetus:

Seniors represent a high percentage of the population in Cape Breton. They have traditionally been cared for in institutions, but the province is not building any more beds. There is a backlog of seniors requiring care.

New Dawn Enterprises developed a business plan to identify families who would be interested in caring for seniors in their home. They tried to see if there was a market for this.

At the same time, they were approached by the municipality of Cape Breton to see if they were interested in acquiring the radar base. New Dawn Enterprises decided to test out their model on this site.

Goals:

To provide housing and support to seniors in a home environment and to provide employment in an area of high unemployment.

Years of Operation:

This initiative began in December, 1991 on the radar base.

Cost:

New Dawn Enterprises has spent \$1 million to date to refurbish 40-45 of the homes. Refurbishing costs were about \$20,000 per home.

The municipality pays about \$400 - \$500 per month in general welfare assistance to about half of the seniors participating in the program. This is less than the municipality would pay if the senior was receiving institutional care.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
The Radar Base was owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Department of Public Works was responsible for transferring the property to the municipality and to New Dawn Enterprises.

Other Partners:
The municipality adopted a strong facilitative role. They helped to market the home living concept to the social services department and to obtain provincial support. The municipality also assumed maintenance costs of the sewer and water services. Once the buildings are occupied, the municipality receives property taxes.

Problems Encountered:
Demand for this program was higher than expected. New Dawn Enterprises had originally projected a demand by 15 seniors. Thirty five are now participating.

The biggest challenge is in helping families feel confident in their ability to care for the seniors. In the beginning, families require a great deal of hand holding with the program manager. They learn as they go along.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
This initiative is providing housing and care for 35 seniors, and the 12 families supporting them.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
New Dawn Enterprises is working with another 8 towns in Cape Breton who are interested in this model.

Formal Evaluation:
An evaluation was conducted in December, 1992. The evaluation found that the families and seniors developed a relationship and became friends. The families enjoyed the work - they felt they were caring for their friends. The seniors also

appreciated the opportunity to develop relationships with each other.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
Seniors are very positive. Friends who visit, who are also seniors, have expressed interest in moving in later when they need some assistance.

People Served:
Seniors in need of some support to live in the community.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
This initiative could work wherever families wish to care for seniors in their homes. It would work best in areas where there is a sense of community, family and kinship. It is important that the families caring for the seniors have good judgement.

Contact Persons:
Rankin MacSween,
Executive Director,
New Dawn Enterprises Ltd.,
P.O. Box 1055,
Sydney, Nova Scotia B1P 6J7
Tel: (902) 539-9560
Fax: (902) 539-7210

Bob Skinner,
Director of Housing,
Municipality of the County of Cape Breton,
865 Grand Lake Road,
Sydney, Nova Scotia B1P 6W2
Tel: (902) 563-2700
Fax: (902) 564-1871

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#55 -HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

GLENMAPLE SENIORS EQUITY HOUSING PROJECT METROPOLITAN TORONTO, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Home Ownership, and Land and Financing for New Development

Description:

The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Development Corporation (MTHDC) has developed the guaranteed equity concept as a new approach to providing housing for seniors.

Interim financing at preferred rates is being provided by the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

This concept gives purchasers the right to occupy a unit according to a "right-to-buy" agreement. If a purchaser wishes to sell his or her unit, he or she must sell the unit back to the MTHDC. In return, the MTHDC guarantees to buy the unit back at the original purchase price on the following conditions:

- If the unit is sold in the first 3 years, the purchaser will receive the full amount paid.
- Commencing in year 4, the purchaser will receive interest based on 2/3rds of any increase in the Toronto Consumer Price Index (TCPI) as calculated by Statistics Canada.
- The sale price will never fall below the original purchase price, even if economic factors cause the TCPI to fall.
- Purchasers must give 6 months notice of their intent to terminate the agreement.

This program was designed to enable the purchasers to live a relatively secure and comfortable lifestyle among their peers.

For example, if a senior sells his or her house valued at \$200,000, and then purchases a guaranteed equity unit for approximately \$125,000, he or she would be able to put the remaining \$75,000 in a bank. The interest on this balance would pay for the maintenance fees. Seniors would not need to spend their pension income on housing costs. In addition, their main asset is secure, and they need not worry about upkeep, maintenance or any other factors involved in home ownership. If they wish to leave their unit vacant for a period of time, they can do so with the assurance that their unit is secure.

Purchasers retain a sense of control that comes with ownership as the Board of Directors is made up of purchasers and it is their responsibility to run the project. The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited (MTHCL) is the agreed-to property manager, but only for a 2-year period. After that, the Board is free to find another property manager if it wishes.

The building receives no subsidy, and therefore, none of the usual requirements associated with existing non-profit housing programs apply.

Responsible Agency:

The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Development Corporation (MTHDC).

Impetus:

This development was specifically designed for seniors (55 or older) who are currently "asset-rich, but income poor". These are generally people whose main asset is their home. They may have spent the last 20 to 30 years paying off the

mortgage, but for a number of reasons, including financial or physical, they can no longer maintain that home.

Nobody is serving this segment of the population, yet many of these seniors have few options when they seek affordable housing alternatives. Most private sector condominiums are too expensive and would use up most of the proceeds from the sale of their homes. At the same time, because of the asset value of their homes, the seniors do not qualify for subsidized housing, even though their pension income is limited.

Goals:

- Provide affordable housing for seniors within Metro Toronto without the need for capital or operating subsidies from government;
- Provide affordable housing that will become more affordable over time;
- Remove the potential for speculation while allowing some equity growth to make the investment in the housing stock attractive; and
- Make better use of the existing housing stock by freeing up under-utilized homes.

Years of Operation:

The first project is still under construction and will be ready for occupancy in July, 1993.

Cost:

The cost of Glenmaple is \$14,200,000 for 124 units. The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is providing interim financing at preferred rates.

The purchase prices of the units will range from approximately \$105,000 for a 785 sq.ft. 1-bedroom suite to \$150,000 for a 1,105 sq.ft. 2-bedroom suite.

Maintenance fees will range from approximately \$320 to \$450 per month, and will include all utilities, basic cable T.V. service, \$1,150 per unit for property taxes,

and all maintenance requirements including property management, staffing and related costs. (The purchaser must pay extra for pay

T.V. and telephone).

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:
None.

Problems Encountered:
Preparing the legal documentation and setting up the corporate structure was complex and time-consuming because of the hybrid nature of this development. It is not a condominium or a co-operative, but something between an equity co-op and a non-profit co-op because of the limitations on the equity take-out upon resale.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
The Glenmaple project (located in Scarborough) is a 14-storey building with 124 units.

Amenities in the building include:

- small library with fireplace (quiet room);
- arts and crafts studio with bench and lockers;
- exercise area with equipment;
- small aerobics area;
- large meeting room (card tables, meetings, parties, etc.)
- horseshoe pitch;
- garden plots; and
- outdoor patio with gazebo and adequate bench seating throughout the site.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
None.

Formal Evaluation:
An evaluation process has recently begun but will not be completed until 1994.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
MTHDC organized a number of focus groups with seniors to find out what they wanted. The response to the guaranteed equity concept was very positive. In addition, the seniors wanted "comfort, safety and no

frills". The amenities included in the building were based on the focus group studies.

People Served:

This program is targeted to seniors who are 55 years or older who currently own their own homes.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

It is critical to have a good location near medical facilities, community services and public transportation. It is also important to locate in an area where the seniors now live and own their own homes as they would prefer to remain in their present neighbourhood, and they are the potential market for the guaranteed equity units.

Contact Persons:

Steve Kupresak,
Project Manager
Metropolitan Toronto Housing
Development Corporation
20 York Mills Road, 3rd Floor
North York, Ontario
M2P 2C2
Tel: 416/397-0909
Fax: 416/392-3037

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#56 -HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

GARDEN SUITES CITY OF LETHBRIDGE AND COUNTY OF PARKLAND, ALBERTA

Sub-Category:
Zoning

Description:

In 1989 the City of Lethbridge and the County of Parkland participated in a pilot project to explore garden suites as a new housing option for the elderly. A garden suite is a portable, self-contained housing unit that is placed in the yard of a relative of an older person. The placement of the unit is temporary, until it is no longer required by the older person.

The municipalities adopted the following land use planning approval process to implement the garden suite pilot project:

Lethbridge

The City enacted a land use bylaw amendment allowing garden suites as a discretionary use subject to approval by the Alberta Planning Board under the Planning Act. The placement of individual garden suites was achieved through granting site specific development permits for the temporary placement of garden suites in accordance with agreed-to project conditions. The Alberta Planning Board granted an exemption under section 78 of the Planning Act for the pilot project sites to allow the garden suites on each lot in accordance with agreed-to project conditions.

Neighbourhood information sessions were held to inform the applicants' neighbours of the project and of the intention to place the garden suite unit on the lot and to respond to questions.

Parkland

Parkland chose to issue development permits on the basis of a Ministerial Order which designated the garden suites sites Innovative Residential Development Areas under section 149 of the Planning Act. This Order automatically waived the

second residence restriction noted in section 78 and did not require an amendment to the by-law. (This approach was more expedient than the traditional by-law amendment approach).

Responsible Agency

Alberta Municipal Affairs, the City of Lethbridge and County of Parkland. In Lethbridge, the units are managed by the Lethbridge Housing Authority. The units in Parkland are managed by the Meridian Foundation of Stony Plain. Both organizations are extensively involved in the management of housing for seniors in their respective jurisdictions.

Impetus:

Alberta Municipal Affairs wanted to explore the prospect of allowing garden suites as one housing option for senior citizens in Alberta.

The city of Lethbridge wanted to investigate the use of garden suites as a viable housing option because they have a large seniors population and many organizations interested in seniors' issues; a significant concentration of the province's manufactured housing industries are located within the City; and the City government is responsive to the needs of its senior population. City Council passed a resolution in 1987 requesting the Minister of Municipal Affairs to investigate the garden suite concept and to consider a demonstration project in a few Alberta municipalities, including Lethbridge.

The County of Parkland had received requests for a second dwelling on a single parcel of land for a number of reasons, including housing for a senior family member. The semi-rural pattern of subdivision in much of the County, with parcels ranging

from 1.2 hectares (3 acres) to 32 hectares (80 acres) was largely responsible for these requests.

Goals:

The goals of the pilot project were to:

- design, construct, place and operate up to 3 garden suites in Lethbridge and up to 3 in the County of Parkland.
- establish and implement a joint provincial-municipal approval process for locating and controlling the use of the garden suites
- evaluate and make recommendations on the appropriateness of garden suites as a housing option for elderly people in rural and urban settings and for different income groups, who require a degree of care and/or service, as well as conditions and procedures for implementing this housing option if appropriate; and
- remove the units after the conclusion of a three year demonstration and evaluation period as appropriate.

Years of operation:

The pilot project started in March 1989. In 1990, two garden suites were occupied in Lethbridge and three in the County of Parkland. The pilot project was to end March 31, 1993, but the term has been extended to March 31, 1996.

Cost:

The per unit costs were \$47,045 in Parkland and \$43,165 in Lethbridge, inclusive of placement costs, locational considerations and a cold weather factor.

The homeowner is responsible for paying rent to the Government of Alberta in the amount of \$400 per month. The homeowner must also pay for taxes and utilities.

The City of Lethbridge agreed to pay for the preparation of the sites to receive the units, the extension and connection of all required utilities, appropriate landscaping

and walkways around the unit, and restoration of the site upon removal of the unit.

The County of Parkland agreed to make a general contribution of \$5,000 towards the project costs.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

This initiative was sponsored by Alberta Municipal Affairs.

CMHC and Alberta Municipal Affairs are providing Rent Supplement assistance to 3 other garden suites in Alberta.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

See Evaluation.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

2 garden suites in Lethbridge and 3 in Parkland.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

In Alberta, one garden suite is being delivered in Red Deer and one is in Slave Lake. These units are owned by the manufactured home builder and receive Rent Supplement assistance. Occupants pay 25% of their incomes to rent the units.

A garden suite pilot project was undertaken in Fredericton, New Brunswick. A one-bedroom garden suite was set up on a property under the direction of the Fredericton Non-Profit Housing Corporation. The unit is rented on a geared-to-income (RGI) basis. In addition to the pilot project, garden suites are also being manufactured and sold privately. The City's Zoning Bylaw does not permit the installation of a garden suite as-of-right on the lot of an existing dwelling. The City has approved garden suites for the sole purpose of housing aging parents. In each case, the approval of the detached accessory unit has been contingent upon a site specific Section 39 Agreement between the City and property owner. To ensure that garden suites are temporary in nature the City registers a Section 39 agreement on title that specifies that the garden suite shall be located for a temporary period on

the property owner's lot for occupancy by the parent(s) of the property owner. The parent must be a "senior citizen". As a further control, the agreement provides that the approval of the garden suite is subject to an annual review by the Development Officer.

In Nova Scotia, the Interchurch Housing Society in King's County received an ACT grant and is working with the Municipality of Kings and the Town of Wolfville to lay the groundwork for introducing garden suites in urban and rural settings in King's County. They are looking to develop legislation that would address the issue of how to ensure that the units are temporary installations, and are used by senior family members only.

A granny flat demonstration project was introduced in Ontario in 1984 when 12 units were built in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, the Region of Sudbury, and the City of Waterloo. An evaluation was completed in 1990. (See literature review).

Formal Evaluation:

A preliminary evaluation was documented in a report entitled, "Preliminary assessment of the Alberta Garden Suite Pilot Project", dated March, 1990. A further report was prepared to provide an interim assessment of the project for the period April 1990 to March 1991.

The Province also undertook a study to obtain feedback from municipalities in implementing a garden suite program. The conclusions are summarized below:

1. There is support for the garden suite concept which enables a host family to provide support, companionship and security to the occupant, enables the occupant to remain in the community longer, and enables the occupant and family to retain some privacy and independence. In the future, program eligibility should be reevaluated to determine the potential for, and implications of, expanding the program to allow for a broader base and non-senior handicapped persons.
2. The land use and development approval process used in Lethbridge, which followed normal, prescribed procedures and allows garden suites as a discretionary use in the land use by-law, should be the approach followed by other municipalities in dealing with garden suite development. Holding neighbourhood information sessions should be left to the discretion of the local municipality.
3. Section 78 of the Planning Act which restricts the number of dwelling units on a lot to one should remain in effect, but the Province should pass legislation to transfer the power to exempt a person or land from this section from the Alberta Planning Board to local municipalities. (In June 1991, the Province passed such legislation). Further study is necessary on ways to control the occupancy of garden suites.
4. Three methods for delivering garden suites have been considered including the private sector method, the public sector method, and a mixed approach. All three methods assume that ownership of garden suites would rest with the delivery agent rather than the occupant or host family. This is viewed as critical to ensure that the suites remain a temporary use and are removed once they are no longer required by the occupant. (Units delivered under the Rent Supplement Program are owned by the Private sector).
5. Little is known about the demand for garden suites. In areas where the program is known, demand appears to be quite limited. However, a study prepared in June 1991 estimated that there was a potential demand for 3,000 units for the 55 and over age grouping and about half that for the 65 and over group, as long as rent levels do not

substantially exceed market rent. (The experience in delivering garden suites under the Rent Supplement Program is demonstrating that there is more interest in garden suites in the rural areas, but limited demand in urban areas.

6. Three major legal issues were identified:
 - The legal security of the garden suite in the event of foreclosure - The Province addressed this by passing the Personal Property Security Act (PPSA) in October 1990, which allows owners of chattels to register an interest in a chattel that becomes a fixture. This gives the owner priority in case of foreclosure.
 - The applicability of the Landlord and Tenant Act - Under the PPSA, if the garden suite is leased as a chattel, no landlord-tenant relationship exists.
 - The acceptability of the garden suite concept under the Charter of Rights in view of its occupancy restriction to seniors who have a parental relationship with the host family - This is still a matter of concern.
7. There may be an issue with municipal assessment in that there is a potential contradiction in defining a garden suite both as a chattel and as real property. This issue needs to be addressed.

Reaction by Tenants, Community and Participants:

All occupants, host families and neighbours expressed general satisfaction with both the living arrangements and the unit itself.

People Served:

People 55 years of age or older in Lethbridge, and 65 years of age or older in Parkland.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

There is a need to resolve the

issues identified in the evaluation, particularly the legal issues, the role of government, and who is ultimately responsible for the ownership and management of the units.

Contact Persons:

Terry J. Toth, P.Eng.,
Research and Technical Support,
Alberta Municipal Affairs,
10155 - 102nd Street, 16th Floor,
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 4L4
Tel: (403) 427-8150
Fax: (403) 427-0418

David Barber, Manager,
Planning Services Department,
County of Parkland,
P.O. Bag 250,
Stony Plain, Alberta T0E 2G0
Tel: (403) 963-2231
Fax: (403) 963-5811

Felix Michna,
Development Services Department,
City of Lethbridge,
910 4th Avenue South,
Lethbridge, Alberta T1J 0P6
Tel: (403) 320-3921

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#57 -HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

BESWICK HOUSE FOR PEOPLE WITH AIDS CITY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA

Sub-Category:

Housing for People with Special Needs

Description:

This project is a joint initiative between the City of Calgary and the Society to House Aids Restricted Persons (SHARP). The City provided funding for the capital costs and acted as general contractor for the project. The SHARP Foundation is a non-profit agency established in 1990.

The project is a residence for people with HIV-AIDS who require assistance in carrying out their daily activities to maintain a suitable quality of life. The project is located in a suburban community. The building was originally designed as a side by side duplex with upper and lower units. It was modified to connect the upper and lower floors and to provide a facility which can accommodate a maximum of 10 persons.

The City of Calgary acquired the unfinished duplex and provided funding to complete the modifications. The SHARP Foundation expressed interest in renting the duplex as a community-based care facility for persons with AIDS.

The project is based on a volunteer component, community fund-raising and co-operative living. The project has several unique features, including an intercom system, the upper floor (north side) is for use by persons with physical handicaps and includes an outside elevator, doorways have been widened for wheelchairs, and there are private telephones in each room. Because of concerns expressed by community residents, the garbage enclosure is designed to be lockable. Parking requirements were reduced as the residents are not able to drive. Parking has been provided for two staff and two visitors.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Calgary and the Society to House Aids Restricted Persons (SHARP).

Impetus:

The waiting list of qualified means tested persons with AIDS was increasing. The SHARP Foundation operates four houses and one half duplex. However, these projects are designed for those who can live independently. Beswick House is targeted to those who can no longer live independently and require access to 24 hour care. The project was intended to be an innovative, cost-effective, community-based model of care for persons who until recently were required to be hospitalized.

Goals:

The goal of the project is to provide community-based care for persons with AIDS and is based on a co-operative living model.

Years of Operation:

The program began operation in late 1992.

Cost:

The total capital cost of the project to the City of Calgary was \$301,000. The annual rental income from the SHARP Foundation to the City of Calgary is \$40,000. Tenants utilize the Provincial Rent Supplement Program to reduce their rent to 25% of their income.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

Alberta Municipal Affairs has provided Rent Supplement funding to enable project operations to become feasible.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

In anticipation that there might be community resistance to the project, the SHARP Foundation worked closely with the Community Association, the Ward Alderman and adjacent residents. A three year Development Permit was granted to the project.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

The facility's capacity is 10 persons.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

While there are several residential projects for persons with AIDS across the country, these projects are designed for persons who are capable of living independently. This project is unique as it is for persons with AIDS who are no longer able to live independently and who require access to 24 hour medical supervision.

Formal Evaluation:

As part of project approval, the City's Housing Department was directed to undertake an evaluation of the project including its neighbourhood and community impact prior to the development permit being renewed. This evaluation will begin in 1994, and will include consultation with staff and residents of the facility, community residents and the Ward Alderman.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

For the residents of the project, it is an alternative to a hospital setting and provides an atmosphere of co-operative living and caring. The SHARP Foundation was experiencing increasing demand for a facility that provided care for its members who, because of the progress of the disease, were no longer able to live independently. Community residents were initially apprehensive because of their concern with waste disposal. This concern was relieved with the incorporation of locked refuse storage and the preparation of a procedures manual for the Alberta Department of Occupational Health and Safety. The SHARP Foundation co-ordinated the community information and consultation process. A

neighbourhood resident now sits on the Board of Directors.

People Served:

10 people with AIDS who have low incomes.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

In this case, the favourable conditions were the interest of a community agency, the SHARP Foundation, to become a partner in a unique project. The organization was able to secure planning approval for a needed facility and was able to provide support and fund-raising ability. In addition, the agency's commitment to pursuing an active community information and consultation process as well as the commitment of the Ward Aldermen were a key component in the project's success.

Contact Persons:

Jim Anderson,
Housing Manager,
The City of Calgary,
Land and Housing Department #8052,
P.O. Box 2100, Station M,
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5
Tel: (403) 268-1455
Fax: (403) 268-1948

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#58 -HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

Sub-Category:

Zoning

Description:

When developers approach the City of Prince George with an application for a plan of subdivision for more than 100 lots, the City requires one lot to be zoned Residential Institutional.

This means that zoning on one of the lots will permit a day care centre, nursery school, women's shelter, or community residential facility (group home) which provides for group living for people with physical, mental, emotional or related problems.

This policy may be applied in developments of between 25 - 100 lots, depending on the level of need in the area.

Responsible Agency:

The Development Services Department,
City of Prince George.

Impetus:

It was very difficult for groups to obtain re-zoning for shelters or group homes. This initiative was introduced to ensure that these facilities can be provided in the community and that properly zoned land is designated at the outset.

Goals:

To make sure that zoning is in place and that the opportunity exists for a variety of facilities and special needs housing to be located in most neighbourhoods of the city.

Years of Operation:

This practice was introduced in the early 1990's, when the City first began receiving applications for new subdivisions. It is now written in the 1993 Official Community Plan.

Cost:

There are no additional costs for this initiative.

ZONING FOR GROUP HOMES IN NEW SUBDIVISIONS CITY OF PRINCE GEORGE, B.C.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:

The City works with a number of groups in the community from time to time to assist them in finding sites.

Problems Encountered:
None yet.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

No one has used this policy yet to build a Residential Institution.

The subdivisions are still being built, and lots are not yet on the market.

**Similar Initiatives Operating
Elsewhere:**
None noted.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

**Reaction by Tenants, Community or
Participants:**
Reaction from the community has been positive.

People Served:
This policy will assist a variety of special groups in need of housing.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Support from the community and from Council.

Contact Persons:

Kerry Pateman,
Senior Planner,
City of Prince George,
1100 Patricia Boulevard,
Prince George, B.C. V2L 3V9
Tel: (604) 561-7691
Fax: (604) 563-8775

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#59 -COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY

CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN CITY OF VANCOUVER, B.C.

Sub-Category:

Development Approval Process

Description:

The Crime Prevention Unit of the Vancouver Police Department plays an important role in helping to make residential developments more safe. It does so by addressing design issues in existing buildings and proposed developments from a safety point of view.

Developers, building owners or residents may invite the Crime Prevention Unit to examine the premises and to make recommendations as to how safety and security in the building can be improved. The officer will consider how landscaping, locks, alarms, and other design features could make the building safer.

The Crime Prevention Unit is also involved in the development approval process to ensure that safety and security issues are considered in the early design stages, before buildings are actually built.

The Unit becomes involved when plans and blueprints have been prepared. They participate on a committee that includes all the vested interests, including the developer, architect, and representatives from the city's planning, engineering, parks and recreation, and fire departments. The committee addresses issues such as how the building will be situated, and the location of parking, entrances, and elevators. Meetings are ongoing until the proposal is accepted by the city.

Responsible Agency:

The Crime Prevention Unit, which is part of the Community Services Section of the Vancouver Police Department.

Impetus:

The idea of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design has developed

over time, and has been adopted from the United States and Europe. In the late 1960s, it was first recognized that buildings could be designed in ways that could improve security and safety.

Goals:

To improve security and safety in the city, and to take a pro-active, instead of reactive approach.

Years of Operation:

The RCMP began giving courses in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in the mid-1980s. The Crime Prevention Unit in Vancouver was established in 1991.

Cost:

Not known.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The RCMP provides training to local police.

Other Partners:

All those involved in the development process.

Problems Encountered:

The Crime Prevention Unit has no authority to require changes to developments. Their recommendations may or may not be adopted. The only way that changes can be required is if they are stipulated in the building code. To date, one change in the building code has been made to require 1-inch, instead of 1/2-inch deadbolts in doors.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

The Crime Prevention Unit is involved in 12 developments in Vancouver.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Several municipalities in B.C. offer this service.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Most people are very pleased with this service.

People Served:

This initiative benefits everyone in the community.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

City Hall must be willing to work with the Police Department. It is important to communicate that this service is available.

Contact Persons:

Constable Jan Vine,
Crime Prevention Unit,
Vancouver Police Department,
312 Main Street,
Vancouver, B.C. V6A 2T2
Tel: (604) 665-3319
Fax: (604) 665-5078

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#60 - COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY

HOUSING AND SAFETY PROGRAM CITY OF MONTREAL, QUEBEC

Sub-Category:
Partnerships

Description:

This program is aimed at improving safety conditions for women in the City of Montreal. It is run by a coordinating committee of the City which includes representatives from 10 different municipal services. The committee examines a variety of issues of interest to women, such as safety, daycare, social housing, and design of family housing.

Its most visible work to date has involved "Security Walks" in four Montreal neighbourhoods. These were aimed at heightening awareness of security issues in urban design, and provided an opportunity for the committee to inform women on such questions as what criteria to use in evaluating the security of their neighbourhoods and how to approach the City to act on their concerns. It plans to extend these activities to include other areas of the City, such as recreational facilities, and will be producing a written guide summarizing its work in the fall of 1993.

Responsible Agency:

Femmes et Ville, a coordinating committee of the City of Montreal.

Impetus:

The initial impetus for Femmes et Ville came from public hearings held on the City's plan for the downtown area of Montreal, at which time numerous women's groups pressed for greater attention to be paid to women's concerns by the City. Subsequently the City recommended to its services to include women's issues in their mandates, and the result was the coordinating committee.

Goals:

Femmes et Ville is intended to improve the quality of life for women in the City by addressing a

wide range of issues. In addition to specific measures taken in such areas as security, it also aims to raise awareness of these issues within the municipal administration.

Years of Operation:

The program has been in operation since 1989.

Cost:

There is no budget for the committee's programs as costs are absorbed within the services themselves.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:

The inter-departmental committee works closely with women's groups in the city and a variety of other partners, such as the police and transit authorities.

Problems Encountered:

While there is one full-time staff member for the committee, all other members are drawn from various municipal agencies and thus have other responsibilities. This can lead to administrative difficulties.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Not applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

There are similar initiatives in a number of Canadian cities, including Calgary, Winnipeg and Ottawa-Carleton.

The Metro Action Committee on Public Violence Against Women and Children (METRAC) was established by the Council of Metropolitan Toronto in 1984. Activities have included conducting a safety audit of the Toronto Transit Commission and High

Park and developing a women's safety audit kit for use by community groups. The City of Toronto established a Safe City Committee in 1989 to monitor the implementation of recommendations in the report adopted by Council entitled The Safe City: Municipal Strategies for Preventing Public Violence Against Women. The Safer City Task Force in Vancouver released a report and recommendations for a safer city in April 1993. (See literature review).

Formal Evaluation:

Each year Femmes et Ville submits a report of its activities to the Executive Council of the City.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The response to the committee and to the safety program has been very positive.

People Served:

Women.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The committee needs a minimum of one full-time member in order to function effectively. The management of city agencies must be ready to include women's issues on their agenda. Ideally, a budget for relevant programs should be allocated by every agency involved.

Contact Persons:

Mme. Anne Michaud,
Module de developpement
communautaire,
Service des loisirs et du
developpement communautaire,
Ville de Montreal,
7400, boul. St. Michel, bureau 121,
Montreal, Quebec H2A 2Z8
Tel: (514) 872-6156
Fax: (514) 872-7447

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#61 - COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY

PROVISION OF VITAL SERVICES BY LANDLORDS CITY OF OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Property Standards By-Laws

Description:

The City of Ottawa received special legislation from the Province of Ontario to authorize the City to pass a by-law requiring every landlord of a rental housing unit to provide an adequate and suitable supply of electricity, gas, hot water, water or other vital service.

If a landlord is in arrears and suppliers are seriously considering discontinuing vital services, the City is able to react in advance to continue the services. The City must be in receipt of documentation.

Suppliers may notify the City of Ottawa's property standards section that the vital service will be discontinued by way of copies of letters to the landlord. The City can then make arrangements with the suppliers to provide the services.

The City is entitled to collect the costs of providing the services together with an administrative fee of 10%, and this amount may be registered as a lien in the form of taxes on the subject property. The amount will be deemed to be payable municipal property taxes and shall be subject to the same penalty and interest charges as unpaid property taxes and shall be collected in the same manner and with the same remedies as property taxes. If the City has provided vital services on behalf of the landlord, the City may also direct the tenant to pay any or all of the rent to the City, instead of the landlord. The rent so paid will be applied by the City to reduce any amount spent by the City to ensure the provision of the vital services.

Responsible Agency:

The by-law is enforced by the City of Ottawa Inspections and By-Law

Enforcement Branch of the Department of Planning and Development.

Impetus:

Each year a number of landlords in the City of Ottawa allow their accounts with suppliers of vital services such as heat or electricity to fall into arrears to such an extent that the service is discontinued by the supplier.

Tenants, often with young children, may suddenly find themselves without heat, hot water or electricity and facing suppliers who will not renew service until sizeable arrears for the entire building are paid and a security deposit is provided for future services.

It was apparent that neither tenants nor the City had effective remedies to require landlords to continue the provision of vital services. Under the Landlord and Tenant Act, tenants could request the Crown Attorney to lay charges, or they could withhold rent and face the possibility of eviction proceedings. These measures are not effective in having services such as heat and hot water restored quickly.

The Property Standards By-law passed pursuant to Section 31 of the Planning Act deals with the physical condition of buildings and property rather than the supply of services.

The City's Heat By-law passed pursuant to the provisions of the Municipal Act applies only to one vital service. In addition, it does not authorize the City to enter into agreements with suppliers of heat and it does not deal with the question of arrears.

Other limitations on the City's ability to take effective action on

behalf of tenants include the lack of legislation permitting the City to pass by-laws allowing for the attornment of rents for the payment of vital services or to collect the cost of providing the services in the same manner as property taxes.

The City wanted to be in a position to react in advance to documentation that the services would be discontinued.

Goals:

To ensure that tenants continue to be provided with vital services such as heat, hot water and electricity.

Years of Operation:

Council approved the request to apply for special legislation in February 1, 1991. The Private Bill on this application received 2nd and 3rd Reading and Royal Assent on June 25, 1992. City Council approved the draft by-law to require landlords to provide vital services on December 2, 1992.

Cost:

The cost of vital services paid by the City along with a 10% Administrative fee will be recovered as a lien in the form of additional municipal property taxes.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The City of Ottawa required special legislation from the Provincial Government to authorize Council to pass this by-law.

Other Partners:

Service utilities.

Problems Encountered:

None.

Number of Units Assisted or

Produced:

Not applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating

Elsewhere:

Several other municipalities in Ontario have expressed interest in this initiative and in being able to adopt a similar by-law.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The public had an opportunity to provide its comments when the application for special legislation was advertised in the local newspapers for four consecutive weeks. Two responses were received from Housing Help/Aide Lodgement and from the Federation of Ottawa-Carleton Tenants Associations which were both in support of the City's application.

People Served:

Tenants in rental housing, unless they have expressly assumed the obligation to pay for vital services in their rental agreement.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The most important factor is the co-operation of the suppliers of the vital services. Experience with the City of Ottawa suggests that a sound communication network which includes acquiring a single contact within the company of each supplier and initiating a notification process to ensure proper documentation of services about to be discontinued is the most effective method for ensuring the continuation of the supply of the vital service.

Contact Persons:

Cathy Junop,
Property Standards Branch,
Dept. of Planning and Development,
111 Sussex,
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 5A1
Tel: (613) 564-1725
Fax: (613) 564-8077

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#62 -HOME OWNERSHIP

HOME OWNERSHIP EQUITY PARTICIPATION CITY OF WINDSOR, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:

Partnerships, Financing, Property Taxes

Description:

The City of Windsor's Home Ownership Equity Participation Program is a pilot program where the city will provide vacant land to first-time home buyers who have little or no funds for a down payment. Most of this land was acquired by the City as a result of property tax default sales.

The City of Windsor will transfer ownership of sites considered acceptable for the construction of single family and semi-detached homes to Winhome, the City of Windsor's non-profit housing corporation. The agreement between the City and Winhome requires any future proceeds from the sale of the lots to be returned to the City.

Winhome is responsible for selecting the families, who must be able to pay for the ongoing carrying costs of the home, and who meet the following eligibility criteria:

- a) are current residents of Windsor;
- b) earn a total gross household income of between \$30,000 and \$40,000 per year and do not have access to a sufficient down payment to purchase a home;
- c) have never had registered or unregistered title to a home or condominium;
- d) have a minimum of one adult 18 years of age or older and one dependent child;
- e) are able to provide satisfactory references as to their former tenancies;
- f) possess a good credit rating;
- g) satisfy all other Program eligibility criteria; and
- h) are willing to allow their names to be published.

Eligible buyers are selected by lottery.

Once selected, the buyer will work with Winhome to select a home design for construction on the lot. The buyer can use the value of the City lot as equity toward the cost of building the home.

Before commencing construction, the buyer must prove that a mortgage for the cost of financing the house has been secured through a lending institution. Winhome assists the buyer in getting CMHC insurance on the mortgage, in administering the financing, and in co-ordinating construction of the home.

The buyers lease the lots, (now worth about \$32,000 each), from the City for \$1 a year in return for a promise to purchase the lot within 10 years at current market rates. They will also pay all carrying costs on the property, including the mortgage, utilities, taxes and insurance.

An attempt is made to keep carrying costs as close as possible to the cost of renting similar housing in the private market (approximately \$750 per month plus utilities).

The suggested initial term of the agreement with Winhome is 5 years with an option to renew for a further 5 years. If the buyer does not purchase the lot within 10 years, ownership of the lot and the house revert to Winhome. Winhome and the City would either sell the home or rent it.

When the occupant exercises the option to purchase the lot, the City, through Winhome, will receive

the current appraised market value of the lot.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Windsor's non-profit housing corporation, Winhome.

Impetus:

The City of Windsor's Mayor's Committee on Housing, chaired by Councillor Donna Gamble, developed this model.

Goals:

This initiative is aimed at providing home ownership opportunities for low to moderate income first time buyers who are unable to raise sufficient funds for a down payment.

Years of Operation:

This initiative was adopted by Council in July, 1992. Applications were developed and circulated in the Fall, 1992. The draw to select the 5 participants was held January 13, 1993. During the Spring, 1993, the 5 households who were selected were in the process of selecting a housing design.

Cost:

The City provides lots that have come into its possession over the years, mostly through tax sales. Instead of paying to maintain the properties, the City will receive revenue through municipal taxes.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
CMHC provides mortgage insurance.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

None to date.

Number of Units Assisted or

Produced:

The pilot project will produce 5 homes.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

A number of municipalities across Ontario have expressed interest. Other municipalities in Canada are also interested, including Vancouver, Fredericton and Truro.

Formal Evaluation:

None yet.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Reaction from the community has been extremely positive.

People Served:

Households with annual incomes between \$30,000 and \$40,000.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

There is a need for serviced vacant lots and demand for this type of housing. It is also important to have the right mix of co-operation and innovation by all the parties involved.

Contact Persons:

Chuck Wills,
Commissioner of Finance,
City of Windsor,
City Hall,
Windsor, Ontario
N9A 6S1
Tel: (519) 255-6223
Fax: (519) 255-6956

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#63 -HOME OWNERSHIP

Sub-Category:

Affordable Ownership and Zoning

Description:

In 1988, the City of Fredericton approved the rezoning of approximately 50 acres of land from R-7 (multiple unit residential) and Future Development (holding zone) to Modular Home zone.

This rezoning permitted the development of a manufactured housing subdivision on an abandoned farm. All the homes in this subdivision were constructed off-site.

The plan of subdivision included 325 registered lots, which could then be sold. This is different from a mobile home park where mobile home owners rent a site for a monthly fee, and there are no registered lots for sale.

The City modified its requirements for lot sizes from the usual 60 x 100 feet to 30 x 90 feet.

Houses sold for between \$75,000 and \$90,000, which was about \$20,000 - \$30,000 less than other private market ownership housing. The lower prices were largely a result of the reduced frontages. The homes do not look like mobile homes. They have a roof line, and most have full basements.

Responsible Agency:

City of Fredericton Planning and Development Department.

Impetus:

The City of Fredericton was approached by a developer who was interested in this type of housing.

Goals:

The City of Fredericton wanted to encourage the development of affordable housing for lower and middle income households.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING SUBDIVISION CITY OF FREDERICTON, NEW BRUNSWICK

Years of Operation:

The rezoning took place in 1988. Approximately 60 homes were built and occupied in 1989, and another 60 were built and occupied in 1990. Sixty more homes are expected to be completed during the summer of 1993, and ground services (water and sewer) are now being provided for a fourth phase.

Cost:

The only costs were for public meetings.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:

George MacFarlane, who was the original developer, and Fred Stairs, who is the manager of Brookside Mini-Home Park.

Problems Encountered:

When the development was first proposed, there were concerns about the quality of the homes that would be produced and fears that the development would become a ghetto. This did not happen. The subdivision has become a very desirable mixed income and social community, and there appears to be a large market for this type of housing.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

The subdivision includes 325 lots. To date, 120 homes have been built and occupied. Another 60 will be completed in the summer of 1993, and services are now being provided for a another 60 homes.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

None identified.

Formal Evaluation:

None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

All the homes were occupied in the first year. There seems to be a market for this type of housing.

People Served:

The subdivision houses people with a range of incomes.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

This case illustrates the need for flexibility and innovation in the application of zoning regulations. The outcome has been positive both in terms of land use and the cost of housing.

Contact Persons:

Robert W. Robertson, MCIP, AICP,
Assistant City Administrator,
City of Fredericton,
P.O. Box 130,
Fredericton,
New Brunswick
E3B 4Y7

Tel: (506) 452-9500

Fax: (506) 452-9509

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#64 -HOME OWNERSHIP

HABITAT FOR HUMANITY CITY OF WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

Sub-Category:

Self-Help Initiatives and Partnerships

Description:

Habitat for Humanity is a community organization which brings together a partnership of individuals, churches, businesses, service clubs and others with those in need of decent shelter to build and renovate housing. Each local affiliate constructs or renovates housing for qualified families by raising funds and recruiting volunteers to help in construction. In the case of new construction, the housing is sold at cost, with free financing for 15 to 25 years. Beneficiaries of the program must presently live in inadequate housing, have a steady source of income (which is below the poverty level guidelines), be ineligible for a conventional mortgage, be willing to live in a community with a variety of people, and be able to provide character references and evidence of ability to pay. Habitat homeowners contribute 500 hours of sweat equity to their new home, in place of a conventional downpayment. A revolving loan fund, comprised of donations and no-interest loans from church, individuals, civic groups, and businesses, provides the source of mortgage money. Homeowners make monthly payments of mortgage principal, which are returned to the fund.

The City of Winnipeg assists in providing land. In 1992, the City provided Habitat with 2.2 acres of land for less than market value at the price of \$39,500. This is sufficient land to build 18 houses.

Responsible Agency:

A local inter-denominational volunteer Board of Directors governs the Winnipeg affiliate of the Habitat for Humanity organization.

The City is generally supportive of Habitat's aims. City support and involvement in Habitat projects generally is in the area of land assembly.

Impetus:

The work of the organization is premised on the belief that people have a right to decent housing and the recognition that, increasingly, people are living in housing which is either inadequate and/or unaffordable.

Goals:

The organization aims to build new affordable housing and renovate existing housing using a combination of sweat equity, in-kind contributions and capital. In addition, by having low income and affluent people work together in partnership, Habitat hopes to build new relationships and a sense of community among participants.

Years of Operation:

Winnipeg Habitat was incorporated as a non-profit organization in June 1987. It was the second Canadian affiliate of Habitat International. Construction and renovation activity occurred in the summers of 1988 and 1989.

Cost:

The Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity affiliate is a non-profit charitable organization. Funds are solicited from a wide range of private sources. Winnipeg Habitat contributes 10% of its donated funds to Habitat International for construction in developing countries.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

Habitat for Humanity does not accept

direct government funding, but it does obtain contributions in the form of land, services and permit fees or funds to acquire these.

Other Partners:

A number of organizations and individuals.

Problems Encountered:

The organization is constantly challenged to find capital for its endeavours, and volunteers who possess leadership and decision-making skills.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

As of December 1992, 23 new homes have been built and 10 have been renovated by Winnipeg Habitat. The organization plans to construct 18 new houses in 1993. The actual number of future renovations is yet to be determined.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

There are 15 other affiliates in Canada located in Winkler, Manitoba; Owen Sound; Toronto; Kitchener-Waterloo; Guelph; Hamilton; London; Niagara; Aylmer; Abbotsford; Kelowna; Calgary; Edmonton; Saskatoon; and Halifax.

Most municipalities support Habitat for Humanity activities by helping to provide land. Municipalities may also waive costs for services and permits.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Reaction from the participants is very positive.

People Served:

People with low wage earned incomes who need housing, whose current housing is inadequate, overcrowded or sub-standard. Households with a disabled member are also served and may receive priority.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

People must be willing to work with Habitat as partners to provide sweat equity.

Contact Person:

Jake Pauls,
Regional Director for Western Canada,
Habitat for Humanity,
181 Church Avenue,
Winnipeg, Manitoba R2W 1B6
Tel: (204) 589-5371
Fax: (204) 589-0252

Wilmer Martin,
Executive Director,
Habitat for Humanity Canada,
159 Herbert Street,
Waterloo, Ontario N2J 1T3
Tel: (519) 571-1044
Fax: (519) 571-1474

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#65 -HOME OWNERSHIP

HOMEOWNERSHIP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM CITY OF MONTREAL, QUEBEC

Sub-Category:
Property Taxes

Description:

This program consists of a three year municipal tax rebate, with a maximum of \$10,000 in assistance to homebuyers of new housing in the arrondissement Ville-Marie (the centre of the City) and \$2,000 to those buying a new home elsewhere. There is no annual limit in the former case, while in the latter the rebate cannot exceed \$1,000 in any year.

The program is a new version of a program that was in operation for the three years until January 1, 1993. In terms of eligibility requirements, the property must be new. It can be a single-family or multiplex dwelling, townhouse or condominium, or non-residential property converted to residential. The deed of sale must be signed before March 1, 1996, although for units in the downtown area the deadline is extended by two years, provided the foundations have been laid before March 1, 1996. If the dwelling is sold within the three year period, the participant cannot claim the remaining rebates.

The program distinguishes itself from its predecessor by offering rebates instead of credits, providing more generous assistance to homebuyers in the downtown, and by elimination a first-time buyer requirement and a purchase price ceiling.

Responsible Agency:
City of Montreal, Service de l'habitation et du développement urbain (SHDU).

Impetus:

The current average market price of a house in Montreal exceeds \$100,000, which is beyond the reach of moderate income households. Young families thus tend to look to the suburbs when purchasing their first homes, with the result that the city's proportion of the regional population has declined significantly over the past twenty years. This program aims to make Montreal more competitive with the suburbs and to boost the City's share of regional housing production. It is also intended to raise the City's homeownership rate, which is currently very low (25%). The goal of increased homeownership is an important part of the City's housing policy, as it contributes to increased revenues, neighbourhood stability and maintenance of the housing stock.

Goals:

The City recognizes that the key to promoting homeownership is increased affordability. To this end, the program not only offers financial incentives to homebuyers, but also encourages the development of less expensive building products, techniques and designs, which can in turn stimulate the home construction industry. The rebates are intended to be particularly attractive to tenant households, since many of them are in a position to become homeowners. In addition, the City is providing a tax rebate premium to homebuyers in the arrondissement Ville-Marie in the hope that increased ownership in that area will help revitalize the City's downtown. Over the long term, the

City hopes to encourage the construction of 10,000 dwellings in Montreal.

Years of Operation:

The program commenced in March 1993, and will continue until March 1996.

Cost:

With the replacement of a tax credit by a rebate, the program now incurs substantial costs where previously there were none. However, these new "costs" merely reflect a change in accounting procedures rather than a change in the City's fiscal position. Furthermore, since the program will stimulate the residential development of vacant land, it will increase municipal revenues in the longer run.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:
None.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

None.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

Under the previous program, 2,218 households received \$5,000 worth of tax credits each, for a total of more than \$11 million.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

Several municipalities in the Montreal area and in Quebec offer tax credits.

As part of a program to revitalize its core area, Quebec City provides fiscal incentives to home owners who buy a residential unit in the downtown area. To be eligible, the property must be the principal residence of the owner and must not exceed an assessed value of \$80,000. In addition to individual households, members of a co-operative who fulfil the above requirements are eligible. The incentives consist of a combination of subsidies and tax credits. The subsidies are calculated according to household size, and range from \$1,250 for an applicant with no children to \$5,000 for a household with three or more children. A tax credit of 50 - 100% is available for

24 months after purchase. A further credit of 25 - 50% for the following 12 months is granted to households with children.

Formal Evaluation:

A profile of participating households was completed a year ago.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The predecessor program was very popular, attracting over 2,000 participants.

People Served:

The program serves the general population, but is aimed particularly at rental households who are prospective home buyers.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

The program must be accompanied by a promotional campaign among the general public.

Contact Person:

Fabien Cournoyer, Surintendant,
Service de l'habitation et du
developpement urbain Module
habitation - developpement,
330, rue Saint-Paul Est,
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1H2
Tel: (514) 872-2848
Fax: (514) 872-3883

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#66 -HOME OWNERSHIP

DIVIDED CO-OWNERSHIP PROGRAM
CITY OF MONTREAL, QUEBEC

Sub-Category:

Conversion of Rental Buildings to Ownership

Description:

Since 1987, conversion of rental residential buildings to divided co-ownership has been legal everywhere in Quebec except in the Montreal Urban Community (MUC). Legislation permits MUC municipalities to derogate from the ban on conversion, however, and the City of Montreal recently adopted a by-law outlining the circumstances in which conversion is permissible on its territory.

The by-law is designed to ensure that tenants in affected buildings can choose whether or not to become owners. Under its provisions, a derogation may be granted for a building only if the vacancy rate in the zone where it is located is equal to or greater than 3%, the ratio at which the market is considered to be in equilibrium. This guarantees those wishing to remain tenants an acceptable choice of housing within their neighbourhood. In addition, rental buildings must have four units or more whose average rent exceeds a benchmark amount set out in a schedule accompanying the by-law. These limits are aimed at curbing conversions of buildings whose clientele have low incomes and who are thus not in a position to become owners. Furthermore, it must be noted that a derogation granted by the City does not constitute an authorization to convert. Landlords granted a derogation must then proceed to the Regie du logement, which grants authorization only if it is satisfied that tenants' rights will be respected.

In order to encourage ownership, the City will accord first buyers of individual units in converted buildings a property tax credit of \$1,250 spread over five years.

Responsible Agency:

The City of Montreal.

Impetus:

This initiative forms part of a broader strategy aimed at stimulating homeownership and shoring up the City's population base. The City has seen its share of the regional population steadily decline over the past twenty years, and is in need of measures to revitalize its downtown neighbourhoods. It feels that conversion will help keep young households in central areas and preserve the housing stock. Current market conditions are also highly favourable to this initiative: vacancy rates are extremely high (above the equilibrium level for the past five years), ensuring that conversion will not adversely affect the rental market; and interest rates are at record lows. Thus tenants opting for ownership will be in a strong negotiating position.

Goals:

To stimulate homeownership by providing a wider choice of available properties. The City estimates that as a result of this by-law, between 5,000 and 15,000 units will be put on the market over the next five years. Their purchase would translate into a maximum 9% increase in the number of homeowners in the City.

Years of Operation:

It is expected that this by-law will come into effect in August 1993.

Cost:

The City will forego property tax revenues of \$1,250 per unit.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

Final authorization for conversion must be sought from the Provincial Government.

Other Partners:
None identified.

Problems Encountered:
It is too early to judge the effects of this initiative.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:
Not yet applicable.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:
Conversion is already permitted everywhere in the province outside of Montreal. Other municipalities have adopted by-laws limiting conversion, but the City of Montreal's by-law is more complex.

Formal Evaluation:
None.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:
There is strong opposition from tenants' advocates.

People Served:
The by-law is directed at tenants in general, but especially those who are in a position to become homeowners. In particular, the City has made duplexes and triplexes eligible for conversion because it sees them as the best alternative to suburban single-family homes that it can offer.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
While this by-law responds to a very complex set of circumstances, favourable conditions in the rental and financial markets, as well as the quality of the converted building stock, stand out as important contributions to its effectiveness.

Contact Person:
Mr. Martin Wexler,
Chef de division,
Service de l'habitation et du
developpement urbain (SHDU),
Module de l'habitation,
303, rue Notre Dame est, 4e etage,
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 3Y8
Tel: (514) 872-5477
Fax: (514) 872-3883

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#67 -HOUSING INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICES

HOUSING REGISTRIES OFFICE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF
OTTAWA-CARLETON, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:
Intensification

Description:

The Housing Registry has two separate elements. The Match & Share Seniors' Homesharing Program provides a screening, matching and referral service to individuals interested in shared accommodation. The Homelink Program matches persons with disabilities with accessible housing. The registries provide information about home-sharing opportunities and accessible housing. The office is staffed by one full-time Coordinator, one full-time Administrative Assistant, and one part-time Community Relations Officer who works in all phases of the program. Three part-time volunteers have been involved in the Match and Share program since the program's inception. In addition to providing information about potential matches for homesharing, the Match and Share Service answers inquiries about seniors housing options in general. About 60% of staff time is spent on the home-sharing program and 40% on accessible housing.

Responsible Agency:

Planning Department, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton (RMOC).

Impetus:

In 1984, the Regional Municipality saw the need to give seniors a choice in their housing, and to use existing housing stock in the community which was under-utilized. This led to the Seniors Homesharing program. The impetus for the Homelink program came in 1986, when the municipality started to link people with disabilities with appropriate housing. The Provincial Government was also looking at this

through the Office of Disabled Persons, and the municipality was able to combine the two programs.

Goals:

The intent of the Housing Registries Office is to accommodate the housing needs of seniors and persons with disabilities of all income levels. The goals of the homesharing program are to:

- offer affordable accommodation to people of all ages, with an emphasis on seniors (one person in a matched household must be 55+);
- offer seniors an alternative to institutions;
- make better use of existing housing stock; and
- maintain a roster of community agencies that may be called upon to provide support services for persons in a shared housing situation.

The Homelink Program exists to:

- develop a mechanism to link private and non-profit landlords with individuals or families who are actively seeking opportunities for independent living;
- expand the range of housing options to persons with disabilities; and
- encourage self-help and self direction for persons with disabilities.

The delivery of housing programs through the Regional Planning Department enables closer co-ordination with Regional Health and Social Services staff and simplifies exchange of information.

Years of Operation:

The seniors homesharing program was initiated in 1984 by the Homes for the Aged Committee of Management. This committee was exploring options in housing for seniors, and homesharing was the approach they decided to take. The Accessible Housing Registry was a RMOC initiative established in 1986 following the identification of a need for a mechanism to help disabled people find specially designed housing. Both programs were amalgamated into one office called the Housing Registries Office in 1986.

Cost:

The 1992 budget for the Housing Registries Office, including both programs, was \$151,113. The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton provided approximately 50% (\$74,000) to fund the program.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

This initiative operates under a co-funding agreement between the Province and the Regional Municipality. The Ontario Ministry of Housing contributes \$40,000 towards the funding of the Match and Share program. The Ontario Office for Disability Issues contributes \$37,000.

Other Partners:

None.

Problems Encountered:

The biggest problem is that future funding from the provincial government is always uncertain. Staff time is diverted from day-to-day activities to address this problem. There is also increasing demand from frail seniors who are hard to match with people who are willing to provide some support and assistance.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

New units are created throughout the community as people decide to share for the first time and open their homes for the purpose of homesharing. This makes better use of existing housing stock and is a soft form of residential intensification.

Similar Initiatives Operating Elsewhere:

The homesharing program is one of 17 programs funded by the Provincethroughout Ontario. Six are operating in Metro Toronto. The City of Toronto Registry Office sends a list of approximately 175 vacant units to libraries and other public agencies. Between 20 - 30 new listings are usually added each week. Most of the vacancies are in rooming houses, or are rooms in houses. There are 10 Homelink Centres (accessible housing registries) funded by the Provincial Office of Disabled Persons.

The City of Medicine Hat, Alberta manages a Housing Registry for senior citizens.

Formal Evaluation:

The Ministry of Housing completed an evaluation of the Ontario Home Sharing Program in 1989. It found that the program was a cost-effective way of providing housing, and it provides an alternative for seniors who want to remain in the community.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

Some of the people who were matched developed warm relationships with caring, support, understanding and laughter.

People Served:

Since its inception, the Match & Share Program has achieved 322 matches which translates to over 800 people housed in a sharing situation (some matches involve several people).

Conditions Necessary for Success:

People are more willing to consider sharing when vacancy rates are tight.

Contact Person:

Sharon Peebles,
Co-ordinator,
Housing Registries Office,
Ottawa-Carleton Centre,
111 Lisgar Street,
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2L7
Tel: (613) 560-1366
Fax: (613) 560-6006

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#68 -HOUSING INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICES

HOMESHARING PROGRAM MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO, ONTARIO

Sub-Category:
Intensification

Description:

Homesharing programs match people who are looking for accommodation with those who are willing to share their homes. Homesharing registries provide a range of services beyond the listing function generally offered by a typical housing registry. Seekers are interviewed to obtain information necessary to help in the search for suitable housing. Providers are interviewed to obtain information to assist in the search for suitable tenants. Potentially compatible seekers and providers are identified, and a few appropriate seekers are referred to providers.

Five homesharing agencies are operating in Metro Toronto in addition to the City of Toronto's homesharing program. Each agency has one full-time coordinator and at least one staff member and also uses volunteers and students.

The matching process of the homesharing program operates in the following way. The initial contact is made on the telephone, followed by an interview during which many living options are explored. Once the homesharing option is chosen, an assessment of the individual's needs is made. This is followed by a search to decide if an appropriate prospective house mate is on the registry. As many as three contact names may be provided. Staff introduce the parties and review the terms of the arrangement. A home visit is made within the first two weeks of a match and mediation services are offered indefinitely.

Responsible Agency:
Since the fall of 1988, the Housing

Division of the Metropolitan Toronto Community Services Department has administered both Ontario's and Metro's financial contributions to homesharing projects in Metropolitan Toronto. Sustained support by the Department will be contingent upon Provincial funding beyond March 1993.

Impetus:

There is a growing awareness and concern in Metropolitan Toronto about housing shortages in general and availability of appropriate and affordable housing in particular. The scarcity of vacant land in Metro is making it increasingly expensive and difficult to address these needs by building more houses. Also, many households require smaller and more affordable accommodation.

An option that is gaining in importance is housing intensification (or residential intensification), which refers to the process of making better use of land and the existing housing stock. Home-sharing is one illustration of intensification where there is an increase in the number of persons per dwelling.

Goals:

The objectives of homesharing projects include: encouraging homesharing in all sectors of the population; increasing the supply of affordable accommodation by educating the community regarding the advantages of renting unused space in their homes; and improving access to support services by helping potential homesharers in resolving other problems through in-house counselling or referrals to appropriate services.

Years of Operation:

Since 1985, the Provincial Ministry of Housing and the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto have funded homesharing projects, beginning with two demonstration projects. Six homesharing projects are currently in operation.

Cost:

In 1992, five homesharing projects are receiving \$53,333 each for a total of \$266,665 in disbursements. The Province pays up to 75% with Metropolitan Toronto contributing the remainder. The City of Toronto is not included in these figures as it sponsors its own Homesharing registry.

While the Metropolitan and Provincial funds do not fully meet proposed funding levels, the homesharing agencies do have access to other resources. Some area municipalities award grants. One project charges user fees. Some sponsoring agencies provide administrative support such as book-keeping, audit and rent. In other cases, volunteers are utilized. The Province provides generic promotional materials and computer software program support.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The initiative receives provincial funding contribution through the Ontario Ministry of Housing, Home-sharing Program.

Other Partners:

Not applicable.

Problems Encountered:

The level of funding (no cost of living increase since 1987) and funding uncertainties (since 1990 funding has been granted in time periods varying between 2 and 12 months) are negatively affecting the effectiveness of the program.

Number of Units Assisted or Produced:

In 1991, 226 matches were made by the 5 agencies. In addition, a range of other services were provided including housing and non-housing referrals, consumer outreach and counselling.

Similar Initiatives Operating**Elsewhere:**

The homesharing program is one of 17 programs funded by the Province throughout Ontario. Six are operating in Metro Toronto. There are only three other programs in Ontario that specifically cater to seniors. They are located in the Regions of Niagara, Sudbury and Metro Toronto. There are 10 Home-link Centres (accessible housing registries) funded by the Provincial Office of Disabled Persons.

Formal Evaluation:

A formal evaluation report will be released in the Spring, 1993.

Reaction by Tenants, Community or Participants:

The homesharing agencies have received many letters of support. They are seen as a very important source of housing and information. They provide alternatives for people who need housing choices, and respond to the particular needs in their communities.

Conditions Necessary for Success:

There is a need for quality support from the homesharing agency to help overcome initial fears by those sharing their homes, and to help address any difficulties that may arise when a match is made.

Contact Person:

Bob Steffler,
Manager, Programs and District Support,
Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited,
20 York Mills Road, 3rd Floor, North York, Ontario M2P 2C2
Tel: (416) 392-6133
Fax: (416) 392-3974

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE FACT SHEETS

#69 -HOUSING INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICES

REGIONAL HOUSING INFORMATION SERVICE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON, ONTARIO

Category:

Community Services

Description:

Two agencies have been funded to provide housing information and advocacy services primarily to low-income tenants. Housing Help serves a region-wide clientele on a drop-in, storefront basis. Action-logement serves a primarily francophone population in the eastern area of Ottawa-Carleton. Both agencies offer service in French and English. Typically, clients require the following services:

- information on assisted housing and help completing multiple application forms;
- help with landlord/tenant disputes;
- information and advocacy on landlord and tenant rights; and
- referral to other agencies.

Both agencies maintain listings of private rental housing that are used extensively by clients. Through a separate provincial program, each agency also has funding for a housing educator who undertakes public education and advocacy.

Housing Help has prepared a Housing Help Handbook and a Housing Help Maze Workbook, which complements the Homelessness Maze used to illustrate problems low-income households encounter in seeking affordable housing.

Action-logement has four full-time staff and Housing Help has seven full-time staff, including the housing educators. Housing Help also recruits student placements and volunteers, and participates in government-funded training programs.

The service was initially structured so that all funding flowed through Housing Help, although each agency had its own board of directors. Housing Help also had a satellite office to increase access to the service. An evaluation of the service in 1991 recommended that Housing Help and Action-logement operate as separate agencies, recognizing a separation that occurred almost at the inception of the service. The evaluation also recommended that Housing Help close its satellite office. The agency found that the satellite was difficult to staff effectively and that clients served at the satellite would frequently come to the main office for follow up assistance. The agency believed access to the service was not enhanced by having the satellite office.

Responsible Agency:

The Planning Department of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton has undertaken a leadership role in securing joint provincial, regional, and municipal government funding for the two agencies. Funding was initially arranged for a three-year pilot project (1989-1991), with all funding flowing through a contract between the Region and the Dalhousie Health and Community Service Centre, acting on behalf of Housing Help and Action-logement. Following an evaluation in 1991, separate contracts for service were signed between each agency and the regional and municipal funding partners. Provincial funding flowed through a new provincial program, Partners in Housing.

Impetus:

Housing Help began in 1986 as a community development project of the

Dalhousie Health and Community Service Centre and operated with periodic municipal funding until 1989. The need for a permanently funded housing information service was identified by the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Planning Department in 1987, and was subsequently endorsed by the Ottawa area Access to Permanent Housing Committee as their top priority. Social service providers and shelter workers demonstrated the benefits of accessible information to the homeless population, including households at risk of becoming homeless. During 1988-89, staff of the Region, the City of Ottawa, and the Ontario Ministry of Housing developed a plan for a community-based housing information service, following extensive consultations. In June 1989, the housing information service was approved by Regional Council.

Goals:

The primary objective of the service is to provide consumers with direct access to assistance and information about housing in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. The objectives are to:

- increase public awareness of social and private housing resources;
- streamline and simplify the public's access to social housing; and
- collaborate with community-based groups regarding the delivery of affordable housing and housing-related information services.

Years of Operation:

Council approved the establishment of the service in principle in 1987, and the actual establishment of the service in June 1989. Secure funding allowed Housing Help to increase its staff and expand its operations at the storefront office it had established previously. Action-logement needed to organize a board, set up an office and hire staff. It began operating in December, 1989. The agencies were funded as a three-year pilot project ending in 1991. Following a favourable evaluation in 1991 by the Region, the City of Ottawa and the

Province, the Region and the City renewed their funding commitment for another three years, with the Region's funding conditional on provincial funding. In 1992, Provincial funding transferred from a pilot project basis to a new funding program, Partners in Housing, and must be renewed annually.

Cost:

Under the 1989 agreement with the Province, City of Ottawa, and Region to fund the agencies, the Province provided \$200,000; the Region, \$100,000; and the City, \$50,000. Of this total budget of \$350,000, \$240,000 was provided to Housing Help and \$110,000, to Action-logement.

Following a positive evaluation in 1991, the two organizations became separate. The Region's contribution increased to \$115,000, the City's, to \$68,000, and the Province's, to \$240,000. Of this total budget of \$423,000, funding for Housing Help increased to \$276,000, and \$147,000 to Action-logement.

Each agency also receives funding from other provincial programs and fund-raising. Action-logement had an estimated 1992 budget of \$169,629 and Housing Help had an estimated budget of \$375,689.

Provincial or Federal Involvement:

The service is funded by the Region, the City of Ottawa and the Government of Ontario.

Other Partners:

Community Services centres were instrumental in setting up both agencies and have served on their boards.

Problems Encountered:

The model of service delivery - a single, centralized office or several more dispersed outlets - was discussed extensively during the planning stage. The current system with two offices (east and west, outside the downtown core) appears to work well, in that each serves a somewhat different geographic area. Funding has been difficult in that the three-year pilot project had no allowance for an annual, inflationary increase. Under the

present funding arrangement,
provincial funding - the largest
share for each agency - must be
sought annually. Both agencies feel
they cannot meet the demand for
their services with their current
budgets.

**Number of Units Assisted or
Produced:**
Not applicable.

**Similar Initiatives Operating
Elsewhere:**
Saskatoon, Kitchener, Sudbury,
Hamilton and Vancouver.

Formal Evaluation:
Evaluated in 1991. It was
recommended that Action-logement be
funded separately and that they have
more autonomy.

**Reaction by Tenants, Community or
Participants:**
More than 100 clients were
interviewed for the evaluation and
virtually all found the agencies to
be very helpful. Community agencies
serving low-income groups or active
in housing issues were also surveyed
and again, the response was
positive.

People Served:
In 1991, Housing Help served 19,000
people, and Action-logement served
12,000. Most of the people served
are low income tenants. Housing
Help also helps a large number of
homeless people who are on the
streets or in shelters. Action-
logement does not have a large
homeless population in its service
area.

Conditions Necessary for Success:
Committed agency staff and Boards of
Directors.

Contact Persons:
Marni Cappe,
Manager, Housing Policy,
Regional Municipality of Ottawa-
Carleton,
Ottawa-Carleton Centre,
111 Lisgar Street,
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2L7
Tel: (613) 560-2053
Fax: (613) 560-6006

Michael Wilson,
Director,
Housing Help,

520 Bronson Avenue,
Ottawa, Ontario K1R 6J9
Tel: (613) 563-4532
Fax: (613) 563-8019

Rosine Kaley,
Director,
Action-logement,
240 Montreal Road,
Vanier, Ontario
K1L 6C6
Tel: (613) 747-8957
Fax: (613) 747-0805

PART 111

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

1. An Annotated Bibliography of Canadian Literature
2. Bibliography of recent Literature from the United States

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CANADIAN LITERATURE

1. Municipal role in the supply and maintenance of affordable housing

Achour, Dominique, et Gerard Divay (1985) Les couts d'habitat: un critere d'urbanisme? Montreal: Institut National de la Recherche Scientifique (INRS)-Urbanisation.

Chapter Eight of this book contains an analysis of public sector assistance to housing in Quebec. It combines considerable statistical information with a critical evaluation of the impact of government programs on different income groups.

Actualite immobiliere, Vol. 9, #1, printemps 1985 - Universite du Quebec a Montreal (UQAM), Montreal.

This edition of the magazine is devoted entirely to the municipal role in the provision of housing. It covers an array of relevant subjects, ranging from the legal powers of municipalities to the role of municipal housing agencies.

Association of Municipalities of Ontario (1991) Implementation of the Land Use Planning for Housing Policy Statement: Issues and Recommendations, Toronto: Association of Municipalities of Ontario.

In July 1989, the Provincial Government issued its land use planning for housing policy statement. In its response, AMO examines the designation of regional and local responsibilities; the supply of land; streamlining; the range of housing; intensification; and monitoring. The report also includes a summary of recommendations.

Belanger, Pierre (1984) Operation 20,000 logements: enquete socio-economique, Ville de Montreal.

This report is based on a satisfaction survey of Montreal residents who became homeowners through Operation 20,000, a housing initiative operated by the City of Montreal. It resembles a marketing study and as such, is descriptive rather than analytic.

Berneche, Francine (1989) Problematiche de l'habitation pour les menages formant la nouvelle immigration a Montreal: Elements d'information et d'intervention, Ville de Montréal.

The author examines the implications of immigration for housing in Montreal. She draws heavily on data from the 1986 Census to provide a detailed portrait of recent immigrants to Montreal, examining such variables as income, household size, home ownership levels and housing costs. She also discusses policy solutions to immigrant housing problems, based on interviews with various people involved in the fields of housing and immigration.

Canadian housing/habitation canadienne, Vol. 6, #2, May 1989 - Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA), Ottawa.

This edition of the magazine features a variety of essays on housing policy and access to housing in Quebec, including articles on housing activities in Montreal and Quebec.

Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (1991) A Review of Joint Ventures: Public/Private Partnerships in Action, Ottawa: Canadian Housing and Renewal Association.

This study analyses eight joint venture projects in five locations across Canada. The study found joint ventures have produced affordable housing and have fulfilled a number of objectives. However, they are not a cost-effective alternative to non-profit or co-operative housing programs. The report suggests circumstances where joint ventures would be beneficial.

Charbonneau, François, Parenteau et Danielle Dumont-Frenette (1989) Accession a la propriete residentielle en milieu urbain, par des menages a faible et moyen revenu / Etude de cas: Operation 20,000 logements, Montreal: Insitut d'urbanisme, Universite de Montreal, Montreal.

This report studies homeowners who obtained their first house through Operation 20,000, a housing initiative of the City of Montreal. It focuses on their social and economic status, in light of the programs stated goal of targeting young households of low to moderate income. The report includes an extensive discussion of the policies of Operation 20,000 and of Habiter Montreal, as well as recommendations for a more effective housing policy.

Gaudreau, Marcel et Benoit Lacroix (1988) Effets de la participation des municipalites a la production de logements pour le march).

The authors examine the recent growth of municipal involvement in the production of market housing in Quebec. Their study covers Montreal, Quebec City and several smaller cities. In addition to examining the rationale underlying municipal involvement, they also study the structure and delivery of programs and the types

of housing they produced. While not strictly dealing with the issue of affordable housing, the report is of interest for its insight into the competition between municipalities trying to attract households and the mechanisms they employ when intervening in the housing market.

Gaudreau, Marcel et Martin Wexler (1987) Un projet de cohabitation separee parents-enfants a Saint-Hubert, Ottawa: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC).

The impetus for this study came from a failed attempt by a local developer to produce a set of bigenerational housing units in the municipality of Saint-Hubert. The project is described by the authors as an innovative method of housing the elderly with their adult children. In discussing the project they touch on the following issues: low-cost housing; housing for the elderly; coordination (or more specifically, lack thereof) among different levels of government; innovation in housing production; and the role of the municipality. They attribute the failure of the project in part to the nature of municipal financing in Quebec, which discourages this kind of innovation.

Gagnon, Normand, "Les programmes municipaux de recyclage: fonctionnement, fonds et performance" - Actualite immobiliere, Vol. 10, #1, printemps 1986.

This article appears in an edition of the magazine devoted to recycling old buildings. The author discusses building renewal programs operating in Quebec City, devoting most of his attention to a description of the programs, their financial structure and their admissibility requirements.

Lower Mainland Affordable Housing Working Group (1992) Working Brief on Innovative Financing For Affordable Housing, Vancouver.

This paper outlines 13 initiatives aimed at providing housing for low and moderate income households. These include: index-linked mortgages; land leases to non-market housing groups; index-linked leases; market surplus cross-subsidy; affordable housing land trust; community bonds; development deposits; working with charitable foundations; investor immigrant program; inclusionary zoning for housing; density bonusing for affordable housing; development cost charges for affordable housing; and general municipal contributions. A municipal role is identified for all these initiatives. (Copies are available from Coro Strandberg, Chair, VanCity Community Foundation, 515 West 10th Avenue, Vancouver, V5Z 4A8 (604)877-7553).

Morin, Richard (1987) Reanimation urbaine et pouvoir local, Montreal: INRS-Urbanisation.

Morin examines municipal strategies for urban renewal in neighbourhoods experiencing decline. His work is based on three case studies drawn from Montreal, Sherbrooke and Grenoble, and emphasizes the economic and institutional forces underlying municipal intervention. The use of case studies permits a detailed examination of the concrete effects of government policies in such areas as social housing, co-op housing and private construction.

Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs (1990) Increasing Housing Choices: Implementation Guideline for the Land Use Planning for Housing Policy Statement, Toronto: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Ministry of Housing.

The policy statement came into effect on August 1, 1989. This document provides guidance to create more opportunities for increased housing choices. The guideline provides a framework within which municipalities can tailor their own implementation of the Land Use Planning for Housing Policy in land supply, streamlining the planning process, the range of housing types, residential intensification and monitoring.

Ontario Ministry of Housing (1992) Consultation Counts: Taking Action on a Housing Framework for Ontario, Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

This report outlines the new directions the government of Ontario will be taking in response to consultations on A Housing Framework for Ontario and Government Land for Housing. Four key policy directions were established including: the creation of a new government/third sector partnership; more resident control of non-profit housing; an improved approach to providing access to not-for-profit housing; and a commitment to greater sensitivity to the support service requirements of residents with special needs. The report recognizes the important role of municipalities, who will be represented on a new Housing Advisory Committee. The Ministry of Housing will explore the possibility of providing "block funding" to participating municipalities which could then choose to implement different types of housing programs. The province will also work with municipalities, school boards and transfer agencies to achieve affordable housing objectives by acquiring surplus sites made available by an agency voluntarily.

Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association (1991) A Housing Framework for Ontario, Response to the Ministry of Housing's "Issues for Consultation", Toronto: Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association.

This report provides a comprehensive response to the Housing Framework for Ontario. Included is an outline of a proposed new non-profit housing program, responses to the consultation

questions and a summary of recommendations. Several recommendations address the role of municipalities on issues such as streamlining the building approvals process, providing information on housing needs, enforcing building standards for the maintenance and repair of existing housing, and administration of housing programs.

Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association (1992) Reforming Ontario's Planning and Development Process, A policy position paper in response to the draft discussion papers of the Commission on Planning and Development Reform, Toronto: Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association.

ONPHA recommends a number of changes to the Planning Act and states that a revised Planing Act should include a goal that makes direct reference to the need to provide opportunities for the creation of housing that is affordable to households with a full range of incomes. Policies relating to the environment should also include tolerance levels in support of goals for intensification.

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (1991) Consultant's Study: Inclusionary Zoning Study for Housing in the City of Toronto: Final Report, Toronto: City of Toronto, Planning and Development Dept.

This report study examines the feasibility of a mandatory inclusionary zoning program for affordable condominium housing in the City of Toronto. Inclusionary zoning would require a set proportion of units within a multiple residential project to be affordable to first-time home buyers.

Parenteau, Rene, Francois Charbonneau et Chantal Beaudoin, "Analyse des mouvements residentiels des menages de l'Operation 10,000 logements de Montreal" Actualite immobiliere, Vol. 7, #1, printemps 1983; pp. 12-17.

The aim of this paper is to examine the effect of Operation 10,000 logements, a low-cost housing initiative of the City of Montreal, on household movements within the Montreal area. The authors find that the program satisfied certain housing needs within the City. They caution, however, that it is unclear whether the program succeeded in attracting households from the suburbs or contributed by itself to the revitalization of neighbourhoods.

Provincial Commission on Housing Options (1992) New Directions in Affordability, Victoria, British Columbia: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Recreation, and Housing.

The Commission on Housing Options was established in June 1992 to consult with British Columbians and find ways to meet housing needs within shrinking federal budgets and limited provincial and municipal financial resources. The report includes 57 recommendations. Several of these address the role of local governments, particularly in the areas of land, secondary suites, and giving municipalities more tools to create and maintain affordable communities. Some of these include giving municipalities authority to establish inclusionary zoning by-laws, use bonus density rights, lease land at below market value rates, issue debentures to raise revenue for affordable housing purposes, and establish a reserve fund for housing purposes.

Regional Chairman's Task Force on Affordable Housing (1991) Regional Chairman's Task Force on Affordable Housing: Final Report and Extended Background Papers, Hamilton: Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth.

The Task Force was established in September 1989 to provide community input to Regional Council on ways to address the growing problem of affordable housing in Hamilton-Wentworth. This report includes recommendations for a new Regional strategy which cover the policy environment; regulatory environment; community development initiatives; generating ideas on affordable housing; enabling and ensuring the construction of affordable housing; and establishing a Regional Housing Commission. Volume 2 includes a series of background papers.

2. Community and Economic Development

Clayton Research Associates Ltd, (1992) Economic Impacts of Co-op Housing Projects, Toronto: Co-operative Housing Association of Ontario.

The purpose of this study was to determine the employment and taxation impacts of expenditures on co-operative housing in Ontario. It found that the construction of 1,000 typical new co-op housing units is estimated to generate a total of 2,210 person-years of employment. The analysis also showed that taxes generated to all three levels of government from the building of 1,000 new co-op units are estimated at \$46 million.

Conference Board of Canada (1986) Economic Impact of the Canadian Homeownership Stimulation Plan and the Canadian Home Renovation Plan.

The Conference Board of Canada examined the separate impacts of the Canadian Homeownership Stimulation Plan (CHOSP) and the Canadian Home Renovation Plan (CHRP) on employment, interest rates, and activity in the construction industry. The report

found that CHOSP had a positive impact on total employment at a very reasonable net cost per job in the short term. CHRP had only modest impact on employment. Over the medium term, neither program maintained a positive impact on employment.

Corbett, Ron and Bill Ashton ed. (1992) Housing as a Community Development Tool, Sackville, New Brunswick: Rural and Small Town Research and Studies Programme.

This book is based on a collection of presentations at an Atlantic Region Housing Workshop in October 1990. It addresses a number of critical questions regarding community development with the focus on housing as an economic development tool, housing as a social development tool, and housing as an environmental development tool.

Ekos Research Associates Inc. (1989) Final Report for the Evaluation of Property Value Impacts: Non-Profit Housing, Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Housing, Housing Advocacy Task Force.

Non-profit housing projects can be a significant source of conflict between sponsors of non-profit housing projects and people living in the neighbourhood. One of the fears is that these projects will reduce the property values of the surrounding properties. This study found that non-profit housing projects had no overall negative influences on the property values of the neighbouring properties.

Hedman, David (1989) Yukon's Housing Industry and Community Economic Development, Masters Thesis, Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

This thesis identifies ways the Yukon government can assist Yukon communities to meet housing needs and help achieve community economic development goals. It shows that housing is an integral part of community economic development.

Hulchanski, David (1990) Planning New Neighbourhoods: Lessons from Toronto's St. Lawrence Neighbourhood, UBC Planning Papers, Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

This report describes Toronto's St. Lawrence Neighbourhood which was developed by the City over 10 years ago. Hulchanski identifies the importance of the physical site plan and building form, the social planning decisions, especially the social mix and the planning process itself. St. Lawrence demonstrates that public planning of large development projects in an open democratic fashion can be successful and that desirable high density socially mixed neighbourhoods can be developed by a municipality.

Mars, J. (1990) Housing-Employment Linkage Study, Toronto: City of Toronto, Planning and Development Dept.

The purpose of this study was to measure the link between commercial development and the need for affordable housing in the City of Toronto; design a linkage fee system, (a way to charge developers of commercial space a sum of money based on the measured linkage to provide a housing subsidy); and assess the impacts of a linkage fee for selected policy scenarios.

Rees, William E. and D. Hulchanski (1990) Housing as Northern Community Development: A Case Study of the Homeownership Assistance Program (HAP) in Fort Good Hope, Northwest Territories, Vancouver: Centre for Human Settlements, University of British Columbia.

In 1982, the Hamlet of Good Hope assumed responsibility for managing the NWT Homeownership Assistance Program. The authors found that the community-based housing delivery system employed by Fort Good Hope improved the local housing and contributed to community pride, independence and self-esteem. They concluded that the provision of housing can have a role in community development in the north.

Vancouver B.C. Planning Department (1989) Economic Impact Study: Rooming House Accommodation: Downtown Vancouver, South Side and East Side, Vancouver B.C.: Vancouver Planning Dept.

This report reviews the existing inventory of low-cost accommodation in the study area. It addresses the impact on these areas of development in Coal Harbour, False Creek North, False Creek East and Downtown South; future trends with regards to demand for low cost housing; economic factors influencing owners' investment decisions; possible loss or gain in the number of units; and the influence of the provincial government's funding programme.

3. Housing and Sustainable Development

Ashton, Bill and David Bruce (1993) Housing and Sustainability, Sackville, New Brunswick: Rural and Small Town Research and Studies Programme, Mount Allison University.

This book includes 20 examples of sustainable housing in Canada and over 100 initiatives. The authors define sustainability in terms of values and principles related to housing. Chapter 3 describes how to develop a sustainable housing action plan for a community.

Ashton, Bill and David Bruce eds. (1993) Beyond Housing: Selected 1992 CHRA/ACHRU Congress Papers, Sackville, New Brunswick: Rural and Small Town Research and Studies Programme, Mount Allison University.

This book is a collection of selected papers submitted by speakers at the 1992 CHRA congress. Part four contains three presentations on sustainable communities, and these discuss how sustainability can be built into new housing developments.

Beavis, M.A (1991) University of Winnipeg Colloquium on Sustainable Housing and Urban Development, Winnipeg: University of Winnipeg.

The papers contained in this volume address the origins of sustainable development and its relation to housing and community planning; the politics of sustainable urban development policy in Canada; the regulatory framework and the development of sustainable housing and communities; research undertaken regarding contemporary suburbia with a view towards a new morphology; and linking affordable housing and environmental protection.

Brownlee, David (1989) Bibliography of Resource Material Related to Sustainable Development, Richmond, B.C.: Planning Department.

The Richmond Planning Department compiled a bibliography of selected source materials related to sustainable development which is intended to provide a useful basis for further research.

D'Amour, David (1991) Les origines du developpement durable et son rapport avec le logement et l'urbanisme, Ottawa: SCHL.

This paper is a background study, and focuses on the role that CMHC and the housing industry can play in attaining sustainable development. It approaches the question at a very general level, and would be of interest mainly as a preparatory document. (Available in English).

Gaudreau, Marcel et Pierre J. Hamel (1990) Le developpement urbain viable a Montreal: quelques avenues de reflexion et d'action, Montreal: INRS-Urbanisation.

This report covers a wide range of issues related to sustainable development. While its scope necessarily prohibits a detailed discussion of the role of housing policy in promoting sustainable development, it touches on some issues of interest to the question. Specifically, it provides a theoretical critique of commonly accepted cost-benefit methods used in calculating environmental impacts; and at the practical level it documents

the environmental costs of low-density urban form, as well as the role of government policy in promoting, or failing to inhibit, urban sprawl.

Liaison Vol.4 No.1, 1992, Toronto: Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research (ICURR).

This issue focused on sustainable development. It includes recent reports on local sustainable development and provides a comprehensive list of reports on sustainable development available on loan from the ICURR library.

MacLaren, Virginia (1992) Sustainable Urban Development in Canada From Concept to Practice, Toronto: ICURR Press.

This study investigates how some of Canada's larger municipalities are implementing sustainable urban development (SUD). One of the goals was to study how municipalities are interpreting the concept and to identify an operational definition. It examines the variety of plans, policies and other tools being used to address SUD, and the problems or successes encountered to date. Volume 1 is the Summary Report. Volume 2 includes an annotated bibliography, and Volume 3 includes a compendium of municipal initiatives on sustainable development across Canada.

Marbek Resource Consultants (1991) Sustainable Housing: A Background Paper for the City of Montreal's Proposed Housing Design Competition, Ottawa: CMHC.

This paper was prepared specifically for a housing design competition, yet it contains information that is of general interest to sustainable development, notably in the areas of resource consumption, site planning, health and well-being, and affordability.

Plan Canada 31:3 May 1991 Toronto: Canadian Institute of Planners.

This issue was devoted to sustainable development. An article by William Rees examines the implications of developing sustainable urban communities and suggests local initiatives for a sustainable future. Another article, by Ray Tomalty and Sue Hendler, reviews the ways in which 6 municipalities in Ontario are incorporating principles of sustainable urban development in the policy process at the local level.

Nozick, Marcia (1992) No Place Like Home: A Book About How To Develop Sustainable Communities, Ottawa: The Canadian Council on Social Development.

This book addresses sustainable development and community economic development, and provides examples of alternative community development from Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Calgary and Vancouver. The book is organized around five themes, including self-reliance, harmonization with nature, attaining community control, meeting individual needs and building community culture.

Rees, William (1989) Defining Sustainable Development, Vancouver: Centre for Human Settlements, University of British Columbia.

This publication offers a working definition of sustainable development and discusses some immediate implications. It also includes a number of definitions of sustainable development offered by government and environmental leaders, and presents a discussion of sustainable vs traditional forms of development.

Rees, William ed. (1989) Planning for Sustainable Development: A Resource Book, Vancouver: Centre for Human Settlements, University of British Columbia.

These symposium proceedings explore how sustainable development applies to specific planning and policy decisions at the provincial and municipal levels, particularly in British Columbia. Included is the keynote address by Stephen Lewis; workshop reports on provincial strategies; economic opportunities; and information on planning sustainable communities.

Regional Chairman's Task Force on Sustainable Development (1993) Implementing Vision 2020, Directions for Creating a Sustainable Region, Regional Chairman's Task Force on Sustainable Development, Hamilton: Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth.

This report serves as a blueprint for a more sustainable future. It is a synthesis of the goals and major directions identified by the Task Force and by citizens during two years of public outreach. The report identifies major policy shifts and directions needed to begin the process of creating a sustainable region. Issues addressed include protecting the landscape, improving the quality of water and air, reducing the amount of waste, consuming less energy, land use in the urban area, transportation, quality of life, and the local economy. The companion document, Detailed Strategies and Actions Creating a Sustainable Region provides over 300 recommendations on what

specific activities should be undertaken to achieve sustainable development.

Regional Working Committee on Alternative Urban Development Standards (1992) Alternative Development Standards, Proposals to Reduce Housing Costs, Ottawa: Planning Department Policy and Programs Division.

This report outlines alternative guidelines for alternative development standards that could generate significant cost-savings in the production of housing and create more compact development. This report takes into account the results of a design charrette, as well as the results of a study on the impact of alternative standards on municipal maintenance costs.

Richardson, Nigel H. (1989) Land Use Planning and Sustainable Development in Canada , Ottawa: Canadian Environmental Advisory Council.

This paper explores the contribution that institutionalized land use planning can make to the achievement of sustainable development, identifies general principles of land use planning and its application to further the implementation of sustainable development in different parts of Canada, and examines the federal interest and role in land use planning in Canada.

Robinson, Terry (1991) Le logement durable en climat froid, Ottawa: SCHL.

This document reviews Canadian research initiatives in sustainable housing, placing emphasis on low energy consumption and environmentally healthy development. In addition to providing a definition of sustainable development it analyses its implications for housing design. (Available in English).

Roseland, Mark (1992) Toward Sustainable Communities: A Resource Book for Municipal and Local Governments, Ottawa: National Round Table Series on Sustainable Development.

This book is intended to help local government officials and citizens who want to apply the concept of sustainable development in their communities. It documents a range of municipal initiatives towards sustainable communities. Each chapter begins with an introductory overview explaining the topic and its relevance to sustainable communities and/or municipal government, followed by a set of tools, initiatives, resources and bibliographic references. Chapter 5 discusses land use and growth management.

Roseland, Mark (1992) "Linking Affordable Housing and Environmental Protection: The Community Land Trust as a Sustainable Urban Development Institution." Canadian Journal of Urban Research Vol. 1, #2, pp. 162-180.

This article examines sustainable development and its implications for communities in North America; explores links between affordable housing and environmental protection within the context of sustainable urban development; and suggests the community land trust as an institution to enable sustainable urban development in Canada.

Task Force on Sustainable Development for the Peterborough Area, Peterborough, Ontario.

The purpose of this publication is to suggest a foundation and some practical ideas for implementing sustainable development within the Peterborough area.

4. Community Safety

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (1989) Overview of CMHC activities related to urban safety and crime prevention, prepared for the European and North American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention held in Montreal, Ottawa: CMHC.

CMHC provides an overview of their activities that relate to urban safety and crime prevention through the delivery of public housing, social housing and housing rehabilitation programs; research activities including the testing of products designed to impede crime; and special initiatives such as public housing regeneration, the development of new neighbourhoods and the delivery of emergency shelters for victims of family violence.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (1989) European and North American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention, A Synthesis of International Literature on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention in Residential Environments: Interim Report and Bibliography, Ottawa: CMHC.

This is an interim report on the existing research on the relationship between residential environments and urban safety. It outlines the terms of reference of the study undertaken by Prairie Research Associates Ltd. in conjunction with Rick Linden at the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, and provides a summary of interim findings. The report includes a bibliography on crime prevention and urban safety in residential environments.

Kosmick, Rick (1988) A Crime Prevention Inventory of Native Organizations and Communities, Winnipeg, Manitoba: Attorney General, Research, Planning and Evaluation Branch.

This document lists a number of organizations with a wide range of activities that address issues of crime prevention pertaining to Natives, including alcoholism services, corrections and justice services, education and employment, family support services, friendship centres, native child and family services, police agencies, treaty status regional organizations, Manitoba indian bands, and Manitoba Metis/non-status communities.

Linden, Rick (1990) Crime Prevention and Urban Safety in Residential Environments: Final Report, Ottawa: CMHC.

This report reviews and assesses results of crime prevention activities directed at housing and residential environments. The different types of programs discussed include: neighbourhood programs, crime prevention through environmental design; police programs, and strategies for crime prevention in public housing.

Linden, Rick and Candice Minch (1987) Listing of programs to prevent rural crime and reduce fear in Canadian communities, Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, Programs Branch, Rural Crime Prevention in Canada, Programs Branch user report; no.1985-54.

This handbook describes programs to prevent crime in rural farm areas and small towns and reduce the fear of crime in Canadian communities. These communities face unique problems of geographic distance, large policing jurisdictions and limited resources. It outlines some of the ways the police and community have successfully worked together to prevent crime in rural areas. (Available in French).

McInnes, Peter et. al. (1984) The Environmental Design and Management (EDM) Approach to Crime Prevention in Residential Environments, Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada Programs Branch User Report no. 1984-83.

This study examined the nature and applicability of an approach to prevent crime through modifications to the environments in which it occurs. This is called the Environmental Design and Management (EDM) approach. The EDM approach to preventing crime is through a combination of modifying both the design and management of residential environments. Previous approaches, such as Crime Prevention through Environmental Design, focused solely on the aspect of design. (This working paper is available in French).

McKenzie, John B. (1986) Strategies For Risk Management in High Density Housing, Alberta: Alberta Municipal Affairs.

The purpose of this study was to identify practical ways of reducing the opportunity for crime in high density apartment buildings and neighbourhoods. The elimination or control of the following five variables were critical to reducing crimes: decreasing opportunities for access and escape; increasing surveillance capability; increasing technical difficulties and risk of gaining access; promoting proprietary feelings among residents and managers; and strengthening the social organization of residents and managers.

McLeod, Linda (1989) The City For Women: No Safe Place, Ottawa: Corporate Policy Branch, Secretary of State Corporate Policy Branch Canada.

The author states that fear of crime, high levels of violent crime and the vulnerability experienced by women are interrelated problems which demand municipally-based leadership across Canada. The report includes recommendations that suggest a blueprint for municipal actions.

Plombini, Marino (1987) Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: The Status and Prospects for CPTED in British Columbia, Masters Thesis, School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is a concept designed to reduce the opportunities for crime. This thesis reviews the status of CPTED in 11 municipalities in the Lower Mainland of B.C. Recommendations are made to facilitate the implementation, evaluation and promotion of CPTED in the future.

Toronto Planning and Development Department and Gerda R. Wekerle, York University (1992) A Working Guide for Planning and Designing Safer Urban Environments, Toronto: Planning and Development Dept.

This working guide is intended to be a tool to help build safer cities. It includes a process for implementing planning guidelines for safer cities, describes factors that enhance safety and security in public space, and discusses ways to improve places that are commonly considered unsafe. An extensive bibliography is also provided.

Toronto (Ont.) Planning and Development Department (1991) Cityplan 91 Task Force Planning for a Safer City, Toronto: Planning and Development Dept.

This report describes why the safe city is a planning issue, how the Official Plan can enshrine strategies to make the city safer, and safe city initiatives in Metropolitan Toronto.

Toronto Safe City Committee (1988) The Safe City: Municipal Strategies for Preventing Public Violence Against Women, Toronto: City of Toronto.

This report outlines various strategies in the areas of Urban Design/Planning, Community Participation, Public Transit and Policing.

Vancouver Safer City Task Force (1993) Final Report of the Safer City Task Force, Vancouver: City of Vancouver, B.C.

A number of issues regarding safety and urban design are addressed including community safety issues, building safer communities through social development, safety audits and domestic violence.

5. Regulatory Reform/Intensification

Canadian Urban Institute (1991) Charrette on Housing Two Million in the Greater Toronto Area by 2021: Proceedings, Toronto: Canadian Urban Institute.

This report contains the proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Canadian Construction Research Board on housing intensification. The purpose of this charrette was to contribute to the discussions about the desirable urban form of the Toronto region as it accommodates a 50 percent increase from its present population of four million during the next 30 years. It focused on redevelopment of larger sites within present built up areas of the City. A background report on housing intensification issues was prepared for charrette participants, entitled Housing Intensification: Policies, Constraints, and Options.

Energy Pathways Inc. (1989) Discussion Paper on Regulations Related to Housing Affordability, Choice, Quality and Innovation, Ottawa: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) is a program designed to stimulate regulatory reform action in residential construction. It is an initiative of the Canadian Home Builders' Association, the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, with financial support from CMHC. This paper provides background information on regulatory reform issues facing those concerned about housing choice, affordability, quality and innovation, and initiatives undertaken

to address them.

Friedman, Avi and Vince Cammalleri (1992) Evaluation of Affordable Housing Projects Based on the Grow Home Concept, Montreal: McGill University, School of Architecture.

This report is an examination of low-cost housing developments in Montreal that have drawn on the Grow Home concept, a minimal-cost housing design pioneered by the McGill University School of Architecture. The design has received considerable publicity and won praise as an important answer to the affordability problem. It has been taken up by some developers in Montreal, largely in suburban areas, and this report studies the design, implementation, cost and resident satisfaction of the projects completed.

Hamilton (Ont.) Planning and Development Dept. (1991) Housing Intensification Strategy: Recommendations, Hamilton, Ontario: Planning and Development Dept.

This report provides background information, a description and analysis of housing intensification issues, and recommends a strategy for housing intensification for the City of Hamilton. An additional companion report provides recommendations to address illegal units, residential conversions, redevelopment, infill and conversions of non-residential buildings.

Logements neufs dans des quartiers déjà établis - Conseils et recommandations, Ottawa: SCHL (1982).

Heavily oriented towards design and site planning, this report would be of interest to anyone working on residential densification. It provides a solid grounding in the problem from an architectural point of view. (Available in English).

Lovatt Planning Consultants (1990) Description of the Alberta Garden Suite Pilot Project, Edmonton: Alberta Municipal Affairs, Housing Division.

This report documents the Alberta Garden Suite Pilot Project introduced in 1989 in cooperation with the City of Lethbridge and the County of Parkland. Additional reports include a Preliminary Assessment of the Alberta Garden Suite Pilot Project, prepared in 1990, and Interim Assessment of the Alberta Garden Suite Pilot Project For the Period April 1990 - March 1991. A further report was prepared on Municipal Issues Related to Implementing a Garden Suite Program, which addressed the garden suite concept, land use and development approval, enabling legislation, methods for delivery, demand for garden suites, legal issues and municipal assessment. A further report prepared in June, 1991, Effective

demand for garden suites in Alberta provided current estimates of effective demand for garden suites.

Ontario, Housing Supply Policy Branch (1990) Portable Living Units for Seniors (P.L.U.S.), or, Granny Flat Demonstration Project: Summary Report, Toronto: Ministry of Housing, Housing Supply Policy Branch.

This report documents the evaluation phase of the P.L.U.S. or "granny flat" demonstration project. The project demonstrated the feasibility of the concept in Ontario in social and technical terms. The demonstration began in 1984, with 12 units in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, the Region of Sudbury, and the City of Waterloo.

Ottawa-Carleton (Ont.). Planning Department, Policy and Program Division (1990) Study of Granny Flats: Opportunities in Ottawa-Carleton, Ottawa: Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton Planning Department.

The purpose of this report is to present recommendations to encourage more granny flats in Ottawa-Carleton through a combination of public and private sector initiatives, including making granny flats eligible for funding under the non-profit housing program, and the role of municipal non-profit housing corporations in delivering granny flats.

Richard Drdla Associates (1990) Metro Main Streets: Economic Feasibility Study, Toronto: Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Planning Dept.

This report introduces the study and summarizes the objectives and approach. It contains a detailed review of the regulatory framework in general and suggest changes which would help overcome identified constraints. Finally, it suggests a strategy for implementation, and provides conclusions and recommendations for consideration, including changes to planning regulations, consideration of planning incentives, and marketing and promotional initiatives.

Senecal, Paul, Carole Tremblay et Dominique Teufel (1990) Gentrification ou etalement urbain? Le cas du centre de Montreal et de sa peripherie, Montreal: SHQ.

This study examines growth in the centre and at the fringes of Montreal. While it does not explicitly touch on municipal policy, it provides an excellent discussion of socioeconomic developments underlying locational patterns as well as an extensive statistical complement to the text. (Available in English).

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT LITERATURE FROM THE UNITED STATES

1. Municipal role in the supply and maintenance of affordable housing

Brownlow, Judith (1991) Fair Share Housing: A Partially Annotated Bibliography, 2nd ed. Chicago: Council of Planning Librarians.

Goetz, E.G. "Local Government Support for Non-Profit Housing: A Survey of U.S. Cities" Urban Affairs Quarterly, Vol. 27, #3 (March 1992).

Gorman, Alice Nudelman and Patricia Baron Pollak (1989) Community-Based Housing For The Elderly: A Zoning Guide For Planners and Municipal Officials, Chicago, Ill. Washington D.C.: American Planning Association.

Herrero, Teresa R. "Housing Linkage: Will it Play a Role in the 1990s?" Journal of Urban Affairs, Vol. 13, #1 (1991) pp.1-19.
Millward, Alison (1990) Affordable Downtown Housing: Innovative U.S. Municipal Housing Initiatives and a Case Study of Seattle, Masters Thesis, School of Community and Regional Planning, Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Sherblom, Becky. "Strategies to Reduce Homelessness." Management Information Services, Report 22 (December 1990) pp. 1-18.

2. Community and Economic Development

Chavis, David M. and Abraham Wandersman. "Sense of Community in the Urban Environment: A Catalyst for Participation and Community Development." American Journal of Community Psychology, Vol. 18, #1 (February 1990) pp.55-81.

Fabricant, M. "Creating Survival Services." Administration in Social Work, Vol. 10, #3 (1986) pp. 71-84.

Grimes, Kenneth. "The San Diego Housing Trust Fund: A Successful Affordable Housing Campaign." Shelterforce (May-June 1991) pp. 8-11.

Guy, Donald C.; John L. Hysom and Stephen R. Ruth. "The Effect of Subsidized Housing on Adjacent Housing." American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association Journal, Vol. 13, #4 (Winter

1985) pp. 378-387.

Hoffman, Daniel and David Schwartz. "Low Cost Housing: A Benefit For Employers." Journal of Housing, Vol. 49, #5 (September-October 1992) p. 233.

Opalski, Douglas V. "Jobs, Housing, Transportation: A Balance Through Mediated Fair Shares." Journal of Housing, Vol. 49, #6 (November-December 1992) p. 290.

3. Housing and Sustainable Development

Goldstein, Gregory; Robert Novick, and Morris Schaefer. "Housing, Health and Well-Being: An International Perspective." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, Vol. 17, #1 (March 1990) pp. 161-181.

Hill, David R. "Sustainability, Victor Gruen, and the Cellular Metropolis." Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 58, #1 (Summer 1992) pp. 312-326.

Raffestin, Claude and Roderick Lawrence. "An Ecological Perspective on Housing, Health and Well-Being." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare Vol. 17, #1 (March 1990) pp. 143-160.

United States, Department of Housing and Urban Development (1992) Proceedings - Housing Finance for Sustainable Developments February 3, 1992, Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Fannie Mae Research Roundtable Series. <BU>

4. Community Safety

Burby, R.J. and M.M. Rohe. "Deconcentration of Public Housing: Effects on Resident Satisfaction with their Living Environments and their Fear of Crime" Urban Affairs Quarterly, Vol. 25, #1 (September 1989) p.117.

Casey, Verna. Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention: A Selected Bibliography 1982-1987, Monticello, Ill.: Public Administration Series (Vance Bibliographies) no.P2507.

Covington, Jeanette and Ralph B. Taylor (1990) Neighbourhood

Structure, Neighbourhood Change and Fear of Crime, New Brunswick, N.J.:Centre for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

Curtis, Lynn A. ed. (1987) Policies to Prevent Crime: Neighbourhood, Family and Employment Strategies, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science v.494.

Greenberg, Michael et.al. "TOADS go to New Jersey: Implications for Land Use and Public Health in Mid-sized and Large U.S. cities." Urban Studies, Vol. 29, #1 (February 1992) pp. 117-125.

Huth, Mary Jo. "Strategies for Crime Reduction in Public Housing." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, Vol. 8, #3 (September 1981) pp.587-600.

Keyes, Langley C. "Strategies and Saints: Fighting Drugs in Subsidized Housing." Urban Institute Periodical. (1992) p.243.

Podolefsky, Aaron and Frederic Dubow (1981) Strategies for Community Crime Prevention: Collective Responses to Crime in Urban America, Springfield Ill.: C.C. Thomas.

Podolefsky, Aaron (1983) Case Studies in Community Crime Prevention, Springfield Ill.: C.C. Thomas.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P. ed. (1986) Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work? Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Sage Criminal Justice System Annuals Vol.22.

Wallis, Allan (1980) Crime Prevention through Environmental Design: an operational handbook, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

5. Regulatory Reform/Intensification

Acker, Frederick W. "Performance Zoning." Notre Dame Law Review, Vol. 67, #2 (1991) pp. 363-491.

Danigelis, Nicholas L. (1991) No Place Like Home: Intergenerational Home Sharing through Social Exchange, New York: Columbia University Press.

Devers, Katherine C. and Gordon J. West. "Exclusionary Zoning and its Effect on Housing Opportunities." Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy, Vol. 4, #2 (Summer 1989) pp. 349-363.

Goetz, Edward G. "Promoting Low Income Housing through Innovations in Land Use Regulation" Journal of Urban Affairs (1991).

Hare, Patrick H. "The Echo Housing/Granny Flat Experience in the U.S." Journal of Housing for the Elderly (1991).

Johnston, R.A. et.al. "Selling Zoning: Do Density Bonus Incentives for Moderate Housing Work?" Washington D.C.: University Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law (1989).

Moore, Brenda M. "Not in My Backyard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing - A Review and Critique." Planning and Zoning News, Vol. 10 (April 1992) pp. 12-17.

Ottensman, John R. "Central City Dominance in Metropolitan Areas and the Availability of Affordable Housing." Journal of Planning Education and Research, Vol. 11 (Winter, 1992) pp. 96-104.

Power, Bill et.al. "Granny Flats as Housing for the Elderly: International Perspectives." Journal of Housing for the Elderly, Vol. 7, #2 (1991) pp. 1-74.

Rubin, J.I., J.J. Seneca and Janet G. Stotsky. "Affordable Housing and Municipal Choice." Land Economics, Vol. 66, #3 (August 1990) pp. 325-40.

Sussna, Stephen. "The Inclusion of Low and Moderate Income Housing in Mixed Use Developments." Appraisal Journal, Vol. 59 (January 1991) pp. 54-70.

Tucker, William (1991) Zoning, Rent Control and Affordable Housing, Washington D.C.: Cato Institute.

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (1991) Advisory Committee on Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Housing Not in my Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing, Washington D.C.: United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

APPENDICES

1. Appendix "A" - Index of Initiatives Included in the 1990 Report, entitled The Municipal Role in the Supply and Maintenance of Low Cost Housing: A Review of Canadian Initiatives.
2. Appendix "B" - Initiatives by Province and Municipality.

Appendix "A"

INDEX OF INITIATIVES INCLUDED IN THE 1990 REPORT, ENTITLED THE MUNICIPAL ROLE IN THE SUPPLY AND MAINTENANCE OF LOW COST HOUSING: A REVIEW OF CANADIAN INITIATIVES

This appendix indicates the status of each initiative included in the 1990 report, and notes whether it has ended or is still operating. If the initiative is still operating, the index indicates where it is documented in this report. If the initiative has ended, there is a brief description and reasons why it has ended.

I. PLANNING AND POLICY

1. The Neighbours Pilot Project, City of Toronto

Brief Description: The purpose of the Neighbours Pilot Project was to deliver advice on homesharing, adding "accessory" or "secondary suites", and renting existing units in converted houses. It also sought to receive feedback on incentives and impediments to conversion activity and to test various approaches to promoting conversion.

Current Status: Ended October, 1991.

Reason Ended: The pilot project was scheduled to end. Several new initiatives were identified which will continue to be used by the City's Home Planning Advisory Service. Information on the Home Planning Advisory Service is included in this report as initiative #18 under the heading of Intensification.

II. REGULATIONS: STANDARDS AND ZONING

2. House Conversion Program, City of Victoria

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #19 under the heading of Intensification.

3. Housing Above Shops, City of Vancouver

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #20 under the heading of Intensification.

4. Income Mix Zoning, City of Vancouver

Brief Description: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #47 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

5. New Communities in Industrial Areas, City of Vancouver

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #48 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

6. Preservation By-law and Demolition Compensation Fund, City of Montreal

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #27 under the heading of Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing.

III. REGULATIONS: PROCESS

7. Evening Building Permit Service, City of Toronto

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #31 under the heading of Regulations: Administration/Approval process.

8. Rental Housing Fast Tracking Policy, District of Surrey

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #32 under the heading of Regulations: Administration/Approval process.

IV. ORGANIZATION

9. Community/Municipal Partnerships for Supportive Housing, City of Ottawa

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #40 under the heading of Partnerships.

10. Joint Ventures in Housing, City of Ottawa

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #39 under the heading of Partnerships.

11. Limited Partnership, City of Ottawa

Brief Description: City Living formed a Limited Partnership in 1987. City Living sold 23 housing projects, valued at \$28.3 million to the Partnership in exchange for a promissory note. Interests in the Limited Partnership were in the process of being sold to investors. This initiative was seen as a way to generate sufficient cash flow to fund major renovation work over 10 years to the 1,264 housing units by allowing private sector equity participation in subsidized housing projects.

Current Status: This initiative is currently on hold.

Reason Ended: Poor market conditions brought on by the recession.

12. Operation Habiter Montreal, City of Montreal

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #49 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

13. Social Housing Advisory Committee, City of Saskatoon

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as part of initiative #33, Edmonton Joint Planning Committee on Housing, under the heading of Partnerships.

14. Third Sector Assistance, City of Ottawa

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as part of initiative #40, Community/Municipal Partnerships for Supportive Housing, under the heading of Partnerships.

15. VanCity Home Improvement Loan Package, City of Vancouver

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as part of initiative #16, Secondary Suite Program, under the heading of Intensification.

16. VLC Properties Limited, City of Vancouver

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #50 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

V. LAND AND BUILDINGS

17. Acquisition, Renovation and Sales Program, City of Montreal

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #26 under the heading of Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing.

18. Core Area Residential Upgrading and Maintenance Program (CARUMP), City of Winnipeg

Brief Description: CARUMP was a housing revitalization and neighbourhood stabilization program. Block by block inspections of substandard dwellings were carried out using a team approach. Teams included a property standards inspector, a social worker, and a home support teacher.

Current Status: Ended March 31, 1991.

Reason Ended: The Core Area Initiative Program, under which CARUMP was funded, expired. The City hopes to get additional funding to continue with this type of initiative.

19. Habitat for Humanity, City of Winnipeg

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #64 under the heading of Home Ownership.

20. Home Ownership and Maintenance Program (HOME), City of Winnipeg

Brief Description: Financing was made available to eligible home owners through a combination of forgivable and repayable contributions to acquire new dwellings, acquire existing dwellings, and rehabilitate existing owner-occupied dwellings.

Current Status: Ended March 31, 1991.

Reason Ended: The Core Area Initiative Program, under which this initiative was funded, expired.

21. Land Bank Program, City of Saskatoon

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #51 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

22. Land Write Down and Lease Program, City of Montreal

Brief Description: The City of Montreal provided long term land leases (52 years) to sponsors of co-operative and non-profit housing at a level equivalent to 75% of market value.

Current Status: This initiative has ended.

Reason Ended: The Provincial Housing Corporation (SHQ) wanted to be able to have more direct control over the land and wanted the City to sell the land to co-op and non-profit housing corporations. The leasing of lands to non-profit housing organizations is fairly common in British Columbia, and this initiative has been documented as initiative #52 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

23. Municipal Housing Rehabilitation Program, Quebec City

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #24 under the heading of Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing.

24. Municipal Rooming House Rehabilitation Program, Quebec City

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #25 under the heading of Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing.

25. Portable Living Units for Seniors, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton

Brief Description: This was a "granny flats" demonstration program in Ottawa-Carleton.

Current Status: The pilot project is over. However, the Region is continuing to administer the 4 PLUS units provided under the program.

Reason Ended: The demonstration project ended. An evaluation completed by the Ministry of Housing in 1990 recommended that the government facilitate the use of granny flats.

26. Singles Housing Opportunity Program, City of Toronto

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #3 under the heading of Homelessness.

VI. FINANCING

27. Affordable Housing Statutory Reserve Fund, Township of Richmond

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #44 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

28. Aid to Tenants, City of Montreal

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #29 under the heading of Community Improvement, Rehabilitation and Preservation of Existing Housing.

29. Bridge Financing Fund, Metropolitan Toronto

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #45 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

30. Downtown Conversion Loan Program, City of Kingston

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #22 under the heading of Intensification.

31. Modified Life Tenancies, City of Ottawa

Brief Description: The City of Ottawa, through City Living and/or through the mechanism of a joint venture, promoted the development of a long term (life) tenancy housing option for senior citizens.

Current Status: This initiative has been shelved.

Reason ended: Re-organization of Housing Department and City Living and loss of the Manager, Joint Venture position.

VII. TAXATION AND FEES

32. Employee Housing Service Charge, Resort Municipality of Whistler

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #43 under the heading of Land and Financing for New Development.

33. Homeownership Assistance Program, City of Montreal

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #65 under the heading of Home Ownership.

VIII. INFORMATION AND RELATED SERVICES

34. Homesharing Program, Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #68

under the heading of Housing Information and Referral Services.

35. Housing Registry Office, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #67 under the heading of Housing Information and Referral Services.

36. Regional Housing Information Service, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton

Current Status: This initiative is still operating. It is included in this report as initiative #69 under the heading of Housing Information and Referral Services.

Appendix "B"

INITIATIVES BY PROVINCE AND MUNICIPALITY

ALBERTA

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Calgary | - | Community Store, Schizophrenia Society of Alberta #11 |
| | - | Lincoln Park Townhouse Projects with Secondary Suites #17 |
| | - | Immigrant Investor Program #41 |
| | - | Acquisition of the York Hotel #42 |
| | - | Beswick House for people with AIDS #57 |
| Edmonton | - | Safe Housing Committee #28 |
| | - | Edmonton Joint Planning Committee on Housing #33 |
| Fort McMurray | - | Shelter for the Homeless #4 |
| Lethbridge and Parkland | - | Garden suites #56 |

BRITISH COLUMBIA

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Burnaby | - | Design Guidelines for Adaptable Housing Units #53 |
| North Vancouver-(District) | - | Long Term Land Leases #52 |
| Prince George | - | Zoning for Group Homes in New Subdivisions #58 |
| Surrey | - | Rental Housing Fast Tracking Policy #32 |
| Richmond | - | Affordable Housing Statutory Reserve Fund #44 |
| Vancouver | - | Secondary Suite Program #16 |
| | - | Housing Above Shops #20 |
| | - | Income Mix Zoning (20% Core Need Policy) #47 |
| | - | New Communities in Industrial Areas #48 |
| | - | VLC Properties Ltd. #50 |
| | - | Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design #59 |
| Victoria | - | Downtown Community Development Project #7 |
| | - | House Conversion Program #19 |

Whistler - Employee Housing Service Charge #43

MANITOBA

Winnipeg - Manitoba/Winnipeg Community Revitalization Program #23
- Habitat for Humanity #64

NEW BRUNSWICK

Bath - Canada Employment and Immigration and Housing #37
Chatham - Inmates Build Garden Suites #38
Fredericton - Manufactured Housing Subdivision #63
Saint John - Saint John Non-Profit Housing Inc. #36
Shediac - Housing and Community Economic Development #8

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Cape Dorset - The Municipal Role and Community Development #10<BU>

NOVA SCOTIA

Cape Breton - Supportive Home Living for Seniors on a former Canadian Radar Base #54
Dartmouth - Up Front Capital Funding for Crystal Heights Co-op #46

ONTARIO

Kingston - Downtown Conversion Loan Program #22
Kitchener - Mediation Pilot Project #30<BU>
Metro Toronto - Homesharing Program #68
- Bridge Financing Fund #45
- Glenmaple Seniors Equity Housing Project #55
Ottawa - Thorncliffe Village #13
- Joint Ventures in Housing #39
- Community/Municipal Partnerships for Supportive Housing #40

- Provision of Vital Services by Landlords #61
- Ottawa-Carleton**
 - Alternative Development Standards #12
 - Housing Registries Office #67
 - Regional Housing Information Service #69
- Peel**
 - Housing Opportunity Centre #34
- Toronto**
 - Homeless Initiative Fund #1
 - Homeless Initiatives Spearheaded by Mayor's office #2
 - Singles Housing Opportunity Program #3
 - Street City (#2) #5
 - Street Enterprise Centre, 761 Queen Street West #6
 - Housing and Economic Development Strategy #9
 - Home Planning Advisory Service #18
 - Evening Building Permit Service #31
 - Healthy Cities Project #35
- Waterloo**
 - Environment First Policy #14<BU>
 - Waterloo Region Green Home #15
- Windsor**
 - Home Ownership Equity Participation Program #62

QUEBEC

- Montreal**
 - Acquisition of Rental Housing Program #26
 - Preservation By-Law #27
 - Aid to Tenants #29
 - Operation Habiter Montreal #49
 - Housing and Safety Program #60
 - Homeownership Assistance Program #65
 - Divided Co-Ownership Program #66
- Quebec**
 - Subsidy Program for New or Recycled Buildings #21
 - Municipal Housing Rehabilitation Program #24
 - Municipal Rooming House Rehabilitation Program #25

SASKATCHEWAN

- Saskatoon**
 - Land Bank Program #51