

Focus Consulting Inc.

*Focus on what you **can** do,
not what you cannot.*

Finding Common Ground

Submitted to:

City of Edmonton and Edmonton Homeless Commission

Submitted by Focus Consulting Inc.

In association with

Gary Gordon

And the Center for Housing Policy, Washington DC

December 2013

© Focus Consulting Inc.

Table of Contents

Summary i

Introduction 1

Phase 1: Setting the context..... 2

Phase 2: Review of best practice in other cities..... 6

 Synthesis of approaches and strategies identified..... 6

 Establish and promote an explicit policy framework 7

 Establish and publicize clear and transparent selection criteria 9

 Early and effective key stakeholder engagement..... 10

 Carefully structure public meetings..... 11

 Create mechanisms for meaningful engagement..... 12

 Use of Good Neighbour Agreements..... 13

 Setting ground rules for engagement..... 13

 Planning smaller scale integrated development..... 14

 Exploring the option of a review panel..... 14

Lessons and insights for Edmonton 15

 Elaboration on recommended options..... 16

 Public Education and awareness campaign..... 16

 Provide training on effective community engagement 17

 Update and publish objective evaluation and selection criteria..... 17

 Explore the idea of a review panel 18

Appendices 19

 Appendix A: Phase 1 Edmonton Case studies 19

 Appendix B: Phase 2 Jurisdictional review case studies..... 19

 Appendix C: Links to cited reference documents 19

Summary

This research report was commissioned by the City of Edmonton Housing and Economic Sustainability Branch and the Homeless Commission with a view to creating a more constructive process of dialogue around proposals for new development, particularly affordable and supportive housing.

The research was undertaken in two phases, the first developing an understanding of issues and concerns in Edmonton that inspired the work; and the second a review of best practice across North America to investigate approaches and mechanisms that other cities have implemented.

Based on this background research a number of options and approaches were identified and the following initiatives are recommended for further development and implementation in Edmonton:

1. Initiate, in collaboration with provider networks, the Homeless Commission and Homeward Trust, a public awareness and education campaign about affordable and supportive housing with a focus on dispelling myths and stereotyping of targeted populations.
2. Provide training and guidance to community-based providers of affordable and supportive housing in under taking effective community engagement.
3. Establish and publish objective selection criteria used in evaluating proposals for supportive and affordable housing funding.
4. Explore with stakeholders a review panel to enhance early dialogue and if necessary act as arbitrator in the event that dialogue between proponents and community representatives /residents cannot reach a satisfactory compromise.

Introduction

The City of Edmonton Housing commissioned this research report with a view to identifying approaches and strategies to minimize confrontation and to create a more constructive process of dialogue around proposals for new development. The city is particularly interested in practices related to affordable and supportive housing targeting former homeless persons and families. The research sought evidence based best practices for fostering interest-based negotiations for the development of a range of housing types in all neighbourhoods of the city.

Often the development of housing is met with resistance through political, administrative, and legal delays. Associated adversarial relationships can be costly and detrimental to community cohesion. To meet the goal of distributing a range of housing types across the city, a more evidence based and effective approach is needed to find appropriate compromise and common ground between developer and community objectives and concerns.

The research was undertaken in two phases.

1. In an initial phase the recent experience in Edmonton was examined to develop a better understanding of the issues and concerns that are being faced. A range of consultations were undertaken with officials, developers (market and non-market) and community representatives.
2. The second phase involved a review of best practice across North America, covering 9 Canadian and 10 US cities. Findings from this review were then presented to a range of stakeholders in Edmonton to identify those practices and approaches that may have some utility and transferability to the local context.

This report provides a synthesis of findings from the jurisdictional reviews and presents a series of recommendations on how the City of Edmonton might refine and enhance its current practices to emulate successful practice. It is expected that adoption of these recommendations will help to find common ground in addressing legitimate concerns of communities while at the same time allowing the City and its community based partner agencies to deliver a full range of affordable and supportive housing opportunities across all areas of the city.

The report first summarizes the types of concerns and issues raised in phase one, the local context. It then provides a synthesis of findings from the jurisdictional reviews (with more detailed information available in an Appendix). The final section then presents options and recommendations for consideration by the City.

Phase 1: Setting the context

In the initial exploratory phase of the research the objective was to develop a clear understanding of the issues and nature of recent community opposition in Edmonton. The work involved identification of recent developments where some degree of resistance had been encountered. These were used as case studies in which participants both from the proponent and the city as well as community representatives were interviewed to determine the basis for community concerns. These interviews also sought to determine how the challenges and concerns were addressed as well as the strategies used by proponents to manage the process of public engagement.

This phase involved two larger stakeholder meetings as well as individual interviews with a range of market and non-market developers and community representatives (see Appendix A for detailed case studies).

The key points and comments received from the discussions with key stakeholders and from the case studies are summarized in the following key points and themes:

Context is important

1. Recent years have seen an increase in funding available for affordable housing, in part due to stimulus spending but also aligned with a provincial priority to implement a 10-year plan to end homelessness. New initiatives are emphasizing housing first and therefore often target formerly homeless persons. There is a degree of stereo-typing wherein the public perception and reaction to the phrase *formerly homeless* conjures the image of the worst stereotype will be imposed on their neighbourhood. This speaks to the need to describe and communicate more clearly about the target groups of new investment and the fact that chronic homeless persons are a small percentage of the overall population that flows through the shelter system (the vast majority simply being individuals facing economic related issues or family estrangement).
2. On October 31, 2012, City Council approved the Non-Market “Housing Investment Pause”, a three-year moratorium on City funding for new Non-Market Housing projects in five specific central-area neighbourhoods where there is a high concentration of affordable housing and/or service agencies. It is perceived that concentration of services agencies and drop in centres tend to attract clients and creates a visible population, including homeless and other disadvantaged groups. This contributes to feelings that the area is unsafe and therefore people avoid going there. In light of this moratorium there is an emerging concern about a spillover effect – that new initiatives will be sited in other nearby areas and could contribute to similar concentration. This suggests a need to explore whether there is a definable limit, or tipping point for each neighbourhood.

Stereo typing and fear of worst outcomes

3. Alerted to the efforts to develop housing for formerly homeless persons, local residents have a perception that this means the individuals they may have seen loitering or

begging in an inner city area will be relocated into their area. This invokes concern that crime, drugs and issues of urban safety will follow. The primary concerns that were identified related not to the built form or scale but to the perceived characteristics of who would live there. Currently, all developments tend to get lumped together – there is little distinction between family developments versus supportive housing for singles and persons with mental health challenges.

The type of clientele impacts the nature, amount and timing of engagement with the community.

4. Generally family oriented developments (and especially those favouring ownership vs. rental) have tended to attract less opposition than projects for singles. In part this relates to stereotyping and concern about former homeless (public assume homeless are singles and not families). But this also relates to community concern that certain community assets may be lost, for example in areas with declining child populations, schools are closing and community leagues often intervene to require more family oriented development as a way to “restock” the school population and retain the school as a key part of the community fabric.

Proponent credentials are important

5. The proponent and their track record are a significant consideration in managing downstream “operational risk”. A new organization attempting to develop a support-service model may have qualified staff and a solid plan, but without proven experience or other existing illustrative facilities to demonstrate that they can deliver, it is unknown if they can be effective and successful. Organizations that have been in existence for decades and are publicly known tend to face less critical opposition compared to newer service agencies. One approach used by some organizations is to provide tours/visits to their existing developments and allow concerned residents to meet and hear from adjoining residents of well-established projects.

Different approaches are used to undertake public engagement

6. Stakeholders, especially experienced social housing providers and private developers, generally favour early consultation, although the form of consultation varies. Some prefer a lower key approach – making key project information available (e.g. via website), but not necessarily conducting an open house or public meeting (instead meeting with key groups/organizations one-on-one). Others see a full public consultation and open house as a useful way to share information early and initiate discussion about certain aspects of the development (mainly design/scale related, versus who will live there).
7. An important caveat was however noted. Any process that adds time to the development approval process also adds a cost. Obviously private developers don't like costly delays (it was suggested that delay costs can be as high as \$500/day per

dwelling), but similarly for publicly funded projects it is desirable to avoid unnecessary cost impacts as these can impact potential affordability, or increase the public cost.

Current process focuses attention at development approval juncture

8. The purpose of the land development approval process is to assess proposals for new uses of land. Thus, the appropriate opportunity for public engagement is at the zoning phase when “use” is established. The approval process may not be sufficient for supportive housing developments since the operational requirements may differ from standard housing developments. This is not to say that the land development process is flawed; however, there may need to be supplemental processes in place for supportive housing. It was noted, that this is partially addressed through the Provincial public notice requirement for funding approval. Development proposals for supportive housing may focus’ stakeholders’ attention at the development permit stage when no land use change is required since there is no other formal statutory juncture to intervene outside of this avenue if communities have concerns about operational or program requirements for a project. In these situations, the appeal process can often result in an adversarial context and there is currently no place for a more proactive dialogue and conciliatory mediated process. As the sole opportunity to have a say, the process invites the worst possible confluence of fear and misunderstanding and without another way to seek modification or change concerned residents seek to prevent the project from going forward at this stage. One way to address this is to distinguish supportive housing from Apartment housing and create alternate options for dialogue to specify future remedies for any potential or anticipated future impact, should they arise (to some degree good neighbor agreements seek to achieve this approach).

The funding process creates a double standard and new junction/opportunity

9. Traditionally public engagement takes place as part of a statutory obligation associated with change in use (rezoning or variance). Formal public engagement is not required if there is no zoning change or variance (or Municipal Development Plan change). However as part of the project funding process for affordable and homeless funds the Province of Alberta has imposed a public engagement requirement. So a developer building market rate housing would not have to engage; but if the project had some affordable/homeless funding associated with it, a public process is required. Some stakeholders argue that a requirement to engage this imposes a double standard, holding affordable housing to a higher degree of scrutiny than market housing. They contest this as discriminatory and suggest there should be no such requirement (except when otherwise required due to rezoning etc.).
10. That said, the funding approval phase is likely the place to review and manage public concerns rather than at the planning/development permit process. Well-defined criteria such as access to transit, proximity to services etc. can be used to guide the siting of affordable and supportive housing so that the project selection process avoids selecting inappropriate locations and thereby lessens the risk of community opposition.

11. While the controversial Terwilleger site was not one of the case studies, the consultant team did visit the site during the open house. This is a good example of where the funding process might have been used to manage concerns. This is an isolated site, with poor access to transit, retail and services and is in a suburban detached housing area. It is debatable whether this is an appropriate site to locate housing for former homeless singles, given a lack of access and amenities. It is equally questionable to have awarded funding for an additional 30 units (initial decision was to fund only 30 units) in this location. This suggests a need to review and or develop a set of selection criteria for applications under the homeless supportive housing process. Advanced engagement about the objectives and form of supportive housing being funded might have also helped address what were often concerns based on lack of understanding about the target population.

Should the city take a pro-active position?

12. A number of project proponents expressed frustration that they were left to address community opposition without any support from city staff. The role of City staff is facilitative, thus the role is not to take a partial position, in part, acknowledging that concerns may escalate and become political. At the same time, the City has approved a Municipal Development Plan that speaks to the need to plan for an appropriate mix and type of housing. The plan endorses affordable and supportive housing as part of the housing mix to help end homelessness. The City has signed on to and is a partner in Edmonton's 10-year plan to end homelessness, which speaks to the Housing First option. Since these are official policies, proponents believe that all City staff should stand behind the plan and explicitly support initiatives that are consistent with these approved policies and plans. However it is important to note that only following a thorough review of the application in terms of whether it meets the intent of these plans, will a decision be made to approve or not approve a development permit or a recommendation is made to support or not support rezoning.

Phase 2: Review of best practice in other cities

The research team sent out requests for best practice across a network of communities and research agencies. From these efforts, a total of 19 cities were identified where strategies or approaches have been developed and implemented. These involved:

- 10 US cities
Arlington County (VA); Chicago, Montgomery County (Md); New York City; Novato (Ca); Philadelphia; Portland (Or); San Francisco; Seattle And Sunnyvale (Ca).
- 9 Canadian cities
Calgary, Hamilton, Montreal, Saskatoon, St. John's (Newfoundland), Toronto, Vancouver, Victoria and Winnipeg

For each a summary case study profile was prepared (available in Appendix B) which identified the types of issues and concerns and how each of the cities has responded to adapt proactive strategies.

In collecting information the nature of issues and concerns in the subject jurisdiction were first reviewed. Many of these are similar to those identified above and evident in Edmonton.

- Perceived impact of planned residents and implications for crime and safety
- Issue that new affordable/supportive development will impact property values
- Concerns about anticipated behaviour of formerly homeless with addictions and mental health challenges, especially in areas with young children
- Increase in visible homelessness (exterior queuing and loitering) perceived to impact local business and tourism
- Issues heightened when there are concentrations of services and related visual impacts
- Less frequent concerns on design (height), parking and traffic (less so with supportive housing)

Synthesis of approaches and strategies identified

Based on the best practices that were documented across these 19 cities a typology of responses and approaches was generated as a way to synthesize the findings and to identify common themes and models. The elements of the typology are:

- Establish formal policy framework and council endorsement – this provides staff a formal a mandate and authority to implement (e.g. an official plan or affordable housing strategy) and enables staff to take a more active role.
- Create a process to promulgate and communicate the policy/plan (education and awareness) with broad scale public engagement and do this prior to any site-specific applications.

- Establish a formal review process with transparent and objective selection criteria (including siting, design and operational aspects) via a funding approval process.
- Initiate early and low scale public stakeholder engagement (one-on-one, to build key stakeholder support)
- Where larger forum such as public meetings are used, ensure these are well planned and structured to avoid unproductive “open-mic” options, which create a soapbox for opponents to grandstand, even if their concerns are frivolous
- Consider direct engagement and involvement via local advisory committee with opportunities to constructively discuss and work through legitimate concerns prior to making decisions or approving funding/development.

Each of these elements is discussed further below, together with illustrative examples drawn from the case studies (which are then attached as Appendix B).

As part of the jurisdiction review team members also sought to determine whether in other jurisdictions formal public engagement was mandatory (as required for supportive housing in Alberta) or voluntary (outside of any required planning process that dictated consultation. i.e. if land already appropriately zoned); and if there was any evidence of creating a special review panel to screen and either recommend or endorse projects prior to formal consideration in a funding or planning process.

In all but two cases (Seattle and San Francisco) there were no requirements for public engagement simply on basis that project was affordable/supportive housing, unless consultation was already required as part of a planning/development approval process. Many jurisdictions did note that, while not formally required, some degree (more often low key) of stakeholder engagement and advisement was seen as a way to manage downstream risk (e.g. community opposition arising and asserting a project was imposed with no consultation, even though not formally required).

The review across 19 jurisdictions did not identify any efforts to create a special third party tribunal or review panel to vet or review applications, outside of reviews already incorporated in a funding approval process. This option has been suggested in Edmonton and was discussed in the phase 2 stakeholder consultations.¹ It is further outlined in the options and recommendations.

Each of the thematic elements of effective practice is briefly described in the following sections.

Establish and promote an explicit policy framework

Across a range of cities the review found that specific plans and strategies have been developed to direct the city’s activities on certain interventions, such as expanding opportunities for affordable housing and creating transitional and supportive housing as

¹ This option was first suggested in early 2013 in an editorial in the Edmonton Journal by David Berger and was accordingly included in the terms of reference as something to explore.

part of strategies to end homelessness. These are articulated in plans such as affordable housing strategies and community plans to end homelessness, which were found in almost all 19 jurisdictions examined.

In many cases these plans and strategies themselves had been created through a process of extensive community engagement and consultation. So the process of developing the plans had already initiated some degree of awareness raising, although more often this was with a narrow set of stakeholders (affordable housing providers and social service agencies) rather than the broader public.

Contacts noted that having an approved policy or plan provided staff with the political support as well as formal and explicit endorsement of council. With this backing staff were able to be more pro-active in implementing elements of the strategy and could become advocates rather than maintaining neutrality in the face of community concerns.

Staff activities included helping to promote and explain the basis and intent of the strategy. This could include providing information to assist the general public and community about who the plan targets, the fact that affordable housing helps to create options for those working in lower wage service sectors that are important to the economy and help support commercial activities across neighbourhoods. Such an initiative could raise awareness that purposeful supportive housing options are less costly to tax payers than simply relying on emergency responses that tend to be used in absence of deliberate options.

Vancouver Supportive Housing Policy

In 2007 Vancouver, Council approved a policy to build supportive housing and set annual targets over a ten-year period to house people with mental illness and addictions. Before selecting specific sites the City, in collaboration with the Regional Health Authority initiated an extensive public awareness campaign. This involved meetings with key groups such as resident associations and BIAs together with a series of fairly large public events. These discussed and raised awareness about mental health and addictions issues, the need for supportive housing, experiences of people with mental health and addictions challenges and the evidence on impacts of such initiatives. This approach focused on pro-actively addressing and responding to fears and breaking down myths and stereotypes about the target population and any perceived impacts on neighbourhoods and included information about existing supportive housing and how resident behavioral issues

The Ville de Montreal similarly used an extensive education and awareness process to promote its affordable housing strategy. To promote the adoption of processes involving interaction with citizen right from the project development stage, a guide for private as well as public and community promoters has been published by the City of Montreal and similar approaches were used in Portland (OR) and New York

A number of cities also commissioned third party research to examine and clarify myths about property value impacts of affordable and supportive housing (e.g. New York,

Philadelphia, Toronto Saskatoon and San Francisco). In a number of cases, city staff plays an active role in coaching and assisting community-based non-profits in how the undertake effective public consultation and engagement.

Coaching and supporting community groups in public engagement

The City of Sunnyvale played an important role in helping MidPen and Charities Housing open up dialogue with residents. City staff sat down with MidPen and Charities Housing at the outset to help craft a strong community outreach strategy. The city encourages community outreach and notification for all significant developments in the city – whether or not it includes affordable housing. In the case of the Armory site, the city suggested key individuals and groups with whom to meet. The city also made suggestions for the type of drawings that would work best in community meetings, and provided advance notice of the kinds of issues that project sponsors might expect to hear. The city also included on its project website a link to a publication on *“Myths and Facts about Affordable and High Density Housing.”*

Establish and publicize clear and transparent selection criteria

Across a range of cities the process to call for proposals and subsequently evaluate these to determine allocation of public funding support included the development and publication of the criteria that were being used to evaluate and select projects. This helps proponents in developing applications as well as informing community representatives and the public about what can be expected.

The application of these criteria can be readily introduced as part of the funding approval process (and is done in places like Arlington VA, Montreal, San Francisco and Portland).

A number of cities have specific siting criteria (e.g. Toronto, see text box) and also require detailed information on the proponents post occupancy management and operational plan. Montreal also requires confirmation that appropriate sustainable funding for necessary and identified support services will be available to implement these plans and ensure appropriate operating practice.

City of Toronto Site Location and City Building Criteria

The City is interested in supporting the development of Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing projects in all wards throughout the City. Priority will be given to projects outside the Toronto and East York Community Council District. Projects should contribute to the diversity of local housing choices.

To illustrate the suitability of the proposed site for future tenants, provide a detailed explanation of the local context including:

- i. A list and map of local community and support services and community facilities that will benefit tenants.
- ii. An assessment of the area in terms of positive opportunities for tenants (employment, community building, etc.).
- iii. An assessment of the area in terms of safety and security for tenants.
- iv. The availability of public transit.

Early and effective key stakeholder engagement

“Never underestimate the value of a cup of tea or coffee”

[Mary Kay Sweeny, Novato CA]

Many of the cities interviewed had learned from experience that large “open mic” events could be difficult to manage and often result in a small vocal minority grandstanding on frivolous or discriminatory issues. Cities have accordingly developed more strategic forms of engagement, focusing on key leaders in the community and in the form of low-key one-on-one meetings. These were initiated early in the process, so that there was time to modify design to respect legitimate concerns, as well as time to build a range of key stakeholder support.

It was found that such discussions help to identify a range of issues and potential concerns. Through discussion and dialogue the basis for these concerns and ways to mitigate or respond can be constructively explored. In a number of cases, when issues were realized about potential behavior and impact of former homeless persons proponents offered tours of similar existing facilities and these were found to be effective in helping community representatives become more familiar with residents and to better understand how the operating and management practices can minimize and eliminate most impacts (e.g. New York, Philadelphia, St John’s)

Subsequently, in larger public events, have the stakeholder speak to the issue and the identified compromises or remedies helps to assuage broader community concerns. Participants more readily accept an explanation and endorsement of these community stakeholders compared to statements from proponents/developers.

In proposed developments in Seattle and Sunnyvale (CA), reduction in the scale and number of units was negotiated through these one-on-one meetings and subsequently proposed to community. In Portland issues about the visual impact of homeless people

queuing outside for a drop in was a concern to the tourism industry and BIA. As a result of these concerns being raised, design modifications were made to create a landscaped interior courtyard where people can queue but are not visible from the street.

Carefully structure public meetings

As suggested above, the experience across jurisdictions revealed that the form and structure of open houses and public meetings can have a significant impact on whether such discussions are constructive and productive in building relationships and understanding rather than simply being opportunities to vent concerns and to enable grandstanding of (sometimes minority but vocal) opposition based on what often turn out to be minor or unrealistic concerns (e.g. the stereotyping of residents and perception that will cause an increase in crime and reduce community safety).

Alternate structures include a “poster session” format with small booth group discussion that actively involve stakeholders and experts to explain specific features and dialogue on specific concerns and solutions (e.g. design, management plan, strategies to minimize neighbourhood impacts). This provides opportunities for multiple participants to ask questions and express their concerns and have these noted by the directly involved professional, who can then examine options to address the concern in the design, or operational practice. For example, in Sunnyvale CA, in response to concerns about design, MidPen and Charities made various architectural changes to soften the height and massing of the building, and improve the safety of routes to school for children.

Project Home, Philadelphia, effective engagement

Prior to initiating the proposal for JBJ Soul HOMES, Project HOME commissioned a study by an independent economic consulting firm – Econsult – to ground-truth the notion that nearby property values plummet after permanent supportive housing is built. The study reviewed all of Project HOME’s 15 permanent supportive housing facilities in Philadelphia and found that property values did not actually plummet, but in fact rose in several instances. Project HOME used these findings in some of its outreach conversations.

Meetings with a number of community organizations highlighted a lack of commercial amenities in the area. Project HOME took to heart the concerns it heard that the development would dampen potential business activity along the corridor. People in the neighborhood wanted access to more places to shop and get food. In response, Project HOME changed their development proposal to include ground-floor retail space. Originally this space was to be for office uses, but Project HOME moved this space to a higher floor.

Some cities successfully converted skeptics that had opposed earlier developments into supports offering “testimonials” about the fact their worst fears (similar to current opponents) never materialized due to the approach and management expertise of proponents.

Create mechanisms for meaningful engagement

One of the concerns heard both in the initial consultation in Edmonton and in the jurisdictional review is that community representatives feel the process of engagement is not sincere, and is often treated as a check box (i.e. they were “consulted” as in were invited to a meeting but were not necessarily listened to).

One variant of a community committee was created in Hamilton when developing Good Shepherds Square (3 buildings on a block, including 165 units and shelter space for women and children, in an old school / convent site). The non-profit developer (the Good Shepherd Centre) struck a Liaison Committee with neighbourhood representatives, convened by the local Councilor – for the duration of the development process. The Committee provided an opportunity for the Good Shepherds to communicate to the neighbourhood where the process stood and offered opportunity for the neighbourhood to comment on issues, speaking directly with the development team, addressing site plan, access, landscaping, security. The outcome was a very green campus, now viewed as a huge asset to the neighbourhood, and part of broader neighbourhood renewal that is improving property values.

Another effective form of engagement, used in Portland Oregon, was the creation of a Citizen Advisory Committee at the design phase so that key stakeholders could engage actively and have meaningful input into the development and design process.

Portland (OR) Citizen Advisory Committee

Early in the development of Bud Clark Commons, during the design phase, Home Forward set up a Community Advisory Committee (CAC). A “multitude” of stakeholders representing local neighborhood associations, local business associations, immediate neighbors, and a couple citywide organizations were joined on this committee by representatives of Transition Projects (both staff and participants in their programs). Home Forward has found it helpful to balance CACs with both neighborhood groups and service providers, given the need to balance these interests and to get everyone in the room so they can see and hear each other. Home Forward also held two design workshops with the CAC. Discussions ended up focusing mostly on siting concerns, with particular attention paid to design of an interior courtyard, which would allow clients to queue off of the sidewalk

In addition to the design focus CAC, Portland, through its municipal housing agency Home Forward also implemented a Good Neighbour Agreement with six neighborhood associations involved with the CAC, the Portland Police Bureau, and the city’s Office of Neighborhood Involvement. The agreement is explicit about it not being expected to resolve all the problems of the neighborhood. Its goals are to:

- “Initiate and maintain open communications and understanding among the parties in order to be proactive and ready to respond if concerns arise in the future.

- Develop procedures for resolving problems.
- Enhance neighborhood safety and livability and promote access to services.
- Reduce crime and the fear of crime in the neighborhood.”

Signees indicate what roles they will play to accomplish these goals. One of the terms of the agreement is also that participants will “use and promote direct, respectful and civil communication.”

Use of Good Neighbour Agreements

GNA’s were found in about one-quarter of the cases, notably western cities: Calgary, Victoria, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco. One key finding from groups who used GNA’s was that the process was more important than the product.

In San Francisco, the GNA mostly incorporates typical property management practice. But the non-profit developer also added more stringent property rules as concessions to the community. For example, the project will provide a staffed, 24-hour front desk, and restrict overnight guests to only 10 visits allowed per month (reflecting acknowledgement that it is more often visitors, sometimes uninvited, rather than residents themselves that create difficulties). Also, CHP agreed to increase the level of staff at the building, to provide greater comfort to the neighbors, and increased the amount of community space available in the building, to address concerns about the environment they will be creating for the youth.

In Sunnyvale CA, in lieu of a GNA, the project developer wrote specific conditions into tenancy agreements. To address concerns about safety concerns and property management, MidPen shared with neighbors and other interested parties its “Good Neighbor” and property “house rules” policies. MidPen does not enter into “Good Neighbor Agreements” with neighborhood associations, but it does with its tenants. These are addendums to the lease that speak to their no-tolerance policy for criminal activity or disruptions that impact the surrounding neighborhood. To clarify how it manages its properties, MidPen shared these addendums with each of the six condo homeowner associations.

Setting ground rules for engagement

While developing community capacity in effective public engagement, the review found that a number of jurisdictions were deliberate in setting the ground rules for consultation. This reflects a desire to establish some balance between on the one hand encouraging public engagement, but protecting proponents and the target residents from discriminatory opposition.

Seattle Consolidated Plan requirements for community engagement

The Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development, states clearly that while the purpose of community engagement is to facilitate understanding and resolve problems, it is not the policy of the city to refuse funding on the basis of neighborhood objection to a project. The Consolidated Plan spells out the members of protected classes who cannot be excluded from a development in accordance with local, state and federal law.

For example in Seattle, while community based proponents were obligated to undertake public consultation, whenever accessing public funding under HUD programs, the City's Consolidated Plan clearly established the basis for engagement as well as what is not on the table (see textbox). Seattle also uses a "reasonable person" test to establish whether specific issues and concerns are frivolous or legitimate (and thus whether the proponent is required to make modifications to address these concerns).

Planning smaller scale integrated development

Another notable approach taken across a number of jurisdictions (Arlington VA, Montgomery County MA, Novato CA, San Francisco, Winnipeg) as a way to manage potential opposition is to develop supportive housing in small projects as well as combine supported housing for formerly homeless into larger affordable housing (which are built mainly under tax credit funding and therefore portrayed as modest rent "workforce housing" which is more accepted in communities).

Exploring the option of a review panel

As part of the terms of reference for this review, the City identified a proposal from David Berger, Deputy Executive Director at Boyle Street Community Services, originally posted as an editorial in the media.² This was inspired by a concern about ongoing conflict between community leagues and resident groups that seek to prevent development of social and affordable housing and providers and advocates of housing. These often become entangled in lengthy, controversial, processes and add cost to development. They also have the effect of constraining the City's ability to meet the broader city goal of ensuring neighbourhoods have a range of housing choice to meet the needs of all demographic and income groups and create more socially sustainable communities.

Berger's suggestion was to create a review panel of credible, trusted community members, appointed by council to act as a tribunal and arbitration panel. With the working label "Neighbourhood Housing Adjudication Panel" this would assist in negotiating between proponents and opponents in an effort to develop compromise and acceptable development options. Reflecting many of the best practices generated in the current review, as proposed it was envisioned that:

"The negotiations would start early and include, for example, discussions about the design concept for the proposed project – before the blueprints are prepared. Discussions would include all aspects of operations, identify opportunities for interaction between future project residents and the local community, identify safety issues and environmental concerns and, of course, chart a way to continue the dialogue after the project is built and residents move in".

The panel is offered as a neutral respected independent body. It is not meant to have ultimate authority, but would make recommendations to council and thereby assist council in making final decisions (where required as part of a planning process). It is

² This is reproduced on the website of the Edmonton Social Planning Council:
<http://www.edmontonsocialplanning.ca/content/view/1140/1140>

expected that like the design review panel it would add insight and professional assessment to help in the ultimate decision making process.

The jurisdictional review investigated whether other cities have created such a body, and found that a formal panel, such as suggested here does not currently exist. This does not mean it is not a useful idea; if Edmonton adopted this approach the City would be a pioneer.

In further discussion of the concept during stakeholder meetings to present findings from the review it was suggested that in an ideal world, with early engagement, and through constructive dialogue proponents and community representatives may find common ground without an intervention. The idea of a panel was therefore refined as a form of mediation or arbitration panel to be used, on a voluntary basis, on a last resort basis, when the parties are unable to resolve different opinions. Should such a panel be established, it is important that appointees are credible and accepted as impartial well-informed citizens.

Lessons and insights for Edmonton

Based on the experience and practices found across the other jurisdictions and respecting the context that exists in Edmonton there are a number of practices or approaches that merit consideration. A number of these may already to some degree be in place, for example phase 1 found that some non-profit developers have already adopted the low key one-on-one early consultation approach and there is already some public awareness about efforts to end homelessness with considerable information on the website of the Homeless Commission.

The following approaches are recommended:

1. Initiate, in collaboration with provider networks, the Homeless Commission and Homeward Trust, a public awareness and education campaign about affordable and supportive housing plans and policies, including the objective of locating non market housing in all areas of the city.
2. Provide training and guidance in under taking effective community engagement to affordable and supportive providers.
3. Update and publish objective criteria as used by the Province, the City and Homeward Trust in evaluating proposals for supportive and affordable housing funding.
4. Explore with stakeholders the development of a review panel to act as tribunal and arbitrator in the event that dialogue between proponents and community representatives/residents cannot reach a satisfactory compromise.

Elaboration on recommended options

Public Education and awareness campaign

The City has an existing overall planning document “The Way We Grow”, and an Affordable Housing Plan³. In addition at a more region wide scale the Capital Region Board has prepared a Housing Plan that identifies the need for affordable housing in all communities across the region. And focusing more on homelessness, Homeward Trust in collaboration with community partners has a 10 year Plan to End Homelessness “A Place to Call Home” and with an emerging emphasis on housing first, is finalizing a new Community Plan.

So a body of policy documentation already exists and has been ratified by local elected officials as formal policy in the City and across the region. This establishes the rationale for funding and support of affordable and supportive housing with appropriate support services. It also articulates principles and targets for production over the mid-term (although these are dependent on availability of funding from federal-provincial sources). In preparing each of these documents, extensive consultation was included; however it is likely that this inevitably engaged with more traditional stakeholders than the broader public, which would be the focus of the proposed campaign.

The awareness campaign would extract and highlight the key policy elements from this array of plans and strategies, and present these as a comprehensive and coherent set of objectives, along with discussion of why these have a broad public benefit and contribute to overall improved quality of life for the region.

The process should include development of collateral materials, including research to document the impacts and outcomes, such as property value and crime rates found across a range of similar developments as a way to help dispel myths and stereotypes.⁴ It is important as part of this campaign to put a face of the target population and to break stereotypes such as a fear that “formerly homeless” is associated with severe mental illness and addictions and that such persons will be dangerous and disruptive to a residential community. It should be acknowledged that some of the target group have mental health challenges or are recovering from addictions but that support levels are designed to manage any behavioural situations.

As was done in Vancouver, this should be promulgated through a series of public events and meetings and should also include staff across a range of City departments that may be implicated (Planning, Communications, Housing, Social Services).

In consultation on the findings of the jurisdictional review, participants emphasized concerns about concentration of social service facilities and housing in the inner city areas and identified a desire to establish clear targets that can help to disperse

³ Cornerstones, Edmonton’s Plans for Affordable Housing (2006-2011 and 2012-2016)

⁴ It is noted that the Homeless Commission has added a US study to their website, discussing property value impacts. This is a useful reference and could be reinforced with Edmonton specific analysis.

additional facilities across a broader geography, provided locations are appropriate (i.e. on transit, accessible etc.). Such locational criteria and targets could be developed and communicated as part of this public awareness campaign.

As was done in Vancouver, this process should ideally precede identification of specific sites, although as new funding rolls out in the emerging new federal-provincial bilateral agreements, it may be impossible to avoid some specific site identification.

Provide training on effective community engagement

The sponsors and proponents of supportive and affordable development are typically small non-profit organizations with limited capacity and expertise in conducting effective engagement. The City/Homeless Commission could assist in building capacity and could also facilitate and support the engagement process. Some might argue that this removes neutrality from the staff role, but as noted previously, staff should not have to be neutral, as they are civil servants charged with the implementation of Council approved policy (as articulated in the aforementioned plans).

The jurisdictional review identified guidelines and documentation developed in other cities (Calgary, Montreal, New York) that could be used to assist in preparing similar guides for Edmonton (see Appendix C for links to specific reference documents).

As a way to encourage improved relationships and pro-active collaboration, it may be useful to include the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues in both the development of guides and in delivering training for non-profit housing providers.

The guides should include information collected in this research, such as initiating communication and dialogue with key stakeholders and community leaders early and on a small scale as well as how to structure open house type events to be more constructive. Feedback on potential options generated some discussion to caution that while early engagement is desirable, in some cases this can be a challenge, as groups may not have secured land or funding approval. Many small providers have limited resources and may not be able to mount an engagement process until they have firmed up their site and funding. This does not mean that efforts should not be made, but circumstances will need to be respected.

Material created and shared as part of recommendation 1 (public awareness) may also be useful in developing and supporting educational/training modules.

Update and publish objective evaluation and selection criteria

In allocating funding under the Federal-Provincial affordable housing program and the homeless Partnering Strategy both the City and Homeward Trust (and in some cases the Province) play an active role in issuing requests for proposals and then evaluating and selecting among proposals received, This inevitably involves creating and from time to time updating proposal evaluation criteria.

Ensuring that these criteria are comprehensive and objective and making the evaluation and selection criteria transparent and available to the public and community representatives can help to respond to concerns about whether sites are appropriate for the intended target population.

Based on the evolving experience of the Homeless commission and Homeward Trust selection criteria can likely be refined and adapted for sub-populations (e.g. establish caps on size of projects to balance operating economies of scale with potential community impacts).

Establishing a review panel

The jurisdictional review did not identify any experience with the type of mediation or adjudication panel proposed in advance of this research. The lessons from other jurisdictions suggest that an improved engagement process and stronger public awareness may help to reduce the confrontation that has emerged in recent years. However, there may also be some merit in creating a review and adjudication panel on a pilot basis to determine if this is a way to create an avenue for dialogue and negotiation. It is unlikely that that this will eliminate the response of aggrieved resident groups from continuing to use the Development Appeal Process (at least when planning change creates this opportunity) but a review panel could help reduce the volume of such appeals.

If Edmonton is to establish a review panel Council should clearly define the parameters of the panel as well as matters that will not be within the scope of the panel. This is not an avenue to prevent the development of affordable and supportive housing; rather it is an avenue to conduct dialogue about the scale, level of supports and appropriateness of certain locations relative to the needs of targeted resident populations.

A final caveat

While the approaches and strategies documented herein should help to create more proactive and positive dialogue there is no guaranteed approach to avoid concerns and opposition, as illustrated in the case study of the Volunteers for America in Chicago. Despite an extensive effort over a period of two years of outreach, education, and consultation plans to build 50 apartments for homeless veterans in Chicago were stymied by last minute opposition from a small group of highly vocal residents who lived near the proposed development and were able to secure the support of the local Alderman who had a veto over any proposal. He was unwilling to support a development that didn't have consensus in the community and withdrew his support for the project.

Appendices

Appendix A: Phase 1 Edmonton Case studies

Appendix B: Phase 2 Jurisdictional review case studies

Appendix C: Links to cited reference documents

Phase 1: Understanding the basis for community concerns

The following organizations/individuals were interviewed:

Affordable/supportive providers:

Alfred Nikolai*	Habitat for Humanity
Greg Bounds and Susan Sarrasin	Capital Region Housing Corporation
Cam McDonald*	Edmonton Inner City Housing Society
Ione Challborne and Gail Haynes	Canadian Mental Health Association
Paul Adams	Inglewood Community League (President)
Dennis Erker	Valour House
Randy Shuttleworth	<u>Queen Mary Park Community League (President)</u>
Murray Skroca	Canora Gardens/Jasper Place Health and Wellness Centre
Jeannette Wright	<u>City of Edmonton (Community Social Worker for area)</u>
Bruce Reith	Hope Mission

Private developers:

Dennis Peck	Canadian Home Builders Association – Edmonton Region
Lynne Christenson with notes from Bard Golightly	Christenson Developments

In addition, the consultants met with a larger group of city staff, community representatives and provider and funder representatives to outline the planned research and collect initial thoughts and insights on the issue of how best to optimize the procurement process to take into account community concerns while facilitating development of affordable and supportive housing across different communities.

Feedback was provided to the consultants on various aspects of in-fill housing issues and concerns and suggestions about how to resolve them. The following individuals participated:

Community Organization representatives:

- Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues (Bev Zubot, Cora Shaw, Liz Solez)
- Edmonton Coalition on Housing and Homelessness (Cam McDonald, John Kolkman)
- Homeward Trust Edmonton (Susan McGee, Giri Puglandra, Dave Ward)

City Administration Branch representatives:

- Current Planning (Tim Ford, Beatrice McMillan)
- Urban Planning and Environment (Lisa Larson)
- Corporate Properties (Tim McCargar)
- Office of Public Involvement/Corporate Communications (David Holehouse, Cory Segin, Jane Purvis)
- Neighbourhood Parks and Community Recreation (Carol Cass, Jeannette Wright)
- Edmonton Homeless Commission (Jay Freeman)
- Housing and Economic Sustainability and Landlord & Tenant Advisory Board (Judy Downey, Michael Brown (Finding Common Ground Project Manager), Cody Spencer, Daryl Kreuzer)

STONY PLAIN MANOR

Description

Stony Plain Manor located at the corner of Stony Plain Road and 159 Street. It is an apartment building with 24 bachelor and one-bedroom units for singles and childless couples. There is also a small commercial space at the front of building. The building is owned and operated by the Capital Region Housing Corporation (CRHC) and has been in operation since July 2011.



Consultation

The CRHC uses a fairly low-key community engagement process. They use their reputation as a good housing provider and their website to inform the community prior to any new developments proceeding. The website presents descriptions of each project, the type of units, form and design elements. The CRHC notifies the community via media, which directs recipients to the their website to view details about the proposed development. There is no or very little detail about the potential occupants of the building.

The website also lists the community principles by which the CRHC operates, which address concerns such as client selection, safety and security, communicating with the community (including issues resolution) and a commitment to build and maintain quality buildings. The CRHC does not enter into Good Neighbour Agreements at the project level, in part due to the large scale of their portfolio but also because they stand by these board-approved community principles. All buildings participate in the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program.

Concerns and Issues

The consultation with the community on this project raised one main concern - the building contains bachelor and one bedroom units – the community wanted two and three bedroom units to attract families to the neighbourhood. The CRHC explained that the size of the units was determined by the limited amount of funding, which did not allow for larger units.

The Edmonton Design Committee (EDC) asked for some changes to improve the look of the building (e.g. soft corners), which were incorporated into the plans. CRHC noted that they feel technical reviews by the EDC provide useful input which can further help to mitigate any

design related issues in advance. While the EDC review process is optional, its approval carries weight with City Council.

Strategies to Mitigate the Concerns and Issues

Upon completion of the project, an open house was held. People from the community came and toured the building. The only complaint received related to the commercial tenant - Cash Canada. Some felt this was not an appropriate business for the area and might cause poor financial behavior for local lower income residents. CRHC asked the company to provide a public statement on how it operates, how they serve the community and how they manage any adverse effects of this type of business.

Comments

All of the pressure on the community occurs at the development permit application stage of the process. There is a need to diffuse community concern before the development permit application (i.e.. earlier awareness raising to manage perceptions and any misunderstanding).

EDWARD STREET RESIDENCE - CMHA

Description

Edward Street is an apartment building with 27 self-contained bachelor units located at 12406-116 Avenue. The project allows people with low income and mental illness to obtain support and live independently in a safe, secure place they can call home. The building is owned and operated by Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA) and has been in operation since July 2011. All CMHA buildings participate in the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program.



Consultation

The CMHA uses a fairly low-key community engagement process. They use their reputation as a good housing and service provider (their name is known nationally and locally) to address any community concerns with their housing projects. In the case of Edward Street, one on one discussions were held with community leaders (e.g. Community League President, etc.) to inform of the project and the anticipated date of construction and occupancy, and other project related details.

Concerns and Issues

There were no significant concerns expressed by the community regarding the Edward Street Project. The CMHA held an engagement session with the community and presented all the relevant information on the project and its client and answered every question, which reassured the community and increased their support for the project.

The issue was with government funding. The CMHA purchased land and after three years of waiting, the funding for the project was not forthcoming. The project was very close to be canceled by the City and CMHA.

Strategies to Mitigate the Concerns and Issues

An unexpected increase in capital funding for Affordable Housing brought the project proposal back to life. The CMHA and the City of Edmonton partnered with Homeward Trust to allocate 6 units to Housing First clients, in return for one full-time support worker. This

partnership provided additional funding, which was another factor that enabled the project to proceed.

While some emergency supports are available, tenants are required to be capable of living independently. There are no on site supports, beyond an overnight resident manager. Individual tenants however are connected to personal support teams and CMHC can contact these teams in event of an emergency or episodic behavior. If problems arise, the tenants are treated like anyone else (police, ambulance, etc.). To date, the CMHA has not received any significant complaints about the occupants of Edward Street.

The fact that the lot had been vacant for three years and the project would be an improvement to a potentially derelict site, was also a factor in the community accepting the project.

VALOUR PLACE -

Description

Valour Place is located at 11109 111 Avenue. The facility is a 12 barrier-free bedroom house for injured soldiers, RCMP and veterans and their families who do not reside in Edmonton and who require a place to stay during the period of their medical treatments and appointments.



Concerns and Issues

The Valour Place Board of Directors (VPBOD) was ready to take ownership of a piece of land from the City of Edmonton, when it was discovered that the land had been earmarked for parkland for the community. When the community found out, they completely opposed the project and the City of Edmonton had to find another suitable piece of the land for the project.

The VPBOD found 20 lots zoned for single detached housing that were made available when the municipal airport runways were closed. The VPBOD proposed to the City of Edmonton that it use the 6 lots closest to 111 street (the least desirable lots closest to traffic) to locate Valour Place and that the remaining 14 lots be designated as parkland for the community. The approach used sought to build a compromise between complete development of parkland and partial development, while retaining some park space for the community.

Strategies to Mitigate the Concerns and Issues

When the VPBOD first approached the community, there were some concerns due mainly to a lack of knowledge of the project. The VPBOD Chair spent four days going door to door and took down all of the names of people for and against the proposal. In the end, the community was overwhelming in support of the VPBOD proposal. They were so impressed, that the Queen Mary Park Community League drafted and adopted a protocol for future non market in-fill housing development in their community. The City agreed with the proposal from the VPBOD and the project was constructed and opened in the fall of 2012.

The local community and others across the city and country have embraced Valour Place since it opened. The project is unique in Canada and any efforts to raise funds for Valour Place are met with an overwhelming response.

Other Comments and Issues

The Queen Mary Park Community League would like to draft a protocol for all market in-fill housing developments as well. They are disappointed with the lack of consultation and available information from a developer who wants to build in the community today.

People in the community are concerned about the zoning that allows duplex development in older areas because they do not appear to be any acceptable design standards.

ANDERSON GARDENS - HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

Description

This is a 47 unit family oriented townhome development located at 123rd Ave and 41st St. The planning process was undertaken over a 2 year period with construction commencing in 2010. Built in phases, it was completed in 2012.



Public engagement-consultation approach

Habitat for Humanity (HH) tends to focus on building homes for low income families, but in Edmonton has also undertaken a number of multi-unit developments, including Anderson Gardens. They use a fairly low key approach to contact various organizations in local community that are involved with youth (e.g. school principals, boys and girls club) as a way to build local connection and support, before open public meetings. In areas with declining school enrollment and risk of school closing family oriented development is often seen as a positive addition to community. Note however this development was funded under Habitat's philanthropic development model, it was not funded under the affordable housing program and as such did not formally require a public consultation, other than that required for rezoning.

Concerns and Issues

Project is located on a former homestead in an area of middle to higher quality homes. The site required rezoning and accordingly required a public process. Opposition was related to a concern that this would introduce low-income families and impact on property values. Five individuals were particularly vocal and made discriminatory comments publicly.

Strategies to Mitigate the Concerns and Issues

HfH deliberately sought to lower controversy by not reacting to these discriminatory comments, which they anticipated did not reflect broader opinions. The strategy was to let people air these concerns and overtime the opposition would diffuse, which it did. HfH's broad reputation and public awareness is also a factor that may help as they undertake development. Also the dwellings were targeted as affordable ownership, which is perceived differently than low-income rental.

CANORA PLACE

Description: Canora Place is a 30-unit apartment building located at 101 Ave & 153 Street. The building contains 15 bachelor units, 14 one-bedroom units and 1 two-bedroom unit. The building is for individuals who were chronically homeless and who have addictions and/or mental illness. At least 60% of the residents come from an aboriginal ancestry. Construction of the building began in November 2011 and was completed in April 2012



Consultation Process

Jasper Place Health and Wellness Centre (JPHWC) say they consulted with the community early in the process. They informed the Community league about the project and they became very confrontational and refused to meet. The Community League says that the JPHWC announced plans to build the facility in early fall, 2010. While a mandatory consultation session was planned, residents felt that the decision to build the project had already been made. The JPHWC rented space at the community hall and had testimonials from potential residents of the project. JPHWC says that most people in attendance accepted the project.

Concerns and Issues

The main concerns expressed by the community were about the clientele and safety in neighborhood. The police expressed similar concerns and were strongly supported by the community. After learning more about the project, the Community Leagues' position was that they accepted and even supported the facility and its intent; their concern was that the process used to engage the community was very misleading and did not give the community the opportunity to provide any input into the project. By the time the Community League mobilized, the building was nearly constructed. It was prefabricated offsite and erected in 6 days. After the project was built, the Community League refused to sign a Good Neighbor Agreement.

Strategies to Mitigate the Concerns and Issues

Canora Place management made considerable efforts to get residents involved with community activities, volunteering for various community activities, etc. The JPHWC also organizes field trips to Ft. Edmonton, the Valley Zoo and other events, which are open to anyone in the community. While there are recent signs that the community is beginning to accept Canora Place, but it has over 2 years since the project opened. A more interactive effort to engage the community may have prevented much of the negative reaction from the community.

PARKDALE APARTMENTS - EICHS

Description

Located at 115th Ave and 82nd St, this project is relatively small, consisting of 14 units of stacked townhomes. Form is mixed family and singles with 4-six-bed; 4 one-bed plus den (= 2 beds); and 4 bachelor apartments. The location is just beyond the boundary of the “stressed zone”, where a moratorium has been placed on new affordable and supportive housing



Public engagement-consultation approach

This site was already appropriately zoned, but was seeking funding under Homeless funding program and thus had an obligation to publically consult. That said, because funding was coming under the stimulus package there was pressure to expedite “shovel ready” approach. This made it difficult to embark on an early process of public engagement. The short deadlines, coupled with the fact that this area is very close to the areas that the City has imposed a moratorium created some tension and opposition.

Concerns and Issues

The primary concern from the community association was that because this area (Parkdale) was not in the temporary non-market housing moratorium area (pause neighbourhoods), it could become inundated with affordable and supportive housing developments as such developments “spillover” outside the restricted area and result in similar concentration. Opposition was mainly from people outside Parkdale in the pause neighbourhoods. During the permit application process, the City Planner discovered an old ARP, which included clauses requiring higher percentage of amenity space to fit family need, so some redesign was required and reduced parking, which generated some concern. Opponents indicated they planned to appeal to Development Approval Board, but this did not materialize.

Strategies to Mitigate the Concerns and Issues

The tight timeframe on this project made early consultation a challenge. Normally EICHS undertake a process of open information sharing and work closely with the local community league as they begin planning a development. EICHS focuses on highlighting how they will manage any downstream operational impacts. EICHS can use existing examples to demonstrate that they are a responsible landlord and have appropriate on-site management. They are willing to execute a good neighbour agreement (although while offered, such an agreement was turned down by the Parkdale Community League, on advice of their legal counsel).

GREEN MANOR: HOPE MISSION

Description

This is a 52-suite apartment located at 106th Ave and 107th St. It is supportive housing targeting individuals and families, for persons recovering from addictions. An opening celebration was held in July, 2013.



Public engagement-consultation approach

The project sponsor, the Hope Mission has an 85-year history of providing care and support to homeless persons and operates a large emergency shelter and they are well known in the community. The Hope Mission wanted to create a supportive housing development to provide greater stability for recovering addicts, graduating from the mission's addiction treatment programs. The Mission openly participated in all public meetings and sought to describe the type of programming that was planned to ensure tenants were able to live semi-independently, with appropriate support in place when needed. Hope Mission staff often felt alone in advocating for the project (i.e. City staff were impartial, even though the City has signed on to a 10 year plan with a Housing First focus). Effort was made to emphasize that persons in need would be supported by Hope Mission, and that this is a proactive program to help stabilize individuals that have completed a treatment-recovery program. Further, Hope Mission has existing program-based relationships with each prospective housing tenant. With Hope Mission only six blocks away, the facility would also receive considerable attention from staff.

Concerns and Issues

Several concerns were raised: from the vantage point of communications, the Community League was frustrated that provincial funding was secured prior to community knowledge of the plans; the Community League also sought to preserve the four housing units that would be replaced by the development; and concerns were also raised regarding inadequate parking provisions (mindful of accessibility requirements and of possible future uses of the development). Particular concern focused on the size of the development and the existing high number and concentration of social service agencies in the area -- the belief that the area was over saturated, and that Hope Mission's on-site support would be inadequate. As a result, opponents -- led by the Community League - actively participated in any and all public meetings or hearings and consistently expressed opposition in an attempt to prevent the project from being undertaken. There is speculation that the Community League was a very small, vocal minority.

Strategies to Mitigate the Concerns and Issues

While a development permit was granted, when the City initially waived parking requirements due to the nature of the apartment complex, the area Community League (CL) appealed to the Development Appeal Board; in response to community pressure, elected representatives withdrew their support. After the City agreed to an underground parking facility, the CL continued to resist, appealing again and threatening to go to the Court of Appeal. Hope Mission secured significant pro bono legal support over this lengthy campaign. Hope Mission was only able to proceed when the Community League withdrew their appeal in Fall 2012. With the facility having opened in July, 2013, Hope Mission staff are particularly mindful of ensuring the property remains clean and well-kept so as to not create new issues. There has been no contact with the Community League since Fall 2012. The CL continues to advocate for a moratorium on facilities in the neighbourhood.

CANADIAN HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION – EDMONTON REGION

Contact

Mr. Dennis Peck, Government Relation Manager

Issues with Market In-Fill Housing

Most builders in Edmonton are reluctant to take on in-fill housing because of the difficulties and uncertainties:

- The Zoning Bylaw needs to be clear regarding in-fill housing if the City of Edmonton (CoE) wants to encourage more density in older neighborhoods;
- Community Leagues must be willing to accept variances in all neighborhoods that allow for increased densities (more than secondary suites).

In-fill development will only be competitive if the cost of greenfield development is not too much cheaper. Otherwise, the incentive is to develop in the new areas only. For builders, they can build on a developer greenfield site with a deposit and finalize payment on sale; but for infill, they have to front the cost to acquire the site 100% upfront and then incur cost to carry land thru to sale.

Consultation on Market In-Fill

It is critical that consultation with the community occur as much in advance as possible. Ideally, all of the big issues should be resolved before any big money commitments are made. Introducing new steps in the process that delay the approval process because of community issues can cost as much as \$500 per day per unit. So it is important to determine a way to add a proactive process, without adding too much time to process.

Strategies to Mitigate Community Concerns and Issues

The CoE should engage the community to prepare an In-Fill Housing Plan that articulates a vision and objectives to encourage in-fill housing. Community Leagues must articulate what they are willing to accept in terms of change to help the CoE meet the objectives outlined in the In-Fill Housing Plan. Incorporating policies and explicitly identifying what type of development will be permitted in planning stage can minimize requirement to incorporate site specific public consultation process.

CHRISTENSON DEVELOPMENTS LTD. (CDL)

Contact

Ms. Lynne Christenson, Community Liaison

Communication with the Community

Christenson Developments used to have more difficulties gaining the acceptance of the community. They learned the hard way that early notice and communication with the neighbors is the best strategy. Communication and lots of it improves the chance of gaining community acceptance and it improves relationship between the developer and the community prior to and after construction of a project. This has significant benefits for whoever is going to own and manage the building over the long term.

Christenson Developments make a sincere effort to listen to the concerns of the community and where possible, address those concerns. This gives them credibility with the community. Depending on the project, they will rent a bus and take the neighbors of a tour of other projects built by CDL.

Consultation Approach for In-Fill Housing

The formal community consultation session (statutory requirement for land use changes such as rezoning) used by CDL involves the following:

- Plans are presented in draft form - less detail is always better.
- Builder (representative) always leads on the project
- There must come a point in the process where a decision must be made
- Builder must have open relationship with Council

While there is no magic bullet, CDL has found that a sincere effort to engage the community and address their concerns as much as possible is the best approach to ensuring success in developing market in-fill housing projects in Edmonton.

Appendix B : Jurisdictional Review Case Study Details

Arlington County (VA)	1
Chicago, Illinois: Volunteers of America	4
Montgomery County, MD (Case Study: Coalition Homes)	7
New York City Case Study: Services for the UnderServed (SUS)	11
Novato, CA Case Study: Homeward Bound	16
Philadelphia, PA Case Study: Project HOME	20
Portland, OR: Case Study Home Forward (Portland Housing Authority)	23
San Francisco, CA Case Study: Community Housing Partnership	27
Seattle (WA) Case Study: Delridge Supportive Housing	31
Sunnyvale (CA): Armory Project	35
Calgary, AB	40
Hamilton, ON	43
Montreal, QC	47
Saskatoon, SK	50
St. John's, NFLD	53
Toronto, ON	56
Vancouver, BC	64
Victoria, BC	67
Winnipeg	70

Arlington County (VA)

Contacts:

- Nina Janopaul

President/CEO, Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH)

njanopaul@apah.org

(703) 276-7444

- Cynthia Stevens

Chief, Housing Assistance Bureau

Department of Human Services

Arlington County

Cstevens@arlingtonva.us

(703) 228-1326

Reasons for Community Opposition

Historically in Arlington County, stand-alone group homes for formerly homeless individuals with mental health disabilities have faced more difficult community acceptance processes than dispersed supportive housing. The Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH) and other housing providers have found that these proposed communities can become targets for vocal neighborhood opposition. When permanent supportive housing is the focal point of new development, which is rare now in Arlington County, communities have voiced concerns about:

- general safety;
- residents with mental illnesses disrupting the surrounding community;
- whether there will be adequate staffing, and at what hours; and
- parking impacts (which come up for new affordable housing developments generally and also market-rate developments).

Overview

Since adopting a multi-pronged Supportive Housing Plan and Program in 2005, Arlington County has developed more than 200 units of permanent supportive housing by encouraging most of it to be built within larger, affordable housing properties. This has improved not just the economic viability of supportive housing, but also its community acceptance. Two recent, successful examples of this approach, which sailed through the community acceptance process and approvals, were shepherded by the Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH) – one of the county’s leading nonprofit

affordable housing developers. By winter 2013, APAH will finish construction on Arlington Mill Residences and Community Center, which features 122 units of affordable housing built in conjunction with a new community center. The housing portion of the development includes 13 units of supportive housing for homeless adults and families (including eight, “low-barrier” efficiency apartments). These are integrated within a larger, four-story, affordable housing community. Beginning in September of 2013, APAH also began buying down the rents of ten existing apartments within the larger Marbella Apartment community so as to offer supportive housing for homeless individuals coming “straight off the streets.”

The integration of permanent supportive housing with other affordable housing units is influenced by a combination of county and state policy incentives favoring integration.

Context

Arlington County is an urban jurisdiction located directly across the Potomac River from Washington, DC. As the smallest county in the United States, it resembles more a city than a county. Like other Washington metropolitan area communities, its median income is relatively high for the nation. The county has earned national recognition among city planners for its high density, transit-oriented development along the Ballston/Rosslyn corridor, and is now pursuing a similar, long-term development strategy along Columbia Pike – the setting for the future Arlington Mills Residences and Community Center. Neglected for many decades, Columbia Pike has faced significant gentrification pressures since 2000 as plans for new streetcar service and more flexible zoning regulations have attracted significant market-rate development. This has in turn fueled new support for affordable housing over the past three years from local residents concerned about preserving the corridor’s diversity.

Orientation to Affordable Housing

Arlington County has made major commitments to affordable housing in recent years. This is reflected in policy as well as a significant yearly set-aside of public funds for affordable housing. In 2012, the county adopted a comprehensive plan for Columbia Pike which aims to preserve all of its de-facto-affordable (market-affordable) rental units. The plan also requires 20-to-35 percent of net, newly constructed housing units to be affordable to households earning between 40 and 80 percent of area median income, in exchange for significant new development potential afforded through the corridor’s new form-based zoning code.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed to Address Community Opposition

Arlington County conditions its gap financing support for affordable housing on a developer’s agreement to serve supportive housing clients in at least five percent of total units. Preference is given to projects with a 10 percent set-aside for deeply affordable, permanent supportive housing.

The state of Virginia's point system for awarding low-income housing tax credits also encourages inclusion of supportive housing. The housing credit program is the most lucrative source of funding for affordable housing in the country, and the pursuit of these credits is highly competitive. In scoring applications for housing tax credits, Virginia awards 50 points (out of approximately 600 total points) for proposals that make 10 percent of housing units affordable for persons with disabilities at deeply affordable rates. Developers such as APAH have earned full points in this category by proposing supportive housing for adults with mental health disabilities and substance abuse issues.

This development approach favoring dispersion and inclusion has eased community acceptance of permanent supportive housing and turned traditional community concerns into non-issues during the development approvals process, according to county staff and a local provider. The strategy also facilitates broader distribution of permanent supportive housing throughout the county.

Arlington County adopted its development/community acceptance approach after consultation with the [Technical Assistance Collaborative](#), based in Boston. The Collaborative has helped other jurisdictions in the US pursue a similar development strategy and is a font of information regarding the design, financing, and implementation of supportive housing, services, and systems of care.

Impact of the Approaches Adopted

Over the past eight years, private providers have produced more than 200 units of permanent supportive housing in Arlington County. Half of these homes serve formerly homeless adults and families (primarily singles). The remaining homes serve households who previously faced a critical housing need and were living in very unstable housing situations. All of the county's permanent supportive housing residents have mental illnesses, and are connected to behavioral health care case managers and related onsite services. APAH, one of the county's five housing providers serving these populations, reports no difficulties getting community or political approvals for its mixed affordable housing developments based on the housing status or disabilities of these tenants.

Chicago, Illinois: Volunteers of America

Contact:

- Nancy Hughes Moyer

President and CEO

Volunteers of America – Illinois

(312)-564-2310

nhughes@voail.org

Reasons for Community Opposition

As Volunteers of America began work on a proposal to develop Hope Manor Apartments, key concerns were:

1. Security – will the neighborhood still be safe? What kind of residents will live there? Will they suffer from mental illnesses that will cause them to prey upon their neighbors?
2. Outsiders – will the development entail bussing people into the community from elsewhere?
3. Services and programming – will the people living there be helped effectively?
4. Jobs – will this development bring economic opportunity to residents from the local neighborhood?
5. Design -- will it enhance the community or detract from it visually?

Overview

Sometimes good outreach plans don't immediately work. This was the experience of the Illinois branch of Volunteers of America (VOA) – one of the largest nonprofit providers of affordable housing in the United States – when it began to develop Hope Manor apartments in Chicago. VOA has taken a special interest in permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless veterans. Its initial plans to build 50 apartments for homeless veterans in Chicago were stymied, however, by last minute opposition from a small group of highly vocal residents who lived near the proposed development. VOA had just finished nearly two years of outreach, education, and development process, but these residents were closely connected to the local Alderman (i.e. the local city councilmember), were highly vocal about their concerns that new residents would be “paranoid/schizophrenics that would prey on the neighborhood,” and could not be persuaded otherwise. The Alderman was unwilling to support a development that didn't have consensus in the community and withdrew his support for the project. In Chicago, this is enough to derail a development seeking zoning or financial support because it is tradition in Chicago that no other Aldermen will vote for something opposed by the local representative.

VOA was more successful in its second try, however. It found a supportive Alderman in Walter Burnett who represents Chicago's 27th Ward on the west side of the city. Working closely with the Alderman, VOA began a new, intensive outreach process in the West Humboldt Park neighborhood where Hope Manor now stands. After six months of community dialogue and education, the housing development received approvals in 2010. It opened its doors in late 2011 and was fully leased in May 2012.

Context

The 27th Ward is a mix of gentrifying areas and struggling communities. It is home to, among other things, the mixed-income housing community which replaced the Cabrini-Green public housing campus. Recently, the West Humboldt neighborhood has been one of the areas of Chicago that have suffered from a rise in drug and gang violence.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed to Address Community Opposition

VOA-Illinois has learned from previous community acceptance efforts that it's very important to:

- be strategic about the population you're serving in a given neighborhood;
- be able to provide really good answers to questions about the resources in place to operate the property responsibly over the long-term. It is important to be able to show how staffing, security, maintenance, and services will be sustained for years to come;
- be able to say that the developer is not just building and leaving, but maintaining a long-term management interest ("with skin in the game"), and will be around to keep the promises that they make about being a good neighbor;
- identify the partners who will be responsible for the day-to-day operation of the property, and have them meet the community at the outset and be involved in all the community conversations; and
- reach out to local schools and local churches, perhaps even first.

To address community concerns proactively in west Chicago, VOA began by developing a strong program for the housing development that could anticipate community concerns. At Hope Manor, formerly homeless vets are aided by case managers, clinic staff members, and other support staff who create individualized plans for each resident to help them achieve self-sufficiency. The property includes on-site services for residents including primary health and mental health services, a business resource center, a fitness center, computer classes, employment training, and substance abuse counseling. There is 24-hour security, aided by cameras, and firm house rules that prohibit loitering or other potentially disruptive behavior outside the property. And the financial structure of the property is designed to provide ongoing resources for staffing, security, maintenance, and services.

VOA's community outreach began with the Alderman who agreed to provide initial support. VOA worked with him to identify the community's key political actors whose support the Alderman would need to provide official backing. VOA then reached out to these influential neighborhood leaders, along with local neighbors, local block groups, and a few local churches.

VOA never held a large, community-wide meeting about Hope Manor. They have found these formats to be counter-productive. Instead they favored a series of smaller meetings of 10-70 people, the largest sometimes involving church groups. VOA's service providers were present at these meetings. The Alderman also attended many of these meetings. VOA instructed the Alderman on how VOA would respond to key questions if asked, allowing the Alderman to give initial responses at meetings before VOA provided supplemental information. VOA found it very helpful to show pictures of other similar properties in their portfolio, and to talk about what they do to make sure these properties work and are good neighbors over time.

In the end, VOA did not need to make any changes to their initial plans to win community support.

Even after winning the local Alderman's endorsement and City Council approval in 2010, VOA did not take community support for granted. VOA started working with the local school – before they had fully leased the property – in attempts to demonstrate their commitment to being a good neighbor. VOA worked out an arrangement to serve both students and Hope Manor residents with some of their service projects. This has helped win a letter of support from the local school for other developments that VOA is now pursuing in the city.

The city of Chicago does not have official community outreach requirements for developers proposing new affordable housing. But the political process effectively necessitates it. To gain the support of the zoning committee and the city's Department of Housing and Community Development, project sponsors need to have a letter of support from the local Alderman. And this, in turn, requires community outreach in Chicago.

Impact of the Approaches Adopted

VOA was able to secure the necessary City Council support, zoning approvals, and financial support after six months of community dialogue, education, and meetings with city officials. Hope Manor opened its doors in late 2011 and was fully leased in May 2012.

Alderman Bennett is now a major champion of the development, and has become an ambassador of Hope Manor to other Aldermen, and has persuaded one of his peers already to invite VOA into another Chicago community to develop Hope Manor II in Chicago's 16th Ward. One of the messages the Alderman shares is that VOA kept all their promises. Also his uncle now lives there. It is one of his favorite projects.

Montgomery County, MD (Case Study: Coalition Homes)

Contact:

John Enagonio

Director of Real Estate, Coalition Homes, Montgomery County Coalition for the Homeless

jenagonio@mcch.net

301-917-6643

Reasons for Community Opposition

- Formerly homeless persons with mental illnesses might disrupt neighbors
- The housing development could depress property values

Context

Montgomery County, Maryland is a large, wealthy suburb of Washington, DC with nearly one million residents. It has one of the highest median incomes in the US, but has worked aggressively since the early 1970s to create housing opportunities for lower-income households throughout the county. For example, in 1974, the county was the first in the nation to develop an inclusionary housing policy, which requires that 12.5 percent of new homes in market-rate housing developments be reserved for lower-income households. The county's policy – known as the Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) program – has produced over 13,000 inclusionary housing units since the program's inception, making it the most productive program of its type in the US.

A distinct feature of Montgomery County's MPDU program is that it allows the public housing authority, the Housing Opportunities Commission (HOC), to purchase one-third of the inclusionary zoning homes within each subdivision, so that they may be rented to households at much lower incomes still and connected to HOC services. As of 2010, HOC had purchased over 700 apartments in otherwise market-rate apartment complexes.

The MPDU program is one of several county policies that have helped affordable housing sponsors, and even supportive housing providers, avoid traditional NIMBY stumbling blocks.

The county's supportive housing stock is distributed widely throughout the county. Montgomery County works with nearly two dozen nonprofit partners to provide a total of about 1,750 permanent supportive housing beds (families may have more than one bed in a unit). In mid-2008, the county began shifting toward a housing-first approach to providing permanent supportive housing to formerly homeless people.

Coalition Homes, an affiliate of the Montgomery County Coalition for the Homeless, provides permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless households that is

integrated throughout the community. Coalition Homes owns and manages 96 permanent homes for formerly homeless and disabled individuals. Many of these were acquired from other developers. Thirty-two of the apartments are part of Cordell Place, a former office building recently redeveloped by Coalition Homes in the downtown Bethesda community.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed to Address Community Opposition

The MPDU Program

According to John Enagonio of Coalition Homes, communities in Montgomery County tend to resist large supportive housing developments, or homes in general that provide supportive services for residents with mental illnesses. But a small number of homes “here and there” goes much more smoothly, if only because they are below the community’s radar. Much of the permanent supportive housing managed and owned by Coalition Homes is scattered in small blocks, including stand-alone single-family homes. Enagonio acknowledges that this can make service provision more difficult or cumbersome, but the cost and time saved upfront are very valuable.

Montgomery County’s MPDU program has aided Coalition’s acquisition of scattered blocks of homes. Between 2005 and 2007, Coalition purchased 34 MPDU units from three separate condo developers in blocks of 16, 10, and 8 units respectively. In each case, the condo developer was concerned about the impending or then current economic downturn impacting the marketability of the below-market-rate MPDU units at a time when the market-rate homes in the rest of the building were also struggling to sell. Coalition was able to purchase pre-built homes at discount prices, integrated into a broader housing community, in desirable county locations, without having to weather any kind of discretionary review or public approvals process.

“By-Right” Development Permissions for “Personal Living Quarters” in Commercial Districts

The county’s zoning policies facilitate the work of Coalition Homes in an important second way. Since the late 1990s, Montgomery County’s zoning code has allowed SRO developments of fewer than 50 units to be built “by-right” – without the need for community hearings or a discretionary review process – when proposed in central business districts. This was a big help to Coalition’s efforts to acquire and remodel a sagging, class B office building into a multi-unit, permanent supportive housing development in 2010. Cordell Place now provides 32-units of permanent supportive housing in downtown Bethesda – the county’s most expensive urban community. The units at Cordell Place are known as Personal Living Quarters – one-room, efficiency apartments in an integrated service environment that elsewhere are typically referred to as SRO’s. The building also features shared kitchens, a community room, and other amenities. All tenants receive on-site case management as well as the opportunity to engage in a range of community events and activities.

Cordell Place is not the only beneficiary of the county's Personal Living Quarters policy. When the County led the renovation of a former Econolodge motel into a supportive housing community known as Seneca Heights Apartments in 2004, the Personal Living Quarters by-right policy played a key facilitating role. The apartment community serves 40 formerly homeless individuals and 17 families.

The Housing Initiative Program

Some of Coalition's supportive housing portfolio involves management of scattered homes that residents are able to rent through use of a portable voucher subsidy. Coalition manages a number of these vouchers, and links its services to the households using them. Some vouchers are made possible by US HUD through its federal Housing Choice Voucher program. But others were created by the county as part of its Housing Initiative Program (HIP), which provides portable vouchers tied to services for formerly homeless individuals and families. Like Housing Choice Vouchers, HIP vouchers pay landlords the difference between prevailing rents and what the resident can afford. The county HIP program serves 245 households countywide. It was started in 2008 when the county began moving to a "housing first" model. The county enlists not just Coalition Homes but also other housing providers throughout the county to provide needed wrap-around services for households with these vouchers.

Because residents use these vouchers to rent individual apartments and homes on the open market, they don't prompt community concerns typically associated with new developments seeking discretionary approvals. Furthermore, the county has recently made it illegal to discriminate against prospective tenants based on their use of a HIP or Housing Choice Voucher. Several other cities nationwide have adopted similar "Source-of-Income" protection laws.

Particular Role/Opportunity Played By Various Actors/Organizations

The county's Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA) is involved with two of the supportive policies described above. The County's MPDU program is administered by DHCA. The county's by-right zoning program for SRO-type developments was first initiated by the DHCA as a pilot program. The Housing Initiative Program, on the other hand, is administered through the county's Housing Opportunities Commission (HOC).

Impact of the Approaches Adopted

Each of the three policies discussed above has enabled Coalition Homes to create permanent supportive housing without having to navigate the cost and uncertainty of community opposition and discretionary approvals processes. In the case of Cordell Place, for example, Coalition was able to move through the full development process – including design, remodeling, and fundraising – in two years. This is considerably less time than it takes traditional affordable housing developments to gain approvals and finish

construction in the county. NIMBY opposition has essentially been a non-issue thus far for Coalition Homes.

New York City Case Study: Services for the UnderServed (SUS)

Contacts:

Cynthia Stuart
Chief Operating Officer
Supportive Housing Network of New York (SHNNY)
cstuart@shnny.org
646-619-9640 ext. 143

Yves Ades
Senior Vice President for Mental Health Programs and AIDS Services
Services for the UnderServed
yades@sus.org

Jessica Katz
Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD)
katzj@hpd.nyc.gov
212-863-6435

Reasons for Initial Community Opposition

A 2010 story by the *New York Daily News*⁵ featured a handful of neighbors describing their initial concerns with the Macombs Residence development built by SUS:

- "People were concerned ... we were afraid, we didn't want it. I went to their website and read some of them were coming out of prison. We have schools nearby."
([Amelia Ramos](#), next door resident)
- "There was resistance; we felt the neighborhood was oversaturated with these types of residences and agencies," said Bernice Williams, chairwoman of Community Board 5's human services committee, who initially opposed the project.
- "They open these places and they don't continue to follow the residents, or there's not enough staff. A lot of times, it's not the residents, but the visitors who are problems," said Sallie Smith, a nearby resident who has lived in the Morris Heights

⁵ <http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/bronx/home-mentally-ill-heart-article-1.451810#ixzz2iNpTVHna>

section of the Bronx for 45 years.

Overview

In November of 2009, SUS celebrated the opening of Macombs Residence in the Morris Heights neighborhood of the Bronx, New York. This supportive housing development was created by Services for the UnderServed (SUS), a nonprofit service provider and developer. Macombs Residence combines 48 studio apartments with services for mentally ill, chronically homeless people. It was a rocky road to gaining community support, however. At one particularly low point SUS staff members were called “terrorists.” But at the opening ceremony, the same resident who made this remark was the one holding the scissors for the ribbon cutting ceremony.

General Context

Neighborhood

Morris Heights is a low-income residential neighborhood located in the Bronx borough of New York City. It is a relatively poor community, dominated by older apartment buildings, vacant lots, and newly constructed, subsidized, multi-unit townhouses and apartment buildings. As a whole, however, New York City remains one of the most expensive housing markets in the US.

City Orientation to Affordable/Supportive Housing

New York City is recognized as the “supportive housing capital of the nation.” It is home to more than 28,000 units of supportive housing. The state of New York is home to an additional 15,000 supportive housing units outside city limits. The city and New York state have entered into three major agreements since 1990s that have freed up substantial resources to house homeless individuals who were mentally ill or otherwise disabled. The most recent “NY/NY” Agreement, in 2005, commits the city and state to creating 9,000 new supportive housing units for chronically homeless and at-risk individuals and families over the next 10 years.

The Supportive Housing Network of New York (SHNNY) plays a major role in helping the city and state achieve their ambitious supportive housing goal. SHNNY is the hub of the state’s large community of nonprofit supportive housing and service partners, with more than 200 organizational members statewide. One of its major goals is to enhance public understanding and support for supportive housing. To that end, SHNNY launched a Good Neighbor Initiative (GNI) in 2007 to assist nonprofits in overcoming NIMBY opposition. Among its activities were:

- producing a 50-page toolkit titled *Building Support for Supportive Housing*;

- creating a video called “Good Housing. Good Neighbors;”
- commissioning research by NYU’s Furman Center on property value impacts of new supportive housing in New York City;
- conducting major outreach to reporters and editorial boards; and
- participating in over 40 tours of supportive housing;
- honoring the efforts of community members and organizations in welcoming supportive housing to their neighborhoods with a Neighbor of the Year award at their annual Awards Gala; and
- networking providers with one another to enable one to introduce the other into communities in which they are already established.

The Network has also prepared a model Good Neighbor Agreement.

According to SHNNY, the organization has assisted approximately 40 providers that are in the process of developing 3,000 units of supportive housing, and has helped convince dozens of community leaders of supportive housing’s value. It is a big proponent of affordable housing tours, careful language and messaging strategies, and where possible, avoiding large community meetings.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed to Address Community Opposition

Services for the UnderServed (SUS) began its outreach for Macombs Residences, like many affordable housing developers, by seeking support from the local district’s Community Board. Community Boards in New York City serve as forums for issues that impact local communities. They are sounding boards and community liaisons for the local Borough President and Mayor’s office. While they do not have any official power, they can be a helpful place to engage with local community members and secure community support to assist with applications for city funding.

As SUS was lining up a meeting with Community Board 5, however, opponents on the Board organized their own large community meeting to discuss the emerging proposal. SUS was present, but the meeting became a very difficult forum for sharing what was in their proposal. SUS staff members were called “terrorists” at one point. As Judith Jackson, chief of staff of SUS, told the New York Daily News in 2009: “In the beginning there was a lot of misunderstanding about what we were bringing into the community.”⁶

But SUS decided not to give up on securing Community Board 5’s support. Over the course of nearly two years, SUS convinced Board members and other community residents to go on tours of similar SUS developments and meet tenants there. SUS also arranged a key

⁶ <http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/bronx/home-mentally-ill-heart-article-1.451810#ixzz2iNpTVHna>

meeting between Community Board 5 members and members of another district's Community Board where SUS had previously developed. The multi-hour meeting was set up to allow a candid, peer-to-peer discussion of SUS's track record, management practices, and the actual experience of people living near existing properties.

Particular Role/Opportunity Played By Various Actors/Organizations

New York City's Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) is an essential funding partner for most affordable housing and supportive housing developments in the city. To receive HPD support, housing providers must at minimum engage with a local Community Board and/or the local elected official. HPD doesn't actually require a letter of support from the Board, elected officials, or other local community organizations, given the possibility of empowering a discriminatory deliberative process that violates federal Fair Housing Act or Americans with Disabilities laws. But a letter of support is "preferred" by HPD.

Impact of the Approaches Adopted

Though it took time, in the end SUS won over the Board and secured a letter of support. Cynthia Stuart, who observed the effort from her position at the Supportive Housing Network of New York (SHNNY) believes the two most impactful tactics employed by SUS were arranging peer-to-peer education and persuasion, and bringing local stakeholders and decision-makers on tours of their properties. People needed to see to believe, explains Stuart. And she believes it was really important for Board 5 members to hear from people in the same position as themselves, and not just the developer, because ultimately residents recognize that the developer has a self-interest in the outcome ("skin in the game.")

All three of the neighbors profiled at the beginning of this case study changed their minds about Macombs Residence, and enthusiastically attended the opening celebration. Their words are telling (again as reported to the *New York Daily News*):

- "They have opened the doors, and we've seen the other side," said next door neighbor Amelia Ramos.
- "They are very good neighbors," said Community Board 5 chair Bernice Williams. "I have never seen so many beautiful people."
- "If I ever got in this situation I would come here," said Sallie Smith.

Most telling of all: the person who had called them a "terrorist" at the first, large community meeting held the scissors for the ribbon cutting.

Novato, CA Case Study: Homeward Bound

Contact:

Mary Kay Sweeney

Executive Director, Homeward Bound

mksweeney@hbofm.org

415-382-3363, ext. 201

Reasons for Initial Community Opposition

Community opposition to affordable housing has reached a fever pitch over the past three years in the city of Novato. Gaining approvals was never particularly easy for affordable housing sponsors. But organized opposition intensified greatly in 2010, when the city attempted to systematically increase permissible residential densities at a dozen sites in the city to create more hypothetical opportunities for affordable housing, in response to new state law. Neighborhood organizations formed in various corners of the city to protest both the zoning changes and new affordable housing generally, raising such concerns as:

- the new proposed densities would drive down property values;
- the new proposed densities would destroy the small town character of Novato;
- new affordable housing tenants would be imported from other cities, commit crimes, and turn various Novato neighborhoods into slums;
- the children of new affordable housing tenants would drag down the performance of local schools and bully the other kids;
- the city (and county's) existing service infrastructure could not sustain the addition of new households, especially those perceived to rely heavily on city services; and
- new retail would be a much better land use than housing given the city's perceived shortage of commercial activity.

This show of organized opposition continues to stall the city's rezoning plans.

In 2011, Homeward Bound began working on a proposal for 14 small rental homes serving formerly homeless families. It generated much less opposition than the city's overall rezoning efforts, in large part due to Homeward Bound's reputation and relationship building in the city. But those that did speak in opposition raised many of the concerns listed above.

Overview

Homeward Bound is a nonprofit provider of shelter, services, and supportive housing for homeless families and individuals based in the city of Novato. It operates shelter programs, supportive services, and a small portfolio of transitional and permanent supportive

housing throughout Marin County. Homeward Bound is best known and well regarded for its Next Key Center (30 units of transitional housing) and Fresh Starts Culinary Academy, both located in the Hamilton community of Novato. In 2011, it began work on the development of Oma Village – a cluster of 14 small rental homes for families transitioning out of homelessness, in an area just adjacent to the Hamilton neighborhood. The “village” will include a community center, homework club, shared gardens, and supportive services. The homes will be highly energy-efficient, one- and two-bedroom units with separate entrances. In July 2013, the Novato City Council voted 4-0 in favor of the proposal (with one councilmember absent). Free now to move forward, Homeward Bound expects to wrap up its fundraising efforts and begin construction in early 2014.

Context

The city of Novato is located in Marin County, one of the wealthiest and most expensive housing markets in the United States. Marin County is directly across the Bay from San Francisco, separated by the Golden Gate Bridge. The county has a strong agricultural and rural character. Environmental advocates and planners have protected 84 percent of the county’s land as parks and open space. New development is almost entirely infill, by necessity. Residents, however, are generally wary of any new development.

Novato is small for a city, with 57,000 residents. Its residents are more likely to be middle- or upper-middle-income than other county residents, and are also more conservative. The city is home to a significant share of the county’s stock of deed-restricted affordable housing.

Oma Village will be the second, stand-alone, supportive housing community built by Homeward Bound in Novato. The first – the Next Key Center– overcame a challenging approvals process of its own in 2006. Next Key includes 32 transitional housing studios and a training kitchen for the Fresh Starts Culinary Academy. Both Oma Village and Next Key Center are located in Novato’s Hamilton community: a predominantly single-family residential community built on a redeveloped Air Force base.

Oma Village came forward in a highly charged environment for affordable housing. Long-time housing advocates observed that they had never seen a more hostile environment in the Bay Area region. Community opposition grew out of response to the city’s proposed comprehensive rezoning program, designed to facilitate a few hundred, new affordable housing units in a dozen, scattered locations. Approximately 400 residents attended the city’s June 2010 planning commission meeting about the proposed rezoning, overflowing city hall chambers. Most spoke out against the changes, and many began circulating stories that localized criminal activity could be tied to a specific, relatively dense affordable housing property in central Novato. This property, incidentally, was operated by a for-profit company with relatively little experience developing and managing affordable housing.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed to Address Community Opposition

Homeward Bound relied on several of the same strategies and mechanisms for Oma Village as it used to win community support for the Next Key Center and Culinary Training Institute earlier in the decade. One of its chief, repeated strategies was small group outreach. As executive director Mary Kay Sweeney underscored: “Never rule out the importance of tea and coffee.”

In addition to at least a dozen small group meetings, which included neighborhood groups and churches among others, Homeward Bound met early and “pre-emptively” with key individuals, especially those who were leading the charge against the city’s comprehensive rezoning program. This proved to be even more powerful than small group meetings in building key community support.

Individual meetings were especially helpful for eliminating “fear-based histrionics” from the discussion and for negotiating the details of community support. Through one-on-one dialogue, for example, Homeward Bound was able to win the support of one of the most vociferous opponents of the city’s rezoning program, in exchange for keeping Oma Village within a certain density limit (20 units per acre) and contributing to one of her “pet” causes – support for the city’s Firedogs.

Homeward Bound also gained community support by being flexible with its design, which was tweaked to stay within a 20-unit-per-acre cap that many Novatans had been advocating in citywide rezoning. Oma Village’s green design was also a strong selling point in a county with a high share of environmentalists.

Homeward Bound also created short videos of typical families who would be moving into Oma Village. These YouTube accessible videos helped support the community outreach and fundraising activities by putting a face to the proposal, and shifting an abstract conversation about density and the perceived relationship between affordable housing and crime to the project’s likely beneficiaries, most of whom already live in Novato.

Homeward Bound also worked to invest the surrounding community in Oma Village’s success. To raise funds, Homeward Bound is highly reliant on individual donations. For Oma Village it issued an “IPO,” which allows individuals to purchase ceremonial “shares” in the organization’s “Immediate Public Opportunity” to end homelessness. Through these shares, individuals receive regular reports on the progress of Oma Village’s families and an invitation to an annual shareholder meeting, among other benefits. Warren Buffett purchased the first share for Oma Village, spurring many others locally to follow suit.

Homeward Bound also connected a local church to its on-site services. One of the pastors of a local church contacted through the outreach process agreed to help out with the tutoring at Oma Village, which is part of Homeward Bound’s plan to help kids at Oma Village do well in school.

Finally, it’s important to note that Homeward Bound works to connect its residents and services to the larger community, and in the process builds long-term support for its affordable housing work within Novato. For example, Next Key includes a 150-person event room connected to the Culinary Academy training kitchen. This room is a sought-after meeting and event space for Hamilton and city residents alike. Also, many events at the space are catered by Next Key residents who train at the Culinary Academy. This brings city residents to see Next Key first-hand, while giving them a chance to meet and enter into

a relationship with actual residents. Each of these dynamics helps break down myths about affordable housing and improves community comfort and support for affordable housing in Novato.

Particular Role/Opportunity Played By Various Actors/Organizations

City staff appears to have played a fairly neutral role in the approvals process for Oma Village. But two Novato organizations helped bring supportive residents to speak in favor of the proposal. One of these was a pro-affordable housing group formed in the heat of the zoning controversy – Stand Up for Neighborly Novato (SUNN). The other was the Marin Organizing Committee (MOC) – a countywide interfaith organization with at least one constituent church in Novato. By turning out supporters to speak in favor of Oma Village, SUNN and MOC helped soften the impact of opponents who shared concerns about the project.

Impact of the Approaches Adopted

In July of 2013, Novato’s city council voted unanimously (4-0) in favor of Oma Village. Fifty people attended the council meeting, a relatively small turnout in light of recent public hearings over citywide rezoning proposals. A majority of the audience spoke in favor of the proposal.

Homeward Bound’s outreach efforts appear to have brought in supportive speakers, while answering the concerns of would-be opponents who no longer felt the need to attend the meeting.

Many in attendance, including council members, spoke to Homeward Bound’s reputation as the reason they were willing to go along with the proposal. It stands to reason, however, that Homeward Bound’s outreach, along with the ways it connects its developments to their surrounding community, helped translate its track record into a positive reputation, both for those already familiar with the organization and for those new to Homeward Bound at the time that Oma Village was proposed.

Philadelphia, PA Case Study: Project HOME

Contact:

Jennine Miller, Associate Director of Education and Advocacy

Project HOME

215-232-7272 x3042

jenninemiller@projecthome.org

Reasons for Community Opposition

- Some neighbors were concerned that JBJ Soul Homes would be a halfway house, home to criminals.
- Residents and local businesses were concerned that the residential development would interrupt efforts to extend nascent business activity farther down Fairmount Avenue.
- Some residents wanted more evidence that the development would generate opportunities for existing residents of the neighborhood.

Context

Project HOME is a nonprofit organization that provides housing and services to chronically homeless men and women in Philadelphia. The organization is working in partnership with People for People, Inc., a service provider in the local community, to create JBJ Soul Homes in North Central Philadelphia. JBJ Soul Homes will provide 55 apartments for formerly homeless and low-income adults and children, along with retail space to spark commercial activity. The development will transform a long-vacant lot into a \$16 million, four-story, mixed-use structure. It is scheduled to complete construction at the end of 2013. Key financial support came from Jon Bon Jovi's JBJ Soul Foundation, along with the City of Philadelphia and other contributors.

JBJ Soul Homes will be located along the 1400 block of Fairmount Avenue, at the southern edge of North Central Philadelphia. This area of the city has been hard hit and economically depressed for the last several decades, but is adjacent to gentrifying areas of the city. Presently there are very few businesses operating in the immediate area, but the neighborhood as a whole is in transition.

The development is about a block and a half from 1515 Fairmount –Project HOME's first permanent supportive housing facility and the focal point for a famous, intense battle in the early 1990s. For over four years, Project HOME's efforts to develop 1515 Fairmount Avenue were blocked by a combination of civic groups and political interests. Ultimately it took a federal lawsuit to compel the city to allow it to be built.

Project HOME was determined to avoid a repeat of this experience with JBJ Soul Homes, and worked to build strong community support.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed to Address Community Opposition

Philadelphia developers seeking a zoning variance must notify the surrounding community before making their case to the zoning board. As part of the notification process, developers have to present at neighborhood community meetings. The proposed four-story structure entailed more floors than allowed under the existing zoning code, so a zoning variance was needed.

Project HOME took various approaches to building community support, in addition to presenting at neighborhood organizational meetings. Project HOME had already laid groundwork for success in its ongoing relationship maintenance with neighbors of its 1515 Fairmount project, a block down the street. At the time of the proposal, Project HOME was just beginning conversations with new neighbors moving into the area around 1515 Fairmount, and utilized these conversations to also educate them about JBJ Soul Homes. Further leveraging existing relationships, Project HOME organized local neighbors to talk with other neighbors living within 500 feet of the proposed new development about their concerns and to enlist support. This local outreach team collected signatures of supportive neighbors and businesses, to document support as they proceeded.

Project HOME took to heart the concerns it heard that the development would dampen potential business activity along the corridor. People in the neighborhood wanted access to more places to shop and get food. In response, Project HOME changed their development proposal to include ground-floor retail space. Originally this space was to be for office uses, but Project HOME moved this space to a higher floor.

Another key tactic employed by Project HOME was to take neighbors and councilpersons on tours of other Project HOME facilities and programs.

Prior to initiating the proposal for JBJ Soul HOMES, Project HOME commissioned a study by an independent economic consulting firm – Econsult – to ground-truth the notion that nearby property values plummet after permanent supportive housing is built. The study reviewed all of Project HOME's 15 permanent supportive housing facilities in Philadelphia and found that property values did not actually plummet, but in fact rose in several instances. Project HOME used these findings in some of its outreach conversations.

By the time of the zoning commission hearing for JBJ Soul Homes, Project HOME brought supportive neighbors, signed petitions from local neighbors and businesses, and former opponents of 1515 Fairmount, who testified that they had been wrong in their fears of what 1515 Fairmount would become.

Particular Role / Opportunity Played By Various Actors / Organizations

The city zoning board required some show of community support in deliberating on the requested zoning variance. Project HOME needed to show tangible evidence, such as

support letters and signed petitions, and show support from local businesses as well as residents to prevail.

Impact

Project HOME was able to get the needed zoning variance, and secure city financial support – without a lawsuit. Its Dec. 2011 zoning board hearing was very successful, with more people attending to speak in favor of the proposal than against. JBJ Soul Homes is currently under construction and is expected to open in the winter of 2013/2014.

Jennine Miller of Project HOME credits three particular tactics: ongoing relationship maintenance in the community after opening 1515 Fairmount decades prior; neighbor-to-neighbor conversations and petitioning; and being able to adapt their proposal to include ground-floor retail uses as requested by the community.

Portland, OR: Case Study Home Forward (Portland Housing Authority)

Contacts

Shelley Marchesi, Director of Public Relations

Home Forward

503-802-8427

shelley.marchesi@homeforward.org

Barbara Shaw, Housing Program Coordinator, Housing Production & Preservation

Housing Bureau of Portland

503-823-3339

Barbara.Shaw@portlandoregon.gov

Reasons for Community Opposition

Residents and business owners were particularly concerned about social service clients queuing up in front of the facilities, given that this has occurred in front of other service centers in the neighborhood. Bud Clark Commons is in view of two major, busy transportation centers operated by Amtrak and Greyhound bus services.

Residents also expressed concerns that the area was already saturated with similar social services and that by taking up an entire city block, Bud Clark Commons would inhibit possible businesses uses that could generate revenue for the city.

General Context

In 2011, the City of Portland officially opened Bud Clark Commons, a multi-use “cornerstone” of the city’s 10-year Plan to End Homelessness. The Commons was developed by Home Forward (formerly known as the Housing Authority of Portland) in partnership with the Portland Housing Bureau, Transition Projects, Inc., and Multnomah County. It includes 130 studio apartments for formerly homeless individuals and couples, a transitional center for 90 men, and a day center that offers a variety of services and resources. The housing component of the Commons is managed by Home Forward, while the shelter and day center are managed by Transition Projects.

In 2012, the Commons won the Creating Community Connections design award from the American Institute of Architects and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. It is also received the first LEED Platinum certification by the U.S. Green Building Council for a facility of its type.

Bud Clark Commons is located in the Old Town Chinatown neighborhood of Portland, which has historically hosted many social service agencies. Surrounding areas have gentrified more than Old Town Chinatown.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed To Address Community Opposition

Home Forward and the Portland Housing Bureau participated in a multitude of meetings with neighborhood associations from the outset of the process. Part of this was a reflection of the city's encouragement and support for a high level of neighborhood-association engagement in city decision-making. Also, Bud Clark Commons was to be built on public land owned by the Portland Development Commission, triggering the need for an even higher level of hearings and outreach.

In addition to making presentations at hearings and neighborhood association meetings, Home Forward employed a Citizens Advisory Committee and Good Neighbor Agreement to work through community concerns and create a healthy forum for communication.

Citizen Advisory Committee

Early in the development of Bud Clark Commons, during the design phase, Home Forward set up a Community Advisory Committee (CAC). A "multitude" of stakeholders representing local neighborhood associations, local business associations, immediate neighbors, and a couple citywide organizations were joined on this committee by representatives of Transition Projects (both staff and participants in their programs). Home Forward has found it helpful to balance CACs with both neighborhood groups and service providers, given the need to balance these interests and to get everyone in the room so they can see and hear each other. Home Forward also held two design workshops with the CAC.

Discussions ended up focusing mostly on siting concerns, with particular attention paid to design of an interior courtyard, which would allow clients to queue off of the sidewalk.

Good Neighbor Agreement

Later in the process, after the design stage, Home Forward and Transition Projects entered into a single Good Neighbor Agreement (GNA) with six neighborhood associations involved with the CAC, the Portland Police Bureau, and the city's Office of Neighborhood Involvement. The agreement is explicit about it not being expected to resolve all the problems of the neighborhood. Its goals are to:

- "Initiate and maintain open communications and understanding among the parties in order to be proactive and ready to respond if concerns arise in the future.
- Develop procedures for resolving problems.
- Enhance neighborhood safety and livability and promote access to services.
- Reduce crime and the fear of crime in the neighborhood."

Signees indicate what roles they will play to accomplish these goals. One of the terms of the agreement is also that participants will “use and promote direct, respectful and civil communication.”

A Good Neighbor Agreement appears to be (or at the time was) required by the zoning code for shelter and day center uses. It is not required for supportive housing, but on occasion the Portland Housing Bureau will require it as a condition of funding when circumstances are deemed to necessitate it.

Home Forward developed the GNA for Bud Clark Commons relatively late in the development process because of the traditional GNA focus on operations and ongoing management procedures. Also this timing allows staff who will be on-site at the time of opening to be involved in the process and get to know the CAC members and other neighbors.

GNAs are not enforceable contracts, but Home Forward believes they are useful at the very least as a communications plan. GNAs allow stakeholders to express concerns and see them memorialized; mitigation plans are put in place and it is made clear how neighbors can reach and stay in touch with staff at the housing development.

There is evidence that the GNA is already working in these respects. In the first six months of Bud Clark Commons’ operation, an on-site social service provider began sending clients out of its lobby and onto the street during staff meetings. Neighbors noticed the “queue” and immediately contacted those listed in the GNA. Home Forward’s operations staff was able to respond immediately and work on a compromise that satisfied all parties.

Particular Role/Opportunity Played By Various Actors/Organizations

The Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI)

Over the past 40 years, the city’s Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI) has worked to slowly nurture a neighborhood-association-centered approach to land use and city decision making in Portland. ONI supports roughly 30 staff members who work with more than 90 neighborhood associations, a handful of immigrant/refugee groups, senior groups, and organizations focused on issues impacting persons of color. They teach meeting facilitation, leadership development, conflict resolution, and how to navigate city bureaucracy, among other things. With a mission of “Building inclusive, safe and livable neighborhoods and communities,” ONI works to create a culture of civil, informed dialogue around civic matters with the aim that this will lead to better outcomes when, for example, potentially contentious land use decisions arise.

ONI sometimes helps facilitate Good Neighbor Agreements, and an ONI staffer was a participant in creating the Bud Clark Commons agreement. Through its Crime Prevention Program, ONI also creates guidelines for what Good Neighbor Agreements can cover and how they should be developed, though these have mostly focused on agreements with liquor-serving establishments.

Effect and Impact of the Approaches Adopted

The Portland Development Commission voted unanimously to use its land to create Bud Clark Commons, and to appropriate \$28 million to enable its development. The City Council shortly thereafter followed suit and voted unanimously to support this land disposition and program.

According to staff from the Portland Housing Bureau, initial skeptics were won over by the positive attributes of new development in the community, as well as the need for the housing and services it would provide to homeless individuals. Rather than oppose the Commons, concerned residents decided to work through the vehicles initiated by Home Forward to shape how the Commons would be run and managed.

The Citizens Advisory Committee was a helpful vehicle for communicating with a range of stakeholders, especially local residents and neighborhood groups, says Barbara Shaw of the Portland Housing Bureau.

From Shaw's perspective, the GNA was less important or necessary for winning community support than the outreach that preceded it – namely the work with the Citizens Advisory Committee and Home Forward's early meetings with neighborhood associations.

Perhaps tellingly, Home Forward did not use a GNA in its next housing development – Stephens Creek Crossing – though the circumstances were somewhat different in that the Crossing involved the redevelopment of an existing public housing development into mixed-income housing. Home Forward did, however, use a Citizens Advisory Committee for Stephens Creek Crossing, which from Home Forward's perspective proved helpful in building community support.

San Francisco, CA Case Study: Community Housing Partnership

Contact:

Gail Gilman

Executive Director

Community Housing Partnership

GGilman@chp-sf.org

Reasons for Community Opposition

Community residents' stated concerns about the Edward II supportive housing proposal included that:

- youth would not thrive in this particular neighborhood, on a busy street, in a 24-unit apartment community;
- youth would exhibit behavioral problems that would spill over into the surrounding neighborhoods;
- property values would be negatively impacted;
- the requested increase from 16 to 24 permissible residential units was too dense for the neighborhood and the site; and
- the historic character of the Edward II Inn would suffer.

Overview

In October 2011, Community Housing Partnership, a nonprofit developer and service provider, won support from San Francisco's Board of Supervisors for a controversial housing project in one of the city's most exclusive neighborhoods that will provide 24 units of supportive rental housing to youth aged 18-24 at risk of homelessness. The project known as Edward II is located in the city's Marina neighborhood. Until construction began in the fall of 2013, the Marina had never previously hosted supportive housing.

Community Housing Partnership (CHP) is the only nonprofit in San Francisco dedicated exclusively to providing permanent, supportive housing to formerly homeless individuals and families. It owns or manages eleven buildings with over 900 units in the city, with an additional 144 units in development. It provides an integrated network of support services for residents of its housing, and is partnering with Larkin Street Youth Services to provide tenant services at the Edward II.

Context

Neighborhood

The Marina District is one of San Francisco's wealthier neighborhoods. It is home to a large share of twenty- to thirty-something professionals who work in the business or legal professions, as well as a smaller share of affluent middle-age to senior households. The neighborhood's status as one of the city's most desirable neighborhoods owes in large part to its easy access and views of the San Francisco Bay, the Marina Green and Crissy Field – a long stretch of waterfront green space that connects to the base of the Golden Gate Bridge. Housing in the Marina tends to be moderate-density, low-slung, and well maintained. The neighborhood is transversed by two streets with a series of high-end retail establishments that serve as destinations for shoppers from the rest of the city.

Cow-Hollow is a very similar, tony neighborhood just to the south of the Marina. It is separated from the Marina District by Lombard Street, where the Edward II will be built. Lombard Street is a wide, lower-rent, major thoroughfare where one is more likely to encounter bars, auto-oriented restaurants, and small hotels than boutiques or chic spas.

City Orientation to Affordable/Supportive Housing

Gail Gilman from CHP describes the city of San Francisco as “incredibly committed” to its goal of creating 3,000 units of supportive housing for homeless individuals and families as part of its 10-year Plan to End Homelessness. One of the top priorities for the city's affordable housing capital assistance program is the creation of new supportive housing for persons who are homeless, threatened with homelessness, or in need of supportive services. The city has also created a Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) dedicated to providing operating subsidies to buildings that provide supportive housing for homeless individuals and families. This program is reportedly well funded.

In addition to funding housing developments that are entirely comprised of supportive housing, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) encourages applicants seeking capital assistance for other types of affordable housing to include within their developments a share of units for formerly homeless individuals, and to link these units to supportive services. For example, the city's Family Rental Housing Program typically requires that a portion of units be set aside for families exiting homelessness together with a comprehensive social services component appropriate for families. The city's housing program for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities employs a similar requirement on occasion.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed to Address Community Opposition

At the beginning of the outreach process for the Edward II, Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier's office assisted in providing CHP with contacts in the Cow Hollow and Marina neighborhoods. CHP then met with the heads of multiple neighborhood associations in the area. This was followed by a couple of large community meetings about the proposed development that were organized by the two largest neighborhood associations. Comments at these meetings got "really ugly," according to CHP executive director Gail Gilman.

Though they were not ready to give up on these neighborhood associations, CHP realized that these groups would not likely become key supporters, and so focused their efforts on other unaffiliated neighbors in the surrounding community. Noticing that a large meeting format was ineffective, CHP reached out to unaffiliated neighbors through one-to-one meetings and house parties. They also conducted an extensive "tel-a-town-hall," in which they called people throughout the community and asked about the issues that most concerned them regarding the project and solicited feedback on which development options would be most appealing. In this outreach, according to CHP, was infused by a desire to win over neighbors so that they felt like they had real ownership over the project, and were heard rather than simply outvoted. Also, CHP's outreach was done in partnership with their service partner – Larkin Street Youth Services – which provided additional credibility.

CHP also put extensive resources into developing an education campaign, including research on property value impacts to show how similar properties had performed in other California settings. They created a dedicated website for the project. They utilized the press heavily to introduce themselves and Larkin Street Youth Services to the broader community.

Another helpful strategy was the signing of a Good Neighbor Agreement with the Cow Hollow Neighborhood Association – one of the key neighborhood associations in the area. This was done at the suggestion of Supervisor Mark Farrell, who succeeded Supervisor Alioto-Pier. CHP reports that they were happy to enter into this agreement. The agreement mostly incorporates typical CHP property management practice. But CHP also added more stringent property rules as concessions to the community. For example, the Edward II will now provide a staffed, 24-hour front desk, and restrict overnight guests to only 10 visits allowed per month. Also, CHP agreed to increase the level of staff at the building, to provide greater comfort to the neighbors, and increased the amount of community space available in the building, to address concerns about the environment they will be creating for the youth.

Finally, the Good Neighbor Agreement established an ongoing Project Advisory Committee (PAC). One of the functions of the PAC, is to provide the community with the space to provide regular feedback and input on the project development and building operation. The PAC also provides a venue for tenants of the building to meet and be part of the community at large.

According to CHP staff, the Good Neighbor Agreement served to make the Edward II a better housing development, while also giving the neighborhood association a needed “win” and true sense of ownership over the development that has fostered greater support.

Impact of the Approaches Adopted

In the fall of 2012, the city Board of Supervisors followed the Planning Commission in voting in support of the Edward II, granting CHP its requested zoning changes and funding support. CHP staff report that even those neighborhood associations that were initially opposed to the development have now moved on to how they can make it the best possible project.

Seattle (WA) Case Study: Delridge Supportive Housing

Nicole Macri, Director of Administration
Downtown Emergency Services Center (DESC)
(206) 515-1514

Community Concerns

Neighborhood opposition to the Delridge project developed along familiar lines: individual neighborhood residents were concerned that the future residents of the development would bring crime to the neighborhood and contribute to a drop in property values.

Individuals opposing the development expressed two primary, if contradictory, objections:

- 1) residents of the development would cause safety problems, and
- 2) the neighborhood is not safe enough (too much crime, too few amenities) for development residents.

The primary intent of the opposition was to stop the project from moving forward. Neighborhood groups weighed in on the development, but were not specifically opposed to Delridge Supportive Housing.

The opposition in this case and in most cases was white, middle class, recent first-time homebuyers in their 30s. In Delridge, these neighbors represent the first wave of gentrification. Sentiment expressed by the opposition was as such: “Here come the downtown Seattle powers that be, putting this development in our middle class neighborhood because they know we don’t have the resources to organize to stop it.”

In general, DESC finds that property values and safety are the number one concern of neighborhood opposition, and traffic and parking are the second greatest concern. Once the legitimate concerns are addressed, the opposition shifts its focus to critiquing the development process, accusing DESC or the city of operating in an unfair manner. Once those who do not want the development to proceed at all realize that they can’t stop it, they disengage from the process. Those who believe they can still get something out of the process remain involved.

General context

Delridge Supportive Housing, expected to be completed in December 2013, will comprise 66 units of supportive housing for chronically homeless people with serious disabling conditions, mostly mental illness and addiction. It is being developed by Downtown Emergency Services Center (DESC). The building offers studio apartments for individuals, as well as a television room, computer room, dining area, and communal kitchen in a first-

floor community space. There is a private courtyard that opens to the street, as well as about 2,500 square feet of first-floor commercial space as required by area zoning.

The development is sited in the Delridge district of the West Seattle neighborhood. It is on that district's main arterial in a neighborhood business district in a location that offers good access to transit and both downtown Seattle and the rest of the West Seattle neighborhood.

Tools / mechanisms developed to address community opposition

Engaging Government

DESC engages with city and county government during pre-purchase, as part of the funding process. DESC leverages relationships with those policymakers supportive of their work to build support for their projects with lawmakers and community members who have concerns.

Engaging Neighborhood Stakeholders

Neighborhood engagement begins once DESC has control of the site. DESC has a comprehensive community engagement process, which is less about convincing the opposition to support the development than it is to ensure DESC meets the requirements to obtain funding and adhere to the project timeline, which has a significant impact on the bottom line and overall viability.

Prior to development, DESC maps stakeholders, identifies neighborhood influencers, and calls them personally regardless of whether or not they have already expressed concern about the project. DESC asks these influencers for advice on how to engage the rest of the community in the process.

DESC prefers to hold its own community meetings over presenting its plans at existing meetings, as the housing first approach is unfamiliar and counterintuitive to many people and takes a lot of time to explain, before the development itself can even be discussed. Community members naturally can have concerns about the housing first approach, feeling it is a free ride and that it might not be safe.

In the case of Delridge, DESC presented at a community forum, at the request of the North Delridge neighborhood, before Community Forum After holding a series of small informational meetings aimed at engaging and educating the community about its plans, DESC created an Advisory Committee in partnership with stakeholders from the Delridge neighborhood. The purpose of the committee is to create a forum for communication with neighbors about the project's design, housing model and services, and to work together with the neighborhood to identify, discuss and act upon issues of neighborhood concern.

Now that the development process is almost over, only the adjacent neighbor is still involved, because he has very specific, personal concerns about parking he wants addressed through this community.

The city's notification requirement (see Official Processes, below) allows for a consistent approach and gives DESC some cover in dealing with opposition, because they can explain

that they are meeting the requirements placed on them by the city. Asking for input in this way can be difficult, because neighbors often hope they are being asked for permission, and are disappointed when they learn their power over the end result is limited. DESC genuinely wants to learn about the neighborhood from the neighbors, who both want their concerns regarding the development they want addressed, and have important information about what goes on in the neighborhood and what needs and issues exist.

DESC has a “reasonable person” test for its community engagement work: would a reasonable person be satisfied with this response? They are committed to responding to questions from neighbors within two days of receipt, and to be responsive to all reasonable concerns.

DESC has no formal review process for its community engagement work, though they debrief internally with key stakeholders and funders after every development process.

Official Processes

City of Seattle Consolidated Plan. Seattle’s Consolidated Plan dictates neighborhood notification and community relations requirements for grantees of HUD programs (HOME, CDBG, HOPWA, and Emergency Solutions Grant programs), as well other city housing funds, like the Seattle Housing Levy. These requirements apply to all applicants for permanent or bridge funding, and apply to both new construction and renovation under new and existing owners.

The document states clearly that while the purpose of community engagement is to facilitate understanding and resolve problems, it is not the policy of the city to refuse funding on the basis of neighborhood objection to a project. The Consolidated Plan spells out the members of protected classes who cannot be excluded from a development in accordance with local, state and federal law.

The minimum notification requirements for developers as stated in the Consolidated Plan are as follows:

- Consult with the city to learn of affordable housing developers operating in the neighborhood, as well as active neighborhood associations. Contact existing affordable housing owners in the neighborhood to learn about historical and current concerns.
- Notify neighbors within at least 500 feet of the development site in writing, prior to submitting an application for funding.
- Contact the Neighborhood District Council prior to application for help in identifying neighborhood and community organizations. Contact those organizations to notify them about the project.

The city requires developers to include with their application a plan for ongoing communication with project neighbors—individuals and organizations—during the predevelopment, design and construction phases. Once the development is completed, the city asks that developers invite community members to project open houses, to establish ongoing communication to “address emerging issues and share successes,” and to keep the city informed of any issues.

Seattle's Consolidated Plan also includes guidelines for neighbors of affordable housing developments. These guidelines ask neighbors to encourage developers to be active community members, to communicate concerns and to work collaboratively to see those concerns addressed, to negotiate a community relations plan with developers if verbal communication is difficult, and to let developers and residents know what is working well.

Good Neighbor Agreements. While a community relations plan or Good Neighbor Agreement (GNA) is not required by the city Consolidated Plan and one was not created at Delridge, DESC has developed GNAs for other projects when supporters of the project on the city and county councils were in favor of it and believed it would help build community support. In one case, developing the GNA took 140 hours of DESC staff time to negotiate.

In the Delridge case, DESC decided to just go straight to the community advisory committee model and skip the GNA.

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations

Seattle's role. The City of Seattle has a long history of supporting affordable housing and staff from its Office of Housing, Department of Neighborhoods, and Department of Planning all regularly participate in community meetings about affordable housing developments. Seattle has depoliticized its funding process, giving final authority for determining the award of housing funding to civil servants, not elected officials. In King County, which provides funding to affordable housing development through its veterans and supportive services levies, elected officials are part of the award decision process, leaving the process vulnerable to direct influence by constituents.

Project proponents. DESC played the lead role in educating the community about the project and developing support. At DESC, there is a feeling that more up-front involvement from city, county and state government officials could help neighbors understand the overarching public policy goals being achieved by development of supportive housing.

Neighborhood organizations. Existing neighborhood organizations did not outright oppose the housing development, though they raised various concerns and provided a forum for community conversation about the development.

Effect and impact of the approaches adopted

DESC successfully received city, county, and state funding for Delridge Supportive Housing, and expects to complete construction in December of 2013.

It also passed design review and zoning approvals after making some modifications to its design and ultimately reducing the total number of housing units from 75 to 66.

Sunnyvale (CA): Armory Project

Contacts:

- Nevada Merriman, Senior Project Manager, MidPen Housing Corp.
nmerriman@midpen-housing.org; (650) 356-2915.
- Hanson Hom, Director of Community Development, City of Sunnyvale
hhom@sunnyvale.ca.gov; (408) 730-7450

Reasons for Community Opposition

Concerns about the Armory project included:

- the loss of an existing, cold-weather homeless shelter, due to the redevelopment of the existing Armory building;
- the local school's capacity to absorb new children;
- parking;
- building design, specifically proposed heights, shadows cast on neighbors, and massing;
- the perceived incompatibility of placing formerly homeless individuals in the same building as families; and
- the safety of other children in the community on their walk to school.

Overview

Two nonprofit affordable housing developers, working together, overcame various community concerns to gain approvals for a 117-unit affordable housing development in Sunnyvale, in which 47 units are reserved for homeless families and individuals. The development is split into two buildings. The first building, known as Parkside Studios, is being developed by Charities Housing. It will feature 59 affordable studios. The second phase, being developed by MidPen Housing Corp., will be a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units, housed in a three-to-four story building that will include 2 offices for mental health service providers, among other amenities. All of the homes will be affordable to individuals with incomes no more than half of the area median (approximately \$50,000 for a family of four),⁷ with those for formerly homeless individuals and families priced considerably lower.

Following a year-long community outreach and educational process undertaken by MidPen and Charities Housing, the Sunnyvale city council granted approvals for the two-building

⁷ http://www.hacsc.org/p_IncomeLimits.php

housing community in April 2013. Charities Housing is beginning construction on the first building in October 2013. MidPen expects to start construction on phase two in April 2014.

General Context

The City of Sunnyvale is located in California's "Silicon Valley," approximately 30 miles south of San Francisco. The city is home to numerous high-tech and aerospace companies, ranging from Yahoo to Lockheed Martin. The city's large share of high-wage earners have contributed to high housing costs consistent with neighboring Silicon Valley communities, making it one of the more expensive places to live in California. The city is also home to the Onizuka Air Force Station, which was decommissioned in August 2010. The City is now developing a reuse plan for the former military base, which has indirectly facilitated the development of permanent supportive housing for homeless individuals and families in a nearby city neighborhood.

As a decommissioned military base, a portion of Onizuka land must be offered to nonprofit organizations for the purpose of assisting homeless people (per the federal Base Realignment and Closure Act and Title V of the federal McKinney-Vento Act). In 2011, two high capacity nonprofit affordable housing developers made claim to this land – MidPen Housing Corporation and Charities Housing. Given the site's relative isolation, however, the city and nonprofit developers agreed to a land swap whereby the city offered free land nearby at its "Armory" site for the development of the permanent supportive housing.

Neighborhood context

The Armory site is located in the city's Lowlanders neighborhood, which is in the middle of transitioning from lower density residential and light-industrial uses to higher-density residential. The property is adjacent to multiple new condominium developments. Many are occupied by first-time homebuyers. An office park is also nearby.

Homeless-related services are not new at this location. Until this year, the "Armory" hosted a seasonal (cold-weather) regional homeless shelter operated by Santa Clara County. The shelter served approximately 1,000 individuals and families per year. Prior to plans for permanent supportive housing, the county signaled its intentions to close the shelter in favor of a decentralized shelter strategy.

Orientation to Affordable Housing

Having offered land at the Armory site, the city of Sunnyvale was invested in an outcome that included permanent supportive housing. More generally, the city of Sunnyvale and County of Santa Clara have made various financial commitments to increase "workforce housing" in recognition of the mismatch between local jobs and local home prices. Nonetheless, local neighborhood buy-in was never a given for the Armory site

redevelopment, particularly in a community concerned about maintaining property values and high performing schools, and in light of the existing facility use.

Tools/Mechanisms Developed to Address Community Opposition

MidPen and Charities Housing took a proactive and open approach to engaging the local community about plans for deeply affordable/permanent supportive housing at the Armory site. Over the course of a year, the two developers developed a project-tracking website, met with six neighborhood associations (in the immediate community and nearby), met with various other neighbors individually, held two large community open houses, shared plans with organizations and churches located elsewhere in the city, developed a tour of similar properties, met with planning commissioners and city council members, conferred with the school superintendant and local service providers, and made revisions to plans based on community feedback. The intention of MidPen and Charities was to meet neighbors “where they were at,” and to make it as easy as possible for city residents to contact the city and developers about the development and to stay informed.

The webpage devoted to the development project provides details of plans, summaries of community feedback (and responses to community feedback), background information on each of the developers, information on where the proposed development was in the approvals process, city analyses of evolving plans, and contact information.

A focal point of the outreach process was the two open houses. The emphasis of the first open house was the introduction of the housing developers to the community. No drawings or plans were presented. According to city staff, this helped focus the conversation on relationship building and underscored that the developers were not arriving to present a “done-deal.”

The second open house featured a short opening presentation, but was structured around six stations at which neighbors could discuss specific areas of concern. For example, one booth focused on design issues, at which the developers’ architects and city planning staff were available to answer questions and take down feedback. Another booth that was focused on property management and house rules was staffed by property management staff from the two developers. For participants interested in understanding the services offered formerly homeless individuals, staff was available from the service providers responsible for these services. This format was intentionally chosen to discourage large-group speeches, one-sided discussion, and the kind of “grandstanding” that can sometimes happen in large community meetings on a given issue. The format facilitated one-on-one interaction between neighbors and key informants/decision-makers. The open house was helpful for both addressing concerns and educating residents about details of the evolving plan, as well as soliciting detailed feedback. Furthermore, the city brought staff who could address long-standing neighborhood concerns that they anticipated might come up, but which were only tangentially related to the proposed development, such as park safety and maintenance issues. The format helped to discourage general or unfocused attacks on the development, and required participants to look each other in the eye and engage respectfully person-to-person.

Responding to Concerns

MidPen and Charities Housing benefitted from having time over the course of the year to be able to meet with many stakeholders in the community, answer key questions, and address all the concerns they could. This was helped by their ability to secure the land for the development early in the process, without the need for an option or loan.

In response to concerns about design, MidPen and Charities made various architectural changes to soften the height and massing of the building, and improve the safety of routes to school for children. To address concerns about the loss of the existing homeless shelter, the two nonprofits had extensive conversations with the shelter manager – EHC Lifebuilders – as well as the Downtown Streets Team – a service provider that conducts outreach to homeless at the existing shelter. Both homeless service providers publicly vocalized their support for shifting to permanent supportive housing, and came to an open house and approvals hearings to speak to the job training services that would be connected to the Armory development.

To respond to concerns about education, the nonprofit developers researched school capacity concerns with the school district, pulled together a short factsheet to summarize their findings, and enlisted the school superintendent to answer questions directly, both through a letter and in-person testimony.

To address concerns about safety concerns and property management, MidPen shared with neighbors and other interested parties its “Good Neighbor” and property “house rules” policies. MidPen does not enter into “Good Neighbor Agreements” with neighborhood associations, but it does with its tenants. These are addendums to the lease that speak to their no-tolerance policy for criminal activity or disruptions that impact the surrounding neighborhood. To clarify how it manages its properties, MidPen shared these addendums with each of the six condo home owner associations. MidPen also developed a tour of one of its existing senior housing projects in Sunnyvale that had been operating for over 30 years. While only the Planning Commission chair attended the tour, senior project manager Nevada Merriman reports that it was helpful to tour a property well into its tenure, located in the same city as the Armory redevelopment proposal.

City Role

The city of Sunnyvale played an important role in helping MidPen and Charities Housing open up dialogue with residents. City staff sat down with MidPen and Charities Housing at the outset to help craft a strong community outreach strategy. The city encourages community outreach and notification for all significant developments in the city – whether or not it includes affordable housing. In the case of the Armory site, the city suggested key individuals and groups with whom to meet. The city also made suggestions for the type of drawings that would work best in community meetings, and provided advance notice of the kinds of issues that project sponsors might expect to hear. The city also included on its project website a link to a publication on “[*Myths and Facts about Affordable and High Density Housing.*](#)”

Formal “Good Neighbor Agreements” are not seen in Sunnyvale. The closest thing to such an agreement in the city tends to be letters from some developers to nearby neighborhood associations that feature pledges to follow certain procedures during project construction. This might include, for example, notifying residents well in advance of days when construction activity will be generating considerable dust, noise, or truck activity on the streets.

Impact of the Approaches Adopted

In spite of some community concerns and opposition, the Armory Site redevelopment secured various zoning and planning approvals, including a zoning change, a General Plan amendment, and a special use exemption. This culminated in a City Council vote in April of 2013, in which the council voted 6 to 1 to allow the project to move into construction. To the surprise of city staff, initial community concerns were no longer an issue by the night of the city council decision. In fact, turnout was relatively limited, and a large majority of residents in attendance spoke in favor of the project.

Calgary, AB

Contact person: Justin Rebello (403-216-5234)

Reasons for community opposition (general or referring to a particular project):

As is the case in many cities, over the years Calgary has been impacted by community opposition to new development – both market based (usually higher density) and affordable/supportive housing. In a recent case (2013), proponents that were seeking to convert an existing hotel for use by formerly homeless singles tried to avoid public discussion and not consult. When the councilor and public became aware there was strong outrage and opposition. Calgary staff believe that it is very hard to take a “fly below the radar” approach. These usually backfire and generate greater resistance. Main public concern is not being informed and involved during planning process.

In the case of supportive housing and special use facilities, such as drop in centres, a key community concern is who will be using the facility, concerns about loitering on street and how this impacts perceived safety. The planning/development approval process does not explicitly offer an opportunity to address these occupant related concerns, so that opposition is manifest on the siting and planning aspects, usually as a foil for the underlying occupant concern).

General context

Like Edmonton, Calgary operates under the framework of the Municipal Government Act (MGA). The development permit process under the MGA imposes a requirement to undertake public consultation when a change in use is contemplated and the Act also creates an appeal avenue when aggrieved parties disagree with any development approval at City Council. Also, as in Edmonton, the funding for any provincially funded affordable and supportive housing requires a process of public engagement as a condition of receiving funding, even where there is no rezoning, change in use or variance from current zoning provisions.

Calgary also has a very active business led foundation (Calgary Homeless Foundation) seeking to end homelessness. Among other things the CHF undertakes broad public education and fund-raising such that residents in Calgary may be more aware of homelessness and the role of affordable housing in helping to reduce visible homelessness on the streets.

Tools / mechanisms developed to address community opposition:

In 2006 the planning department initiated a review to determine how to manage the development of special use facilities (including drop in centres, halfway house, addiction centres and supportive housing). Such uses were considered a change in use and required a development approval process, including public engagement.

As part of this review, staff conducted consultations and focus groups to better understand the nature of community concerns. It was through this process that the main issues related

to who would use/live in such facilities and the impact that their behavior might have on the neighbourhood were identified. It was recognized that the existing planning based review process did not formally or explicitly cover this issue (i.e. planning process deals with density, height, siting access/egress etc.).

A need was identified for some mechanism to facilitate dialogue around ongoing operational and management practice. In researching this further, staff identified Good Neighbour Agreements (GNAs) as a possible mechanism. At the time (2006) these had been implemented in Red Deer and Lethbridge.

The GNA option was examined and identified as a way that could help in conducting an open and frank discussion about issues and concerns as well as creating the opportunity to present evidence about impacts and break down stereotypes (e.g. that all homeless are drug addicted and active criminals).

As part of the review, staff conducted focus groups with a wide range of stakeholders (including residents, councillors EA's and developers) to better understand issues and concerns. It was through this process that the primary issue was highlighted: the main concern is that undesirable uses are imposed without a fair and open process. Concerned parties wanted a process that is open and transparent, allowing concerns to be aired, and when appropriate identifying remedies or refinements in the proposed development plan.

Additional research included public surveys on attitudes about "affordable", "social" and "supportive" housing and revealed a lack of understanding about these different terms and descriptors. This in turn stimulated the development of educational and awareness information materials to clarify terminology and also to dispel myths and misconceptions. Staff have developed a guide for proponents on how to do effective public engagement, and this includes information to help clarify what is affordable housing. This information is available through the links below

The GNA is seen as part of an educational/awareness raising process. The document simply codifies a set of principles and opens and maintains dialogue around operational matters and specifies the process to remedy issues when these arise (e.g. unacceptable behavior of residents). It creates a separate platform for discussion separate from any planning matters.

Blueprint for development of Surplus School Sites

As a separate process the City of Calgary is also developing a process to manage redevelopment of surplus city owned sites: a "Blueprint for development." Again, there has been community reaction when the City has designed surplus lands (including land set aside for school sites, some of which have been used/perceived as park space). When declared surplus, such lands are made available to other city departments for civic use, and the Housing company is able to place a request to have appropriate sites designated for affordable housing. The redesignation is undertaken in "in camera" meetings of council and there is no consultation of public notice as council has the authority under the MGA. AS affordable housing is a city mandate and priority, Council feels it is not productive to engage in consultation prior to designating sites. The Blueprint process, currently being developed aims to initiate public engagement immediately after designation, and includes a strong educational/information component about what is affordable housing and who lives

there (and emphasizes that it targets working poor, many of whom are key to the City's service economy. Up to 10% of units can be also designated for persons/families transitioning out of shelter system and this aspect is acknowledged, but not highlighted.

The public engagement process does not reopen the decision but allows public input into design elements (and will incorporate a GNA process to openly discuss the ongoing operational and management plan).

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations:

Planning staff had the lead role in the review related to siting special facilities and the resulting information/education materials. They were supported by staff in housing as well as staff from the City's municipal housing company. Housing and CHC staff are also proactive participants in planning review/approval process for new projects for affordable housing. Their role is supported by a council policy to support and encourage affordable housing.

Effect and Impact of the approaches adopted

City staff noted that the Good Neighbour Agreement (GNA) ideally runs parallel to the development permit process, and does not deal with development permit issues. They have however found that when communities know the GNA is being created, concerns and fears (separate from planning) may be dealt more effectively and this enables the development permit process to continue. Staff did however also find that you may also have a case where communities hold up the DP process as an 'excuse' saying the GNA has not been completed. The Calgary Planning Department is very clear in saying, the progress of GNA in no way impacts the timing of a development permit approval

Links to the guided noted earlier

<http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/LUPP/Pages/Current-studies-and-ongoing-activities/Care-facilities/Care-Facilities.aspx>

<http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/LUPP/Pages/Current-studies-and-ongoing-activities/Care-facilities/Good-Neighbour-Agreement-Initiative.aspx>

<http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/LUPP/Documents/Publications/special-care-guide.pdf>

Hamilton, ON

Key contact persons:

- Brian Kreps, Manager, Emergency Shelters & Domiciliary Hostels, City of Hamilton
 - Telephone: 905-546-2424 x4329 / Email: Brian.Kreps@hamilton.ca
- David Brodati, Housing and Homelessness Action Plan, City of Hamilton
 - Email: dbrodatti@Hamilton.ca
- Jeffrey Neven, Executive Director, Homestead Christian Care
 - Telephone: 905-529-0454 / Email: Jeff@hsc.ca
- Alan Whittle, Director, Community Relations and Planning, Good Shepherds
 - Telephone: 905-528-5877 x 3322 / Email: AlanWhittle@GoodShepherdCentres.ca
- Renee Wetselaar, Project Director, Affordable Housing Flagship
 - Telephone: 905-522-1148 ext 311 / Email: rwetselaar@sprc.hamilton.on.ca

Reasons for community opposition:

- The **Radial Separation By-law** is currently subject of significant debate, after the Ontario Municipal Board (with an intervention by the Ontario Human Rights Commission) ruled in September that the Lynwood-Charlton (LC) should be permitted to merge the Lynwood and Charlton Hall in one facility on Augusta Street, offering supportive housing for young women. According to the By-law, which the City sought to enforce, Residential Care Facilities are not to be located within 300 metres of one another, with the number of beds in each facility also limited. On these grounds, the LC was not permitted to relocate. Another case (the St. Leonards Society's planned renovation and expansion of a facility) has also drawn attention to the by-law. The City may appeal the decision.
 - Debate includes community voices (including Councilors and civic organizations) speaking to a perceived over-concentration of services for a particular group in one area, while others emphasize a human rights framework.
- There is a recognition that the City's Planning framework (e.g., calls for development to emulate the character of a neighbourhood, or for certain parking provisions) often work in opposite directions to goals of housing mix. Land-use planning can be used as a smoke-screen for contesting developments. There is a noticeable difference (by proponents) in ability to work with **City's Housing Department versus the Planning Department** (where even the choice of trees, landscaping can cause project delays).

General context:

- Phase 1 of the **City's 10-year Housing and Homelessness Plan**, with 54 strategies, was passed by City Council in June, 2012. One of the core values is “place and neighbourhoods,” emphasizing that “a full range of quality housing options contributes to neighbourhoods that are healthier and more dynamic,” recognizing that a need for affordable housing exists across the geography of the new City, from the core to its rural villages. Specifics are being worked out in Phase 2, an implementation plan, with 5 outcome areas and approximately 20 critical investment strategies (priorities); Phase 2 is expected to go before Council in December, 2013.
 - One of the 5 outcome areas is “affordability and choice,” to be linked to the City’s Urban Official Plan, which similarly speaks of neighbourhoods with a mixed range of housing options; it is recognized that a strong citywide planning framework is the time to envision future possibilities for inclusive neighbourhoods, removing the need for site-by-site exemptions.
 - Further, each Critical Investment Strategy is expected to include a workplan, identifying specific actions, stakeholders to be involved, timing, resource needs, measurements)
 - While there has been some discussion on inclusionary zoning or pre-zoning (possibly looking at density bonusing or other incentives), it is recognized that some stakeholders are not supportive; rather than municipal leadership, it may be necessary for the Province to legislate
- Through the City’s **Neighbourhoods Strategy**, the City has a role in facilitating development of neighbourhood plans and developing inclusive neighbourhoods. Encouraging neighbourhoods themselves to develop plans and encouraging inclusion of affordable housing are two roles / objectives that can clash when neighbourhood groups can see development of affordable housing as counter to their interests.
- **Licensing:** through a City by-law (07-170), Schedule 20, the City licenses Residential Care Facilities (though not facilities licensed and funded by the province (e.g., group homes)). Though helpful in ensuring adherence to minimum standards (e.g., fire code, room size, amenities), the bylaw is less effective in resolving / responding to quality concerns. There are also subsidy contracts (e.g., for domiciliary hostels), where subsidies are dependent on compliance with the by-law. Challenges exist in terms of who (particularly within the municipally) “owns” the program; should issues be resolved by the Police? Legal services? City social supports?
- With the Urban Official Plan now in effect, the City is finalizing its Comprehensive Zoning By-law (post-amalgamation), and is developing a **residential intensification** strategy to meet provincial targets.

Tools / mechanisms developed

- Homestead Christian Services (HCS) has been lauded for its **significant community involvement**, its responsiveness to community concerns, especially regarding development of the Perkins Centre, with 46 units for individuals who were generally

homeless (coming from shelters, group homes, hospitals). Many staff live in (and are sought out from) the neighbourhoods where programming occurs. In developing the Perkins, staff knocked on neighbours' doors, making adjustments to plans based on their concerns. The ED is willing to share contact information, explaining to residents, "call me if you have any problems." Even the neighbourhood association was supportive.

- HCS was also seen positively for creating affordable housing by **retrofitting an existing rooming house, / bar (possibly brothel / grow-op)** removing a perceived 'blight' from the community – offering something tangible for the community (contribution to neighbourhood renewal, mainstreet clean-up). The goal here is leaving the community better off with the new development than without it.
- Neither the City nor the Province require public consultation as a result of funding support (in other words, no requirement beyond those required through zoning and planning processes).
- There is no requirement for **Good Neighbourhood Agreements**. However, when developing Good Shepherds Square (3 buildings on a block, including 165 units and shelter space for women and children, in an old school / convent site), the Good Shepherd Centre struck a **Liaison Committee** with neighbourhood representatives, convened by the local Councilor – for the duration of the development process. The Committee provided an opportunity for the Good Shepherds to communicate to the neighbourhood where the process stood and offered opportunity for the neighbourhood to comment on issues, speaking directly with the development team, addressing site plan, access, landscaping, security. The outcome was a very green campus, now viewed as a huge asset to the neighbourhood, and part of broader neighbourhood renewal that is improving property values.
 - With the completion of the development, and the group now having disbanded, the Director of Women's Services for the Good Shepherds continues to participate in the activities of the local Neighbourhood Association, aiming to incorporate the development into the ongoing structures of the neighbourhood.
- Through the City's Neighbourhood Development Section, neighbourhoods can prioritize the importance of **affordable housing in their neighbourhood plans**. While these plans do not trump the planning process, they can be helpful (contact Suzanne Brown for more details).
- Through its interventions in the Lynwood-Charlton case and others, the Ontario Human Rights Commission is encouraging a **human rights framework** is applied to decision-making, in effect, peeling away the layers of the planning regulation framework and planning process by encouraging consideration of the purposes of planning and zoning. The Commission works to ensure that – through a human rights framework - zoning is directed to uses rather than people. According to Barbara Hall, Ontario Human Rights Commissioner, the Commission has intervened in Sarnia, Kitchener and Toronto over similar bylaws; Kitchener has recently voted to scrap its bylaw.

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations:

- *Project proponents:* The City sees the developer or project proponent as the one that needs to lead consultation; they own the project and need to be the face in the community
- *Broader housing network:* The Affordable Housing Flagship is a roundtable that brings together a broad array of community representatives, including City officials, realtors, rental owners, homebuilders, social services. The Flagship's currency is dialogue, respecting difference, and keeping a dialogue going. The Flagship is also now getting more into development possibilities – continuing to challenge problematic policies and regulations – but also looking for waivers, for parkland (etc.) to prevent the high front-end costs of development (where much NIMBY comes from).

Does the jurisdiction have any internal guidelines on process/steps staff should employ in managing development approval aspects and public engagement?

- The City's efforts focus on groundwork before projects go ahead, encouraging project proponents to work in advance with neighbourhood groups, encouraging full transparency and credibility. The City works to engage the community (e.g., participation at information sessions) and to develop awareness of the need for affordable housing, communicating the 10-year plan, for example, as a way to build support for the provision of affordable housing.
- Proponents suggest that the City could play more of a lead in articulating how housing projects are a positive contribution to the community. For example, if residents desire a strong downtown, it is important that those working in the service industry (with lower wages) have places to live.

Montreal, QC

Contact: (Francois Goulet 514 872-6064)

Reasons for community opposition

Strong opposition tends to be less frequent in Montreal in part related to the contextual factors noted at outset. However certain projects have faced some resistance, especially when targeting hard to house populations.

General context – Montreal has some similarities to Edmonton in that it includes a large number of independent municipalities but also has a region wide administrative body (Montreal Urban Council). In the area of housing the Ville de Montreal carries out an overall coordinating function for the region and is the primary conduit for funding (using both city's own funds as well as allocations of Federal/Provincial funding).

In addition, Montreal is somewhat unique in Canada with a much proportion of rental housing, especially in the central boroughs.

The City has had a long history of involvement and programming for affordable housing. Since 2001 there have been 3 rounds (each 4 years) of programming articulating a goal to create 5,000 units of non-profit housing in 4 years (with additional goal for general rental creation). Montreal also has inclusionary policies. The housing department has an explicit and strong mandate, which is fully supported by council, at least with the city proper; in the boroughs the local councils are not always as supportive, especially those that are predominantly ownership tenure and higher income (less familiarity with non-profit housing).

This strong mandate is further reinforced by Montreal's charter, which supersedes the provincial municipal government act, and in particular includes a clause (Article 89) that *enables the City council to carry out a social housing project, notwithstanding any by-law adopted by a borough*.⁸ Article 89 can be used to intervene and, for example override any requirement to conduct a public referendum on a specific development. This must be done prior to opposition (i.e. it is not a veto) This effectively gives council some control over the process in managing any opposition to such projects. That said, politicians may be reluctant to invoke this power in the face of strong opposition. It can, however, be effective in the case of frivolous opposition.

Distinct from other cities, Montreal tends to have two types of resident associations: rate payers (owners) and tenants. The later have historically been strong supporters of

⁸ «89. The city council may, by by-law, enable the carrying out of a project, notwithstanding any by-law adopted by a borough council, where the project relates to ... (4) housing intended for persons requiring assistance, protection, care or lodging, particularly within the framework of a social housing program implemented under the Act respecting the Société d'habitation du Québec (chapter S-8);»

affordable housing and tend to be more established than homeowner associations (often more temporary entities, opposing specific initiatives). So not only is there less opposition, there is sometimes active lobby for affordable housing. The tenant associations have however sometimes opposed condominium development, especially when they felt it was gentrifying traditional working class neighbourhoods.

Tools / mechanisms developed to address community concerns:

As the City began to roll out its goals of 5000 units in 4 years initially in 2001, they created a process of public engagement to raise awareness and understanding about social and affordable housing (including rental, co-op and supportive housing). This included creating brochures/flyers providing facts and information about who tends to live in this housing.

The city housing staff also developed and conducted presentations across the region, including to all borough councils. This was used to promote understanding of the concept and nature of affordable housing and how it is important (including its role in providing housing for those working in the lower wage service economy – i.e. the economic benefit of this housing).

For projects that comply with actual zoning there is no requirement for public consultation; however any site involving a change in use or density/height (rezoning) requires a public process and residents can request a referendum on a specific development (open to residents in a specified geography). Over the years, some private and non profit developers have developed an expertise on how to win a referendum. Holding such referendum can sometimes be positive because this then canvasses the views of many, not just a vocal minority opposing a development.

In any public information meetings/hearings, housing staff actively participate as advocates for the development and work closely with the proponent and local borough staff to provide information and clarifications about the project.

And as noted above as the funding approval agency, the City housing staff can ensure design issues and operating plans are developed as part of the funding review process, and confirm to residents that these are in place. Beyond a plan, proponents of supportive housing must show that they have the necessary funding support to fully implement the level of supports indicated. Without this approval, the project is considered unviable and would not secure the housing grants.

There is no specific requirement attached to funding to conduct a public process unless it is required under planning requirements (i.e. change in use). However, as part of the funding application, a proponent is required to provide a letter of support from senior official of borough council. The City encourages all project proponents to openly consult local community as part of the application process.

As a separate measure, city staff have conducted surveys of car ownership among NP/Co-op residents and this data has shown lower ownership and thus less need for parking. This helps reduce number of parking spaces and thus costs) and also helps to address community concerns re additional traffic and street parking as a result of new development (when non-profit). This data is now used to convince potential or actual opponents that a non profit housing project will have little impact on parking in their neighbourhood.

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations:

As noted above, the information/education initiative was led by City staff (in collaboration with sector organizations and resource groups – the intermediaries that often help in development).

Staff from the City’s housing department are also active in any public meeting related to the development approval process, although planning staff tend to remain more impartial. And, as above have assisted in generating car ownership data to address parking and traffic impacts

Effect and Impact of the approaches adopted

As noted, vociferous opposition is infrequent in Montreal and residents are generally more tolerant of non-profit and affordable housing. However the informational/education approach used has helped to reinforce this support and to minimize and diffuse concerns when these arise. Montreal has the added clout of its Charter provisions and can use these to intervene when it sense that opposition may arise (mainly to avoid the delays and cost associated with conducting a referendum).

The concept of a referendum offers two perspectives. Historically proponents and staff saw this as an insurmountable obstacle. If a community (borough council) accepts resident request for a referendum, it adds delay and cost and often this has the effect of abandoning the project; On the other hand as most opposition is a minority, a referendum opens the opportunity to hear from a broader set of residents, potentially including those that may be indifferent or even in favour. Over time NP resource groups/developers have become more skilled at managing the process to achieve a positive outcome. However this does create delay and add cost.

Additional contextual notes:

Montreal has not used “Good Neighbour Agreements”

To promote the adoption of processes involving interaction with citizens right from the project development stage, a guide for private as well as public and community promoters was published by the City of Montreal (available in English):

http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/GUIDE_CONSULTATION_EN/MEDIA/DOCUMENTS/GUIDE_PROMOTEURS_210605_EN.PDF

Another guide was produced by and for non-profit housing promoters. Montreal Housing Department did a contribution to the content of that guide:

<http://www.habitation.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/internet/centredoc/pubSHQ/0000021140.pdf>

Saskatoon, SK

Key contact persons:

- Alan Wallace, Manager, Planning and Development, City of Saskatoon
 - Telephone: 306-975-2755 / Email: Alan.Wallace@Saskatoon.ca
- Charlie Clark, Councilor, City of Saskatoon
 - Telephone: 306-229-4447 / Email: charliedavidclark@gmail.com

Reasons for community opposition:

- In general, **affordable housing and its community integration** has not been a controversial issue; there have been few proposals for homeless initiatives outside of the city centre, but some very successful ones. Since 2008, the City has exceeded targets of 500 new units of affordable housing per year (including affordable rental, secondary suites, affordable ownership, market rental and entry-level ownership), with a mixture of housing across the continuum, including transitional and supportive housing, primarily in existing neighbourhoods.

General context:

- The City's Housing Business Plan, 2013-2022, was adopted in principle in May, 2013, and is expected to be presented to the City's Budget Committee in December, 2013. **Among its priorities is the availability of attainable housing in all neighbourhoods.**
 - "A priority of this plan will be to ensure that housing projects supported by the City will be in a variety of neighbourhoods, including both new and existing neighbourhoods. Priority will be given to housing projects that bring the specific types of attainable housing to areas that lack it" (page 11).
- Different from many other Canadian cities, the City of Saskatoon is an active land developer, developing residential, commercial and industrial land. This process provides the City with opportunity to pilot a process called **land pre-designation**. As noted in the Business Plan, "the City has land pre-designation programs for entry-level, affordable ownership, and purpose-built rental housing designed to ensure that these types of housing are included within all new neighbourhoods." As the City develops Neighbourhood Concept Plans (about 1 per year), they typically identify at least two sites in each new neighbourhood for affordable rental and ownership housing, sending out the RFP to builders. Prices are fixed, so proposals fit with the City's specific objectives (e.g., the City may ask for large suites, rental housing or affordable home ownership). In private subdivisions, the City will deal directly with a builder.
- **Tying licenses to performance:** Care home operators hold business licenses that ensure compliance with zoning bylaw; however, these licenses are not tied to any type of affordable housing agreement (regarding operations or neighbourhood impacts).

Another tool for ensuring quality operations is the **Crime-Free Multi-Housing initiative**, of the Saskatoon Police Service, where landlords are certified for conformity with safety protocols (also seen as a marketing benefit for landlords). There is a reluctance in pursuing business licenses for all rental housing.

Tools / mechanisms developed

- With regards to scattered site housing, the City will offer land on first refusal that it acquires through tax enforcement to non-profit housing providers. In a strong market, there are currently few of these sites.
- The City has a five-year contract with the Saskatoon Housing Initiatives Partnerships (SHIP) to provide **third-party expertise** in the community regarding affordable housing, providing impartial information at public meetings where it is expected that NIMBY concerns may be prominent. SHIP is a non-profit partnership with a mission to enhance the environment for affordable housing and offer support to non-traditional housing providers. In this way, SHIP is able to dispel some of the common myths vis-à-vis affordable housing (e.g., fear of reduced property values, introduction of social issues in the neighbourhood).
- Even where no **public consultation requirement** exists (e.g., opening a new EGADZ home), the City encourages public consultation – to dispel myths and be open with the community. EGADZ, a provider of care homes for youth (including single mothers), is widely supported by the community and has introduced these homes in many neighbourhoods. The homes follow Saskatoon’s personal care home guidelines (up to five persons permitted).
 - While EGADZ was hesitant in holding public meetings when not legally required, these proponent-led meetings have been generally successful and are now more standard practice. Holding meetings also offers the opportunity to reply to complainants, after a meeting occurred, that a public meeting was held. Though not a legal requirement, there is now a policy requirement to hold these public meetings, in the interest of transparency.
- To encourage deconcentration of affordable housing, the City of Saskatoon has also introduced a **land cost differential incentive**, adding a 5% capital grant if developers look at areas where there is no predetermined concentration of affordable housing – ensuring that affordable housing is not only built in areas of lower land value.
- While **Good Neighbour Agreements** have not been used for affordable housing projects, they have served as a starting point for convening discussion when particular community facilities (e.g., faith-led centres) open in existing neighbourhoods (sorting out traffic, parking, external impacts). In these cases, the City pays for a facilitator and the group itself decides on a plan of action.

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations:

- *Municipality:* City Council set the ambitious target of creating 500 new affordable housing units annually or 2,500 units over the five-year period from 2008 to 2012. By the end of 2012 the target was achieved with a total of 2,534 units counted during the five-year period. In total, the City has worked with 32 partner organizations in achieving its housing targets since 2008.

Does the jurisdiction have any internal guidelines on process/steps staff should employ in managing development approval aspects and public engagement?

- When the City is developing neighbourhoods, the City will – as vendor – stipulate **Design Guidelines (characteristics)** in an RFP. With reliance on a design professional, the City’s review team considers design in ranking submissions (vis-à-vis adherence to RFP). Developments on private lots are not subject to a design review. Specifically, new infill guidelines are expected to be released in 2014. However, currently the Province does not allow municipalities to exercise architectural control unless in large areas that are designated as Architectural Control Districts. As such, the City will seek to use its influence vis-à-vis developers.

St. John's, NFLD

Key contact persons:

- Bruce Pearce, Community Advisory Committee, Community Development Worker
 - Email: bpearce@nl.rogers.com
- Teresa James (NIMBY project lead), Canadian Home Builders Association - NL
 - Email: membership@chbanl.ca

General context:

- The City's 2010-2013 Corporate Plan speaks of a desire to advance initiatives that communicate with and **develop citizen awareness** regarding challenges facing the City (noting, among other challenges, a low availability of rental accommodations).
- In addition to direct delivery of affordable housing through the City's Community Services branch (just over 400 units), the Planning and Development Division recognizes its role in facilitating affordable housing opportunities exist through enabling zoning legislation; **the City seeks to be an advocate** for new affordable housing and inclusiveness.
 - In February, 2011, City Council passed the City's Affordable Housing Charter and Action Plan, 2011-2013, prepared by the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Affordable Housing; the Action Plan is oriented around three directions, Produce, Protect and Promote rental and ownership affordable housing. The City hosts an annual Housing Forum. Indeed, while its own tools are limited, the CCPA has noted that "there are strong networks of advocates for affordable housing who push the City and the Province to do more to address housing and homelessness, including the (former) Deputy Mayor, Shannie Duff."
- During 2012-13, the St. John's Community Advisory Committee on Homelessness (CAB) identified the development of strategies for overcoming opposition to affordable housing and homelessness developments as a priority. The CAB, through funding by the Homelessness Partnering Strategy, and with the City as a partner, is investing in the **development of a NIMBY toolkit** by the Canadian Home Builders Association-NL (CHBA-NL)
- As seen by those assembling the toolkit, one commonality across the province is that **early community engagement** in the development of projects (regardless of the need for rezoning) leads to developments with fewer NIMBY challenges. A key goal is to encourage early communication strategies, and the early addressing of expected questions. For example, there has not been evidence to show that property values decrease or that the character of neighbourhoods change. It is important to anticipate what the different anxieties may be.

Tools / mechanisms developed

- **The CHBA-NL toolkit**, to have provincewide application, is expected to be available in Fall 2013. The toolkit will encompass the role of the municipality, with tools and advice for housing and service provider proponents, aiming to facilitate the creation of innovative affordable housing solutions, including rental properties, increased housing density, innovative housing forms, supportive housing and mixed-income communities.
 - Drawing on five or six recent development proposals (some more successful than others), it is expected that early strategies for communications, public relations and messaging are expected to be primary focuses. The kit will also encourage clarity in communications, emphasizing that proponents be clear in specifically what a building will be used for and addressing expected questions about property values (noting that there has never been evidence of property values decreasing) and neighbourhood character.
- **Good Neighbour Agreements** are not in use; there are concerns that such agreements create expectations, inflexibility and community divisions (premised on the “difference” of this housing development, which requires an agreement with neighbours, as opposed to other developments, that do not require agreements).
- The CAB has encouraged the use of **charettes** in planning projects; the City of St. John’s hosted a charette for a two-acre parcel of land in Pleasantville, being developed for social housing and community enterprise (part of larger Canada Lands development). In another example, the development team for the Tommy Sexton Centre, a shelter and supportive housing project for persons living with HIV/AIDS, explicitly sought input from the broader community through a workshop titled, “Headstart for Housing,” hosted by the CAB and sponsored by CHRA.
- The CAB has also helped to put in place a shared Technical Resources Facilitator position, working provincewide to provide non-profit and their consulting teams with **technical advice** during the development of affordable housing projects (including the renovation of existing buildings); NL Housing funds the position, which is hosted in the community by Stella Burry Community Services. The position is currently held by a semi-retired building professional who had previous experience with non-profit housing developers such as Habitat NL.
- A 2012 research report, “Community Impacts of the St. John’s Community Advisory Committee on Homelessness 2000-2012,” points to the revitalization of the Lilly and Stella’s Circle buildings, and how they contributed to the **preservation of the architectural heritage** in the Heritage District of the City.

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations:

- *Municipality*: The municipality’s role falls within the development of an overall housing strategy and the development of policies for affordable and supportive housing. It is expected that the CHBA may recommend that the municipality identify specific residential areas where affordable and supportive housing may be under consideration.

- The City may also move to offer workshops on planning issues and processes, encouraging a proactive community capacity. It is recognized that community understanding of the development process (from the moment a builder comes forward) is key to enabling a proponent to plan their engagement and communications strategy, anticipating challenges and questions. Preparation is a key theme.
- The main hub for the City's leadership on this issue is the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Affordable Housing, which includes representatives from all three levels of government and the community and private sectors.
- *Project proponents:* Similar to elsewhere, the housing proponents play the most significant role
- *Broader housing network:* The Community Advisory Board on Homelessness has had impacts on the community, making inroads in raising awareness of homelessness and mitigating NIMBY, gaining public acceptance of people who have complex needs and challenges. Specific initiatives have included a "Growing Homes" newspaper supplement; pancake breakfasts; the Sleep Out 120; and the production of a DVD, entitled "Making a Difference." The 2012 report cites the significant focus of the CAB on community development. Further, the Canadian Homebuilders Association – NL has been involved beyond the NIMBY Forum, strongly identifying affordable housing as an important concern for the economic and social well-being of St. John's

Does the jurisdiction have any internal guidelines on process/steps staff should employ in managing development approval aspects and public engagement?

- The City is partnering with the CHBA-NL in the development of a NIMBY toolkit, which is expected to address the City's role more clearly.

Toronto, ON

Key contact persons:

- Simon Liston, Manager, Housing Development, Affordable Housing Office, City of Toronto
 - Telephone: 416-392-0602 / Email: sliston@toronto.ca
- Michael Shapcott, Director of Housing and Innovation, The Wellesley Institute
 - Telephone - 416-972-1010, x231 / Email: michael@wellesleyinstitute.com

Reasons for community opposition:

- **Fear of the unknown, and particularly of declining property values, are common concerns.** One recent application – deemed strong by the City – saw a housing project with supports proposed for a City-owned site, with a police station and library adjacent on the same site; yet, there was massive opposition. This was an area where both the local Councilor and many local homeowners were opposed, fearing a decrease in property values. Approximately 600 individuals attended a public meeting, many strongly voicing their opposition. The project was approved by Council, and today there are no identifiable issues with the project. In many cases, projects are actually improving the streetscape, or reusing abandoned buildings.

General context:

- Drafted in 2009, the *Toronto Housing Charter – Opportunity for All* is intended to acknowledge the housing rights of all residents. The Charter emphasizes that all residents should have a home, and that they should be able to live in their neighbourhood of choice without discrimination. Building on the Ontario Human Rights Code, all residents have the right to equal treatment. The Charter is read at the beginning of committee meetings and hangs inside committee rooms to confirm zero-tolerance for discriminatory remarks.
- Currently, the City of Toronto is undertaking a major **zoning by-law harmonization** process. As a part of this, the City is embarking upon a process of public consultations to extend provisions for rooming houses across the entire City (currently allowances in the former City of Toronto differ from other areas of the new City). Distancing provisions used by former municipalities have been challenged by the Ontario Human Rights Commission; the City is working with Homecoming.

Tools / mechanisms developed

- With regards to questions of non-compliance with good operating procedures, the City's **Municipal Licensing and Standards** is responsible for ensuring property management standards are adhered to and issues are resolved. Two major enforcement challenges relate to infestations (private sector landlords) and building standards in older housing

stock (e.g., Toronto Community Housing). New developments are held to common standards, but see far fewer building issues, also as the City aims to select strong operators through a **rigorous RFP process**, specifically seeking out groups that have good relationships with neighbours (see more below).

- **Community consultations are only required if particular planning amendments / approvals are required**; provision of public funding does not require public consultation); however, local Councilors commonly ask that proponents hold information meetings. These meetings can be challenging, and some supportive housing providers do not participate, believing that residents may not listen, and moreover, that providers have the legal right to proceed with a project. Some Councilors also request establishing **community liaisons** (among the operator, builder, neighbours) during construction and afterwards with regards to integration. Citing human rights frameworks, the City itself does not require these.
- It has been learned that experts or champions from within cultural communities, who **understand cultural differences**, may be required in neighbourhoods of particular cultural concentrations (e.g., to understand the nature of a housing project being proposed).
- In 2011, WoodGreen Services opened the First Steps to Home program in the New Edwin Hotel, a century-old railway hotel, to provide 28 units of housing for formerly homeless men. The CEO and senior staff met with local business owners and door-knocked local residents to do the initial outreach. Prior to opening the building as housing units, WoodGreen opened the building to the community, first as an art show, showing the historical development of the community and the building, and the impact and personal stories of many of those who use the Centre's homeless programs. **The event became a housewarming party**, with local residents dropping off bed sheets, lamps, kitchenware, etc., filling an entire room with supplies for the new residents. Today, WoodGreen is a member of the local BIA, ensuring regular dialogue, and continues to receive regular donations from area businesses – large ones, like Canadian Tire, and small ones, like the street florist who maintains the window boxes on the building (including flowers and tomato plants).
- Funded by the City and Province, individual workers through Habitat Services **monitor the operations of private boarding home operators** who provide room and board to individuals with mental illness. The organization / service was launched about 25 years ago when the Province found that individuals were subjected to maltreatment. Habitat works with operators to ensure that property standards are maintained, that food is nutritious and available, that heating and cooling issues are dealt with, etc. The workers visit tenants to ensure this private sector supportive housing is strong.
- **Homecoming Community Choice Coalition** has published two toolkits for proponents of affordable and supportive housing, in 2003 (updated in 2005) and 2011, to encourage developments that are well-integrated with the community. Several case studies within the publications are from Toronto, including:
 - Gower Park (Toronto) – VincentPaul Family Homes (proposal for 7-story affordable housing development) included a common room that was turned over

to City's Parks and Recreation Department (effectively, the community got a satellite community centre).

- Fontbonne Place is today home to 18 older single women who need RGI, as well as two Sisters who live on the premises. The property is also home of Mustard Seed and In Good Company (two Fontbonne Ministries), and the City of Toronto continues to operate a pre-existing dental clinic on the site. The operator had earlier rented a nearby storefront to assess community needs.
- Since 2006, the Centre for City Ecology has held an annual one-day **YIMBY festival**, focused on the role of neighbourhood groups in working for positive change. Community groups speak with one another and with politicians (<http://yimbytoronto.org/>)

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations:

- *Municipality:* While City staff are available to provide assistance, staff are there to represent all; as such, they are more impartial. The housing proponents are responsible for getting supporters engaged, and for including dialogue with elected officials. The proponent is there to deal with ongoing concerns, and the community needs to see the face of the group
- *Project proponents:* If community opposition is expected at a public information meeting, the proponent is encouraged to have answers to others' questions, working with thought to questions around housing, planning, building, supports, safety / security). The key is to be well-prepared.

Does the jurisdiction have any internal guidelines on process/steps staff should employ in managing development approval aspects and public engagement?

- In its calls for proposals (regarding development of housing to assist homeless people from the streets to housing), the City of Toronto may include particular requirements to help ensure that tenants will have smooth transitions and find a welcoming atmosphere in communities. For example, if the project is an acquisition / rehabilitation, it is understandable that construction noise may become an issue. Who will residents be able to call to express concerns? How will development / construction be managed? Further, the **CFP may outline particular measures to be taken** in (a) engaging the community (Community Engagement and Communications Plans), (b) ensuring a Support Service Plan is in place and (c) ensuring a Property Management Plan is in place (See Appendix 1 for Excerpts from a CFP)
- With regards to **design considerations**, there is an urban design review panel in Toronto, and citing a desire for architectural excellence, some affordable housing developments have been subject to it. The City is also concerned with interior design, and is finalizing a set of interior design guidelines that could be included in CFPs (e.g., regarding Aging in Place, duty to accommodate, accessibility, potential for common amenity space, etc.).

- Drawing on earlier support through the federal homelessness program, the City has also undertaken research on alternative housing options (e.g., supportive and transitional), considering how to use design to facilitate good community development. These guidelines are provided to groups and are available online:
http://www1.toronto.ca/staticfiles/city_of_toronto/affordable_housing_office/files/pdf/housingdesign.pdf

Toronto Appendix 1: Excerpt of Recent Proposal Call for Transitional Housing

Section 4 – Property Management and Support Services Plan

One of the City’s priorities is to support Proposals that assist homeless people to move from the streets or shelters to Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing by working in co-operation with community-based support networks, Municipal Shelters, Street Outreach services, the City’s Assessment and Referral Centre, and the City’s Streets to Homes and Shelters to Homes programs (see Section 7 - City Priorities).

Support Service Plan

- a) Provide a Support Services Plan detailing step by step the process a typical tenant would follow along the trajectory from homelessness to stable housing. Explain the network of supports that will be available to tenants to help them make this transition from street or shelter to stable housing.
 - (i) Describe the proposed target group and explain their needs.
 - (ii) Describe tenant selection criteria, referral plans and agreements, tenant orientation plans, and community development initiatives.
 - (iii) Provide a comprehensive outline of how supports will be provided (i.e., on-site staff, network of community-based supports, case management, etc.). Documentation should clearly indicate the supports that will be provided and the period of time covered. Complete Appendix L, a typical staffing schedule.
 - (iv) Confirmation of funding for internal supports (Proponent’s staff) and confirmation of support from external support providers in the network of supports is required (in the form of a letter, service agreement, contracts, etc.). Include sources of funding as applicable. Provide confirmation of any support funding from other sources, such as a provincial ministry or federal department.

Property Management Plan

- b) Explain how property management for the project will be carried out (i.e., on-site staffing, a management company, etc.). Provide details of how staff will work with tenants, regarding security, landlord - tenant relations, property management, etc. as applicable.

Relationship between Property Management and Support Services

- c) Explain the relationship between the property management and Support Services in detail. This should include a rationale for whether these services are linked or de-linked and a description of how issues between tenants, and between tenants and neighbours, will be addressed and resolved.
- d) Provide a detailed 24-7 weekly staffing plan with justification notes (see Appendix L).

Consultants, Organizations and Individuals Involved

- e) List any key consultants, organizations and individuals that would be involved in property management and Support Services provision, their experience and expertise in relation to similar projects and an explanation of their duties and responsibilities regarding the proposed Project.
- f) Provide resumes for the consultants and individuals involved in property management and support provision as an Appendix to the Proposal. Include signed consents authorizing the disclosure of personal information to the City, or its designated agent, for any resumes that are submitted. However, the Proponent will accept all liability for disclosure if consents are not provided to the City.

Section 6 – Community Engagement and Communications Plans

The following requirements will demonstrate the Proponent’s capacity and plans to engage and consult with the local community and relevant stakeholders, and to provide appropriate information taking into account the local context.

The Proponent should demonstrate it has the capacity to build support and facilitate the integration of the proposed housing and its residents into the local community over the longer term to the mutual benefit of the tenants and the existing community.

- a) Provide an outline of the proposed community consultation, community engagement, tenant engagement and communications plans to be implemented at appropriate times over the life-cycle of the project (i.e., planning approvals, construction and occupancy phases). The plan should take into account the Planning Act and City Council Planning Policy (e.g., see the city report “Improving the Planning Process” available at: www.toronto.ca/planning/process.htm) as well as protect human rights.
- b) The community consultation, community engagement, tenant engagement and communications plans will demonstrate the capacity of the Proponent to be a good developer, manager and service provider, landlord, neighbour and member of the community. It will also demonstrate the Proponent’s understanding of the local community and services that tenants may need to access, including knowledge of community services and resources, schools, libraries, associations, recreational opportunities, etc. Provide an outline of any specific neighbourhood issues which would require particular attention in the engagement or communications plans.

Consultants, Organizations and Individuals Involved

- c) List any key consultants, organizations and individuals that would be involved in the community consultation process, their experience and expertise in relation to similar projects and an indication of their duties and responsibilities regarding the proposed Project.
- d) Provide resumes for key consultants and individuals to be involved in community consultation and communications as an Appendix to the Proposal. Include signed consent forms authorizing the disclosure of personal information to the City, or its designated agents, for any resumes that are submitted. However, the Proponent will accept all liability for disclosure if consents are not provided to the City.

- e) Provide a statement of any conflict of interest. It is expected that members of the Proponent's team will be dealing at arm's length with the Proponent and with each other. Arm's length for the purpose of this RFP shall mean the same as defined in section 251 of the *Income Tax Act*..
- g) Provide a statement of any conflict of interest. It is expected that members of the Proponent's team will be dealing at arm's length with the Proponent and with each other. Arm's length for the purpose of this RFP shall mean the same as defined in section 251 of the *Income Tax Act*..

Section 7 – City Priorities

a) Reducing Street Homelessness and Shelter Use

The City's Streets to Homes and Shelters programs could benefit a Proponent's Proposal (and their future tenants) by providing support to tenants both before and after they move into the building. The programs assist homeless people in making the transition to stable housing by providing a variety of supports, including, developing housing plans, accessing income supports, obtaining identification documents, and preparing housing skills. Depending on the program, follow-up support can be provided to the clients and their landlord for approximately one year. Supports are also provided to help clients connect with employment opportunities and the community. (For more information see <http://www.toronto.ca/housing/about-streets-homes.htm>.)

The City is interested in supporting the development of Transitional and Supportive Housing projects that reduce the use of municipally funded shelters and assist people in moving from homelessness to stable housing.

As noted in Section 4 – Property Management and Support Services Plan, priority will be given to projects that work in co-operation with community-based support networks, municipally funded shelters, street outreach services, the City's Assessment and Referral Centre, and the City's Streets to Homes program.

Reflecting your Support Services Plan:

- detail how your organization will work with these groups, organizations, or City entities. Include information regarding any meetings that may have taken place, agreements signed or contemplated, etc.
- Provide a schematic representation (i.e., chart, etc.) reflecting the step by step progression in your Support Services Plan following a client from the street or shelter use to stable housing, indicating what supports are provided along the way and by whom.

b) Site Location and City Building Criteria

The City is interested in supporting the development of Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing projects in all Wards throughout the City. Priority will be given to projects outside the Toronto and East York Community Council District. Projects should contribute to the diversity of local housing choices.

To illustrate the suitability of the proposed site for future tenants, provide a detailed explanation of the local context including:

- i. A list and map of local community and support services and community facilities that will benefit tenants.
- ii. An assessment of the area in terms of positive opportunities for tenants (employment, community building, etc.).
- iii. An assessment of the area in terms of safety and security for tenants.
- iv. The availability of public transit.

Vancouver, BC

Contact: (Celine Mauboules 604-873-7754)

Reasons for community opposition (general or referring to a particular project):

- Previously, (and even with the policy discussed below in place and approved by council) there have been cases when a small vocal group of residents have reacted and fought proposed developments.
- In the case of affordable and supportive housing, the concerns related to the clients being served and fears about crime and impact on property values. In some lower density areas, there were also concerns related to built form, scale and traffic.

General context – The City of Vancouver has been very active in responding to homelessness alongside a long-term commitment to affordable housing. Both current and past councils have supported an active city role. The City works in partnership with BC Housing and network of non-profit providers.

In 2007 the City undertook the development of a 10 year supportive housing strategy to implement Vancouver Coastal Health’s Mental Health and Addictions Supported Housing Framework. The Supportive Housing Strategy built on Vancouver Coastal Health’s (VCH) Framework document and focused on housing for people with mental illnesses or addictions, including low barrier housing for people who may not be actively engaged in treatment. The city anticipated that concerns would arise when plans were announced to develop supportive housing. Accordingly prior to implementing the strategy, they devised a broad based pro-active approach of public engagement and education as part of the development of the strategy, and prior to its formal adoption.

Tools / mechanisms developed (to address community concerns):

The key aspect of this engagement around development of the supportive housing strategy is that it was undertaken at the policy development stage. As such it was generic, rather than site specific (distinct and in advance of any project development approval process).

Working in collaboration with BC Housing and the main supportive housing funder, Vancouver Coastal Health, the City initiated a series of fairly large public events to conduct discussion and raise awareness about mental health and addictions issues, the need for supportive housing, the experience of people with mental health and addictions challenges and the evidence on impacts of such initiatives. This focused on pro-actively addressing and responding to fears and breaking down myths and stereotypes about the target

population and any perceived impacts on neighbourhoods. This included information about existing supportive housing and how resident behavioral issues are managed.

The city widely advertised the meetings and invited BIA's, community associations and the general public as a way to generate a broad cross section from usual concerned citizen groups.

These meetings provided an opportunity to present the proposed policy on supportive housing – making it an approved use in any multi residential zone.

The policy still requires that any supportive housing and affordable projects to follow the normal development application process (including notification, and where deemed necessary, public meetings); proponents are required to develop an operational management plan outlining the level of supports and how they plan to manage any disruptive behaviour among tenants, As part of the funding approval process it is necessary for proponents to provide such a plan as well as proof of operational expertise/track record.

The policy promoted the establishment of a community advisory committee to act as a mediator on issues arising from the ongoing operation of the new development. Such committees include representation from the community, such as school principals, local BIA and neighbouring residents.

Following the series of public meetings, staff refined the policy and brought it to council where it was approved and subsequently implemented. The benefit of adopting a city-wide policy was that when a specific application was made for the development of supportive housing, there was established policy to support it.

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations:

As noted above, the information/education initiative was led by City staff (in collaboration with province and others).

Staff from the City's housing department are also active in any public meeting related to the development approval process, although planning staff tend to remain more impartial.

Effect and Impact of the approaches adopted

With the awareness raising/education done in advance, local communities were more aware of supportive housing and so were not taken by surprise when subsequently notified

of a development application, to provide a supportive housing development on a specific site. They were able to express concerns and when these were significant the city requires the proponent to host information meetings to discuss and address concerns. And these can be brought forward via the Community Advisory Committees, which are typically established as a condition of the rezoning or development approval. They also encourage proponents to set up meetings with key community stakeholders once the building is occupied.

Vancouver does not seek to formalize this relationship in a Good Neighbour Agreement, Rather, they use an Operations Management Plan that outlines the operators mission, staffing/services and who to contact in the event of a concern.

With an approved policy in place, rather than remain impartial, staff can stand up for the proposed project on the basis that they are implementing approved council policy. Similarly elected officials could take a supportive position – effectively minimizing any politicization from the project approval process.

When resident object, proponents and staff were able to refer to previously used information (from education/awareness campaign) and to advise that staff and council were supporting the project. This may not have fully assuaged concerns, but it did allow project to proceed.

Note however that in BC there is no appeal mechanism/tribunal as is the case in Alberta or Ontario. .

Additional contextual notes:

More info on the City of Vancouver Supportive Housing Policy is available here:

<http://former.vancouver.ca/commsvcs/housing/supportivehousingstrategy/index.htm>

Victoria, BC

Contact: (John Reilly 250-361-0351)

Reasons for community opposition (general or referring to a particular project):

- Concerns from residents regarding the potential for public disorder, real or imagined, associated with the client based served.
- Concerns from businesses and other services in the area that the development could negatively impact their business operations.
- Concerns that a given neighbourhood has to bear a disproportionate concentration of these types of services thus undermining the ability to achieve goals related to sustaining multigenerational, diverse, mixed income communities.

General context

Like many municipalities in Canada, over the past two decades, issues related to street homelessness have emerged in Victoria, and the City has worked with a wide range of stakeholders to create a variety of supportive housing projects and social agencies to address issues in the core area. Funding opportunities via the federal-Provincial housing and homeless programs have enabled development of a number of housing sites, many targeted to homeless persons, particularly those with mental health and additions issues. The level of community concern expressed can vary depending on the type of facility in question. It can be especially acute when these types of services become concentrated in a given area or when introduced into new areas. Some of the concern and opposition can be attributed to misinformation and stereotyping.

In BC there is no formal requirement to undertake public engagement as a condition of receiving funding under the housing or homeless program. However, if rezoning or an Official Community Plan amendment is required for a proposed development, the proponent must hold public meetings according to City and provincial policy. Development applications that include a variance from existing zoning requirements require Council approval and City staff will refer the plans to the local community association for review and comment. Where developments are within existing zoning requirements, no consultation is required but the City of Victoria often encourages open discussion and dialogue between developers (for profit and non-profit) and the community before any substantial new developments proceed.

Tools / mechanisms developed to address community concerns:

The Primary approach taken has been to development of Good neighbor agreements Victoria has sought to use GNA's as a way to manage community concerns and provide clarifying information. GNAs are generally not used when it comes to low income housing – only with developments that include social services and low barrier housing that tends to create impacts in the public realm. Other tools, such as a municipal policy or Official

Community Plan (OCP) provisions relating to the range of housing types may be more appropriate (rather than developing a GNA each time). The use of the GNA was first introduced in 2001 in conjunction with the City's liquor licensing policy and process. In 2006 a GNA template was created as its use was extended to include social service and low barrier housing developments.

It is noted that some opposition will likely continue, but through sharing information and a process of awareness raising, it is possible to engage with a larger often silent majority.

The development of the GNA is separate from, and follows the planning review process and has no bearing on staff recommendations or council decisions related to development. The objective is to manage any impacts and demonstrate that there is a process to address any issues that arise during operation of the new development.

The GNA's set out broad principles for a safe and liveable community. The agreements include some context, acknowledging the type of concerns raised by the community and speak to the need and benefit of affordable and supportive housing and explicitly acknowledge that "*provision of such services may be accompanied by public disorder that can be difficult to control, calling upon residents, businesses, social agencies and the City to ensure that negative impacts to public and private property are minimized or eliminated*" (from existing agreement). The GNA identifies the geographic area and organizations included, the process to discuss and address issues arising in operation of the service and commitments that are made by the parties to the agreement (these apply to all parties but tend to apply more to the new facility).

Most GNA's include a terms of reference for the operation of a committee or advisory group to oversee the implementation of the Agreement, which usually includes regular meetings to discuss operating matters initially every 4-6 weeks.

A critical aspect of managing these downstream impacts is not just a commitment to defined operating practice and any measures identified by the GNA group, but the ability of the proponent to carry out appropriate operations and manage their operation to an appropriate standard. There is accordingly a need to evaluate the competence and funded capacity of the facility operator.

Effect and Impact of the approaches adopted

After using for a few years, City staff feel that the use of GNAs provide a useful forum through which multiple stakeholders can identify and take coordinated action to solve problems associated with the operation of shelter and other services directed toward homeless people. Although sometimes considered a temporary measure to mitigate issues as a new service is developed, the operation of most of the GNA groups currently continue as community issues tend to ebb and flow, mostly because efforts to address the systemic causes of homelessness have yet to be addressed.

Staff noted that in some instances, when pursued cynically and disingenuously as a means of advancing a controversial use of a site, the process (to develop GNA) has undermined its intent as an opportunity for honest and open communication. In these cases, proponents or operators of the controversial use may want to off-load responsibility for impacts onto the neighbourhood as a collective issue.

The experience in Victoria has generally been that they have created an avenue and process through which to open dialogue between project proponents and local community (including residents and BIAs). Any given GNA must be maintained as a voice of the neighbourhood, not as a government hosted exercise that does not always act assertively to address issues that are raised.

Particular role / opportunity played by various actors / organizations:

The City has created a model GNA template that proponents and community groups can adapt. The City's social planning and other staff have traditionally played a coordinating role in developing and implementing GNAs. As issues come to the attention of the committee or advisory group through the operation of the new service, the City liaison staff will help negotiate the use of City resources to resolve problems.

BC Housing, as the primary funder of housing and homeless programs, has no formal role in the GNA process.

Any party can initiate a GNA process, if they so desire. The City often has a supportive role it can play in addressing issues (e.g. improved street lighting), leading resolution of particular issues and in following up to ensure action items are addressed. Towards that end, the City allocates a small amount of funding to address issues. The staff person involved can also make a difference, of course.

Do staff actively support a development application or remain impartial? - As per earlier reference, GNAs have no formal role in the development approval process. There may be some discussion about issues between social planning staff and the area planners and/or more senior staff within the Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department, but in the end, staff would not take a formal position one way or the other on a development application with respect to matters related to the content of a given GNA.

Winnipeg

Jino Distasio, Director, Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg

- Telephone: 204-982-1147 / email: j.distasio@uwinnipeg.ca

Linda Ring, retired City of Winnipeg employee

- Telephone: 204-783-4642 / email: lpring@mymts.net

Reasons for community opposition

- Rising fears of decreasing property values as neighbourhoods otherwise become more affluent
- Perceptions by owners that they are contributing more to neighbourhood improvement

General context

In September, 2013, the City of Winnipeg adopted a new Housing Policy; an Implementation Plan is now being developed. The Housing Policy aims to expand programs / incentives made available to the city's core and to targeted neighbourhoods (Housing Improvement Zones) through the 1999 Housing Policy. The City seeks to make support for affordable housing options – expanding applicability of the Housing Rehabilitation Investment Reserve – city-wide.

The 1999 Housing Policy created the requirement for HIZs to develop, through broad community consultation, housing plans in advance of major project development; a neighbourhood development corporation was created in each HIZ, with resources provided (Housing Coordinator dollars) to convene community-led development of neighbourhood housing plans.

The 2013 Housing Policy aims to reflect *OurWinnipeg*, the City's official development plan, and its Complete Communities Direction Strategy, adopted by Council in 2011. The framework seeks to encourage diverse housing options in each neighbourhood. *OurWinnipeg* allows for the creation of secondary neighbourhood plans, wherein neighbourhood goals for land use, densities, heritage assets and some design guidelines can be established.

In 2012, the City ended a requirement for homeowners to go through a public-hearing process before creating secondary suites within new or existing homes; homeowners now need to comply with a standard set of rules governing secondary suites and apply for a building permit.

Tools / mechanisms developed

In the community-led development of neighbourhood housing plans, arising from the 1999 Housing Policy, some designated neighbourhoods recognized the importance of rooming houses to meet the need for safe and secure housing of existing neighbourhood residents. Community ownership of the plans, original responsiveness to local needs and a requirement for projects to respect the neighbourhood Housing Plan means fewer development surprises – and helps avoid NIMBY. Advocates of the model suggest that by including residents in the decision-making process long before specific proposals are made, they feel they are legitimate contributors to formulating the community's long-term goals; new development stands a much greater chance of gaining acceptance. At the same time, the neighbourhood's Housing Coordinator (partially funded by the Province, City, local funders), continues to play a liaison role, monitoring the community context, and developing a strategy vis-à-vis education and outreach, always aiming to ensure continuous or new buy-in.

As one example, over 300 affordable housing units, the majority of which are rental units, have been developed in West Broadway through partnerships initiated by the West Broadway Community Organization (WBCO) (formerly the Community Development Corporation). Currently, the organization is working to fulfill the recommendations of a community consultation (design charette) held in 2008 to determine the future of the property at 198 Sherbrook Street; outcome called for a mixed-use development, incorporating a building that includes housing units, community services, and social enterprise business, along with a community garden, gathering place and recreation space in public open space. Outreach for the consultation event was significant, with advertising to gardeners who had been working the land, to all residents through Canada Post, through the community newspaper, through posterage, through door-to-door engagement and a with a news release to media. "Every effort was made to be as inclusive as possible."

In private rooming houses where landlords grant permission, a WBCO Rooming House Outreach Worker also links tenants with social services (encouraging tenant engagement / engagement).

The WBCO is currently developing a new Housing Plan (2013-2017), to be based again on community directed priorities and goals. To do so, they are developing a new Committee, with 12-15 individuals meeting over 6 months. In recruiting for the committee, the WBCO seeks a committee that will be a reflection of the diverse neighbourhood, noting "The success of this new Housing Plan is dependent on participation from the community – this is the community's plan after all."

In another example of infill that had been successfully integrated in the neighbourhood, SAM Inc. Management (St. Andrews Management) developed four eight-unit pocket suites, referred to as Pocket Housing, in 2007. These small, affordable, self-contained apartment type dwellings for single persons were regarded as a pilot project (alternative to rooming houses) in neighbourhoods where safe rooming house options were needed. While built on narrow lots, the lots were owned by and given by the City of Winnipeg, with the City agreeing to zoning variances in advance. The broader community accepted these developments recognizing them as superior to the poor quality existing rooming houses. The context is slowly changing – with SAM Management considering hiring a tenant relations worker - as neighbourhoods improve, as tenant needs heighten.

Design Guidelines:

Apart from the Downtown Winnipeg Urban Design Guidelines, no particular guidelines were identified for housing developments.

Appendix C: Links to cited documents

Sunnyvale CA includes on its project website a link to a publication on “[Myths and Facts about Affordable and High Density Housing.](#)”

Arlington County adopted its development/community acceptance approach after consultation with the [Technical Assistance Collaborative](#), based in Boston.

The Supportive Housing Network of New York (SHNNY) commissioned research on property value *Impacts Impact of Supportive Housing on Surrounding Neighborhoods* Furman Center for Real Estate & Urban Policy, 2008

<http://shnny.org/research/supportive-housing-and-property-values-the-landmark-study/>

SHNNY also produced a 50-page toolkit titled *Building Support for Supportive Housing*; created a video called “Good Housing. Good Neighbors;”

<http://shnny.org/learn-more/video/supportive-housing-a-good-neighbor>

Calgary staff have developed a guide for proponents on how to do effective public engagement, and this includes information to help clarify what is affordable housing

<http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/LUPP/Pages/Current-studies-and-ongoing-activities/Care-facilities/Care-Facilities.aspx>

<http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/LUPP/Pages/Current-studies-and-ongoing-activities/Care-facilities/Good-Neighbour-Agreement-Initiative.aspx>

<http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/LUPP/Documents/Publications/special-care-guide.pdf>

Montreal guide on public engagement (available in English):

http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/GUIDE_CONSULTATION_EN/MEDIA/DOCUMENTS/GUIDE_PROMOTEURS_210605_EN.PDF

Toronto research on property value impacts *Good Housing. Good Neighbors*, Wellesley Institute. <http://shnny.org/research/supportive-housing-in-toronto/>

More info on the City of Vancouver Supportive Housing Policy is available here:

<http://former.vancouver.ca/commsvcs/housing/supportivehousingstrategy/index.htm>