LETTER FROM THE MAYOR

300 Dufferin Avenue
P.O. Box 5035
London ON
N6A 4L9

June 10, 2010

Dear Friends:

On behalf of the City of London and the Council Housing Leadership Committee, we are pleased to share with you the London Community Housing Strategy. As a municipality, one of our key challenges is to help ensure we meet the housing needs of all our citizens, including children and youth, seniors, single persons, couples, families and households with special needs.

To this end, the Affordable Housing Task Force established a vision of 'A City of London where all members of the community have access to housing that is safe, secure and suitable to their needs and ability to pay'. Our London Community Housing Strategy is based on this vision, with an emphasis on the whole continuum of housing - from streets and shelters to homeownership, and everything in between.

We also recognize the need to partner with others to achieve our goals, including the building and development industry, the rental sector, other orders of government, community and support agencies and ratepayers.

The City of London is committed to ensuring our housing investments and partnerships enhance the rental and ownership market, as well as meet the needs of households through community engagement, programs, advocacy, and service innovations.

Thank you for your input on this document. Together, we will create made-in-London solutions, which include high quality, integrated housing options to complement our community's quality of life.

Sincerely,

Anne Marie DeCicco-Best
Mayor

Councillor Susan Eagle, Chair
Council Housing Leadership Committee

The Corporation of the City of London
Office 519.861.2500 X4920 Fax 519.861.5308
adecicco@london.ca
www.london.ca
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Appendices
Ten years ago, the Affordable Housing Task Force established a vision for the future: “a City of London where all members of the community have access to housing that is safe, secure and suitable to their needs and the ability to pay”. The vision remains true today.

In housing services, the City has shown considerable leadership investing $2 Million annually into affordable housing and has assumed a stronger role in establishing policy, creating programs, understanding needs and embracing its role as a Service Manager. The Provincial and Federal orders of government have demonstrated an “on again, off again” relationship. But, through the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program and other local initiatives, more than 1,100 units of affordable housing have been committed by the City of London since 2004.

In homelessness services, the City has endorsed community plans on homelessness that articulate local priorities. The City has taken a lead role as policy developer and funding administrator for Provincial and Federal funding and has worked with the community to change and enhance service capacity. While Provincial funding has been relatively stable, the Federal funding has been uneven, thereby complicating the ability to look at program sustainability or undertake meaningful long-range planning. Funding from the other orders of government needs to better reflect local strategies, synergies and desired outcomes regarding new innovations and initiatives that are implemented in London to address homelessness.

One such initiative is Hostels to Homes, a provincial pilot project made possible in part because of the relentless advocacy of the City. Together, with local emergency shelters and other service partners, the City is committed to investing additional resources to move people out of the shelters and into housing with supports. Another initiative is London CAREs, a Community Addiction Response Strategy that aims to improve health and service outcomes for street involved individuals in London. These initiatives display the willingness and readiness of the community agencies and the City to engage in new, integrated ways to address homelessness prevention and intervention.

Housing and homelessness are also impacted by numerous changes and initiatives at the Provincial level. The Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review (PMFSDR) is changing the funding relationship between the Province and Municipalities in a post-devolution operating reality. The efforts to consolidate housing and homelessness programs and improve human services integration is providing hope for the people of London. In addition to these developments, other recent Provincial initiatives such as the Ontario Poverty Reduction Strategy or milestones from earlier in the decade such as the Social Housing Reform Act, have changed and improved the housing and homelessness landscape in London.

In 2005, an Affordable Housing Strategy for the City of London was created. Most of the recommendations from that original strategy document were met. Those that were not met, such as facilitating the creation of 1,200 units of affordable housing, reflect a lack of available funding, not a lack of local resolve or expertise. With over 1,100 units committed, the achievements in making more affordable housing available in the community must be acknowledged and celebrated.
This updated London Community Housing Strategy (LCHS) will guide the City until December 31, 2015. The Strategy was developed through consultation with a range of organizations throughout London and guided by City staff from Social & Community Support Services, Housing, Planning and Finance. The Strategy was informed by discussions with a Community Reference Group comprised of the London Homeless Coalition, Urban League, London Development Institute and London Property Management Association. Key informant interviews, a local initiatives survey, review of relevant academic and grey literature, analysis of available documentation and data, review of practices in other jurisdictions, open houses and action-oriented consultation sessions have all contributed to the content of the LCHS. What has been learned through the analytical process has been married to evidence-based and evidence-informed practices for the LCHS. The LCHS was designed to have a strong correlation to the needs and capacities of the community—as defined by the community’s desired outcomes.

The London Community Housing Strategy uses a continuum framework along three dimensions to understand and appreciate the range of needs and responses required. The first dimension is the Life Cycle: appreciating the differences in housing needs from children and youth through to aging older adults. The second dimension is Needs and Supports: appreciating the range of potential supports required for independent living with no supports through to fully supported, institutional care. The third dimension is the Type of Housing and Shelter Accommodation: appreciating that the community needs everything from crash beds and emergency shelters through to market rental housing and home ownership and every variation along the housing continuum.

1,000 units is the collective target to be committed on or before December 31, 2015.

The London Community Housing Strategy then sets a sub-target of 700 units of affordable housing through new construction, acquisition, affordable homeownership and rent supplements/subsidies. This includes 375 newly constructed or acquired units with 75 that are affordable homeownership and 250 that are a combination of different approaches depending on available resources. This target is achievable, acknowledging that it is less than the previous target. Within this target, the intent is to develop units that are more affordable. That means someone on social assistance can afford the housing through deeper subsidy in capital costs that reduces operating costs and rent.

In addition to the 700 units, there are various sub-targets that reflect diverse community needs. These are the number of bedrooms per unit, needs of specific populations such as lone-parents, seniors, youth and Aboriginal people and rent levels.

In addition to this target of 700 units for which the City will assume responsibility, subject to available resources from other orders of government, a sub-target of 300 supportive and/or alternative housing units has been set for other orders of government, especially the Province of Ontario. This reflects the deeper need for supports among Londoners. It is within the purview of the Province to develop and provide operating funding for this type of housing.
The data supporting the need for the London Community Housing Strategy is overwhelming and irrefutable from a number of perspectives.

From the perspective of the rental market, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation data demonstrates that even with vacancy rates in excess of 3%—a level which is supposed to suggest a “renter’s market”—average rents have generally not stabilized or lowered despite the higher vacancy rates. Rents remain unaffordable for many Londoners. From the individual with an annual social assistance income of less than $7,000 per year to the individual making less than $20,000 working full-time in a minimum wage job, rents are unaffordable. Meanwhile, even with owner households earning 2.5 times more than tenant households, the cost of ownership housing continues to go up—an average housing price of $225,000 is unaffordable to an increasing number of people in London.

From the perspective of low-income households, Statistics Canada data paints a sobering picture. Altogether, 12% of London households are considered to be low-income. There are 45% of tenant households spending 30% or more of their gross monthly income on rent and one in five spends 50% or more. Meanwhile, one in six homeowners spends 30% or more of their gross monthly income on housing. Female-led, lone-parent families, are in a precarious position because one in four are considered to be low-income. There are 10,000 lone-parent and two-parent households in London that spend between 30% and 99% of their gross monthly income on rent.

The economy is also changing in the London Census Metropolitan Area. Over the past decade, 8,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost. There has also been a decrease in service related jobs. There is a shift towards a more knowledge-based, higher skilled, increasingly educated and more professional workforce. The data indicates gains in management positions, professional business and finance occupations, teachers, professors and jobs in applied and natural sciences over the past five years. This shift has also resulted in the loss of 3,400 clerical occupations, 1,000 sales and services occupations and 5,900 occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities over the same time period.

The population of London is another reflection of change. There are increases in Aboriginal people and newcomers. The population is aging and more baby boomers are entering retirement. The composition of households indicates increases in people never married, childless couples male-led, lone-parent families and in the number of widowed people.

From a dollars and cents perspective, the cost of continuing to invest in emergency responses that meet immediate needs but do not solve a person’s homelessness is staggering. Consider that the cost for an individual to stay one month in a homeless shelter in London is $1,450, or, on a daily basis, the cost for jail or a detention centre is in excess of $140. Psychiatric in-patient beds cost in excess of $650 per day and acute in-patient beds in hospital cost over $1,000 per day. This spending is not sustainable and does not solve the problem of homelessness.

David Hulchanski points out, “while homelessness isn’t only a housing problem, it is always a housing problem.”
The London Community Housing Strategy emphasizes the need to provide appropriate supports to vulnerable populations once housed. The LCHS examines opportunities within existing programs to make the necessary changes that will ensure long-term, more stable housing outcomes. Service models and standards, capacity building and professional development are all part of a comprehensive approach that will improve housing stability and reflect an individual’s choice and greater independence over time. In addition to housing, people involved with programs in the City will be encouraged to be engaged in meaningful daily activities, active participants in civic life and to seek opportunities from volunteerism to full employment.

The London Community Housing Strategy recognizes the vital link between housing, health and quality of life. It respects the importance of environmental stewardship in meeting the overall objectives. Most importantly, the LCHS recognizes and builds stronger connections between homelessness services and housing. Emerging from the Strategy will be prioritized recommendations providing a framework for a revised Community Plan on Homelessness. The framework will better consolidate, position and focus the City and local services on homelessness prevention and interventions with housing based outcomes.

The London Community Housing Strategy also harnesses the good will and expertise of the local community. As a community-based planning process, the framing of housing in the LCHS ties into a wide range of initiatives across the City. From opportunities for local social purpose enterprises, to strengthening neighbourhoods, assisting with the work of the Child and Youth, Agenda to leveraging the strengths of newcomers to the community, the LCHS helps build positive momentum. Housing in the LCHS is framed as a catalyst for opportunity. Woven into the fabric of city life, it is a necessary component for achieving community vitality and economic prosperity.

Increased measures of accountability are a hallmark of the LCHS. This includes an enhanced role for the City to play in the administration of programs and the development of clear standards and expectations for service delivery. It also includes building capacity within the community-based sector. New measures will be embedded in the proposal call and evaluation of proposals to develop or acquire new affordable housing. The LCHS also calls for an annual implementation update and a strong role for the Mayor to convene relevant stakeholders to report on progress. In addition, the LCHS seeks new opportunities to improve client information systems, better determine the number and service needs of people who are homeless, align funding to better meet those needs and to focus on outcome based funding in the future. Furthermore, the LCHS is aligned to a scorecard that allows for defensible and meaningful tracking of outputs and outcomes relative to the objectives and action items named within the Strategy.

The targets within the London Community Housing Strategy and all of its elements will guide decision-making and priority setting on housing and homelessness—in an integrated fashion—until December 31, 2015. To achieve the results within LCHS, there is work required to align committees to identify and achieve mutual goals for an integrated continuum approach to housing and homelessness. Resources and alignment within City divisions will be reviewed to meet the objectives of the plan. To meet the objectives of the
plan, City resources will be reviewed and City divisions will be aligned. The City will seek new opportunities to integrate and become a resource to neighbourhoods throughout London. The City will review and implement evidence-based, promising practices from other jurisdictions that are relevant to the housing and homelessness situation in London.

London will continue to provide leadership in this endeavour. The Municipality cannot do it alone. London will only be able to achieve the objectives and targets laid out in this plan with assistance from other orders of government, the support of the community’s many non-governmental organizations, non-profits, businesses, local residents and other stakeholders.

As a mature, responsible, fiscally prudent and accountable order of government, London is ready for the challenge and looks forward to providing the leadership to achieve the results outlined in the London Community Housing Strategy. The vision remains true today.
Overview

The London Community Housing Strategy (LCHS) provides a detailed framework for how the City of London will continue to aspire to its housing vision by December 31, 2015.

During the development of the LCHS, it became very clear that the London community is aligned in its sense of a desired future state. Consultations and interviews with homeless and housing service providers, tenants, people with lived experience, the business community, home builders, developers, and City staff often focused on similar areas of attention. There is a shared interest across London in achieving the vision.

The LCHS continues work that began more than a decade ago with the Affordable Housing Task Force and it builds upon a number of successful, innovative local programs and initiatives such as Hostels to Homes, London CAReS, and the No Fixed Address Demonstration Project. These linkages are explained more fully in the complete LCHS report.

The LCHS recognizes the solid track-record in London’s affordable housing development with 939 units created from 2006 to 2010 through investments by the municipal, provincial and federal governments, as well as private equity and mortgages.

By targeting 1,000 more affordable housing units over the next 5 years within this strategy, the City is aligning its resources behind an evidence-based and evidence-informed housing strategy with solutions designed to address the needs of the people of London today and in the years to come.

The target of 1,000 housing units is a minimum. It is achievable and supported by the data. The sub-target groups within the 1,000 units reflect the priority needs of those Londoners with very low-income who currently have the most difficulty accessing affordable housing.

By addressing the priority needs of these groups, the entire spectrum of homelessness to home ownership in the community is positively impacted. The strategy supports affordable housing where it is needed most, which then also contributes to the broader community vitality and economic prosperity outcomes for the City.

The LCHS Process

The process of developing the London Community Housing Strategy (LCHS) was both speedy and very thorough. Fifty-one representatives from private and non-profit organizations responded to a comprehensive online survey and over 175 people attended 3-hour community consultations and open houses that were facilitated throughout the City. Over 7,000 pages of data and relevant literature were reviewed. Key informant and stakeholder interviews were conducted with more than 120 people. Informed by the perspectives of a range of Londoners, the Council Housing Leadership Committee, a City Steering Committee and a Community Reference Group, the LCHS process provided multiple opportunities for input, feedback and validation.
The timing is perfect for the strategy and reinforces London’s leadership in seizing the opportunity to set out its future direction for affordable housing. As new opportunities emerge from the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review, the Province’s Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy, the Federal Homelessness Partnering Strategy, and the growing calls for integrated national and provincial housing strategies, there is also increased movement towards more consolidated housing and homeless programs at a local level based on the needs and outcomes of the community. The LCHS assures that London is prepared to respond proactively to any provincial and federal initiatives.

Flexibility is one of the key features of this strategy. Adjustments can be made every 18-24 months to targets, recommendations or specific actions in response to changing circumstances within the City or with the other orders of government. Adjustments will remain linked to the broader objectives of the Strategy throughout the next 5 years.

The Continuum of Housing

The LCHS report reflects three integrated components in the LCHS that address the different ways of looking at housing continuums –

1. Life Cycle (youth to seniors);
2. Needs & Supports (the range of interventions and housing types); and
3. Types of Accommodation (various housing forms).

These are the lenses through which the LCHS should be viewed relative to the continuum. Doing so provides a three dimensional and very human picture for the City. The lenses also help guide the resources needed to bring the strategy to life.

This continuum approach to the LCHS is one that supports and promotes a diverse range of services and types of housing that respects the changing needs of individuals and families throughout changing life circumstances and needs.

By recognizing needs and solutions along these multiple continuums, the LCHS is able to address the needs of individuals while achieving multiple outcomes.

As an example, an affordable housing solution that provides safe accommodation to a young female victim of violence with transitional supports will address needs along all three continuums within one appropriately targeted initiative.
The Strategy

The London Community Housing Strategy is a comprehensive continuum of housing solutions based on 5 key areas of focus:

1. Strong System Design;
2. Evidence Based and Integrated Programs and Services;
3. Political Will and Commitment;
4. Focused, Measurable, and Targeted Deliverables; and
5. Strong and Responsive Administration.

Together, these areas of focus harness the accumulated input into the strategy, including literature reviews, data analysis, local program and services reviews, and the direct participation from stakeholders, service users, and the London community at large.

Each of the areas of focus in the strategy is also guided by a goal statement, a strategic approach, and clear recommendations which align together to create an integrated 5 year work plan with measureable outcomes.

Targets

One key set of measureable outcomes is the revised affordable housing target for the next 5 years of the LCHS plan. In total, the LCHS recommends the development of 1,000 new housing units over the 5 year term. As previously noted, these units are broken down into sub-targets which reflect the more specific needs and current gaps.

Considerable focus of the strategy will be placed on housing targets over the next 5 years. Although not all municipalities establish a target based approach to new affordable housing developments, London has a track record of setting challenging but achievable targets and working toward their development.

It is important to note that the strategy is more complex and aggressive than the development of these 1,000 housing units. There are a number of interdependent initiatives that require attention and that guide the work toward this target.

London's targets are more ambitious than those in many other large communities, but more notably, the targets coexist within a strategy aimed at creating a service environment that addresses gaps, recognizes local strengths, and is flexible during the course of implementation.

As an example, the appropriate access to the new targets relies on actions such as reviewing and making improvements to the social housing waiting list in order to better capture and understand the number and service needs of persons who are homeless in London.

The LCHS is a "Made in London" strategy. London's target of 1,000 units by December 31, 2015 is strong, realistic and achievable relative to the size of the City population. It takes into account local conditions across key indicators. It reflects the most urgent and pressing needs within the community and the needs for the community to be directly and indirectly involved in solutions.
London's development of an evidence-based strategy that considers the City's unique circumstances as well as best practices keeps the City on the path to the Vision and achieving the 5-year targets.

**Breaking Down the 1,000 Unit Target**

The LCHS aims to serve an inclusive range of groups identified within the strategy with housing, funding allocations, and service considerations for each group.

These sub-targets are another unique feature of the LCHS that recognize that there are clear sub-populations of individuals and families with specific needs that cannot be overlooked.

While it is possible to meet multiple, co-occurring objectives within any new development—for example, housing prioritized for youth who are lone-parent families with rents less than $550 per month—the sub-targets frame the conversation of need and response.

One of the unique sub-targets pertains to better meeting the housing needs of victims of domestic violence. Responding to concerns of saturation within existing social housing and safety concerns for victims, this novel approach will allow victims to better integrate elsewhere within the community. While this will require changes on the part of the Province, it is important advocacy for the City with the intent of affecting change.

Another objective within the sub-targets is creating opportunity for households that have succeeded in affordable rental housing to be in a position to consider home ownership opportunities. This “flow” will release a rental unit for another household seeking accommodation.

**Facts Influencing the Targets & Sub-Targets**

The overall target of 1,000 represents an increase of 61 units compared to what was achieved between 2006 and 2010. Achieving the 939 units from 2006 to 2010 exhausted the City’s financial allocation from the provincial and federal governments.

While the target of 1,000 is less than the target of 1,200 set out in the 2005 Affordable Housing Strategy, it is not a reflection on less need but rather a reflection on changed need. Urgent focus needs to be placed on those people who have been chronically underserved by the housing market and with exceptionally acute financial issues. These current service gaps contribute to the escalating costs of emergency services associated with health, justice, shelter, and other homeless programs.

As an example, increased funding allocation to affordable new housing development upfront will result in lower mortgage and operating costs, allowing for rental rates that are more affordable to those individuals and families living below even the current affordable housing rates.
Other groups are also the focus of sub-targets as a result of changed needs. For example, the increase in lone-parent families with affordability problems requires attention. The increase of Aboriginal people coming to the City requires an appropriate affordable housing response that continues to engage First Nations service providers, other orders of government, service users, and others in solutions.

By examining a range of indicators and measures while taking into account the top priorities that will yield greatest impact on the overall opportunities across the continuum, the 1,000 target and sub-targets allows the City – in its stewardship of provincial and federal funds, as well as the City’s annual $2 M contribution, to invest in change and spend on impact. This is a targeted, strategic approach to investment. It appreciates the fact that not all needs are equal.

The Investment & Financial Implications

The positive impact of the municipal investment in London cannot be underestimated as a large volume of the impressive achievements over the past 10 years were leveraged through municipal funding. Furthermore, it is the municipal investment that assists in raising London’s profile and making it possible to reframe the dialogue with other orders of government.

The strategic alignment of funding across all orders of government as well as private equity and mortgages has made development possible. On a go-forward basis that same sort of synergy is going to be necessary. It is through building on that momentum that the results envisioned in the LCHS will be possible.

The LCHS is designed to allow for flexibility for 250 units in how they will be realized – rent supplements/subsidies, rental housing construction or acquisition, home ownership dwellings or more supportive housing. This positions the City to seize opportunities through other programs and funding as it emerges, while balancing with new stock creation and acquisition.

As a result of that flexibility, the Strategy can outline orders of magnitude of investment, but the Strategy is limited in its ability to provide a precise measure. In addition, there are many variables that need to be factored into each and every development—the investment will not be the same time over time, i.e., size of units, whether land is purchased, and choice of building materials all influence costs.

When examining the orders of magnitude in the examples used in the presentations to Council (See Appendix E), it is important not to consider the numbers as absolutes. For example, the rate of purchase price and down-payment on home ownership impacts affordability. In rental acquisition or construction, the investment per unit is not going to be $165,000 in all opportunities, but certainly investments of greater than $140,000 per unit will increase affordability and investments in the range of $165,000 to $185,000 per unit are more likely going to result in the needs of London’s most disadvantaged residents being met.

- **40% (280)** - of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership swellings will be prioritized for households at the 30th percentile of incomes or lower within London
- **300** - units will be supportive or alternative housing and funded by the Province
- **70** - units, two or more bedrooms, with at least 23 of these $550 or less
- **305** - units, bachelor or one-bedroom, with at least 102 of these $400 or less
- **5% (35)** - of the rental units created or acquired will be interim or transitional housing for people who are homeless, or people who were homeless and moved into housing but need to be re-housed
- **5% (35)** - will be prioritized for new comers, immigrants or refugees
- **10% (70)** - will be prioritized for Aboriginal specific housing
A Decade in Review

Over the past decade, London has experienced a “coming of age” related to homelessness and housing services as well as a number of other unique social policy initiatives. The post-devolution reality meant that the City has had to create appropriate policies, programs, and innovations to address the new reality.

These initiatives have flourished since devolution and the City has demonstrated its ability to draw upon its own strength-based approaches to better meet the housing needs of Londoners.

Decade + in Review

The impact and value of the Affordable Housing Task force from the late 90s cannot be underestimated. It set forth a vision and direction that holds true today. It is the momentum generated since then that places the target of 1,000 affordable housing units into the appropriate context.
Service Integration and Alignment

Many recent initiatives in London, especially those which champion shared interests across housing, social, health, and justice sectors, have demonstrated the City’s leadership, the community’s readiness, and the person focused approach to local solutions.

Within the City, much work has been done by housing and social program areas; however, these areas recognize that more is still required in order to functionally align services with an outcome-based focus. Programs and services must be community focused, evidence-based, and integrated in order to deliver sustainable housing outcomes.

The LCHS calls on the City to continue efforts to coordinate services and outcomes – especially those supporting persons with the deepest needs. This will both require and result in stronger integration across policy and program objectives.

The approach to alignment of research, programs, services, and innovations is one that builds upon evidence-based outcomes that can be replicated and enhanced. Building upon that which is working enhances the City’s ability to meet its strategic priorities of community vitality and economic prosperity.

Some Unique Elements of the Strategy

There have been valuable discussions throughout the consultation and validation process that reflect a need to summarize some recommendations within the LCHS report.

Each recommendation must first be understood in its connection to the broad theme. The following three examples reflect the integrated nature of the recommendations:

Example #1: Provide Clearer Policy direction on Planning Matters (Recommendation 3.13)

Many recommendations, such as those associated with inclusionary zoning, are related to existing political initiatives and advocacy.

In the example of inclusionary zoning, it is also important to note that the recommendations may be based on existing local positions and are almost always intended to be understood within a continuum of strategies.

As such, the LCHS does not rely on inclusionary zoning as a mechanism for achieving affordability targets but rather recognizes that, as of June 2010, the City has a position of support in principle regarding inclusionary zoning noting that the Provincial Bill 198 is not yet legislation. That is, it is still without any details of future tools and instruments of implementation that municipalities will require.

The LCHS acknowledges that London is a ready and capable community that must continue to participate proactively in the ongoing discussion of proposed legislative changes, such as inclusionary zoning, to ensure they meet the continued unique interests of healthy mixed income/mixed housing neighbourhoods.
Example #2: Strengthen the Capacity of Housing Providers (Recommendation 3.3)

Landlords are valued and critical partners who will help the City achieve the targets and this is noted several times in this Strategy.

During the process of information gathering for the Strategy, there were several tenants who reported that they had dysfunctional relationships with their landlords and vice versa. There were also landlords who were recognized for their compassion and role in making housing safe and affordable.

It is important to recognize the fact that multi-unit residential living is the locus of community for many Londoners and that the early resolution to landlord and tenant issues in a mutually satisfactory manner is essential to creating stable housing for persons living in vulnerable conditions. These skills of negotiated resolution and tenant management contribute to housing security and the vitality of the community.

As in the first example, these matters would require Provincial advocacy and coordinated community based discussion.

Example #3: Review Shelter System (Recommendation 2.3 and 2.4)

The LCHS report echoes comments made within the emergency shelter community for changes and services that reduce reliance on their services.

The recommended plan to reduce shelter beds in London by 15% over the next 5 years will require ongoing work that will be started within the revised community plan on homelessness.

The intent of the LCHS is not to reduce shelter beds and manage impact but rather engage all orders of government and service providers in a comprehensive plan to create appropriate permanent housing solutions for homeless Londoners who chronically rely on the shelter system. Building on the great work of Hostels to Homes and the No Fixed Address pilots, London must continue to advocate with the other orders of government for supportive housing options for those with complex health issues and new funding solutions to support the transformation of emergency shelters back into a strong and short term safety net for those requiring their services.

The reduction in shelter beds must be a consequence of success in these other areas of the strategy. Ending homelessness remains important work and a strong goal. A national homelessness and housing strategy remains an essential and still outstanding element in this work across Canada.

Together, these examples highlight the manner in which recommendations must be understood within the context of the associated theme and carefully implemented together with stakeholders.
Ongoing Strategy Reviews and Adjustments

Since the needs of the community can shift and new funding and/or program opportunities can be unveiled by the Province within the next 5 years, the LCHS includes a mechanism for reviewing the targets and priorities every 18-24 months while maintaining the overall integrity of the strategy. It is the City’s intent—whenever possible—to take advantage of every opportunity during the next 5 years to exceed the target.

The final strategy consists of prioritized objectives to achieve pre-determined results based upon the best available data and evidence as of June 2010. It is a strength-based, community informed, rigorously researched and comprehensive plan with woven interdependencies throughout the overall approach.

Given the challenges of undertaking such an important plan, it is natural that some elements of the strategy and its recommendations may change over the course of its 5 year term.

The approved LCHS will introduce a Report Card that will reflect the objectives and focus of attention of the strategy. The progress relative to the overall strategy will be measured and reported out at regular intervals.

Next Steps

The next 5 years will bring greater alignment and responsiveness by the City administration. Changes will be made to system design as well as to programs and services to better meet the needs of Londoners across the entire housing continuum.

The City will assert its position as a mature and responsible order of government and continue to demonstrate its political will by working with other orders of government, municipalities within the Region, and with cities of similar size in Ontario to bolster its position as a leader—not just another stakeholder.

Upon Municipal Council approval, the City in conjunction with the housing consultants will begin a comprehensive exercise in developing a report card format, creating implementation plans, and beginning work with the community on a revised Community Plan on Homelessness.

The LCHS will deliver—over the next 5 years to meet the needs of the young and the old, lone-parents, two-parents, singles, and families.

The LCHS promotes a blend of supportive housing, affordable rental through new construction and acquisition, home ownership dwellings, and the flexibility for the City to seize opportunities related to available rent supplement programs in order to achieve the affordable housing targets.

The London Community Housing Strategy positions the City in its leadership role as a caring compassionate place to live and work.
INTRODUCTION

The London Community Housing Strategy (LCHS) was developed by OrgCode Consulting Inc. starting in January 2010.

The content of the report is based on information gleaned through consultation, open houses, structured and semi-structured key informant interviews, structured and semi-structured interviews with people with lived experience, a review of existing documentation and data, an overview of other City initiatives, a review of relevant literature, and a survey with local organizations involved with any aspect of housing along the continuum. The comprehensive methods used to develop the London Community Housing Strategy are outlined in Appendix A.

This document is organized into the following sections:

1. Executive Summary
2. London Community Housing Strategy
3. The Housing Continuum
4. The Need for a Comprehensive Strategy Across the Housing Continuum
5. The Matter of Affordability
6. The Local, Provincial & Federal Interface—Housing and Homeless Initiatives
7. Community Vitality and Economic Prosperity: How the Community Housing Strategy Helps Address These Important Council Priorities
8. Achievements and Shifts in Local Context: A Decade of Change, Innovation, Increased Awareness and Results
9. Targets
10. Recommendations

Within this Strategy document, some initiatives and data are repeated on more than one occasion. This is intentional and is related to how the document may be used in the future, with some people having a specific interest in certain chapters.

The London Community Housing Strategy will be supplemented by an updated Community Plan on Homelessness later in 2010. Some initiatives noted in this document will be laid out in greater detail in the Community Plan on Homelessness.

The Strategy, as laid out in this document, covers the period from June 28, 2010 when Council approves the LCHS to December 31, 2015.
Community is a frequently used word that has a number of meanings. In human communities, intent, beliefs, resources, preferences, needs, risks and a number of other conditions may be present that affect the members of the community and their degree of cohesiveness. In the London Community Housing Strategy (LCHS), community encompasses both a geographic understanding and a personal associative understanding. It is both place and people and, most often, the connection between the two. Community is warm and welcoming, safe, a place of belonging, a place to call home. Community is an ideal - a call to action for a better future, to a more inclusive place to live with more connections to the fabric of city life and the people that make the experience of community real, meaningful, pleasant and productive.

Housing is a human necessity. As such, housing must be understood as part of an integrated, community-based planning system that includes issues of social and economic inclusion, health and wellness, mobility and accessibility, life changes, ethnicity and culture – to name a few. The necessity of housing is realized through personal attainment, balanced with government intervention as it pertains to legislation, regulation, funding, management, policy and planning.

There is diversity in community. This diversity is manifest in many ways: cultural, racial, religious, ability, economic, social, need, support, etc. Diversity beckons one to ensure that a Community Housing Strategy meets the unique needs of different populations who are all part of the community. The LCHS examines every facet of housing along the continuum from safe beds and emergency shelters to market rental and affordable homeownership—from youth to older adults and from independent living to institutional living. The strategy is founded on past and present evidence that, when combined with a vision for the community, provides a view to the future.

London has demonstrated success when the community is vibrant, safe and progressive—when its residents have good homes and the community attracts new employers and opportunities that help the economy prosper. The health and wellness of the people of London, their safety and productivity are all linked to the diversity of housing that meets the diverse needs of its residents. There are practical reasons for having a vital community based on housing as a fundamental element of long-term viability. Housing helps drive and support the economy—it is one of the key indicators of the health of an economy. It is through housing that neighbourhood identity is created and the pride that one associates with their place of dwelling—personally and collectively. The environment is impacted by the type of housing we have, how it is cared for and where and how London grows. Housing is fundamental to resident stability that is a key ingredient for civic engagement, economic prosperity and community vitality.

Strategy is the means through which a better future will be created for Londoners. It is the alignment of our values to our community vision that provides a clear sense of the activities that are required to get there. The LCHS will guide London’s housing and homelessness decisions until December 31, 2015. The chronological and sequential logic of the plan is designed to build traction towards achieving the community’s collective goals.
The concept of a housing continuum is used to help us understand the range of needs and housing that is required for a diverse community and population. It is a concept to help organize and focus our strategic approach.

This section of the Strategy highlights the:
2. Lenses for Understanding the Housing Continuum – Stages of the Life Cycle; Needs and Supports; and Types of Housing and Shelter Accommodation
3. Influences on the Housing Continuum
4. Support for the Continuum Approach in Existing Initiatives
5. Shifting Away from Silos in Our Thinking and Approaches

London’s Social Policy Framework and Ontario’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Influencing the Understanding of the Housing Continuum

Since 2006, London has had a Social Policy Framework that rightfully acknowledges the municipal role as a policy-maker, including social policy – a sphere of policy development previously relegated to other orders of government. In the Social Policy Framework, there has been an emphasis on enhancing the community vitality of Londoners. It appreciates, respects and reinforces the myriad ways in which that can occur, and the interconnectivity of issues and supports across all orders of government.

The Social Policy Framework “formalizes a way of thinking about and response to the social impact of changes in community.” The Social Policy Framework recognizes that quality of life, health and well-being of community stems from having “meaningful opportunities to participate in and contribute to our community.” The three components of the Framework: 1) Safety Net, 2) Social Inclusion, and 3) Community and Neighbourhood Capacity Building are interconnected. This demonstrates the importance of meeting basic needs, having opportunities for community inclusion and being able to participate in the health and well-being of the community as a whole.

Changes in the social issues are noted within the Framework – household composition; labour market; income inequality; aging population; and needs of newcomers and immigrants. Due consideration of these issues are all necessary in having a comprehensive view of social policy at the local level – even when the root causes of the social issues are outside the sphere of municipal control.

Housing is recognized as part of the Safety Net within the Framework. The crucial importance of housing – along with food security and income – are acknowledged as core foundations to quality of life. These are seen as basic entitlements – not a privilege and not a reward.

London’s Social Policy Framework predates the work of Ontario’s Poverty Reduction Strategy and shares a similar perspective as the Framework with its vision: “where every person has the opportunity to achieve his or her full potential, and contribute to and participate in a prosperous and healthy Ontario.”

“I had to give my mother custody of my kid because I can’t afford a place that I could afford for both of us.”

– Homeless Youth
The ten core principles of the Ontario’s Poverty Reduction Strategy share similarities with London’s Social Policy Framework, including an emphasis on community, tapping into potential and effectiveness. There are differences, as well. For example, whereas the Framework looks at the entire London population, the Poverty Reduction Strategy places very strong emphasis on children. Whereas the Framework is a platform to view social issues, the Poverty Reduction Strategy moves to action and goal setting with a bold direction to decrease child poverty by 25% within 5 years. The Poverty Reduction Strategy also notes that Ontario will not reach this target without assistance from the Federal government and other stakeholders such as the private sector.

The Poverty Reduction Strategy has become a lens through which the Government of Ontario has engaged with communities through various ministries. While the Strategy “sits” with the Ministry of Children and Youth Services, it is cross-ministerial in its reach. For example, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in its engagement with Service Managers has asked how local initiatives help meet the intent of the Poverty Reduction Strategy.

The Poverty Reduction Strategy is expected to continue to influence decision-making over the next five years. As this relates to the housing continuum, the Housing Measures and Standards of Living indicators have not yet been released as part of the Poverty Reduction Strategy. However, investments in a Community Opportunities Fund to co-ordinate community revitalization projects and more stable funding for the Provincial Rent Bank Program to provide financial assistance to households facing likely eviction are both examples of initiatives that are likely to have an impact on objectives of the London Community Housing Strategy.

**Lenses for Understanding the Housing Continuum**

A “housing continuum” is a concept. The concept is useful for organizing a range of perspectives on housing:

1. how housing relates to where people are at in their life cycle, from the needs of children and youth through to older adults and persons who are aging;
2. how housing relates to the degree of support desired or needed in that housing, from institutional living to completely independent living without support; and
3. types of housing and shelter accommodation, from safe beds and emergency shelters to market rental and affordable homeownership.

The concept of the housing continuum is an opportunity to comprehensively and directly organize the housing and homelessness system. The sectors supporting housing and homelessness are complicated - and at times complex – given the strategies, perspectives, populations served, genesis of programs, funding sources, links to other agendas, intersection with other areas of social policy, role of government, history, etc. Layered on top of these elements are the needs of the individuals who rely on or are directly impacted by that system. Every person is not going to navigate services as if climbing an imaginary ladder to prosperity and growth.
Lenses for Understanding the Housing Continuum –
1) Stages of the Life Cycle,
2) Needs and Supports,
3) Types of Housing and Shelter Accommodation
– are different approaches to examining the continuum. The stages address many of the limitations of the housing and homelessness sectors. None of them are mutually exclusive and, in fact, it is through the overlap of these three understandings of the spectrum that a human picture emerges.

The following charts explain these three approaches in more detail.

1. Stage of the Life Cycle

The first continuum concept important to the London Community Housing Strategy is the life cycle and its various stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of the Life Cycle</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children and Youth</td>
<td>Most often living with one or two parents or legal guardian. Some children and youth will need foster care or group homes. Some children and youth will experience the need for shelters when experiencing homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td>Often require access to student housing when attending college, university or other educational institutions that may be outside of their home community. Other young adults will not pursue education beyond high school and will seek employment in the labour market. Others will find themselves accessing homeless shelters. Some young adults will require group homes and supportive living environments. Most often, young adults have their housing needs met through rental accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Household Formation</td>
<td>New household formation occurs when individuals decide to live together. New household formation often begins with rental accommodation and can be the period when the household begins saving for a down payment to enter the ownership market; however, some newly formed households will require access to a homeless shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless Households</td>
<td>Childless households are single people without children, as well as common-law or married couples without children. Single people may rely on the rental market with only one income to support their housing needs. Some single people will also need group homes or other supportive living environments. Childless couples will rent or own depending on personal preferences and income. Some childless households will require access to a homeless shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>Households with one or more children will include single parents as well as two parent households. The number of children, personal preferences and income will inform whether housing is owned or rented. Some households with children will require access to homeless shelter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unwell people can’t navigate the system on their own to get the help that they need.

– Frontline Agency Worker

Unwell people can’t navigate the system on their own to get the help that they need.

– Frontline Agency Worker
1. Stage of the Life Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of the Life Cycle</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td>Older adults who have adult children—currently many of the baby-boomers—tend to have equity in their houses. Some older adults in ownership housing will remain “over housed”, that is, more bedrooms and space than one or two adults require for daily living, while other older adults will “right size” their housing and move to smaller ownership accommodation such as a smaller house or condominium. Some will forego ownership and rent housing. Other older adults, including those who have always been renters, take on the characteristics of childless couples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging Older Adults with Needs</td>
<td>Aging older adults are those adults that begin to require care to meet their needs. This frequently describes aging older adults who have lost a spouse. If they owned a house, some aging older adults may still remain in their house and require supports for daily living. Other aging older adults may move in with their adult children, enter or remain in the rental market or move into retirement residences or long-term care housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A range of approaches to housing are needed to meet housing needs throughout the continuum. The range of approaches needs to accommodate the ways in which households can be formed, re-constituted and permanently altered over time. The variation in households all impact the approaches to housing that are required. A range of needs and supports, as well as a range of different types of housing and accommodation are both necessary to meet housing needs throughout the life cycle outlined above. Lastly, there must be balance in the approach to addressing the housing needs within the continuum and, at the same time, determining the specific needs that are present. It’s important not to allow one element of the life cycle to trump the needs across the continuum.

2. Needs and Supports

The second continuum concept important to the London Community Housing Strategy addresses needs and supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs and Supports</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living</td>
<td>The ability to be self-sustaining and self-sufficient in housing without any external supports to the household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding Homes</td>
<td>A residence where tenants live independently with the exception of meals that are prepared as a support strategy. This helps with their housing stability, improves food security and addresses a deficit in their life skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Needs and Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs and Supports</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing with Supports</td>
<td>Most often, a tenant residing in a private or non-profit apartment where external supports visit on a regular—rarely daily—basis to provide assistance with life skills, psycho-social supports or accompaniment to appointment in the community. What distinguishes Housing with Supports from Supportive Housing is that the housing is integrated and scattered within the community. There are no on-site professional supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>A residence with on-site dedicated professional supports to tenants for most or all of the day. There can be supports with life-skills, daily living, psycho-social supports or accompaniment to appointments in the community. In most situations, each tenant has their own lockable bedroom or unit with some shared common space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Institutional Care/Living| A residence with on-site dedicated professional supports to tenants 24-hours per day. The support structure is usually aligned with a common feature of the residents, for example:  
• all in need of medical supports  
• all aging and requiring additional supports  
• all adults with developmental delay  
• all youth removed from their home environment  
While there are many similarities to supportive housing, people in an institutional care/living environment most often share common meals, have a range of structured programs and they often have more structured and screened access to the facility. |

Understanding needs and supports must be balanced throughout the housing continuum. It is not just the polar extremes of independence and institutional care. The variations and nuances in independence and support throughout the continuum must be taken into consideration. Where an individual is at in their life cycle, as well as the type of housing or other type of accommodation they are in, will inform specific activities related to the provision of supports, if required.

3. Types of Housing or Shelter Accommodation

The third continuum concept important to the London Community Housing Strategy is the types of housing or shelter accommodation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Housing</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Beds/Crash Beds</td>
<td>Housing that is usually within an apartment or supportive living residence for a person with a mental illness to stay until stabilized, outside of institutional care. It is most often seen as a type of emergency housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Types of Housing or Shelter Accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Housing</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Hostels</td>
<td>A hostel where board, lodging and money for personal needs are provided to homeless adults, families and youth, on a short-term and infrequent basis. Funding is provided under the Ontario Works Act, 1997. For individuals, shelter is usually provided through the assignment of a bed in a dormitory environment with common and social areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domiciliary Hostels</td>
<td>Housing with limited supports for vulnerable adults who require some supervision and support with activities of daily living but who are not eligible for long-term care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Housing with a fixed length of stay. There is usually some programmatic requirements as a condition of tenancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>Temporary housing where a household can stay as they await access to other housing. It is usually provided for populations with special needs. There are usually no or few programmatic requirements as a condition of tenancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes</td>
<td>A highly structured residential setting where youth or adults with similar presenting issues or life circumstances live together. Group homes are often the result of particular diagnosis or life circumstance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding Homes</td>
<td>A residence where meals are provided as part of the tenancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooming Houses</td>
<td>A building that usually looks like a single-detached or semi-detached home on the exterior but, on the interior, has been subdivided into multiple rooms. Residents tend to rent a room and often share some or all of the other amenities such as the washroom, shower, kitchen and common area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>A residence with on-site dedicated professional supports to tenants for most or all of the day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Housing

Social Housing, as the term is commonly used, is a category of housing that includes rent supplements, cooperatives, non-profit and public housing.

Rent supplements are provided by government to a private market landlord. The supplement makes up the difference between 30% of the tenants income and the average market rent of the apartment unit—this is called full subsidy. In some instances, there is a partial or shallow subsidy that assists the tenant with rent but it is not designed to bring the rent level all the way down to 30% of the tenant’s gross monthly income.

Co-operative housing is a form of social housing in which the households that live in the housing are members of the cooperative corporation that own the building. Amongst themselves, they elect a board of directors who oversee the management of the building.

Non-profit housing is the most dominant form of social housing in Ontario. Non-profit housing is affordable rental housing where most tenants pay rent that is geared to income (RGI) and most often does not exceed 30% of their monthly gross income. The non-profit housing provider receives other subsidies—usually through government—to bridge the costs.

Public housing is 100% rent-geared-to-income housing, usually within larger projects. This housing was developed by the Ontario Housing Corporation through a federal public housing program, with a focus mainly on low-income families and seniors. After downloading to the Municipal Service Managers, public housing became the part of the social housing portfolio managed by the local housing corporation.

Affordable Rental Housing

An affordable rental residence can be either private or non-profit in nature. Housing is considered affordable by some people if no more than 30% of monthly income is required to cover rent; however, others consider housing to be affordable when rents are no higher than average market rents in the community by housing type.

Market Rental

A market rental residence is most often in the private sector though some non-profits have a small number of market rental units. A market rental unit rent for a new tenant is determined by the property owner and can be set at any price they think that the market will support. Pricing is often influenced by local vacancy rates, location, age of building, characteristics of neighbourhood and amenities.

Secondary Suites

A secondary residence within a house. Secondary suites are usually a basement or attic apartment.
Types of Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Housing</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Homeownership</td>
<td>Ownership housing where the resident—most often a low-income family—receives assistance toward a down-payment or part of the down-payment. The amount is at the discretion of the Service Manager and is below the maximum house price limit as based on the average MLS Resale Price for the area. Consideration is given to how much of the resident’s gross monthly income is required to cover the housing costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Hospice and Palliative Housing</td>
<td>Housing with supports for persons with life-threatening or terminal illness in a home-like setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Care Housing</td>
<td>A residence for people who require the availability of 24-hour nursing care and supervision within a secure setting usually with higher levels of support than people would receive in supportive housing or a retirement home. Long-term care housing offers a variety of accommodations and services with co-payment required on the part of the tenant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The types of housing and shelter accommodation has a range of diversity not just across the categories, but within each category as well. For example, shelters have different designs and numbers of beds just like apartment buildings; ownership housing may have different square footage and land around the house; long-term care housing has a variety of services and payment structures. The types of housing and shelter accommodation necessary in the continuum is further influenced by where people are at in the life cycle and their needs and supports, if any. The continuum seeks to ensure there is an appropriate range and quantity of different types of housing and shelter accommodation within the community to meet the needs of its residents.

Influences on the Housing Continuum

Influencing the three continuum concepts above are considerations such as personal preference needs, life circumstances and access to resources. Some examples include:

- not everyone with a larger income will choose to own the place where they live,
- availability or lack of available supports impacting a person's ability to remain housed in a specific type of housing such as needing ramps in a rental unit,
- people moving into or out of the City such as a student who lives in London for three or four years while attending college or university,
- a family with three children moving to London for a job,
- a homeless person from a neighbouring community who needs access to a shelter,
- inter-generational housing such as children, adults and grandparents who share housing,
- immigration and newcomers,
- job interruption or access to the labour market,
- special needs, etc.

“A neighbourhood is where you live and continue to stay over the course of your life—even as your housing needs change.”

– Participant, Community Consultation
Support for the Continuum Approach in Existing Initiatives

The continuum approach is supported by other important City initiatives, policies and documents that include:

- the Mayor’s Anti-Poverty Action Group,
- Municipal Council’s 2006 Social Policy Framework,
- the 2000 City of London’s Affordable Housing Task Force Report,
- the City’s Community Plan(s) on Homelessness,
- the 2005 Affordable Housing Strategy.

The City’s Affordable Housing Task Force set out a vision of “a City of London where all members of the community have access to housing that is safe, secure and suitable to their needs and ability to pay”.

The Social Policy Framework recognized the vital link between a safety net of services to healthy community engagement and vitality and economic prosperity. In addition, an Official Plan amendment also placed a stronger focus on affordable housing, especially for those households at the 30th percentile of household incomes in the City of London.

Shifting Away from Silos in Our Thinking and Approaches

One of the distinct benefits of using the continuum concept to describe housing in London is that it encourages the people of London to shift away from thinking about housing and homelessness as separate and distinct silos. Instead, the continuum approach provides the opportunity for the City to embrace the interconnectivity of the housing strategy from those most in need—no housing—through to homeowners who are least in need of government assistance. Addressing the specific housing needs of certain populations such as youth, Aboriginal people, seniors, etc. must be done within the lens of the broader community. That is, the entire spectrum of housing variations within the continuum must be embraced. The London Community Housing Strategy cannot focus solely on one end of the continuum or the other.

This Strategy is comprehensive and does not focus solely on the needs of a particular group but on the continuum as a whole. The rationale for doing so is compelling: two of the City of London’s priorities—Community Vitality and Economic Prosperity—are dependent upon it. The evidence, as collected and compiled by Statistics Canada, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, analysts and researchers is clear and irrefutable.
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Local Responses: Innovation, Commitment and Investment on the Part of City Council and the Community

This Strategy recognizes and builds upon much of the recent work that has been occurring in London. Momentum has been growing in London in response to local needs and much has been accomplished over the past decade, as outlined in the section of this Strategy, “ACHIEVEMENTS AND SHIFTS IN LOCAL CONTEXT: A DECADE OF CHANGE, INNOVATION, INCREASED AWARENESS AND RESULTS”.

There are a number of responses such as The Heat and Warmth Fund, Consolidated Homeless Prevention Program, Rent Bank and shelter funding that has been evolving throughout the decade, along with a shift in Federal homelessness funding from the Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative to the Homelessness Prevention Strategy. Meanwhile, after experiencing some of the final effects of the devolution of social housing with the Social Housing Reform Act ten years ago, recent initiatives such as the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review have been initiated. These initiatives deal with some of the legacies of devolution such as whether the municipalities or the Province of Ontario should pay for specific income supports. The Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review has also resulted in the creation of the Homelessness and Housing Consolidation Working Group. This group was initiated to consolidate the wide range of housing and homelessness programs.

Outside of these types of interventions from other orders of government, London has contributed significantly to policy and program development locally to meet the needs of its most vulnerable residents.

Accepting its share of responsibility for affordable housing and as a mature and responsible order of government, London has been investing $2 Million annually towards afford-
Accepting its share of responsibility for affordable housing and as a mature and responsible order of government, London has been investing $2 Million annually towards affordable housing in recent years. This is a strong example of London investing in the needs of its residents across the continuum.

The City has been proactive in determining the housing needs of its most vulnerable residents. A local study reviewed discharges from local London hospital psychiatric wards reflected that individuals who received treatment exited care to emergency shelters or to the streets almost 200 times per year. Based on this finding, a pilot project was developed in a partnership between the City of London, the Canadian Mental Health Association, and the Community University Research Alliance—led by Dr. Cheryl Forchuk—and titled the No Fixed Address (NFA) Demonstration Project.

The first phase of the NFA initiative began in 2005 with a goal to prevent the discharge of patients in the mental health units at local hospitals to the streets and to emergency shelters. The revised approach would provide housing and social services interventions while the patient was still in medical care prior to discharge planning. The connection to social services and housing supports relied on participation and co-operation from local Ontario Works (OW) and Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) offices, the recipients, and housing and mental health service providers. The City of London and the University of Western Ontario funded the pilot.

The early results of the first pilot period reflected that all of those volunteer participant who received the intervention remained housed when interviewed 3 and 6 months later. This approach included improved access to either OW or ODSP where a designated representative was contacted to book the application and housing supports through the Canadian Mental Health Association. The second group of participants who did not receive the intervention were still homeless 6 months later, or in one case, housed due to recruitment into the sex trade to avoid homelessness. Based on the early results of the pilot, the initiative was halted and redesigned to implement the intervention as standard care.

Since that time and through subsequent pilot initiatives, direct contact prior to discharge has been supported through an Ontario Works caseworker engaging with a CMHA housing worker at the associated hospital and initiating applications for assistance and housing and developing case plans ahead of a scheduled discharge.

This integrated partnership continues to display great success and promising practice. It also reflects the potential of these types of innovative approaches to homelessness prevention on the quality of life of vulnerable population groups. Similar work is being designed related to discharges from criminal justice.

In addition to the above initiative, London’s tireless advocacy resulted in the Province of Ontario creating a pilot project called Hostels to Homes. Implemented in select urban centres in Ontario, the program invested almost $300,000 per year to assist individuals and households in moving out of the shelters and into housing with supports. The pilot showed significant promise in London and other centres such as Hamilton. However, the pilot is
not scheduled to be renewed. Instead, Hostels to Homes is being considered as part of the Province of Ontario’s Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy. The Hostels to Homes initiative is described in more detail under “Promising Innovations in Addressing Homelessness” in this document.

London, through the leadership of City Council, the Chief of Police, the Medical Officer of Health and the General Manager of Community Services, along with considerable community input from service providers, local businesses and others, is also demonstrating innovation through the London CAReS (Community Addiction Response Strategy). The formation stage of London CAReS over the past 18 months has yielded considerable learning that will be used to help inform the next stage of the program’s evolution and link directly with the London Community Housing Strategy.

The entire decade of learning and experience is being applied to this Community Housing Strategy. We are learning from our mistakes and building upon our successes. We have a stronger understanding of what works best in our local context. We are prepared to invest in change where it is warranted and make the necessary refinements to better coordinate and integrate our housing and homelessness initiatives within our community.

**Bookends of the Continuum**

On the bookends of the continuum—homeless shelters and homeownership—there are some telling tales. Future scenarios all point to the need to invest heavily in housing homeless individuals with a strong focus on supports appropriate to help them stay housed. The results of the Hostels to Homes pilot initiative in London has provided promising direction for homelessness services. The initial stages of London CAReS has provided a wealth of experience and indications about what can work in the community. In examining the next evolution of the London CAReS program, for example, integrating housing strategies for those experiencing homelessness will be part of its focus. Initiatives like these need to be aligned with a housing strategy that addresses both access to housing and the necessary supports required to stay housed.

In serving and responding to those individuals with the deepest needs, our approach to supporting these individuals will focus on:

- respecting the dignity of the individual,
- providing access to appropriate, affordable housing,
- reinforcing the individual’s choice in housing – where they want to live, what type of housing they want and the degree of support they wish to have in their housing – relative to what they can afford,
- providing personalized, documented planning with an intensity of service relative to their needs,
- building upon each individual’s strengths rather than focusing on their deficits
- delivering services in the community,
- implementing harm reduction,
- brokering access to appropriate health, mental health and addiction services,
- re-housing individuals who may lose their housing,
- avoiding coercion in the delivery of services,
• supporting greater independence of the individual over time,
• being person-centred,
• using a recovery orientation with individuals who experience mental illness,
• wellness and the ability to heal – the ability to look beyond pathology, illness or labels,
• more intensive supports and smaller support worker to client ratios,
• a rational approach for establishing service priorities,
• using evidence-based practices as appropriate, from supported employment to motivational interviewing to integrated dual disorders treatment,
• empowering individuals to make meaningful, lasting change in their life, as determined by them,
• helping individuals engage in meaningful daily activities from socio-recreational events to volunteerism and employment,
• leveraging existing community resources and expertise,
• appropriately using peers, and
• using data and information to be reflective practitioners and make changes in policy, approaches and funding as appropriate, and as supported by clear metrics.

In continuing to move in this direction, it may result in changes in policy and funding over time. It will also result in a more defined role for the City in establishing service requirements or standards. Working with the community sector to help increase the likelihood of successful implementation, training needs and opportunities will be identified with subsequent investment in capacity building and professional development. In most cases this approach to housing and supporting people will be distributed throughout the community and efforts will be made to not concentrate services to one area or location unless within the managed environment of a specific program.

The argument for investing in this type of support for those with deepest need is a strong one. For one, research and program interventions are demonstrating that this type of service approach is achieving positive client outcomes. For another, without it, costs of other types of emergency services from shelters to jail and use of emergency rooms will continue – and will likely escalate – without actually solving the issue of homelessness. Our focus of investment is on finding permanent solutions to homelessness and ensuring that shelter use decreases over time. Shelters were always meant to be short-term, infrequent solutions and not a form of housing. The cost of making these changes can be justified. Consider that it costs $1,450 for a single individual and $5,800 to shelter a family of four for one month. That does not include ancillary costs such as homeless programs and services—street outreach or drop-in services—that these individuals are likely to access. Consider that the cost for a jail cell or detention centre exceeds $140 daily. Psychiatric in-patient beds can be in excess of $650 and acute in-patient beds in hospital can be over $1,000—daily.

At the affordable homeownership end of the continuum, the current market appears to be balanced. It is neither a buyers’ market nor a sellers’ market. This reflects the local economy, the amount of product being developed by builders and prudent planning policy. But, the market does not speak directly to affordable homeownership and the policy mechanisms

I’m 34 now and I was originally homeless by choice when I left home at 14. After being in treatment three times for my addiction to crack, I’m tired of life on the street and just want my own place so I can get away from this stuff.

— Person Living in Shelter
required to assist a household entering the homeownership market for the first time as an alternative to renting. The average re-sale housing price in London is approximately $225,000. Assuming that the household saved a 10% down payment, their monthly mortgage payment exceeds $1,000—and does not include utilities, taxes or maintenance costs.

**Housing Facts and Vacancy**

Between the 2001 and 2006 Census periods, the average price of an owned dwelling increased more than $55,000 in London – an increase of 35%. Homeownership over that period became increasingly inaccessible to people at the lower and moderate range income.

The rental market has also seen changes over the past decade, as demonstrated in the two tables below on vacancy rates and average market rent.

### Vacancy Rate (%) by Unit Type, October 2005 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Rental Market Survey, October 2005 through October 2009.

The Rental Market Survey “targets only privately initiated structures with at least three rental units, which have been on the market for at least three months. The survey collects market rent, available and vacant unit data from sampled structures.” It can be argued that a “balanced rental market” is 3%. Examining the vacancy rates across almost all types of units over the past five years, vacancy rates in excess of 3% would seem to indicate that London is a “renter’s market”. A “renter’s market” suggests that those looking to rent have more choices and that landlords, in order to compete for tenants, level or lower rents. As noted in the following table, there is no evidence that rents are leveling or lowering. Some landlords are choosing to keep their units vacant rather than lowering the price point to attract tenants—a reality confirmed through surveys with local landlords.

Vacancy rates are just one indicator, however, of the vacancy situation in London. It is important to also examine unit turnover and vacancy loss. The more frequent turnover of tenants can drive up costs for landlords. It is desirable to have longer-term stable tenancies. There is the opportunity to examine further alignment between programs designed to help people access and sustain rental housing while reducing the vacancy loss and turnover costs experienced by landlords. Vacancy indicators seem to suggest this can be a win-win situation. And some landlords have embraced that lowering their rents to attract more tenants, while decreasing vacancy loss, enhances their bottom line and is a viable business strategy for more normalized revenue and greater long-term profit.
Average Rent by Unit Type: 1999, 2004 and 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-99</th>
<th>Oct-04</th>
<th>Oct-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apartments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>$408</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>$607</td>
<td>$714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>$639</td>
<td>$761</td>
<td>$909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>$790</td>
<td>$958</td>
<td>$1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Townhouses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>$693</td>
<td>$805</td>
<td>$860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ Bedroom</td>
<td>$747</td>
<td>$849</td>
<td>$905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Over the past decade, increases in rent have outpaced increases in inflation in Ontario. For those who rely on social assistance to pay for their rent, the situation is bleak. The $539 average rent for a bachelor apartment exceeds the amount of shelter allowance issued by Ontario Works by almost $200. The average rent of a one-bedroom apartment (not adjusted for inflation) has increased approximately $200 over a 10-year period. A two-bedroom apartment increased by $300. Income and support payments have not experienced the same rate of growth.

In addition to vacancy rates and rent levels, the composition of housing in London is changing. There has been a decline in the number of rental dwelling units in London from 55,645 (43%) of all housing stock in 1996 to 54,880 (38%) in 2006.

**Income Facts**

A frequent debate is whether housing affordability is a housing issue or an income issue. A focus on just one or the other can cloud and confuse the truth. Housing is both a matter of income and a matter of access to housing and services.

Overall, ownership households in London have seen greater gains in income than tenants. While both owner-households and tenant-households have seen some gains in income as noted in the past three census periods, the gap between owner-households and tenant-households is increasing, with ownership households now having 2.5 times the annual income of tenant households. Forty-five percent (45%) of tenant households are spending 30% or more of their gross monthly income on rent and one in five spends 50% or more of their gross monthly income on rent. Meanwhile, one in six owners (17%) are spending 30% or more of their gross monthly income on housing.

Low-income is an issue for many households in the London community. Statistics Canada data shows that 11.8% of all households are considered to be low-income. Among some segments of the population, the situation is more pronounced. One in four (25%) of female led, lone-parent families is considered low-income. There are thousands of households with children—two-parent and lone-parent families—that are spending more than 30% of their gross monthly income on rent.
The income issue is not just one affecting people on social assistance, though they are certainly impacted. An individual working full-time hours every week on minimum wage earns less than $20,000 gross per year. Statistics Canada data shows that the average income for a single person household is $28,342. An individual who is eligible for the maximum budget on Ontario Works (social assistance) will receive less than $7,000 in income each year.

The Growth of London

Between the 2001 and 2006 Census periods, London grew by almost 5%, representing a net increase of more than 15,000 people.

London currently accounts for 86% of the population of Middlesex County and will increase by 99,000 persons by 2031. One report projects 55,650 new households in the City of London by 2031 with 54,740 new dwellings required to satisfy this household demand. Medium and high density housing will account for approximately 38% of housing completions. Furthermore, the pattern of construction is expected to shift throughout the projection period from low density to medium and high density. Examining the time period of the projections that overlap with this Strategy, between 330 and 380 row housing units and 380 and 410 apartment units are needed to account for the needs of new households.

These projections, however, do not adequately account for the needs of existing households and the pent-up demand—despite the vacancy rate—to address the housing needs of all people of London. In addition, as noted in Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation’s research and analysis, most rental apartments and condominium apartments developed recently and anticipated to come on stream in London are in the high-end rental category. This housing focuses on empty nesters and retirees as the key customer group who will opt for this type of housing given the relative low maintenance and convenience provided by an apartment or condo lifestyle.

Responding to future population growth requires appropriate housing development to meet current affordability demands while ensuring a range of product type and cost across the continuum of housing. This approach is currently supported within the Official Plan though evidence of a comprehensive mix within the City is lacking. One approach to achieving a comprehensive mix is inclusionary zoning. This approach requires private developers—through development regulations and approval process—to provide some portion of the housing within their new market projects as affordable housing. While the City, in principle, has declared its support of inclusionary zoning, it would be unrealistic to rely on inclusionary zoning to address all affordable housing needs solely through this approach.

Responding to growth must also demonstrate environmental leadership. Environmental stewardship is a responsibility that the City of London must embrace in the Community Housing Strategy.

Housing needs to be within sufficient proximity to where people work and transit nodes to reduce pollution and encourage physical exercise. Furthermore, the Strategy needs to ensure that surplus federal, provincial and municipal lands are considered for affordable
housing prior to being made available for other uses. The density within the City will be increased, making the use of existing infrastructure more efficient and more affordable. This approach blends and intensifies existing neighbourhoods.

Environmental considerations and appropriate action are important throughout every aspect of the continuum concerning types of housing. One of the largest consumers of energy in the country are households who use 17% of the country’s energy. Households are also significant contributors to greenhouse gas emissions producing about 16% of Canada’s greenhouse gases.26

With an aging housing stock, maintaining and retrofitting existing housing stock becomes a strategic priority. First, it reinforces that existing housing is a community asset, especially housing with public investment throughout the years. The protection of these assets and a willingness to retrofit buildings to environmentally favourable practices and materials combine to decrease operating costs over time when full life cycle costing is completed. An investment in public buildings is good policy and positive reinforcement of environmental considerations within the community.27 Second, given that many homes in London are going through their first, second or third wave of life cycle improvements, now is the time to introduce more energy efficiency such as appliances and materials that have less environmental impact in their creation and greater energy operational efficiency. Also, diversion from landfill whenever possible and wider use of proven technologies that decrease environmental impacts will benefit the community. Investments in the maintenance and repair of all publicly funded housing stock will go through a sustainability lens in the life cycle costing at the end of its useful life to determine replacing or maintaining all existing building components.

Preservation, transit-orientation and parking requirements must also be considered in the continuum. London needs to focus on saving and upgrading affordable housing—private and non-profit—that is already located in pedestrian friendly and transit oriented communities, with proximity to employment and amenities. This is a cost-effective way of maximizing the use of existing infrastructure, maintaining a healthy supply of affordable housing and reducing the need to recreate it elsewhere within the community.

London will also continue to build upon initiatives aligned to Smart Growth principles including: maximizing use of existing infrastructure and housing policy favouring key areas within the City;

• creating a range of housing options and choices for all income levels;
• supporting compactness of neighbourhoods and providing residents options to live, work, play and shop without over-reliance on automobiles;
• promoting transit and cycling; and
• preserving open spaces, farmland, critical environmental areas and natural beauty.

Recent work to increase bike lanes, the Downtown Plan and Housing Policy favouring key areas within London are all examples of work the City is doing in this regard.

The City blurs the line between builders and developers… London doesn’t have many companies that are both builders and developers so they need to be treated differently when it comes to incentives.

— Participant in Community Consultations
Smart Growth helps improve affordability through density and the diverse types of housing structures created. A Smart Growth approach sees a range of housing forms: smaller units, secondary suites, townhouses, row houses, duplexes, triplexes, and, if supported by the urban form, low-rises and high-rises. The increased affordability is achieved through more units per each plot of land. The range of built forms and density will need to be considered when examining housing opportunities in some locations within the City that are slated for larger scale development such as South Street Campus of Victoria Hospital and the London Psychiatric Hospital lands.

The environmental impacts of Smart Growth are real and measurable when they have a transit-orientation. Victoria, British Columbia has demonstrated that with a yield of 30 units to the acre, transit ridership increases three-fold. While London and Victoria may differ in many ways, this example does demonstrate the importance of continuing to focus on opportunities for development within the City rather than continued growth at the perimeter of the City. Appropriately designed, transit-oriented development also reduces greenhouse gas emissions per household between 2.5 and 3.7 tonnes annually. If people live within a 15-minute walk to transit, they are less likely to own a car.

Responding to growth also needs to take the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement into account when considering the consistency with Local planning.

As it pertains to housing, the Provincial Policy Statement indicates that “planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents…” the Policy Statement further indicates that this is to be met by “establishing and implementing minimum targets for the provision of housing which is affordable to low and moderate income households…” Furthermore, the Policy Statement goes on to permit and facilitate, “all forms of housing required to meet the social, health and well-being requirements of current and future residents, including special needs requirements.”

Landlords are more likely to keep buildings and units in disrepair unless money is made available from the City that helps both landlords and low-income renters. Investment in existing units is cheaper than building new units.

— Participant, Community Consultations
It is important in the context of the LCHS to have a common understanding regarding the definitions cited in the Policy Statement:

"Affordable" means:
   a) in the case of ownership housing, the least expensive of:
      1. housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30% of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or
      2. housing for which the purchase price is at least 10% below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area.
   b) in the case of rental housing, the least expensive of:
      1. a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30% of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or
      2. a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area.

"Low and moderate income households" means:
   a) in the case of ownership housing, households with incomes in the lowest 60% of the income distribution for the regional market area; or
   b) in the case of rental housing, households with incomes in the lowest 60% of the income distribution for renter households for the regional market area.

"Special needs" means: any housing, including dedicated facilities, in whole or in part, that is used by people who have specific needs beyond economic needs, including but not limited to, needs such as mobility requirements or support functions required for daily living. Examples of special needs housing may include, but are not limited to, housing for persons with disabilities such as physical, sensory or mental health disabilities and housing for the elderly.

Within the City of London Official Plan, the plan goes a step further to describe low and moderate income households for both affordable ownership housing and affordable rental housing. In both categories, low and moderate income households means those households with incomes in the lowest 60% of the income distribution for the City of London.

Development Trends and Activities

Patterns in building activity have changed in London over time. The chart below illustrates the breakdown of annual residential building permit activity by type. It shows that high density was the dominant form of development undertaken between 1970 and 1980. After 1980, low density residential development became relatively more popular, particularly for the period 1994 to 2007. In 2008, high density residential development overtook low density residential for the first time since the early 90s.

Developers should be required to build one unit of low-income housing for every luxury unit proposed.

— Participant, Open House
The increase in building permits for high density residential is a reflection in increased condominium and rental accommodation. However, an analysis of what is being developed reveals that much of what is being created at higher density is not affordable and, in fact, is more oriented towards meeting the needs of empty-nesters through luxury rentals and condominium developments.33

**Changes in the Economy**

The economy is changing and the inter-connectivity between housing and the economy is increasingly clear.

Changes in the manufacturing sector in Southwestern Ontario and the Census Metropolitan Area of London have negatively impacted the local economy of London. For example, the manufacturing sector in the London Census Metropolitan Area (CMA)34 has shed almost 8,000 jobs since 2000.35 The downturn in manufacturing jobs has also resulted in a decline in service-related jobs as people spent less.36 Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation notes that it will be health and natural science professionals driving the resale home market and not those in manufacturing and support services.37

Altogether, the London CMA is demonstrating a shift towards a more knowledge-based, higher skilled, increasingly educated and professional workforce. For example, data indicates the following for the five-year period 2004 to 2008:

• increase of 800 management positions,
• increase of 1,300 in professional business and finance occupations,
• increase of 2,500 in teachers and professors,
• increase of 3,200 jobs in applied and natural sciences.

During the same period, decreases were experienced with the loss of 3,400 clerical occupations, 1,000 sales and service occupations and 5,900 occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities.38

An examination of shifts in educational attainment also supports the shift in the nature and types of employment. For example, a comparison of the 2001 and 2006 Census data reveals the following:

> The high cost of recidivism and expensive medical interventions are mitigated when people have supported living…it’s a basic human right to have a home.

— Participant, Community Consultations
• 10% increase of people with a University Certificate, Diploma or Degree,
• 10.5% increase of people with a College Certificate or Diploma,
• 2.6% increase in Apprenticeship or Trades Certificate/Diploma, and
• 41% increase in High School Certificate or Diploma.

Changes in the City’s Demographics

The demographic composition of the City is changing and that influences the understanding of the housing continuum.

The three biggest considerations in the change of demographic composition are:

1) the extended life expectancy,
2) migration into the community, and
3) increases and changes to households.

Men and women are expected to live longer—80.4 years combined—78.0 and 82.7 years, respectively. This represents an increase of six years in life expectancy over the past 25 years. With more physically active post-retirement years and longer life expectancy, a deeper understanding of the housing needs of this segment of London’s population is needed. Intuitively and based on historical perceptions of the housing required by older people, one would project an increase in retirement residences, long-term care housing, hospice and palliative care but that does not account for other options. For instance, some older adults will prefer to live in their existing housing with supports. Others will want a secondary suite to live with their adult children, but independently. Some are likely to “right size” to smaller accommodation once they have no more dependents while others will remain “over housed” for many years. The latter group will hold a component of housing stock better suited to a larger household and driving up demand—albeit arbitrarily—for other multi-bedroom homes.

Migration into the community through immigration and intra-provincial migration from elsewhere in Ontario also impacts housing in London. Research conducted by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation demonstrates that international migrants are most likely to settle first within high-rise apartment buildings before they move to resale townhouses close to their original location. Intra-provincial from within Ontario will likely be from Toronto. Intra-provincial migrants are attracted to London because of the relative affordability of housing compared to their cities of origin and they tend to remain in rental housing less than two years. This group has been fuelling a significant percentage of the London resale housing market over the past few years.

London has experienced a steady increase in families as a whole. In particular, this increase includes lone-parent families that generally have lower incomes than their two-parent counterparts and they are more reliant on the rental market. Consider also that there has been a 12.8% increase in people never married, a 7.3% increase in those people separated but still legally married, a 9.0% increase in divorced couples and a 4.4% increase in those people who have been widowed. These changes have a high potential to place additional pressures on the rental market or drive demand for affordable homeownership.
The Age and State of Repair of the Housing Stock

The housing stock within London is beginning to age and major repairs are needed on some of the stock.

The years 1946 to 1980 represented the largest building period in London and accounts for 51% of London’s total 145,525 private dwelling housing stock. Many of these dwellings are approaching or have passed their second stage of building lifecycle improvements that include: roof replacement, heating, ventilation and air conditioning replacement, window replacement, etc. Therefore, investment in these dwellings is likely to increase. Altogether, 6% of London’s housing stock is in need of major repair—more than 8,700 private dwellings.

In a recent assessment of social housing building conditions, the stock remains mostly in good condition. There are three properties in fair condition and 31 properties noted as being in fair/good condition. Of those in the fair/good category, most are older buildings from the late 1960s and at an age of building maturity when investment becomes increasingly necessary to protect the asset. Of the three properties in fair condition, two of them are just over 20 years-old. Without continued investment, routine maintenance and capital repairs, there is a strong probability that properties considered in good condition today will slip into fair condition or worse.

The Relationship Between Housing and Quality of Life

Quality of life is impacted by affordable housing, especially when it is spread throughout a community as opposed to concentrated.

Households who live in affordable housing that is concentrated with other affordable housing and in high poverty areas have a poor quality of life and are more prone to psychological distress, exposure to violence and traumatic events.

Location of housing matters on a number of levels, from decreasing stressors to improving mental health, improving education outcomes of school aged children to access to food.

As London implements additional affordable housing, it is important and necessary that the housing be as mixed as possible throughout the broader community. As discussed in the segment on the growth of London, a variety of instruments from a planning and policy perspective are necessary to ensure the mix comes to fruition. As London embarks upon revitalizing larger tracks of land, it is important that a range of housing options be considered, not just one housing type or price point.

It is also important that we build upon the momentum and knowledge gained through the Strengthening Neighbourhoods work. Initiated in 2008, this strategy aims to make all neighbourhoods within London strong, with a good quality of life.

The Relationship Between Housing and Health

Health outcomes are improved through adequate, appropriate and affordable housing. The

Several sex workers died last fall because the case management in this city is inconsistent. London CAReS was very helpful in making Londoners aware but it needs to be expanded to solve the essential problem...we need to house people.

— London Police Officer
World Health Organization’s Commission on the Social Determinants of Health recognizes poor housing as one of the main determinants of health. In addition, the recent Senate Report *In From the Margins: A Call to Action on Poverty, Housing and Homelessness* recognizes that poverty and homelessness impact health outcomes, acknowledge that illness exacerbates poverty and can even lead some households into poverty. The Senate Report further notes that even with universal health care, the experience of accessing doctors and hospitals is different for the rich than it is for the poor.

When examining those most lacking housing, people who are homeless are subject to higher mortality rates and more chronic health ailments, and an examination of self-reported health once a homeless person has achieved housing provides clear evidence regarding the value of housing in conjunction with human health. The importance of housing in addressing the health needs of homeless persons cannot be overstated. Research has demonstrated the difficulty that homeless people face managing their medications, following a prescribed diet and attending follow-up appointments without having stability in their housing.

When housing is affordable relative to household means, health outcomes also improve as the household has access to funds for the purchase of more nutritious food. Food security and appropriate, affordable housing, also improves quality of life.

For low-income households with children, it has also been shown that children who are in a household receiving subsidies are healthier than those who do not. Iron deficiencies, and underdevelopment are more common amongst children in low-income families that do not receive a housing subsidy. Other research has suggested that positive health impacts of affordable housing on children increase over time.

Housing that is affordable also helps households manage chronic diseases such as hypertension, HIV/AIDS and diabetes, as they are better able to maintain their treatment regimens. The stability of housing has also proven to have positive affects in helping persons with chronic diseases improve their health outcomes and maintain the level of care they need for their chronic illness.

One focus of the London CAReS initiative is to improve the health outcomes of the City’s street involved, substance using population. Early implementation of London CAReS has focused on community participation and connecting with service users. This has resulted
in an increased understanding of the people served by CARES, the street-involved people who are in need in the community, and a preliminary understanding of which interventions are working and where there are gaps in meeting service needs. Understanding this, the next phase of London CARES will incorporate, as planned, a greater housing focus with a mix of housing and supports that is affordable to those individuals who are being assisted through the initiative.

For many low-income households, including several in London, “doubling up” with other households is a strategy employed to address housing affordability and avoid homelessness. Doubling up should not be confused with inter-generational or multi-generational housing. With doubling up, there is an inadequate amount of space for the multiple households that are sharing the living space. This overcrowding is shown to increase stress, have negative impacts on mental health, negatively impact relationships, and increase disease transmission.59

London’s Leadership Role with Other Orders of Government and Within the Community in Addressing Homelessness and Housing Needs

London is demonstrating leadership and is a partner with other orders of government and the community in working to address homelessness and housing needs.

Municipalities have gained expertise through strategy development, management, program implementation and experience since the devolution of social housing from the Province in 2000. Municipalities are not “just another stakeholder”. Municipalities establish social and housing policy, fund affordable housing programs, establish homeless programs and services policy, manage and fund income assistance programs and manage and fund social housing programs. Unequivocally, Service Manager Municipalities are partners with other orders of government in addressing homeless and housing needs.

Whether by default or design, the City of London is a pillar within the region. London is the engine for the area economy, a hub for the arts, a centre for higher education, a regional centre for mental health care, a centre for criminal justice services and a destination for emergency shelter services—London is clearly recognized as a destination and resource to surrounding communities.

Meeting the needs of London’s most vulnerable and disadvantaged residents is undertaken by the non-profit sector in matters of both housing and homelessness. While the City is a partner with other orders of government, the Municipality is a partner with non-profit organizations, as well. All four homeless shelters in London are owned and operated by non-profits. Initiatives ranging from London CARES to Hostels to Homes are delivered by non-profits at the frontline level and, with the exception of rent supplements provided in private rental accommodation, government assisted housing in London is provided by non-profits.

“I was raised by alcoholics and started drinking when I was 8 or 9. When I was 11, my father left. My mother couldn’t afford to keep me so she told me to find another home. When I was 34, I had trouble with the police [armed robbery] and a condition of my release from Penetang was to find a shelter in London.

– Homeless Person
The table below provides an overview of the social housing sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th># of Groups</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public Housing        | London Middlesex Housing Corporation  
Shareholder: City of London  
Managed by LMHC                | 1           | 31            | 3,282       | 100% Rent Geared to Income (RGI)                                                                                |
| Private Non-Profit    | Owned by sponsor organizations such as churches and service clubs, and either self-managed or managed through a property management company. Boards are all volunteer. | 27          | 37            | 1,815       | Approximately 70% of the Non-Profit units are designated for RGI Housing, the rest are market rent—not subsidized.  
Market rent applicants apply directly to the non-profit.                                                      |
| Co-op Non-Profit      | Housing co-operatives are similar to other non-profit housing corporations. However, the volunteer Board of Directors is comprised from the members of the co-operative. Each resident has a voice and participates in the day-to-day operation of the co-op. | 16          | 16            | 1,122       | Approximately 70% of the Co-op units are designated for RGI Housing, the rest are market rent—not subsidized.  
Market rent applicants apply directly to the co-op.                                                             |
| Federal Non-Profit    | Owned by sponsor organizations such as churches and service clubs, and either self-managed or managed through a property management company. The Boards are all volunteer. | 20          | 27            | 1,357       | Very few of the Federal Non-Profit units are designated for RGI housing, most are market rent—not subsidized.  
Federal Non-Profit housing providers are not required to participate in the centralized waiting list and applicants apply directly to the non-profit. |
| Rent Supplement Program | Private market. Tenants pay their portion of the rent (30% of gross household income) to the private sector landlord and the LMHC provides the Rent Supplement to the landlord—the difference between the tenant portion of the rent and the landlord market rent. | 25          | -             | 484         | Rent Supplement Programs include:  
- Commercial  
- Ontario Community Housing Assistance Program (OCHAP)  
- Strong Communities Housing Allowance Rent Supplement (HARS) component of the Canada-Ontario New Affordable Housing Program. |
The City’s leadership in working with the non-profit community, is different depending on the situation, funding source and circumstances. In some instances, the relationship is a Purchase of Service – the delivery of a service based upon certain criteria and funding structure, i.e., homeless shelters. In other instances, the City works to broker access to health, mental health or addiction services or change discharge planning from corrections on behalf of the community non-profits. At other times, the City advocates for regulatory or policy changes that will improve operations, increase efficiencies or protect the investment such as non-profit housing. Sometimes, the City engages in community development strategies in partnership with the non-profit sector or creates a policy framework and program innovation to bring non-profit partners to the table. The University spearheaded new projects with the community-based sector that the City has supported. As a leader, the City of London has valued the role of non-profits and has a proven track-record of working with these organizations. The City will continue to develop engagement strategies with non-profits that are appropriate to the specific circumstances.

The Relationship between Social Assistance and Housing

One of the areas in which London meets the needs of its residents is through Ontario Works. The City of London is a Consolidated Municipal Services Manager (CMSM). CMSMs were created as part of the devolution of certain housing and social service programs from the Province of Ontario to municipalities. As a CMSM, London is responsible for carrying out the funding and administrative responsibilities of the Social Housing Reform Act, as well as Ontario Works – and other areas such as child care. The Province of Ontario provides the legislative and regulatory framework for the delivery of Ontario Works.

Ontario Works, coupled with the Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP is a provincially run social assistance program), are the income benefits most often sought from government by those in need. Case loads for Ontario Works and the Ontario Disability Support Program have grown. There are almost 10,000 cases currently on the Ontario Works case load with another 9,000 cases receiving ODSP supports. The increase over the past five years alone cannot be overlooked. While part of the increase can be attributed to the economic downturn, there are other reasons involved. Moreover, while some of the increase in the ODSP case loads can be attributed to individuals on OW being eligible for and receiving ODSP, the complementary decrease in OW did not accompany this in any way.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASELOADS</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OW</td>
<td>7,765</td>
<td>7,515</td>
<td>7,524</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>9,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSP</td>
<td>7,444</td>
<td>7,783</td>
<td>8,267</td>
<td>8,595</td>
<td>9,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of London, Community Services, 2010
Individuals who need to rely on social assistance to meet their housing needs have difficulty meeting their housing needs, affordably, within the private market. Even a bachelor apartment is unaffordable to many on Ontario Works. People on ODSP receive more assistance on a monthly basis but they also experience limited affordable housing options.

The majority of Ontario Works services are offered through one primary downtown location. There are also two smaller community based sites that have shown promise in meeting the needs of local communities. The need for social assistance can be found throughout London. It is important to think about Ontario Works services and offices as centres for opportunity—service hubs within neighbourhoods. It is time to examine opportunities for expansion of these hubs to ensure integrated access within neighbourhoods where services are most needed.

Another component of Ontario Works within the scope of responsibilities of the CMSM is emergency shelters. There are four emergency shelter locations in London operated by three non-profit providers. Violence Against Women shelters are within the purview of the Province, not the Municipality. Funding for emergency shelters is cost-shared on an 80/20 basis with the Province of Ontario using a per diem based model. Shelter providers receive funding only for occupied beds. Consideration to other operating models have been suggested to the Province which would increase the incentive for shelter providers to help residents leave the shelter for permanent housing while addressing the operating sustainability issues presented by such a change in funding approach.

Understanding Service Demands and Needs

While there are indicators of service demands and needs, it is currently difficult to assess the full scope of those needs.

There are demands on homeless program and service providers that demonstrate one of the extreme ends of the spectrum of need. Since 2002, there has been a significant increase in shelter beds from 240 to its current fixed shelter beds of 360. The number of unique individuals occupying shelter beds has also increased dramatically from 6,048 in 2002 to almost 12,000 five years later.

The extent of demand relative to availability of services, however, remains unknown in London. The City has responded in part to the assumed level of services need by locating two satellite Ontario Works offices in Glen Cairn and South London to better serve people who may find it difficult to access the primary, downtown location. Shelter use is just one indicator but it is a compelling one. There are no rigorous, valid estimates for the number of unsheltered homeless individuals and/or “hidden” homeless individuals in London, i.e., couch surfers. It is difficult—if not impossible—for the City to gauge and manage a response to an issue that is not robustly measured. The City has a desire to move from an output approach to measurement to one of outcomes that is correlated to investments and other inputs. This will better inform a plan to accurately forecast the amount of affordable housing required for its most vulnerable residents including housing with supports, supportive housing and interim housing. This change in approach would also determine the return on investment for the City and its partners. It will also influence the sub-targets

I was #13 on the waiting list one week and then #53 two weeks later when I decided to go back on the streets. When I returned here four months later after my leg got infected, I was #90 on the list.

– Person in Transitional Housing
within the Strategy. Such an approach will also help differentiate between street involved persons (who may be housed) and their needs, and, persons who are homeless.

Furthermore, there is no homelessness management information system that is shared across service providers, yet it is clear from discussions with homeless individuals, low-income tenants and service providers that there is a clear overlap in the services being used. Much of what emerges as data from homeless programs and service providers is actually a "narrative of need." There are cross-referenced indicators from the shelter system and Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program case loads but without a direct and defensible understanding of the demand. Simply stated, the situation is intuitively real but the evidence is slim. Anecdotes are being used liberally to replace data and it limits effective decision-making regarding service levels, types, coordination, etc.

The City has been working with service providers and has an interest in shared data management strategies. At one point, the City considered the Federal Government’s Homeless Individuals and Families Information System. After a more thorough analysis and consultation with homeless service providers, the City is no longer considering the system because the system would not meet the needs of the community. There has been support for increasing appropriate data sharing. It is acknowledged that in addition to a homelessness management information system, an appropriate homelessness management information strategy is required. The strategy will take into consideration some existing systems used by service providers, the mobility of people across service providers, privacy and confidentiality, type of data needed, costs and the role of the Province.

There are also demands on non-profit housing providers. But, like homeless service providers, the available data does not necessarily provide an accurate portrait or proof of need. Below is a snapshot of the Social Housing Waiting List, which is administered by the London Housing Access Centre.

**Social Housing Waiting List by Household Size & Type: September 30, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Group</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>1 bdr</th>
<th>2 bdr</th>
<th>3 bdr</th>
<th>4 bdr</th>
<th>5 bdr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Dependents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with no Dependents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Households</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4,329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data from the Waiting List is unreliable. It does not reflect all housing providers, as some housing providers do not use the list. Furthermore, the nature of how people apply to the list and update their applications does not reflect shifts in that household from their time of application. The Waiting List needs to be reviewed and improved.
Policy and Funding Challenges to the Social Housing Sector

The challenges to the social housing sector come from both a policy and funding perspective and they interface with both the Provincial and Federal governments.

Annual federal spending on existing social housing is in decline. These are planned expenditure reductions. From 2007 to 2012, federal funding to the City for existing social housing programs will be reduced by $379,754 and by 2035 the reduction of subsidies to London will be over $8.7 Million.

The gradual reduction in federal non-profit housing program subsidies also reduces the ability of social housing providers to offer rent-geared-to-income subsidies to tenants. Over the next 12 years, this will result in 1,357 lost rental subsidies. The reduction in federal funding also impacts provincial non-profit, cooperative and public housing. Under the Social Housing Reform Act 2000, the City is legislated to provide 5,939 rent-geared-to-income units.

Another challenge is that federal block funding is not indexed to inflation. While costs go up, funding is being reduced and the differences in costs are borne by municipal taxes. The federal government has held the view that social housing should be self-supporting once its mortgage is retired. But, the reality in London demonstrates that this is not true.

Approximately 60% of tenants in social housing in London receive Ontario Works or Ontario Disability Support Program benefits. OW and ODSP tenants in private sector housing receive a maximum shelter allowance which is considerably higher than the rent scale as established by the Province. The rent scale cannot be adjusted locally and it has not changed since 1993. The discrepancy between the maximum shelter allowance attained in private sector housing and that which is received in social housing has resulted in negative revenue growth for social housing providers.

Furthermore, the ability of London to be a local decision-maker on all matters of housing policy is restricted by provincial legislation and mandates. Legislation does not permit London to demonstrate complete responsiveness or innovation in areas such as making victims of domestic violence a special priority for social housing. Legislative constraints limit the City’s ability to ensure that people get the housing they need and limits flexibility in the response to local needs.

Even with the legislative limitations, the City has maintained its commitment to new affordable housing and has met most of the objectives of the last Affordable Housing Strategy prepared in 2005. The City of London has exhausted its allocation under the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program (COAHP). Since 2004, the City of London has committed to 1,134 new affordable rental units, and has leveraged $20.2 Million in municipal funding and over $79 Million in private sector funding under COAHP. But, there is no way of determining if the investment in affordable housing is strategically meeting the needs of the broad range of groups requiring affordable housing, and it should be noted that while 28% of all new affordable housing is set at either the OW or ODSP shelter allowance rate or are rent-

Property Managers don’t have the skills or desire to deal with tenants who have special needs.

— Frontline Worker
geared-to-income, most of the building initiatives under the program have been for 80% or 70% of CMHC average market rent – not reaching many of those with the lowest incomes. Not all affordable housing is created equal, nor do all groups that may request affordable housing dollars have the same depth of need.

Affordability is a comparative word, an evaluative word, a moral word and a scientific word. The meaning depends on context, intent and audience.

While all social housing is affordable, not all affordable housing is social.

**Action Plan Development**

Discuss and debate each idea in the small group.
Don’t be afraid to have a “devil’s advocate”.
Complete an Action Plan sheet for each idea which includes:
- What is the idea?
- What is the problem the idea addresses?
- Why is the idea necessary?
- Which resources, if any, can be used to make the idea happen?
- Who, generally, needs to be involved in implementing the idea?
- How should the outputs and outcomes of the idea be measured when implemented?
- When, generally, should the idea be implemented?
- How valuable and difficult is the idea?
- Contact details if consultants have follow-up questions
This section of the Strategy highlights:

1. The Meaning of “Affordability”
2. The Difference Between Affordable Housing and Social Housing
3. Defining “Affordable” in Policy
4. Core Housing Need

**The Meaning of “Affordability”**

*Affordability* is a comparative word, an evaluative word, a moral word and a scientific word. The meaning depends on context, intent and audience.

‘Affordable housing’ begs the questions: Affordable to whom? Affordable based on what criteria? Is it relative or absolute? Is affordable housing necessary due to a lack of personal productivity or a lack of opportunity? Is it intended to meet a short-term need or should it be designed to provide permanent, sustainable tenure? Is it a reflection of income insufficiency or social status?

**The Difference Between Affordable Housing and Social Housing**

Affordable Housing is often confused with social housing. While all social housing is affordable, not all affordable housing is social. The type of affordable housing is contingent on the mechanisms by which the housing is created, including: the funding program, intended audience, role of non-profits, government and private sector. All of these factors determine the type of affordable housing.

**Defining “Affordable” in Policy**

Over time, government investments in affordable housing have changed along with measures about what constitutes affordable. With a retreat of investment from the significant affordable housing construction levels of the 1970s and 1980s, the new approach to building affordable housing frequently assembles funding from all orders of government, mortgages from private banks and taps into reserve funds. Usually, some type of fundraising is also used as a measure of the business or community’s sensitivity towards affordable housing.

Current policy discussion on affordability - as it pertains to rental housing - is most often understood as the cost of the rent relative to the household’s income or the cost of the rent relative to other rents within the municipality.

Current, policy discussion on affordability - as it pertains to rental housing - is most often understood as the cost of the rent relative to the household's income or the cost of the rent relative to other rents within the municipality. It is not uncommon for a broader definition of affordability to be used by consumers, housing providers and advocates. There is also general agreement that households spending 50% or more of the gross household income on housing are at greater risk of homelessness. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation refers to this situation as “severe housing affordability problems.”
In London, according to 2006 Census data, 27% of households spend more than 30% of their income on shelter and 44% of renters spend more than 30% of their income on rent. These percentages remained relatively stable from the previous Census. The table below shows affordability by family type, renters and owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing affordability by family type, renters and owners, 2006</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Spending less than 30% of household income on housing costs</th>
<th>Spending 30% or more of household income on housing costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - Household type</td>
<td>145,145</td>
<td>105,600</td>
<td>39,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households</td>
<td>95,185</td>
<td>77,745</td>
<td>17,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only households</td>
<td>88,765</td>
<td>72,375</td>
<td>16,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple family households</td>
<td>74,505</td>
<td>63,795</td>
<td>10,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without children</td>
<td>34,415</td>
<td>29,455</td>
<td>4,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children</td>
<td>40,085</td>
<td>34,340</td>
<td>5,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-parent family households</td>
<td>14,265</td>
<td>8,580</td>
<td>5,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family households</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family households</td>
<td>49,955</td>
<td>27,855</td>
<td>22,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person households</td>
<td>43,490</td>
<td>23,690</td>
<td>19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more person households</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>4,165</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Core Housing Need

It is imperative, however, that ‘affordability’ is only considered as one part in understanding housing need. The other two elements are adequacy and suitability. Together, affordability, adequacy and suitability make up Core Housing Need. Acceptable housing—Non-Core is defined as:

Adequate and suitable shelter that can be obtained without spending 30% or more of before-tax household income. Adequate shelter is housing that is not in need of major repair. Suitable shelter is housing that is not crowded, meaning that it has sufficient bedrooms for the size and make-up of the occupying household. The subset of households classified as living in unacceptable housing and unable to access acceptable housing is considered to be in core housing need.70-71

Within the London Census Metropolitan Area, the 2006 Census noted 22,625 households in Core Housing Need – an incidence of 12.8%.72 While in terms of incidence this represented a decrease from 13.2% in 2001, it was an increase of almost 1,000 households—21,640 up to 22,625.

Provide funding and incentives to private sector such as rent supplements for the working poor and this would decrease the number of applicants on the waiting list, create a better mix of economic strata in the neighbourhoods and reduce vacancy rates.

— Participant, Community Consultations
This section of the Strategy highlights:
1. London's Commitment to the Strategy
2. Other Orders of Government and Homelessness
3. Other Orders of Government and Housing
4. Other Orders of Government and Income Supports
5. Merging Local Objectives with Those of Other Orders of Government

London's Commitment to the Strategy

The City of London is committed to achieving the objectives of this strategy and the City acknowledges that each order of government has a role to play. The City will assist in the development and implementation of a long-term, national and provincial affordable housing and homelessness strategy that reflects the needs of London’s residents. The City is interested in working with the provincial and federal government to establish a broad legislative and policy framework for housing and homelessness with outcome-based accountability. The framework should also identify the respective roles of the three levels of government regarding housing and homelessness. The commitment on the part of the Municipality cannot be overlooked or understated.

The City commits $2 Million each year to new affordable housing development. It follows provincial and federal requirements in managing housing issues, provides input into policy discussions and provides oversight to housing administration.

When it comes to homelessness, the City has been the catalyst for a number of innovations, provides a policy framework for service implementation, contributes to federal and provincial policy discussions, and monitors program implementation. The City also contributes funding to Ontario Works, provides a 20% cost share of emergency shelter per diems and provides City staffing to support a range of homeless programs and services each year.

The role of planning is also an important one by creating policies reflective to community needs and adhering to the regulations and frameworks created by the Province.

In addition, other City initiatives in assisting community development and creating healthy and engaged neighbourhoods, services to groups such as children and youth, newcomers, seniors, etc. as well as the administration of income supports are also integral to the overall strategy.

Other Orders of Government and Homelessness

Both the Provincial and Federal governments—most often in isolation of each other—provide funding for homeless services and have a policy framework for addressing homelessness.

The Provincial government, through the Ministry of Community and Social Services, provides annual funding to London to fund homeless programs and services such as the $544,213 in Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program in 2010, as well as an 80% cost share in the per diems of emergency shelter and other services. The City of London, in
its role as a Service Manager, has a strong role to play in strategically determining where and how to invest this funding in the local community for the delivery of homeless programs and services. Provincial funding has often been considered a more stable funding source for homeless programs and services than that provided by the Federal government.

London’s role in the management, delivery and funding role of the Provincial Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program and other initiatives that provide homelessness intervention and prevention services include (in gross figures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>2009 Allocations</th>
<th>2010 Allocations</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Prevention Strategy (HPS)</td>
<td>$ 527,372</td>
<td>$ 513,214</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Strategy</td>
<td>$ 539,690</td>
<td>$ 544,213</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Anti-Poverty Task Force</td>
<td>$ 185,000</td>
<td>$ 185,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heat and Warmth Program (THAW)</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>Note 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Emergency Fund</td>
<td>$ 69,150</td>
<td>$ 69,150</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Bank</td>
<td>$ 188,200</td>
<td>$ 188,200</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London CAReS</td>
<td>$ 1,150,255</td>
<td>$ 1,250,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>$ 6,077,930</td>
<td>$ 6,115,356</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domiciliary Hostels</td>
<td>$ 299,022</td>
<td>$ 299,022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 9,136,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 9,264,410</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1. Reflects April 1 to March 31 fiscal contract approvals
2. London CMSM approved allocation
3. For 2009, there was a further $100,000 provided late 2008 under MAPAG. Effective 2010, annual allocations have been adjusted to be provided in the same calendar year.
4. This budget also covered a $300,000 annual allocation for the direct program costs of the Hostels to Homes program. For 2010 there is approximately $150,000 allocated to cover the program costs until the program winds down June 30, 2010.

These programs are delivered by community-based non-profit organizations, with an annual investment of over $9 Million. The outputs of these initiatives do not seem reliable enough to publicly report and outcomes are not comprehensively indicated.

The Ministries of Health and Long-term Care and Community Safety and Correctional Services also impact homelessness and related programs and services. This is largely due to the interaction with health, mental health and addictions as well as incarceration and interaction with the law experienced by homeless persons. Children and Youth services should not be overlooked as the needs of homeless children and youth need to be met.
The Federal government through Service Canada—first the Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative and now through the Homelessness Prevention Strategy—provides funding to local communities to address homelessness, subject to the approval by the Federal government of the Community Plan. London receives $513,214 per year in this regard. It is a common concern within the community-based sector that this seems to be lower than other communities of similar size across Canada – and even other communities within Ontario relative to the size of the population such as Hamilton, Windsor, Waterloo and Niagara. The formula used by the Federal government is a dated one, and one that is based on data that is 10 years old. The Federal source of funding for homeless programs is not as stable as the Provincial funding and, therefore, is not a source of stable, predictable and ongoing operating funding for organizations.

In the most recent Community Plan on Homelessness prepared for approval by the Federal government in order to receive federal funding through the Homelessness Partnership Strategy, the following initiatives were named as community priorities:

- Meeting the housing and service needs of urban Aboriginal people who are chronically or episodically homeless.
- Increasing supports including transitional housing for women who are chronically or episodically homeless.
- Developing comprehensive services for chronically homeless substance users and persons with concurrent disorders.
- Focusing on improvement of current programs, services and housing provision (transitional, supportive, and social housing) that are not adequately geared or funded to meet the key needs and problems of those seeking and maintaining safe, affordable and adequate housing.
- Providing youth who are chronically or episodically homeless with unique issues and a lack of housing options support services such as: health issues, concurrent disorders, addictions, isolation, lack of advocacy and lack of awareness of services available.

Projects are developed and delivered that align with these priorities of the Community Plan. Services are delivered by community-based non-profit organizations, with an annual investment of $513,214. The Federal government determines the program parameters and which types of initiatives are eligible for funding and which are not. For example, while transitional housing can be eligible, permanent housing is not technically allowed.

Unlike some communities in Ontario, London municipal staff do not directly provide services to homeless people in shelters or through outreach. However, London has a very important role to play as a Service Manager by establishing standards, funding services and monitoring outputs and outcomes as part of the contract oversight process and as part of policy development.

The investments made by the Provincial and Federal governments have not, thus far, ended homelessness in London. Even initiatives such as Hostels to Homes and London CAREs—have shown both innovation and promise—warrant review and changes to better align with the Strategy. Hostels to Homes, a pilot initiative within OW, will end on June 2010. The
Province has deferred further commitments on this strategy to its Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy. Despite this, there remains great opportunities to build on the learnings and outcomes of Hostels to Homes in the London Community Housing Strategy.

Similarly, London CARES, a program designed around a municipal drug strategy with a priority population of those experiencing addictions, mental health issues, and homelessness in the core areas, has greatly influenced the community’s understanding of its vulnerable population. Understanding this, the next phase of London CARES will incorporate a greater housing focus with a mix of housing and supports that is affordable to those individuals who are being assisted through the initiative. Funding from other orders of government is necessary to realize all of the potential benefits from CARES.

Local investments need to be aligned with ending homelessness, not managing it. The cure for homelessness is housing. As David Hulchanski of the University of Toronto points out: “…while homelessness isn’t only a housing problem, it is always a housing problem”. An updated Community Plan on Homelessness will be created that is informed by this Strategy, and take into account the direction that London CARES and programs similar to Hostels to Homes will play in focusing on permanent solutions to homelessness in London.

Other Orders of Government and Housing

Both the Provincial and Federal governments after devolution and, in some instances, as a consequence of devolution, remain involved with housing by providing funding and various programs, legislation and policies.

The Province most directly impacts how government assisted housing is administered. This is done through the Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA), a prescriptive piece of legislation that details operating agreements. Considerable opportunities for local innovation are restricted as a result of the SHRA. To increase the effectiveness and responsiveness of London as a Service Manager, there are several changes required, including:

- Shelter Allowance & Rent and Utility Scales,
- Special Priority Policy,
- Ability to borrow against the equity in social housing assets to address capital repairs, and
- Properly addressing the expiring operating agreements to provide for long-term stable financing.

The Province also directly impacts many other important aspects of housing. This includes legislation that outlines the rights and responsibilities of landlords and tenants and rental increases for in-situ tenants. It also includes planning legislation through the Provincial Policy Statement, the Planning Act and new considerations like Bill 198 which is focused on inclusionary zoning. The City has supported Bill 198 in principle but cannot commit to it becoming legislation without understanding the policy framework and tools for implementation. The Ontario Human Rights Code is also a consideration in housing since all residents have the right to equal treatment in housing without discrimination.
The Federal government impacts housing through their legacy investments in housing, as well as new programs. Federal subsidies for existing social housing cease each time the mortgage is paid off for a social housing project. As a result, by 2035 the reduction of subsidies to London will be over $8.7 Million. It should also be noted that federal contributions are not linked to inflation. While funding goes down, costs go up and the difference is covered by municipal taxes.

Meanwhile, the Federal government, through the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program, is investing in new affordable housing. This should not be confused with social housing or the approaches to government-assisted housing development that were present in Canada until the mid-90s. The federal government recently made a five-year commitment to the Affordable Housing Initiative of $1.2 Billion. The first two years featured $352 Million for repairs to existing housing stock, $185 Million for seniors and persons with disabilities and $87.5 Million to extend other existing programs from homeownership to northern housing. The federal-provincial discussions are intended to set the framework for the final three years of the program and the remaining $575 Million. A notional allocation is preferred for London. This Strategy was completed in June 2010 and the exact amount that London will receive over the next five years was unknown. However, with this Strategy, London will be well positioned to move quickly and activate elements of this Strategy that are aligned with future provincial and federal funding.

Collectively, the Provincial and Federal responses to new housing represent an “on again, off again” relationship. A long-term, comprehensive strategy is needed on their part. This is a strategy that will require predictable funding sources and which will value London as an equal partner in local decision-making. London needs the flexibility to align funding opportunities from other orders of government with the strategies as outlined in this plan.

**Other Orders of Government and Income Supports**

A discussion regarding the roles of other orders of government and housing and homeless services is not complete without a discussion of income supports that are vital to meeting the needs of a range of people and a critical element in the fabric of the social safety net.

Income supports are fragmented in funding and administration. Roles, responsibilities, policy landscape and regulations vary considerably. The Province is prescriptive in the administration of Ontario Works which is cost shared with municipalities and delivered locally. The Ontario Disability Support Program is vital to many low-income and homeless persons. It is largely paid for and delivered provincially but recipients rely upon municipal and community delivered and funded services such as case management—case management is not provided through ODSP. While the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review will gradually reposition some of the costs to the Province, the City remains the major contributor but with little local discretion.
There is also the issue of the amount of funding available through these income supports. Regardless of where a person lives in the Province, the rates are the same. A single person in London on Ontario Works receives $221 each month to meet their basic needs and an additional $364 to meet accommodation needs. Meanwhile, the average rent for a bachelor apartment is currently $539—$46 remains. If a single person on Ontario Works dipped into their basic needs to afford a bachelor at that price, it leaves $1.53 per day to meet all other living expenses such as food, transportation and clothing.

Ontario Works recipients would benefit from other amendments to the program. This would assist the City and community-based organizations to better serve low-income households in London. Examples of possible amendments include making improvements to eligibility criteria and, in particular, how assets, vehicles and Registered Retirement Savings Plan money are considered; increasing the size of the benefit to better assist people in meeting basic needs within the local context ranging from additional benefits for food to transportation assistance, and, removing disincentives to work.

The current Ontario Works rules discourage people from trying to find work for the first three months that they are in the program and from being innovative enough to start their own business. Removing disincentives could include allowing Ontario Work recipients to keep a portion of their benefits during the first three months of employment, allowing people to keep 50% of what they earn from self-employment, and also giving consideration to case-by-case loans for exceptional circumstances. This would increase stability in the transition from Ontario Works to employment.

Organizations such as the Child & Youth Network have been working to articulate these positions as outlined in the City of London’s Child and Youth Network Position Paper Submission to the Cabinet Committee on Poverty Reduction. The London Community Housing Strategy is another opportunity to echo the importance of making these changes to improve access to housing and overall housing stability.

**Merging Local Objectives with Those of Other Orders of Government**

The structures established by other orders of government complicate or work as a disincentive to develop a coherent local strategy that meets the needs of Londoners across the housing continuum. While rumours abound concerning Cross-Ministerial Initiatives, most often ministries within the Province and Federal governments continue to operate in silos. Just as the City has demonstrated leadership in this Strategy by addressing the needs of Londoners throughout the continuum, the strategic opportunity exists for various ministries to work together to develop a coherent, comprehensive framework. For example, at the Provincial level alone, harnessing the strengths and resources across various ministries such as Community and Social Services, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Community Safety and Correctional Services, Health and Long-term Care, and Children and Youth Services will produce better results and a more powerful and attainable policy agenda.

However, in the absence of other orders of government assembling operational partnerships across ministries, London will play a local leadership role bringing those vital partners from other orders of government to the table on local matters. London will inspire inno-
vation and champion change at a local level to get the best services and housing for its residents while holding other orders of government responsible for that which is within their purview to fund or manage. In discussions with other orders of government, London will continue to assert that it is an equal partner, not just another stakeholder.

The City is keen to work with its partners in other orders of government to create and amend policies and programs that impact its residents. An example of a promising initiative in this regard is the discussions that the City has been participating in with Justice and Corrections, increasing awareness that mandating people to shelters is not an appropriate policy or programmatic response, and helping other orders of government better appreciate the implications of doing so. The City wants to work with those partners to create viable alternatives that are in the best interests of the individual and all orders of government.

The City is also actively engaged in forums that provide an opportunity for meaningful change that impacts local objectives. For example, the City participated in the consultation process to assist the Province of Ontario’s work on its Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy. The City is also participating in the Housing and Homeless Program Consolidation Working Group borne out of the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review to help appropriately align and consolidate programs, and contribute to the important work of the Human Services Implementation Steering Committee which is supporting the implementation of human services outcomes from the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review.
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The Link Between the London Community Housing Strategy and Council’s Strategic Plan

The City of London, Council Strategic Plan 2007-2010 has two strategic priorities that influenced the framework and line of inquiry for this Community Housing Strategy.

The first is Community Vitality. The goal of City Council, as named in the Strategic Plan, is “to assure the health, safety and well-being of individuals and families while promoting liveable and inclusive neighbourhoods”. Council envisions Community Vitality as “enhancing a creative, caring and engaged community”.

The second is Economic Prosperity. The goal of City Council, as named in the Strategic Plan, is “to accelerate the growth of a strong and vibrant economy and foster private sector investment in the City”. Council envisions Economic Prosperity as “creating an environment for a resilient, diversified and inclusive economy”.

Local experts indicate, “Inherent in these priorities is the provision of opportunities for all Londoners to contribute to these priorities. Too often, however, the absence of safe, appropriate and affordable housing becomes a barrier.”

Community Vitality and Economic Prosperity are Inextricably Intertwined

Community Vitality

Community Vitality is a concept that can be examined in four domains:

1. social engagement
2. social supports
3. community safety
4. attitudes towards others and community

It seeks to build social capital that bond people together in neighbourhoods and build bridges for people to new opportunities. It seeks to establish mutual caring and trust between residents, private sector, public sector and civil society organizations; improve the safety and well-being of all residents; keeping eyes on the street and reduce crime. It fosters both individual and collective wellbeing.
The recommendations contained within the Community Housing Strategy and the anticipated outcomes stemming from the implementation of those recommendations enhance the Community Vitality of London, and provides an opportunity for residents across the housing continuum to contribute to the Community Vitality of the City by:

- Increasing the opportunity of those benefitting from housing across the continuum to participate socially, civically and economically with the stability of appropriate and affordable housing,
- Reframing housing not solely as a commodity or a government benefit but, rather, the locus of community-based planning,
- Developing more housing, with greater mix throughout the City to meet the needs of a broad range of groups rather than a "one size fits all" approach,
- Rebuilding of social networks, across income strata and throughout mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods,
- Improving perceptions of safety through better distribution of housing and focus on ending homelessness and street involvement,
- Increasing supports to people once housed to promote better community integration,
- Avoiding over-saturation of social issues,
- Developing trust and increasing respect and understanding between residents, private sector, public sector and non-profit sector, while increasing partnership opportunities,
- Keeping the broader community of London informed on an annual basis of the progress being made in implementation, and
- Creating the opportunity for people to feel a sense of belonging, increasing the stability of their housing and the vibrancy of their neighbourhood.

Economic Prosperity

Economic Prosperity is a concept that can be explored through an examination of personal income, labour force participation, educational attainment, economic growth, employment distribution, housing suitability and affordability, and food security. It seeks economic prosperity for the public good not simply wealth generation of the individual—together, everyone achieves more. It increases the competitiveness of the City, the ability to attract new employers and cultivate new innovation. It strategically leverages local public assets. It encourages each individual to increase their self-sufficiency, contribute to the local economy and pay taxes. But it also appreciates that the measure of any community’s economic prosperity is how it cares for its most vulnerable.
With Council’s desire to attract private sector investment and have an inclusive economy, the recommendations contained within the Community Housing Strategy and the anticipated outcomes stemming from the implementation of those recommendations enhance the Economic Prosperity of London and provide an opportunity for residents across the housing continuum to contribute to Economic Prosperity of the City by:

- Increasing production of housing. This is one of the key indicators of economic health of any community as it creates and sustains jobs, and helps ensure that the range of housing stock and affordability is balanced to increase overall competitiveness,
- Prioritizing investment in the Strategy, thereby improving efficiencies with government funding,
- Maintaining the importance of affordable homeownership,
- Increasing housing with supports to help each individual achieve their full potential, including moving from Ontario Works to employment as they are able, as well as positioning some employment assistance initiatives to Supported Employment.
- Promoting prevention strategies to decrease economic costs of emergency provision of shelter,
- Protecting existing public assets through increased investment in capital repairs,
- Reclaiming surplus federal, provincial and municipal lands for affordable housing thereby decreasing development costs and allowing for lower rents, serving people with deeper economic need with less or no additional operational subsidy,
- Embracing environmental stewardship through the life cycle and in how communities are structured,
- Examining economic development potential in all new affordable housing development of three or more storeys, and
- Seeking cost recovery from other orders of government for money saved through decreased demands on emergency services.

“You need to instill hope in the community.”

– City Official
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**The Affordable Housing Task Force**

In 1999, London City Council created the Affordable Housing Task Force. The report of the Task Force was released in 2000. It provided a comprehensive analysis of the need for affordable housing in London and triggered a call to action. The result has been a decade of change, innovation, increased awareness and results. With leadership from City Council, committee structures such as the Council Housing Leadership Committee were formed and followed by various social policy initiatives that have all contributed to a mature awareness of housing and marginalization within the community. The non-profit and private sectors have contributed their expertise, knowledge, determination and commitment to address the challenge of meeting housing needs in London.

City government cannot do it alone. London and residents from across the City need Federal and Provincial partners as well as the continued commitment of the private and non-profit sectors to achieve the objectives of this Community Housing Strategy. A great deal of progress has been made over the past decade. Much work remains to be done.

---

Neighbourhoods need to have housing that meets needs throughout your entire life.

– Open House Participant
A Decade in Review: New Opportunities and New Challenges

The past decade has been one of new opportunities and new challenges.

Decade + in Review

The graphic above illustrates some of the milestones of the past decade. The milestones include:

- Report of the Affordable Housing Task Force: released in 2000, the report provided a comprehensive overview of housing, income and affordability issues. The report contained 12 major recommendations with multiple objectives pertaining to each recommendation.

- An Affordable Housing Strategy for the City of London: released in 2005, the Affordable Housing Strategy marked the first strategic update since the Task Force report in 2000, and it outlined 38 recommendations—discussed below.

• **Updated Official Plan:** By legislation, in 2006 London was required to undertake its five-year review of the Official Plan. This review was completed in 2008, with Council approving amendments in March 2008. In December 2009, the Minister approved the Official Plan amendments. At present there are 12 appeals to the amendment. The City will be bringing forward a motion to have the non-appealed portions brought into force and effect in the very near future.

• **Updated Provincial Policy Statement:** in 2005 the Province of Ontario updated its Provincial Policy Statement, including a section on housing. The Provincial Policy Statement provides direction related to land use, planning and development, and planning decisions at the local level must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. The updated Statement blended low-income and moderate-income definitions pertaining to housing affordability.

• **Social Housing Reform Act:** passed in December 2000, the Social Housing Reform Act provided the legislative framework for the transfer of social housing from the Province to Municipalities and how it operates. Regulations with the legislation provide further details on operations and can be updated from time to time. The City of London, as a local Service Manager, only has the authority to establish local rules in a limited number of areas as permitted by the Act.

• **Residential Tenancies Act:** came into force in January 2007, replacing the Tenant Protection Act, which had been the legislation governing landlord and tenant issues since 1998. The Residential Tenancies Act outlines everything from rent increase guidelines to the eviction process. Social housing is exempt from rent increases but private, affordable housing is not.

• **Ontario Poverty Reduction Strategy:** in 2009, after extensive consultation throughout the Province, the Government of Ontario released Breaking the Cycle, which sets a vision of reducing poverty amongst children by 25% over the next five years. The Strategy also focuses on potential changes in income supports through “Smarter Government” improvements to education and early learning, strengthening communities and longer-term commitments. The Strategy reinforces the importance of strong neighbourhoods and initiatives such as the Provincial Rent Bank to help prevent evictions.

• **Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program:** in 2005, the Federal and Provincial governments signed the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Agreement. The City of London exhausted its allocation under the Program. Altogether, 1,134 new affordable rental units were created, leveraging $20.2 Million in Municipal funding and over $79 Million in private sector funding under COAHP.

• **Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative (SCPI) and Homelessness Partnership Initiative (HPI):** SCPI began in 1999 and morphed into HPI after a change in government at the Federal level. Through these federally funded initiatives for homelessness, London developed several community plans on homelessness and has been able to pilot and test a range of innovative programs.
Hostels to Homes: after considerable advocacy on the part of Ontario municipalities, the Ministry of Community and Social Services allowed a pilot project in a handful of Ontario municipalities—including London—to use the provincial costs that would have been spent on shelter per diem funding to be used to support people in housing. Initiated in 2007, the program has gone through a few phases of refinement.

London CAReS: a 2007 “Made in London” innovation to improve health outcomes for those living with addiction, reduce the incidence of homelessness in London and enhance the quality of life and business prosperity in downtown/priority areas. London CAReS uses an outreach-based strategy to engage street involved individuals.

Municipal Housing Facilities By-law: created in 2002, this by-law aimed to increase the supply of affordable housing by having the Municipality provide financial or other assistance at less than fair market value to private and non-profit housing providers.

Affordable Housing Reserve Fund By-law: created in 2003, this by-law established an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund to provide capital funding support to non-profit housing providers, as well as partnerships between non-profit housing providers and the private sector for the development of housing for low-income and special needs households.

Local Convert to Rent Program: first established in 2004, and then amended in 2006 to include rehabilitation, the program provides capital funding to convert vacant or unused space into rental housing in return for a commitment to provide rent targeted at low-income households.

Housing Partnership Policy: established in 2007, the Housing Partnership Policy provides grants to non-profits that do not qualify under existing government affordable housing funding programs to support the development of new affordable housing in return for a commitment by the non-profit to meet specified affordability targets.

Residential Rental Unit Licensing By-law: created in 2010, this by-law applies to buildings containing four or fewer rental units including single detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and converted dwellings. The by-law addresses sub-standard housing conditions in rental units and protects the amenity, character and stability of residential areas. Licensing rental units in these smaller scale rental properties is intended to help the City identify and remedy unsafe and/or unhealthy building conditions.

Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review: saw in 2009 the devolution of various services and funding commitments to municipalities in the 90’s and was addressed in recent years through a review process between the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the City of Toronto and the Government of Ontario. The result of the review is a gradual uploading of costs over 10 years (up to 2018) of various activities currently funded by municipalities, including: Ontario Works, Ontario Disability Support Program and Ontario Drug Benefits. Housing and Homelessness Program Consolidation and Human Services Integration, emerging from
the PMFSDR note the need for consolidation of existing housing and homelessness programs into a housing service managed at the Municipal level. The goal of this review is to focus on enhancing the capacity of municipalities by coordinating community-based local service delivery and build on multi-year housing plans.

- **Changes in Leadership at the Provincial and Federal Orders of Government:** in 2003, Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberals came into power in the Province and replaced Ernie Eves and the Ontario PC Party. The PC Party had been in power from 1995. In 2006, Stephen Harper and the Conservative Party came into power Federally and replaced Paul Martin and the Liberals. The Liberals had been in power since 1993. The shifts at the Provincial and Federal orders of government brought changes in ideology, policy and direction in subtle and direct ways related to housing, social policy and income supports.

- **Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy:** initiated in 2008, this local strategy aimed to make all 42 neighbourhoods within London strong, with a good quality of life, walkable communities near amenities and parkland, a feeling of support and connectedness amongst neighbours, vibrant local businesses, clean streets and an environment that shuns crime and violence.

- **Kipps Lane Initiative:** demonstrated resolve to work with high need communities to improve neighbourhoods. In 2005/06, London Intercommunity Health Centre Needs and Capacity Inventory demonstrated that Kipps Lane had high risk indicators with respect to health, education, family and individual well-being including isolation and noted that the neighbourhood was under-serviced. The City has increased opportunities for community members to be involved and engaged in their neighbourhood, while supporting community leadership to build a strong and vibrant neighbourhood where residents can feel safe and proud.

- **Child and Youth Agenda:** in 2008, almost one in every four children was left behind due to poverty and experienced problems in school, health issues and social stresses. The City—in conjunction with community partners—developed “The Best for Our Children, Youth and Families: The First Three Years of London’s Child and Youth Agenda to 2015”. The Agenda priorities included ending poverty, increasing literacy, leading the nation in increasing healthy eating, healthy physical activity and creating a family-centred service system.

### Shifts in City Needs and Priorities Over the Past Decade

The composition of the City and the needs and priorities within the community over the past decade has also changed. These changes impact how the housing continuum needs to be considered, including:

- **Population increase:** from the 1996 to 2006 Census, London grew by over 8%. London is Canada’s 15th largest city and projections indicate continued growth. This needs to be reflective in all components of the housing and income continuums.

- **Increased number of dwellings:** from the 1996 to 2006 Census, the number of dwell-
ings in London increased by 12.4% from 129,415 to 145,525. Ownership dwellings represented the largest increase and rental dwellings showing a slight decline. Unlike other communities where condominium conversions of rental stock have been an issue, that is not the case in London. Growth in the number of dwellings, however, must reflect all components of the housing and income continuums.

- **Increases in homeless shelter beds**: throughout the decade the number of permanent homeless shelter beds rose dramatically. For example, there were 240 shelter beds in 2002, and now there are 360—a 64% increase. The current hostels forecast predicts demands on shelters to increase. A focus on housing longer-term shelter users who have experienced chronic homelessness will address the demand issue. Not only are they the most expensive users of the systems, chronic homeless individuals “block” the shelter system from performing its original mandate: short-term, infrequent use.

- **Changes in household composition**: from the 2001 to 2006 Census there is evidence of large increases in various types of households. For example, common-law households increased 19%, male-led, lone parent families increased 31%, never married households increased 13% and widowed households increased by 4%.

- **Aging of the population**: on average, the City is getting older. The median age was 35.4 years in 1996 and increased in almost three years to 38.2 in 2006. Also, in 2006, Statistics Canada projected that within 10 years, the number of people who can leave the workforce will exceed the number entering the workforce—the boomer impact will continue to impact the local landscape.

- **Waiting list for social housing**: a snapshot of the social housing waiting list demonstrates that it is households without dependents that are the group most represented on the waiting list for social housing.

- **Increase of Aboriginal people within the community**: from the 1996 to 2006 Census, there was an increase of 3,000 people of Aboriginal origins in the City—a 46% increase. Aboriginal people remain over-represented in the homeless and low-income populations of the City.

“Nothing about us, without us”, a mantra from persons with lived experience is apt.
• Increase in newcomers, immigrants and refugees in the community: from the 1996 to 2006 Census, there was a large increase in people of ethnic origins in London other than Canadian, Aboriginal, British Isles or French. The following table using Statistics Canada data summarizes the origins of the newcomers, immigrants and refugees to London:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Origins</th>
<th>Number: 1996 to 2006</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1,200 to 5,245</td>
<td>337%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>4,795 to 9,925</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>3,335 to 4,700</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>129,405 to 156,300</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin, Central &amp; South American</td>
<td>7,935 in 2006</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asian</td>
<td>635 to 4,010</td>
<td>531%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>4,165 to 6,820</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East &amp; Southeast Asian</td>
<td>9,035 to 15,790</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanic</td>
<td>415 in 2006</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 In 1996 there were no people recorded as being from these locations of ethnic origin.
6 In 1996 there were no people recorded as being from these locations of ethnic origin.

London is becoming much more diverse and the table above indicates that London is a community where people of different ethnic origins want to live.

Going forward, it’s important that targets are achievable.

The 2005 Affordable Housing Strategy

Moving forward with this Strategy requires us to analyze and learn from the 2005 Affordable Housing Strategy.

In 2005, an Affordable Housing Strategy for the City of London was created. It marked the first comprehensive update since the Affordable Housing Task Force report in 2000. Unlike this Strategy, which comprehensively examines the entire continuum of housing needs, the 2005 Strategy was largely focused on affordable housing.

The City has a strong track record of acting upon the 38 recommendations contained within the 2005 report:

• Regular updates to City Council and the Council Housing Leadership Committee on all matters related to housing within the City,
• A mix of low-income and moderate-income rents in new affordable housing developments,
• Stronger work with the Aboriginal community. Aboriginal organizations were granted funds for Aboriginal-specific housing,
• Successful implementation of Convert to Rent program, though not always in the way envisioned in the Strategy,
• Education on affordable housing through the City’s website and participation in various other community initiatives,
Successful creation of new supportive housing,
• Use of Municipal surplus lands for affordable housing,
• Good working relationship with London Property Management Association. The Association helped build interest in the Housing Allowance component of the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program,
• Thorough exploration by Planning regarding the Official Plan review process and encouraging mix of affordability in new developments,
• Annual investment of $2 Million to fund the various Municipal initiatives in the Strategy, and
• Increased support in the Housing Division.

Some action elements recommended in the report remain outstanding. In some instances, shifts in policy direction precluded implementation. In other instances, the work to achieve the recommendations extended beyond the 5-year time frame—some of those ideas are echoed in this Strategy. The recommendations not fully implemented include:
• Involvement of social housing residents and potential residents of new affordable housing in the construction of all new housing,
• Having a specific process for accessing surplus federal and provincial lands for affordable housing,
• Additional rent supplements beyond those that are part of existing programs or announcements,
• Reviewing the rules regarding parking standards and new affordable housing, and
• Reaching the target of 1,200 new affordable housing units or existing rent units made affordable by 2010.

Rate of Affordable Housing Development

The rate of affordable housing development cannot be overlooked.

The 2005 Strategy set a goal of creating 1,200 new affordable housing units or existing rental units made affordable by 2010. Including all new construction and supplements, 1,134 new units have been committed to since 2004. While this pre-dates the 2005 Strategy, it demonstrates that developing new units and using housing allowances is possible in London. However, the experience also taught the City a number of lessons that have been factored into the targets for the next five years of this Strategy.

Given the Strategy was prepared in December 2005 and that the recommendation was to achieve the goal by 2010, this can better be understood as 300 units per year in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. Going forward, it’s important that targets are achievable.

The 2005 targets were not achievable. The City exhausted its allocation of the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program and the City committed significant resources each year in affordable housing development as well as housing allowances. Simply stated, while the expertise and willingness was present to create more housing, the funding was inadequate to fully reach the targets.
The table below illustrates the new development, but does not include rent supplements. It demonstrates that in any given year, there will be projects that do not move forward. The units attributed to the 2002 Pilot Program were reported in the 2005 Strategy.

### Summary of Affordable Housing Committed by Year and Name of Program, 2002 - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Number of Units Approved</th>
<th>Number of Units Cancelled/Not Built</th>
<th>Total Number of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002 Pilot Program</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 RFP</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 RFP</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 RFP</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 EOI</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 RFP</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert to Rent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home at Last</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1224</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>1128</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL – 2006 to Present</strong></td>
<td><strong>965</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>873</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Continuation of Homelessness Throughout the Decade

Over the past 10 years, while there have been new programs, increased funding, and changes in delivery structure, homelessness remains in the London community.

As noted elsewhere in the Strategy, it is impossible to say whether homelessness has gone up or down since there are no reliable, comprehensive metrics across the service system. However, indicators of service use from shelter beds would seem to indicate increased demand and increased use but shelters only represent a component of the need and may be skewing our understanding of homelessness in the community.

Housing is the only known cure to homelessness. Permanent solutions to homelessness are therefore the focus of this Strategy to address homelessness. These solutions include an emphasis on proven prevention strategies, as well as implementation and ongoing support of evidence-based interventions by appropriately trained, professional staff.

Charitable responses are appropriate for meeting immediate needs on a short-term basis but are not meant to be the long-term solution to complicated social issues. A Canadian tradition, charitable responses from the community will remain invaluable to deal with the short-term need. However, it needs to be acknowledged that charitable organizations are limited in their scope, preparedness and training to deal with entrenched or chronic homelessness amongst people with multiple complex barriers. Therefore, we need to ensure that our community partners have the appropriate opportunities for professional development and training to meet today’s challenge of focusing on permanent solutions to homelessness.
This Strategy also values the contributions of persons with lived experience in the development of policies and programs to meet their needs, as experts in providing feedback on the effectiveness of program and policy approaches, and as valuable contributors to getting their peers involved and engaged in effective program responses. “Nothing about us, without us”, a mantra from persons with lived experience is apt. We will continue to seek opportunities for persons with lived experience to be engaged in delivering on the Strategy, in a manner that appreciates their experience, but also recognizes the moments when professional interventions are most appropriate – lived experience does not always equate to expertise. Roles need to be refined and/or defined.

Promising Innovations in Addressing Homelessness

The local response to homelessness demonstrates innovation and active involvement throughout the broader community. Ongoing refinements are necessary if the community is going to focus on permanent solutions to homelessness.

As mentioned elsewhere in the Strategy, considerable effort, resources, time, and community development in recent years has resulted in two innovations: London CAReS and Hostels to Homes.

London CAReS represents an investment of $1.15 Million in 2009 to achieve its objectives of improving health outcomes for those living with addiction, reducing the incidence of homelessness in London and enhancing the quality of life and business prosperity in downtown/priority areas.

The work of London CAReS through its outreach strategy in its early stages of implementation has increased awareness of the needs of the street involved population within London. As service users have been engaged by frontline workers, and as community partners have engaged in meaningful program discussions, a great deal has been learned about the effectiveness of the response and new opportunities to refine the approach have been identified. To date, the volume of needle exchange, the engagement of staff with people who are street involved and the introduction of Safe Havens for this population have all been positive steps. However, there is an understandable frustration amongst many people in the community concerning the perceived lack of reductions in street involvement and the low number of people achieving housing outcomes. Furthermore, service approaches across the partner organizations involved with CAReS are uneven.

Housing is a credible harm reduction instrument. Street involved clients with stable housing show reductions in substance use without any requirements that the clients reduce or stop using. The development of housing and availability of subsidies and supplements envisioned in this plan will support the housing objectives of a repurposed London CAReS.

London CAReS will be evaluated further and a new policy and program direction will accompany the updated Community Plan on Homelessness. Of particular emphasis in the examination of the next phase of London CAReS will be elements such as:

• An understanding of the case management approach to help service users achieve stable housing,
• Aligning access to housing from this Strategy to the needs of people served through London CAReS,
• Increasing the level of professionalism of staff through training, coaching, monitoring, as well as clear policies and procedures, standards of service, case planning and documentation,
• The City taking a more active role as the Service Manager,
• Improving landlord relations through quarterly roundtables, direct payment of rent and issue resolution mechanisms, and
• Prioritizing which clients are served, how acuity is measured and tracking supports and stages of change, with an emphasis on outcomes, not solely outputs.

Originally, London CAReS was a five year commitment with approximately four years left. The time to prepare for the next phase of the Initiative is now with a new implementation approach in place by autumn 2010. The outputs and outcomes achieved through the new approach will provide evidence of whether the program will be necessary beyond its pre-determined event horizon.

In 2006, after a series of meetings between city and shelter leaders advocating for Provincial changes to the emergency shelter system, the City of London and the Ministry of Community and Social Services engaged in the Hostels to Homes (H2H) Emergency Shelter Redirection Pilot Initiative. The goal of this initiative was to demonstrate innovative approaches to case management, community partnerships, rapid re-housing, and the savings and benefits of supporting individuals and families in sustainable, appropriate housing while reducing the cycle of homelessness—including emergency shelter use.

London participated in the Hostels to Homes pilot as one of six Ontario municipalities, each expressing similar concerns related to trends in shelter usage and each pilot site reflecting the need for a locally based model to support the unique needs of those relying on emergency shelters within their community.

London’s H2H model focused on individuals with co-occurring and complex issues (mental health, addictions, and chronic reliance on emergency shelters), youth in shelters or homeless, and families in shelter. The target of 190 participants was exceeded in both the initial and second phase of the pilot.

H2H in London was delivered through five outreach staff (secured through service agency contracts) working with two Ontario Works caseworkers and other involved community supports. The City provided coordination for program design, service management, and evaluation.

Phase I – London H2H Pilot
These are reflective of accumulate results six months post Phase I program completion.
Total Number of Participants - 208
89.5% are housed of which 71% were in private/rent supplement housing;
11% used a shelter six months post Phase I;
19.6% received income through employment.
Phase II – London H2H Pilot
Total Number of Participants – 232
Of the 105 Participants currently in the program, 96% are housed of which 59% are in private/rent supplement housing.
Municipal Council has recognized the positive outcomes of H2H and has supported the continuation of this successful approach to service delivery. Council has advocated to the Province that they make this program permanent.

Although the Province announced a second phase of the pilot in 2008, this initiative is scheduled to conclude June 30, 2010. The Province has acknowledged the success and innovation of this program, but has deferred its decision on ongoing support and funding to await the findings of the Provincial working group on Homelessness to Housing Consolidation Review.

Delays in announcing the continuation of H2H have resulted in the ending of this initiative, cancellation of contracts, and an anticipated increase in high cost reliance on shelters.

The Hostels to Homes initiative look at shelter per diem rates and expenses related to those who chronically relied on shelters. Through a housing first approach with supports, and with OW funding dedicated through a special Provincialy approved discretionary budgets allowance, the initiative showed a cost-effective approach to the use of the per diem funding compared to the emergency response investment in shelter. In 2009, Hostels to Homes program costs represented a cost-shared investment of approximately $300,000.

Hostels to Homes has shown promise in the first two phases. Like London CAReS, while refinements can be made to the approach, the initiative – or one like it – holds tremendous value to the community. The needs of long-term shelter users should not be lost if the program does not continue. Currently, the initiative is being considered as part of the Province's Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy.

Should Hostels to Homes continue as part of the Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy, or other similar initiatives be considered, London will closely review its outputs and outcomes, as well as look more intensely at the approaches other select Ontario municipalities have used in delivering their Hostels to Homes programs. For example, Hamilton's experience with a narrowly defined focus on long-term shelter users seems to have achieved very strong outcomes. Consideration will be given to a similar focus in London if the opportunity to deliver Hostels to Homes or a similar program is a possibility. While previous phases of Hostels to Homes service delivery in London had a “Hard to House” category, with six months or more of shelter stays or multiple shelter stays, the renewed focus of Hostel to Homes would be those clients who remain in shelter and have been there the longest. The associated support strategy will ensure that support workers have the skills and training necessary to adequately support these individuals who are likely to have deeper and more complicated needs.

If CAReS and Hostels to Homes are changed in the ways described above, reductions in the number of shelter beds and the amount of shelter use are likely. If the changes are not made as outlined above, the City will need to invest in developing more shelter beds by
2011 and the development of new shelter beds will need to be one of the top investments of the next round of federal funding for homeless initiatives.

In addition to CAReS and Hostels to Homes, there are opportunities for other refinements in the community response to homelessness that will also be detailed in the Community Plan on Homelessness or as a parallel document. In either case, the changes will be linked to the strategic directives of this Strategy. These include:

- Improvements to prevention services, including new triage approaches at the point of shelter intake,
- Exploring different ways of organizing shelters and the interconnectivity between them; this allows for greater degrees of specialization and tiers of service relative to service user needs and acuity,
- Implementing a common Client Information System across providers with appropriate consents and controls to allow for more responsive system management and better understanding of the issues,
- An emphasis on choice, not placement, in housing service delivery; the approach will be client-centred, and empowers clients to choose the type, frequency, duration and intensity of services,
- Continuing the pursuit of professional excellence in service delivery, and
- Improvements to the interface with landlords; this places greater value on their contributions and acknowledges their role in meeting these important initiatives.

The first National Forum on Housing and Safe Communities for Women in Canada Conference will be hosted in London in May 2011. This is another example of London’s innovative leadership to address homelessness on a national scale. The conference focuses attention on women’s needs in homeless service provision and housing—acknowledged as an “invisible reality.” Gender analysis and related considerations need to be taken into account and woven into the implementation phase of the Strategy—women are not a special interest group.

**Updating the Community Plan on Homelessness**

The Community Plan on Homelessness needs to be updated.

As part of the requirements for Federal funding, the London Community Plan on Homelessness will be updated. The plan will be completed by the end of 2010 and will be a companion document to the Community Housing Strategy. The London Community Plan on Homelessness will also tie into other policy and program discussions with the Province, such as the work being done post Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review.

“A measure of social consciousness is if we regard decent housing as a right, not a privilege.”

— Participant, Open House
This section of the Strategy highlights the following:

1. Considerations in the Establishment of the Targets
2. Development Target to be Facilitated by the City
3. Supportive and/or Alternative Housing Target for Other Orders of Government
4. Sub-Targets to Better Address Specific Needs
5. Sub-Targets are Not Mutually Exclusive
6. Prioritizing for Sub-Targets
7. Why the Target Projections are Lower than the 2005 Target
8. Cost Projections
9. Opportunity for New Innovation from Cost Savings
10. Considerations in the Built Form
11. Strengthening Neighbourhoods
12. Other Considerations in the Proposal and Evaluation Process

Considerations in the Establishment of the Targets

Many different variables were taken into consideration when establishing the targets for the Community Housing Strategy, including:

- The entire continuum: the life cycle, intervention and supports, and the range of different types of housing,

- Indicators of need, as an entire community and for specific populations: indicators common to the entire community, as well as specific indicators of need within sub-groups of the population,

- Funding availability and potential funding sources relative to costs of construction: investments from all orders of government — secured (stable), predicted and unknown, as well as costs of construction including more environmental features that will reduce operating costs over time,

- Growth of the community and existing population and housing need projections: the ways that the overall population is expected to increase

- Volume of existing affordable housing stock: affordability and availability of affordable rental housing and ownership properties that may be available

- Previous targets and achievements relative to those targets: purpose built and new rent supplements/subsidies that have occurred over the past decade,

- Various City initiatives: programs directly related to housing and homelessness, as well as impacting or benefitting from the Community Housing Strategy, e.g., Child and Youth Agenda, Official Plan, etc.,

- Various initiatives stemming from other orders of government—Ontario Poverty Reduction Strategy, Homelessness Prevention Strategy, etc.: taking into consideration opportunities and restrictions posed by priorities and strategies emerging or available from other orders of government,
• **Policy, legislative and regulatory landscape:** approved policy positions, as well as legislation and regulation that influences the development and operations of housing and homeless programs, as well as influencing how development occurs,

• **Capacity of local resources:** providers interested and with expertise to respond to proposal calls, availability within the development and construction industry, municipal staff to oversee the funding and proposals,

• **Perspectives of persons with lived experience:** taking into consideration the information gathered through 83 semi-structured interviews with homeless persons and low income tenants,

• **Priorities from Open Houses and Public Consultations:** after careful analysis and due diligence, consolidating multiple and often diverse perspectives from the 14 consultative sessions and open houses, and

• **The timeframe for implementation:** taking into consideration commitments from the previous Strategy, the start and end point of the current Strategy and approval and development cycles.

The targets contained within the Community Housing Strategy:

• Should be viewed as minimum performance thresholds,

• Should be reviewed every 18-24 months and adjusted if there are unforeseen emerging opportunities or needs,

• Are in addition to those affordable housing units and rent supplements/subsidies already committed as part of previous funding programs or in relation to the previous Strategy,

• Are in addition to the housing projections prepared by Clayton Research,

• Start with Council approval of the Strategy on June 28, 2010 and continue until December 31, 2015,

• Include all units and rent supplements/subsidies where there is a firm commitment of funding and approvals within the time period of the Strategy. The unit does not have to be constructed or occupied; the rent supplement/subsidy does not have to be allocated to a specific individual

• Are contingent upon the funding predicted as being available, remaining available – or increased – during the time frame for the Strategy

• Do not include current or future opportunities such as Hostels to Homes or comparable programs where shelter per diems are used as a funding source,

• Do not include new institutional or quasi-institutional housing that is 100% funded in capital by other orders of government,

• Do not include supportive housing that is 100% funded in capital by other orders of government, and
• Do not include rent supplements or subsidies made available through a Ministry of another order of government such as Health and Long-Term Care where the City is not the administrator of the rent supplement and/or allocate to which population the rent supplement is to serve.

**Overall Affordable Housing Target**

1,000 affordable housing units is the target for the 2010-15 Strategy. This 1,000 target can be achieved through any or all of the following means:

- new supportive and/or alternative housing,
- newly constructed or acquired affordable rental housing,
- homeownership dwellings, and
- rent supplements/subsidies.

The City will advocate to the Province of Ontario for 300 of these units to be supportive and/or alternative housing, with the Province providing all capital and operating funding. These details can be found later in this document. The remaining 700 will be within the City’s purview to facilitate and will be funded through a combination of private equity and mortgages, provincial and federal funding, and municipal funding. The overall target will be examined every 18-24 months during a systematic, internal review cycle for the London Community Housing Strategy. If amendments to the Strategy are required to take advantage of emerging opportunities or to respond to unforeseen needs, it is possible to do so while maintaining the integrity of the overall Strategy.

**Development Target to be Facilitated by the City**

By December 31, 2015, London will facilitate 375 newly constructed or acquired units of affordable rental housing. The City will also facilitate 75 affordable homeownership dwellings and an additional 250 affordable housing opportunities through any combination of newly constructed or acquired units of affordable rental housing, affordable homeownership and/or rent supplements or subsidies. In total, the target within the City’s purview is 700.

**Supportive and/or Alternative Housing Target for Other Orders of Government**

In addition, the City will advocate with the Provincial government for 300 units of permanent supportive and/or alternative housing with capital and operating funding to be provided by the Province of Ontario and/or the Government of Canada. The intended recipients of this housing will be one or more of the following groups—not mutually exclusive:

- homeless and low-income persons with serious and persistent mental illness,
- persons with brain injury or other cognitive impairments including Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders,
- chronic substance users,
- persons with concurrent disorders.

As noted later in the breakdown of the City’s 700 target, the delivery of this housing changes the composition of the City’s Sub-Targets.
Sub-Targets to Better Address Specific Needs

Within the overall strategy target of 1,000 units, the City has 700 units under its purview that are not mutually exclusive. The Sub-Targets are broken down as follows:

**Bedrooms within Rental Housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Target</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 305 of all the units will be bachelor or one-bedroom rental units</td>
<td>Single persons dominate the shelter system and the Social Housing Waiting List</td>
<td>Must be at or below the Low-Income Cut-off to be eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single persons are most common amongst people served through London CAReS</td>
<td>Can be achieved through new construction or acquisition of rental housing, or through rent supplements/subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflects changes in household composition</td>
<td>Can be achieved through various types of rental properties: low-rise; high-rise; secondary suites; legal rooming houses; rowhouses; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bookends of the life cycle: youth 16-24 and older adults 60+</td>
<td>The requirement of 305 bachelor or one-bedroom units will be reduced to 140 units in the event of provincially funded supportive and/or alternative housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 70 of the units will be rental units with two or more bedrooms</td>
<td>Households with dependents make up a large portion of households on the Social Housing Waiting List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to address family unit shelter beds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lone-parent families experience affordability and poverty issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining rental properties can be any bedroom size, dependent upon emerging needs within the years of Strategy implementation.
### Depth of Affordability in Rental Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Target</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 305 bachelor or one-bedroom rental units, at least 102 will rent for $400 or less per month</td>
<td>Specific interest in better meeting the affordability of individuals who rely on Ontario Works as their source of income</td>
<td>If new construction is being used, achieving this rent level will likely require greater capital investment in the construction to decrease the amount to be borrowed and carried, as well as the availability of land at little or no cost and units are more likely to be smaller in size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the 70 two-or-more bedroom rental units, at least 23 will rent for $550 or less per month</td>
<td>Specific interest in better meeting the affordability of lone-parent households who rely on Ontario Works as their source of income</td>
<td>If rent supplements or subsidies are being used to reach this level of affordability, they must be available to the individual for a minimum of 5 years. As Ontario Works rates change, so does the rent level for new people moving into the housing. The 102 units renting for $400 or less per month is reduced to 62 in the event of provincially funded supportive and/or alternative housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining units will be a minimum of 10% below CMHC average market rent for the same unit size in London.
Access to Homeownership Dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Target</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% homeownership dwellings of all homeownership dwellings</td>
<td>Provides opportunity for movement within the continuum</td>
<td>The rental unit from which the household moves is made available for another household, remaining affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructed or acquired will first be made available to households with</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can include any type of affordable ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two or more people that are residing in rental accommodation that was</td>
<td></td>
<td>All income testing and eligibility requirements for affordable homeownership still apply; households selected from rental must meet all requirements to be eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>built from 2002 to December 31, 2015 as part of any funding initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration will be given to developing a common application with a lottery selection for a short list from all eligible applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitated by the Housing Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all other affordable homeownership, the definition of affordable homeownership within the Provincial Policy Statement (2005) or any subsequent amendments to the Statement will apply.

Specific Populations to be Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Target</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 15% (105) of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent</td>
<td>People who have experienced chronic homelessness and/or multiple incidents of homelessness are served well through stable, affordable housing and decreased emergency response costs</td>
<td>This target is independent of others who have experienced chronic homelessness and served through Hostels to Homes or comparable programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership dwellings will be</td>
<td></td>
<td>This target is reduced to 5% in the event of new provincially funded supportive and/or alternative housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritized for persons who have experienced 18 months of homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cumulatively within the past 4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Specific Populations to be Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Target</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 15% (105) of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership dwellings will be prioritized for youth aged 16-24</td>
<td>Youth 18-24 comprise the largest group of low-income individuals in London</td>
<td>The age is intended to apply at time of move-in. With permanent tenure, people will age out of the demographic, but are not required to move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier stage intervention is intended to help youth move out of poverty and provide stability before aging</td>
<td>This demographic may include individuals, lone-parent households where the head of the household is 16-24, two parent households where at least one adult within the household is between 16-24, as well as childless couples whether married or common-law where at least one person is 16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 15% (105) of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership dwellings will be prioritized for lone parent households</td>
<td>Lone-parent families experience significant affordability issues</td>
<td>The Ontario Poverty Reduction Strategy and the Child and Youth Agenda within the City will be closely monitored in the event there are new opportunities to help address the needs of low-income lone-parent families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lone-parent families are increasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investments in the lone-parent families improve outcomes for children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households with dependents make up a large portion of households on the Social Housing Waiting List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to address family unit shelter beds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 10% (70) of the rent supplements/subsidies will be prioritized for victims of domestic violence</td>
<td>Victims of domestic violence are a special priority for social housing; however, this policy is saturating some housing with victims of domestic violence which is potentially compromising their safety</td>
<td>May require an amendment to the Special Priority Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May be considered on a pilot project based over the next five years, with research and evaluation component to better understand impact on social housing by having this diversion allowing victims of domestic violence to mix and integrate within neighbourhoods throughout London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specific Populations to be Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Target</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 10% (70) of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership dwellings will be prioritized for households where at least one head of household is 60 years of age or older</td>
<td>The population is aging, and baby boomers are in their older adult years</td>
<td>This is reduced to 7% in the event of provincially funded supportive and/or alternative housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 10% (70) of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership dwellings will be prioritized for Aboriginal specific housing</td>
<td>Aboriginal people are disproportionately represented in the low-income and homeless population</td>
<td>The Aboriginal community will be empowered to develop the selection criteria for the allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal people may choose to live in Aboriginal specific housing with other Aboriginal people and (re)create community specific to their cultural identity and facilitating the protection and safety of their cultural practices</td>
<td>This is reduced to 7% in the event of provincially funded supportive and/or alternative housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 5% (35) of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership dwellings will be prioritized for newcomers, immigrants or refugees</td>
<td>London is increasingly a destination for newcomers, immigrants and refugees</td>
<td>The housing is not intended to be developed for any particular ethnic origin, but rather the broader group of newcomers, immigrants and refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages for the sub-populations do not add up to 100%. The specific populations are not mutually exclusive. For example, a 62 year-old newcomer would meet two sub-targets. A range of populations, including those not explicitly named here can and will be met through the Strategy. Sub-targets may also be adjusted – including new ones added – within the five years of the strategy with credible evidence of changing needs, and subject to Council approval.
Interim and Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Target</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 5% (35) of the rental units created or acquired will be interim or transitional housing for people who are homeless, or people who were homeless and moved into housing but need to be re-housed</td>
<td>Some people who are homeless will choose to live in a transitional housing environment with more structured programming such as life skills training, employment training, etc. before moving onto more permanent housing</td>
<td>Time limited stays are envisioned in either the interim or transitional housing, with the rehabilitation and therapeutic component of the Residential Tenancies Act being used. Some people housed through programs that help homeless people get housing will need to be re-housed in situations such as change in life circumstance or problems with the tenancy and interim housing provides a short term stay without becoming homeless again. These units may look like any other unit, and may be blended in with other developments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Affordability Threshold Relative to Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Target</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 40% (280) of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership dwellings will be prioritized for households at the 30th percentile of incomes within London or lower</td>
<td>Households with the lowest incomes in London are the priority to be served through the Strategy</td>
<td>This is reduced to 20% in the event of provincially funded supportive and/or alternative housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Targets are not Mutually Exclusive

As noted previously, the sub-targets are not mutually exclusive. Consider the following example: a single Aboriginal person, 22 years of age, who gets access to a bachelor unit renting for $395 per month and who has a monthly income of $585 per month and who was homeless for two years prior to being housed would meet five of the Sub-Targets.

Prioritizing for Sub-Targets

In those instances where a Sub-Target makes reference to a specific population or income threshold being prioritized, this will form part of the Requests for Proposals and will be included as part of the proposal review process to frame investments relative to the priorities. However, the proposals that aim to meet the needs of a prioritized population must still be quality, cost effective, credible and achievable. The City may, as necessary, consider proposals that do not explicitly meet the needs of a prioritized group when that proposal is superior to any proposals submitted for prioritized groups.
Why the Target Projections are Lower than the 2005 Target

As noted previously, numerous variables were considered in detail in creating the targets in this Community Housing Strategy.

One of the strongest influences has been the desire to make units more affordable. It is anticipated that a larger contribution for each unit will decrease the overall capital and operating costs of the housing. This will result in lower rents in the case of rental housing, and lower mortgages in the case of affordable homeownership. While this will need to be evaluated on a project by project basis, the direction is clear.

Another strong influence is the desire to see an increase in environmental features considered in each development. This does not mean that developments will seek Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards. But it does mean that a range of environmental features will be an important consideration in each development when lower operating costs can be anticipated over the life cycle of the building. In certain circumstances, depending on the features being considered, which will be unique to each project, this will result in more up front capital.

Cost Projections

Cost projections associated with the targets should be considered as an “order of magnitude”. Individual projects, circumstances, funding program requirements, access to private equity and mortgages will all impact the amount of funding required from government to make the targets a reality.

Overall, the development contributions from all orders of government are estimated to be at least $62,250,000 for the 375 newly constructed or acquired rental units and 75 homeownership dwellings up to December 31, 2015. This takes into account a greater per unit contribution, likely in excess of $140,000 in most instances for rental units, to achieve a greater degree of affordability. Not included in this estimate is land provided at no cost by any order of government, or waived or reduced fees associated with the development. Nor does it include additional fundraising or mortgages required to make each development viable.

For the 250 units that can be achieved through construction, acquisition or rent supplements, the variability between how this may be configured does not make it possible to project the costs. However, consider that a rent supplement of $350 per person each month translates to $4,200 per person per year.

Opportunity for New Innovation from Cost Savings

Other recommendations within this report call for a reduction of shelter beds and shelter use, as well as advocacy for cost recovery from other orders of government for diversion from health and correction services. There is precedent for this innovation including the Resource Access Center in Portland, Oregon where the police department is investing in housing.
Beginning in 2013—subject to reducing shelter costs and using the previous shelter funding in this manner and/or subject to being able to recover costs from the Province from decreased interaction with hospitals, corrections and other emergency services—the City will work to create a temporary shallow housing subsidy program. Up to a total of $450,000, should be set aside for the program with additional funding to cover administration costs. This subsidy will help offset the rent of the following groups:

- Youth 16-24 living without their parents who are employed in low-income jobs, including part-time and seasonal employment,
- Low-income youth 16-24 living without their parents, and are attending college, university or trade training in London, and
- Low-income older adult households who are retired, semi-retired or unemployed.

The shallow subsidy is envisioned to provide support of up to $250 per household. The shallow subsidy will improve affordability for up to 100 households each month for an entire year. As subsidies are no longer needed by the household, they are recycled to another eligible household.

**Considerations in the Built Form**

A range of built forms will be considered in the development and acquisition of units when achieving the targets.

Consideration will be given to ensuring that a component of the bachelor and one-bedroom units are smaller in nature, thereby decreasing construction costs, increasing potential density, and/or, making the living space more compact and manageable as part of tenant choice.

One or more of the developments will create smaller loft spaces such as Mike Gidora Place operated by Victoria Cool Aid Society. This innovative project recognized by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation for how the modified unit size and design improves affordability, features 186 square feet of main floor living space with an additional 63 square feet of loft space in each unit. Another example of a similar design is Fort York Residence in Toronto.

Opportunities in larger redevelopment sites will be sought when achieving the targets, such as London Psychiatric Hospital land, South Street Campus of Victoria Hospital and/or the CPRI lands on Oxford Street West. In each instance, Smart Growth principles will be considered by way of compact, mixed housing with increased yield and improved affordability, as it relates to that component which helps meet the targets.

Urban design will be an important consideration with all new construction. Efforts will be made to have an aesthetically pleasing product that conforms to the style of the surrounding buildings, while increasing the overall appearance of the neighbourhood and surrounding buildings. Consideration will also be given to ensuring green space, and where possible and appropriate, community gardens for the residents and neighbours. This will provide another meeting and gathering location to increase community connectivity while also helping to address food security.

— Participant, Community Consultations
Implementation of features that have less impact on the environment and/or improve the environment and decreasing operating costs over the life cycle will also be a consideration in the built form. Green roofs, white roofs, water recovery, power generation and other features will all be encouraged and considered, as will the choice of building materials that have lower environmental impacts.

Acquisition and renovation of existing properties will also be a consideration in achieving the targets. Opportunities to preserve local heritage, including sites that are older but not heritage buildings, reuse buildings that are being under-used or are vacant and conversion of commercial or industrial buildings for housing will all be considered.

Consideration will also be given to changing and/or re-profiling existing emergency shelter facilities into housing, in whole or in part. This will signal part of the transformation from managing homelessness to taking measures to end homelessness in the community.

**Strengthening Neighbourhoods**

Fulfilling the targets will also focus on strengthening neighbourhoods. Each unit or home developed or acquired is intended to contribute to the fabric of the community. Within each home is a centre of opportunity; within each development is the opportunity for increased community vitality and improved economic prosperity.

In meeting the targets, consideration will be given to infill opportunities as they exist as well as reclaiming and revitalizing abandoned properties. These may include renovation to the existing home, or demolition and new construction.

Within larger developments, consideration will be given to having community space accessible to the residents but also made available to the community at large. From meeting space to places for cards, games and recreation to kitchens for community meals, opportunities to cost effectively create additional community resources will be sought as well as address community needs that extend beyond the needs of the residents.

In new development of three or more storeys, analysis will be conducted to determine the viability of commercial functions at grade. This may include businesses owned by the community organization that owns the building and operated by the tenants or other low-income people within the neighbourhood or, at minimum, the opportunity to reinvest rental revenue from a third party back into the building maintenance and operations. From social purpose enterprises to franchise operations like the Ben and Jerry’s PartnerShops with common ground housing in New York City, there are many examples of effective, revenue generating partnerships that increase the community vitality and economic prosperity at a micro-level within the community.

Part of strengthening neighbourhoods is the desire to avoid stigmatization or an over-concentration of new affordable housing developments or acquisitions in any neighbourhood, as well as ensuring residents have access to appropriate services relative to their needs. To avoid over-saturation, meeting the targets will look for a mix of opportunities throughout
the entire City. Locations for newly built housing will take into consideration neighbourhood planning initiatives and the unique character, strengths and opportunities of each neighbourhood being considered.

**Other Considerations in the Proposal and Evaluation Process**

In all Requests for Proposals related to the targets outlined in the Strategy, proponents will be asked to demonstrate how their proposal increases the community vitality and economic prosperity of London. Proponents will need to be in accord with the intent and spirit of the Strategy.

Proponents will be asked which needs, relative to the Strategy, their proposal helps meet. Proponents will need to demonstrate an understanding of those needs.

Proponents will also be asked to describe the level of support they believe their tenants will require and the basis for their description. Appreciating that the type, duration, frequency and intensity of supports will vary depending on the population that is going to be served, a range of support strategies will be appropriate, from intensive to that of “regular” building operations and maintenance. How and who will be providing supports to the tenants, relative to the needs described, will be outlined in the proposal.

Proponents will also be asked to include consideration of environmental initiatives within their proposal, specifically as it relates to their pro forma and anticipated operating costs. Based upon projections, proponents may be eligible for additional capital funding for more sustainable features that decrease operating costs over time.

Proponents will also be asked to make reference to other City initiatives where appropriate. Wherever the City can achieve multiple social policy objectives through meeting the targets, such as strengthening neighbourhoods or advancing the Child and Youth Agenda, the investment and outcomes extend beyond just this Strategy. That helps build community.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are the call to action. They are not static platitudes of what would be nice to do. These are the things that must be done – that must be committed to do – to achieve the anticipated outcomes of the Community Housing Strategy. They are the objectives of the Strategy.

The objectives are organized under five themes:

1. Organizational change for effective strategy implementation
2. Focus on permanent solutions to homelessness
3. Working with other orders of government
4. Future development targets and considerations for existing affordable housing stock
5. Continuation of policies and programs that hold promise

The recommendations are presented in four different ways to assist the reader:

a) Highlights: the high-level objectives organized by theme
b) In a summary framework: each objective explained further, the focus of attention and activities for the objective, the order of government responsible, and the priority level
c) By priority: a listing of the actions for the recommendations by priority level
d) By order of government responsible for actively facilitating or working to resolve the actions

Highlights

THEME 1: Organizational change for effective strategy implementation

1.1 Focus on housing and homelessness together
1.2 Central administration within the City for housing and homelessness change initiatives
1.3 Decentralize Ontario Works office
1.4 Regional identity

THEME 2: Focus on permanent solutions to homelessness

2.1 Review London CAReS for alignment with Community Housing Strategy
2.2 Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program - to the most chronically homeless
2.3 Reduce shelter beds and shelter use over the next five years
2.4 Review shelter system and programming
2.5 Increase supports to people once housed
2.6 Invest in prevention strategies
2.7 Align all funding to support investment in priorities and needs
2.8 Consider supported employment
2.9 Shared Client Information System
2.10 Outcome based funding
2.11 Determine the number and service needs of persons who are homeless
2.12 Community Plan on Homelessness
THEME 3: Working with other orders of government

3.1 Increase London profile as equal partner, not just another stakeholder with other orders of government
3.2 Increase income supports
3.3 Strengthen capacity of housing providers
3.4 Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion
3.5 Increase investment in settlement services and culturally appropriate assistance to newcomers
3.6 Expand opportunities to meet the needs of Aboriginal people
3.7 Adjust shelter allowance and rent/utility scales
3.8 Continue Federal investment in Social Housing
3.9 Permit borrowing against equity of existing Social Housing
3.10 Provide new grants to maintain stock
3.11 Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program
3.12 Provide additional rent subsidies and supplements
3.13 Provide clearer policy direction on related planning matters
3.14 Obtain cost recovery from programs that divert people away from hospitals, corrections, etc. and reinvest into new affordable housing capital and affordable home ownership
3.15 Amend Special Priority Policy and Local Priority Rules
3.16 Acquire buildings and property from all orders of government

THEME 4: Future development targets and considerations for existing affordable housing stock

4.1 Continue to redefine and clarify roles and responsibilities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division
4.2 Build capacity amongst property managers
4.3 Target for the City of London
4.4 Supportive and alternative housing target for other orders of government
4.5 Create mix within larger scale redevelopments
4.6 Mix throughout the City
4.7 Embrace environmental stewardship
4.8 Maintain existing stock
4.9 Examine economic development opportunity with each new affordable housing development of three or more storeys on a major or minor arterial road
4.10 Improve the waiting list for subsidized housing
4.11 Mayor’s update on Community Housing Strategy implementation

THEME 5: Continuation of policies and programs that hold promise

5.1 Ensure quality housing where tenants have their needs met
5.2 Responsive and innovative Special Ontario Works Teams
5.3 Maintain annual $2 Million City investment in affordable housing
5.4 Continue to nurture the City’s national and provincial profile and expertise
5.5 Embrace the synergies and opportunities of the Housing Division and Social and
Community Support Services Division working more closely together to achieve mutual objectives

**Summary Framework**

Recommendations in the Summary Framework are organized under each theme. Also included is an explanation of what the recommendation means, and the focus of attention for each recommendation.

Beside the actions associated with each recommendation, in round brackets ( ) is an: I, S or L. These stand for:

- **Immediate** - those recommendations that should be acted upon within the first 9 months
- **Soon** - those recommendations that should be acted upon within the first 24 months
- **Later** - those recommendations that can be acted upon in years three, four and five of the plan.

Also beside each action associated with each recommendation, in square brackets [ ] there is an: M, P or F – Municipality, Province, Federal. This indicates the order of government responsible for actively facilitating or working to resolve the action – with an appreciation that other stakeholders also play a vital role in achieving the objective. Ultimately, meeting the recommendations set out in this Strategy requires all orders of government working together with a range of community interests in the non-profit, non-governmental and private sector contributing towards the Strategy’s success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME 1: Organizational Change for Effective Strategy Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **1.1** | Focus on housing and homelessness together | Building upon the momentum of this Strategy which examines the entire continuum, decision making, funding decisions and planning with service providers that work with homeless and vulnerable populations and housing providers needs to be integrated and mutually supportive | • Review all existing housing and/or homelessness related committees and terms of references to determine overlaps and gaps; combine into fewer coherent committee structures aligned with the spirit and intent of a continuum approach to the Community Housing Strategy (I) [M]  
• Create unifying vision and complementary strategies between Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division (I) [M]  
• Coordinate funding of groups to achieve mutual objectives (S) [M] |
| **1.2** | Central administration within the City for housing and homelessness change initiatives | Recognizing the City’s role as Service Manager and strategic leadership of innovation, the City will establish a stronger role in the delivery of innovative homeless programs and services, housing programs for specific populations and be proactive in the development of new affordable housing, while also conforming to the Municipality’s service review and aligning with the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review | • Create client priorities, establish clear policies, evaluate effectiveness of implementation, develop and enforce standards of service and develop and implement training and coaching for London CAReS and Hostels to Homes, or similar initiative(s) (I) [M]  
• Reinforce need for a specific entity to manage capital projects, RFPs, etc. in new affordable housing development (I) [M]  
• Ensure RFP calls for new development and other housing resources such as rent supplements specifically address needs and pressure points of Social and Community Support Services Division as part of the capital investment strategy and use of housing subsidies (I) [M] |
| **1.3** | Decentralize Ontario Works office | Improving the presence of income supports and ancillary supports offered through Ontario Works, the City needs to have multiple Ontario Works offices spread throughout the City and function as centres of opportunity | • Conduct feasibility study to separate the primary downtown Ontario Works office into three or more additional community offices (L) [M]  
• Pilot mobile Ontario Works workers or satellite offices within more select community agencies or housing providers (S) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.4       | Regional identity               | • Assemble strategic roundtables with neighbouring municipalities, and seek acknowledgement of London’s role in meeting housing needs and serving people who are homeless and low-income (S) [M]  
|           |                                 | • Continue deliberations and program discussions with health, mental health, justice and other sectors, with an eye to funding, programs, supports and integrated policies that reinforce London’s regional identity (S) [M] |

**THEME 2: Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness**

| 2.1       | Review London CARES for alignment with Community Housing Strategy | • Create client priorities, establish clear policies, evaluate effectiveness of implementation, and develop and enforce standards of service (I) [M]  
|           | Representing a significant investment of resources and courage in program innovation, the City will review London CARES for its next phase of implementation and ensure alignment to the vision and objectives of the Community Housing Strategy, taking a more hands-on role in providing Service Management to the program, and promoting a housing support approach with measureable fidelity | • Reinforce focus on housing as the prime objective, with housing as harm reduction (I) [M]  
|           |                                                                 | • Build capacity amongst service providers in delivering an appropriate housing support program through training, coaching and monitoring (I) [M]  
|           |                                                                 | • Implement service prioritization tool to target those with most acute needs first (S) [M]  
<p>|           |                                                                 | • Invest in supports to people once housed – for 6-18 months – with a strong focus on Stages of Change, a recovery orientation, strength-based and client-centred case planning, and movement towards greater independence, and with those indicating a higher acuity receiving more intensive service (I) [M] |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Objective</strong></th>
<th><strong>What is Meant by this Objective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Focus of Attention</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2 Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program - to the most chronically homeless | Embracing an opportunity made available through the Province, the City needs to build upon the lessons learned in the early phases of implementation and closely examine jurisdictions such as Hamilton that have been effective in addressing chronic homelessness through the opportunity, while advocating that the Province continue the program or initiate a similar program | • Advocate for continuation of Hostels to Homes as part of the Province’s Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy, and/or the development of a similar program to Hostels to Homes (I) [P]  
• Examine the experience of other Ontario municipalities that implemented a Hostels to Homes program, including Hamilton, and the policy and program structure and outcomes (I) [M]  
• Create client priorities, establish clear policies, evaluate effectiveness of implementation, and develop and enforce standards of service (I) [M]  
• Implement service prioritization tool to target those with most acute needs first (S) [M]  
• Acknowledge program refinements necessary to Hostels to Homes – or a similar program - on a local and provincial level to be effective (I) [M]  
• Invest in supports to people once housed – for 6-18 months – with a strong focus on Stages of Change, a recovery orientation, strength-based and client-centred case planning, and movement towards greater independence, and with those indicating a higher acuity receiving more intensive service (I) [M]  
• Establish sustainability plan for Hostels to Homes, including meeting the needs of existing clients (I) [P] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.3       | Reduce shelter beds and shelter use over the next five years | • Reduce the number of shelter beds by a minimum of 15% by 2015 as compared to the number of permanent shelter beds that existed in April 2010 (L) [M]  
• Reduce individual shelter users by 25% compared to total number of unique individuals served in 2009 (S) [M]  
• Adjust reduction targets relative to the effectiveness of London CARES, Hostels to Homes and/or other related programs (L) [M]  
• Study the opportunity to begin conversion of existing shelters into interim or permanent affordable housing (L) [M]  
• Advocate to the Province of Ontario to examine its funding mechanisms and the use of per diem funding for other program purposes that focus on providing permanent solutions to homelessness (L) [P] |
| 2.4       | Review shelter system and programming | • Establish triage and diversion protocols at shelter intake, leveraging Rent Bank and other community and family & friend resources (L) [M]  
• Give consideration to specialization – different tiers of service – within shelters served by professional support accordingly (S) [M]  
• Implement service prioritization tool to target those with most acute needs first, including intensive services to long term and repeated users of the shelters as focus for housing interventions (S) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Increase supports to people once housed</td>
<td>Appreciating that access to housing is often only the first step to community integration and housing stability and that neighbourhoods are strengthened when people feel supported, the City needs to align program initiatives to ensure there are adequate supports by appropriately trained individuals to ensure long term success in housing, effectiveness and sustainability in investments in helping people achieve housing, and embrace housing as a right, not a reward and without conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sub-divide City into geographic areas to coordinate support and establish neighbourhood/community leadership for identified areas, and focus on neighbourhood/community integration (L) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Invest in supports to people once housed – for 6-18 months – with a strong focus on Stages of Change, a recovery orientation, strength-based and client-centred case planning, and movement towards greater independence, and with those indicating a higher acuity receiving more intensive service (I) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhance relationships with other service sectors (e.g., health, mental health, corrections) to broker for appropriate services and provide more complete, wrap-around supports (S) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop multi-disciplinary team of professionals – or similar approach - to more appropriately serve those with more complex needs (L) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase knowledge and capacity of sector to implement an appropriate support approach with a specific housing stability focus (I) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create client priorities, establish clear policies, evaluate effectiveness of implementation, and develop and enforce standards of service (I) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Invest in prevention strategies</td>
<td>The City will continue to use and invest prudently in the delivery of existing prevention programs and implement other mechanisms to improve prevention response because becoming homeless can be traumatizing and have considerable effects on one’s social relations, health, mental health, sense of belonging and well-being, and emergency responses are more costly than prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor the effectiveness of the Rent Bank and THAW and make program refinements based upon emerging needs (S) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish triage and diversion protocols at shelter intake, leveraging Rent Bank and other community and family &amp; friend resources (I) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement policies and procedures to rapidly re-house individuals before they become entrenched in homelessness (S) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>What is Meant by this Objective</td>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Align all funding to support investment in priorities and needs</td>
<td>Homelessness and housing funding that the City has direct control over determining how it is used will be used to support investments related to the Community Housing Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.8             | Consider supported employment                                                                                                                         | While the City, through Ontario Works, has undertaken considerable work to improve employment initiatives, and values the work of community-based organizations that also help people secure employment, Supported Employment as promoted by the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration is proven to be an evidence-based practice that needs to be implemented as part of an employment strategy for low-income people that experience many barriers in accessing employment | • Develop expertise in the delivery of Supported Employment (L) [M]
• Pilot Supported Employment with a minimum of 10% of Ontario Works recipients that are served through the next phase of London CAReS (L) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.9 Shared Client Information System | Acknowledging that service providers do not currently use one client information system and data that is currently reported is non-identifiable and most often used in an aggregate form, there is no way to track the number of unique individuals that use the broad array of services across providers, the City as Service Manager has no meaningful way of knowing where and how unique individuals are (or are not) accessing services, and lack the ability to make more "real time" adjustments in policy or programs to meet needs – all of which can be resolved through a unifying client information system. | • Implement shared client information system as a condition of funding, with due consideration of costs and data base compatibility (S) [M]
• Invest in software, user rights and training of one of the many lower cost client information systems available “off the shelf”, as appropriate (S) [M]
• Ensure information system provides credible data to funder and is used for longer term evaluation, and build criteria for sharing data into contract terms with service providers (S) [M]
• Create data review committee which includes community partners (L) [M]
• Develop appropriate client consent forms for intake and data sharing and storage protocols (S) [M]
• Complete Privacy Impact Assessment for the City related to the information system (S) [M]
• Use information for policy development, client priority setting and program refinements (e.g., examine where services are accessed, by whom, frequency of use, recidivism, etc.) (L) [M]
• Strengthen community education and awareness through aggregate findings (L) [M]
• Adjust Sub-Targets and inform investment of new housing initiatives (L) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.10      | Outcome based funding            | • Educate service providers on inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes, with special attention paid to distinguishing outputs from outcomes (S) [M]  
• Create logic models for each program relative to contract and conditions of funding that emphasize outcomes and the evaluative tools that will be used to know if outcomes are being achieved (S) [M]  
• Consolidate investments in the community based sector to those organizations that achieve long term, positive outcomes relative to the populations they are serving (S) [M] |
| 2.11      | Determine the number and service needs of persons who are homeless | • Research appropriate approaches to homeless counts and needs assessments that may be relevant to a City of London’s size with the make-up of service delivery and composition of the homeless population known to exist within the community, which will provide useful results for planning and decision-making (I) [M]  
• Implement activity to determine the number and service needs of persons who are homeless (S) [M]  
• Adjust sub-targets and inform investment of new housing initiatives (L) [M] |
| 2.12      | Community Plan on Homelessness   | • Consult further with service providers on the actions and content of the Community Plan on Homelessness (I) [M]  
• Create a new Community Plan on Homelessness (I) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME 3: Working With Other Orders of Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1       | Increase London profile as equal partner, not just another stakeholder with other orders of government | - Continue to embrace all elements of being a Service Manager and local decision-maker, exercising all discretionary powers allowed by current legislation and advocating for changes in legislation and regulation as appropriate and necessary (I) [M]
- Establish City policies and positions related to the housing continuum, not just reactive ones during consultation processes spearheaded by the Federal or Provincial governments (S) [M]
- Mayor to invite local MPs and MPPs to inter-governmental dialogue on housing and homelessness, and the ways in which all orders of government will work together to achieve success in the housing continuum (I) [M]
- Provide leadership with neighbouring municipalities, while acknowledging and embracing London’s role as a regional centre (S) [M]
- Host a summit on housing and homelessness with Ontario municipalities of a similar size to strategically align positions, and learn of promising practices from each other (S) [M]
- Advocate for changes to provincial legislation that define expected outcomes and service levels rather than how to manage programs, increasing flexibility in local decision-making and meeting local needs (I) [P] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.2       | Increase income supports        | • Advocate for increases in Ontario Works rate of shelter allowance relative to local average market rent, and basic needs relative to local cost of living (I) [P]  
• Advocate for increases in Ontario Disability Support Program rate of shelter allowance relative to local average market rent, and basic needs relative to local cost of living (I) [P]  
• Advocate for changes that will remove disincentives to work and increase stability in the transition from receiving assistance to being employed (I) [P]  
• Study the ability and mechanisms to subsidize transit passes for low-income residents (L) [M]  
• Develop strategies to improve food security, and use a healthy food basket measure to determine baseline (L) [M]  
• Increase awareness of income support levels by hosting an annual week long campaign (e.g., a challenge for people to buy food and live off of the same amount of income that a person on social assistance would receive) (S) [M] |
| 3.3       | Strengthen capacity of housing providers | • Advocate for the Province to establish accreditation for persons and companies working in the management of rental properties. (S) [P]  
• Advocate for changes to the Residential Tenancies Act to include mandatory minimum standard for tenant/member property/content insurance (S) [P] |

Objective 3.2: Increase income supports

Recognizing adequate income supports as vital to a successful community housing strategy, as a Service Manager delivering Ontario Works, and as a funder of other income supports provided by other orders of government, London will continue to advocate for increased income supports, increase awareness regarding income support levels, and work to ensure low-income people of London can afford to have housing while also meeting their basic needs.

- Advocate for increases in Ontario Works rate of shelter allowance relative to local average market rent, and basic needs relative to local cost of living (I) [P]
- Advocate for increases in Ontario Disability Support Program rate of shelter allowance relative to local average market rent, and basic needs relative to local cost of living (I) [P]
- Advocate for changes that will remove disincentives to work and increase stability in the transition from receiving assistance to being employed (I) [P]
- Study the ability and mechanisms to subsidize transit passes for low-income residents (L) [M]
- Develop strategies to improve food security, and use a healthy food basket measure to determine baseline (L) [M]
- Increase awareness of income support levels by hosting an annual week long campaign (e.g., a challenge for people to buy food and live off of the same amount of income that a person on social assistance would receive) (S) [M]

Objective 3.3: Strengthen capacity of housing providers

Appreciating that expertise and improved training of housing providers impacts tenancy outcomes, and acknowledging that insurance is an important function for addressing issues, London will advocate for necessary changes from the Province to improve management of rental properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.4 Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion                         | Because people being released from correctional facilities, as well as health, mental health and addiction facilities have a significant impact on service demands of homeless programs and services providers and housing providers, and appreciating that these are systems outside of London's direct control as Service Manager, London will continue to work with the appropriate stakeholders to make improvements in discharge planning and reduce reliance on shelters by other sectors | • Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from hospitals, mental health and addiction facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary (L) [P]  
• Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from Provincial correctional facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary (L) [P]  
• Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from Federal correctional facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary (L) [F]  
• Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons who are being released after being held on remand, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary (L) [P] |
<p>| 3.5 Increase investment in settlement services and culturally appropriate assistance to newcomers | Acknowledging the rich diversity to the community provided by newcomers, London will help create more appropriate settlement services and supports, which will be culturally appropriate                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | • Advocate for an increase in the number of Federally funded settlement houses (S) [F]                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 3.6 Expand opportunities to meet the needs of Aboriginal people          | Embracing the history of the area, acknowledging the geographic proximity to several First Nations Reserves, and appreciating the contributions of Aboriginal culture to the local fabric of the community, London will work with the Federal government to better meet the needs of Aboriginal people who reside in the City, respecting roles, history and culture                                                                                                                                                                                                 | • Advocate for continued and increased funding to create more housing specifically for the Aboriginal community (S) [F]                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.7 Adjust shelter allowance and rent/utility scales | As a prudent and fiscally responsible Service Manager, London recognizes that the current framework instituted by the Province related to shelter allowances and rent/utility scales is insufficient and outdated especially given that almost 60% of social housing tenants rely on Ontario Works or Ontario Disability Support Program, and as such London will advocate for necessary changes in shelter allowance and rent/utility scales. | - Advocate for adjustments to rent/utility scales that reflect the present year; not 1993 (their current base year) (I) [P]  
- Advocate for changes in social housing rent calculations to be the same as the maximum shelter allowance used in the private sector rather than the current legislated rent scales which leave social housing providers at a gross disadvantage (I) [P]  
- Assess the impact on administration costs for Ontario Works and seek cost recovery if implemented by the Province (I) [M] |
| 3.8 Continue Federal investment in Social Housing | Appreciating the importance of Federal investment in current social housing, while acknowledging that mortgages are approaching maturity and the Federal investment will soon be lost, London will make the importance of this funding known, and will advocate for a continuation of the funding even after operating agreements mature. | - Advocate for a reinvestment of expenditure reductions from maturing mortgages into preserving existing social housing stock, addressing the backlog of capital repairs within social housing, and developing new housing to address emerging and pressing needs (I) [F]  
- Advocate that rental subsidies scheduled to be lost are preserved (I) [F]  
- Advocate for Federal block funding to be indexed to inflation so that Municipal tax dollars are no longer needed to make up the difference (I) [F] |
| 3.9 Permit borrowing against equity of existing Social Housing | Social housing providers are currently unable to borrow against the equity of the asset to allow for building repairs, expansions or energy retrofits, and London will seek changes from the Province to permit this, as the asset presents a tremendous opportunity to address multiple building needs and is a missed opportunity. | - Advocate for regulatory changes to allow social housing providers to borrow funds against their equity for capital repairs (S) [P]  
- Advocate for extensions in mortgages so that social housing providers can pay back the additional debt (S) [P]  
- Advocate for amendments which limit the leverage of social housing assets for expansions and/or energy retrofits (S) [P] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Provide new grants to maintain stock</td>
<td>To protect social housing as a public asset – made possible through taxpayer investment – London will seek additional funding to ensure that the assets remain in a good state of repair</td>
<td>• Prepare a business case showing importance of protecting public assets, and advocate for new grants for capital repairs of existing stock to ensure all units are in habitable condition and ready for tenancy (S) [P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program</td>
<td>Recognizing this program as a critical resource to new housing development to address needs throughout the continuum, while acknowledging frustration that housing programs have for too long been “on again, off again” with shifting requirements and a lack of sustainability, London will demonstrate leadership in delivering on the opportunities afforded by the program while advocating for changes in design and overall sustainability</td>
<td>• Acknowledge the important contributions of other orders of government in making the program possible (I) [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Provide additional rent subsidies and supplements</td>
<td>Appreciating that the vacancy rate is above 3%, acknowledging that rent subsidies and supplements are an important prong of the Housing Strategy and understanding that subsidies and supplements provide access to housing more rapidly than new built construction, London will seek additional subsidies and supplements from various Provincial and Federal ministries and entities</td>
<td>• Give consideration to all rent subsidies and supplements being “portable” – attached to the individual, not the specific property (I) [F,P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate for longer term rental subsidies for Hostels to Homes participants equivalent to current subsidy, plus inflation, using shelter per diems in this flexible, innovative and appropriate manner (I) [P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate for supplements and subsidies to meet targets (I) [F,P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>What is Meant by this Objective</td>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.13      | Provide clearer policy direction on related planning matters | • Continue to support inclusionary zoning in principle, while requesting clear implementation guidelines and policy direction related to Bill 198 (I) [P]  
• Advocate that Municipalities be given the tools necessary to respond to and implement Provincial planning policies (I) [P]  
• Advocate for improvements to the Provincial Policy Statement related to the mix of housing types and affordability, respecting deeper levels of assistance with affordability (S) [P] |
| 3.14      | Obtain cost recovery from programs that divert people away from hospitals, corrections, etc. and reinvest into new affordable housing capital and affordable homeownership | • Establish cost baseline of interface between London CARES and Hostels to Homes (or similar programs) clients with hospitals, walk-in clinics, police, EMS, and justice systems prior to intervention and in 6 and 12 month period following supports (S) [M]  
• Create a business case reflecting the cost savings through diversion (L) [M]  
• Advocate for cost recovery from Provincially funded systems as a direct result of supports and diversion (L) [P] |
| 3.15      | Amend Special Priority Policy and Local Priority Rules | • Advocate for Provincial funding to research the impacts of Special Priority Policy for victims of domestic violence on social housing (I) [P]  
• Advocate for pilot or amendments to policy allowing for 70 rent supplements/subsidies over the next five years to decrease concentration within social housing and divert victims from social housing, mixing and integrating into communities throughout London (I) [P] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.16  Acquire buildings and property from all orders of government | Acknowledging that there have been previous attempts and successes, and a number of “one-off” approaches to acquiring surplus properties from other orders of government, London will work with the other orders of government to establish a clear policy of having surplus government properties used for housing and/or having the revenue generated from the sale invested in housing that supports the Comprehensive Housing Strategy. | • Work with the Federal and Provincial governments to develop a coherent policy on the use and/or sale of surplus properties to support the housing needs identified within the Strategy (S) [F,P]  
• Advocate for the Federal and Provincial governments to invest in the City acquiring and renovating residential apartments and similar buildings such as single room occupancy hotels to provide sustainable and affordable rental housing: (S) [F,P]  
  1. to single, vulnerable populations  
  2. single people in the process of being re-housed  
  3. as interim housing and shelter diversion strategy  
• Advocate for land owned by the Federal or Provincial governments that is deemed to be surplus, economically evaluated and either Provided to the Municipality as sites: (S) [F,P]  
  1. for affordable housing development—including covering all costs of site remediation prior to providing London the site; or,  
  2. Sold to the private sector, with the City being the sole beneficiary of the funds gained from the sale, and used exclusively for the development of new affordable housing and/or rent subsidies/supplements  
• Bank land not immediately needed for affordable housing initiatives for a later point in time (L) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME 4: Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing Stock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **4.1** | Continue to redefine and clarify roles and responsibilities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division | • Conduct staffing review in Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division relative to achieving objectives of the London Community Housing Strategy (I) [M]  
• Clarify roles, functions, priorities to address the needs of people in the continuum so that they are understood and accepted by partners, clients and the public (S) [M]  
• Create unifying vision and complementary strategies between Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division (I) [M]  
• Coordinate funding of groups to achieve mutual objectives (S) [M] |
| **4.2** | Build capacity amongst property managers | • Advocate for the Province to establish accreditation for persons and companies working in the management of rental properties. (S) [P]  
• Increase training opportunities for property managers, especially pertaining to tenant relationship management (S) [M] |
<p>| <strong>4.3</strong> | Target for the City of London | • Facilitate the construction and acquisition of affordable rental properties, affordable homeownership dwellings and rent supplements/subsidies to meet the needs of 700 households (details in section on targets) (I) [M] |
| <strong>4.4</strong> | Supportive and alternative housing target for other orders of government | • Work with the Province to provide capital and operating funding for 300 units of supportive or alternative housing (I) [P] |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.5       | Create mix within larger scale redevelopments | **Objective**<br>Seizing the unique opportunity to redevelop various larger sites within London, the City will work to ensure that the Comprehensive Housing Strategy goals are reflected in the redevelopments  
**Focus of Attention**<br>• In the anticipated larger scale redevelopments such as London Psychiatric Hospital land, South Street Campus of Victoria Hospital or the CPRI lands on Oxford Street West embrace Smart Growth principles by way of compact, mixed housing with increased yield and improved affordability (L) [M]  
• Ensure that a minimum of 25% of all units – rental and ownership – created within the redevelopments of the London Psychiatric Hospital land, South Street Campus or the CPRI lands on Oxford Street West meet or exceed the affordability thresholds as identified in the Official Plan (I) [M] |
| 4.6       | Mix throughout the City | **Objective**<br>Reflecting the strong desire of communities and neighbourhoods throughout London to decrease saturation of affordable housing, while increasing opportunities for community integration, the City will develop a policy position that seeks more mix throughout the City, respecting and reinforcing the policies contained within the Official Plan, and aligned with strengthening neighbourhoods  
**Focus of Attention**<br>• Align new affordable housing development with neighbourhood planning (S) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.7       | Embrace environmental stewardship | - Include in the proposal process a condition that all pro forma and life cycle costing for new affordable housing construction must consider implementation of green technology with a green lens towards funding decisions (S) [M]  
- Apply Smart Growth principles in all Greenfield development and larger scale redevelopments that include a component of units related to this Strategy, while staying aligned to the policies of the Official Plan (L) [M]  
- Include in the proposal process a condition that access to transit and pedestrian friendliness will be a consideration in all new affordable housing development (S) [M] |
| 4.8       | Maintain existing stock          | - Subject to resources from other orders of government, protect existing affordable housing stock by having the ability to borrow against equity, etc. to ensure all social housing units are in a state of good repair and ready to be rented (S) [F,P]  
- Stabilize and support existing affordable and social housing communities through maintaining investment in community based sector and community development that meets the needs of those communities (I) [M] |
| 4.9       | Examine economic development opportunity with each new affordable housing development of three or more storeys on a major or minor arterial road | - Feasibility of each new affordable housing development of three or more storeys should give consideration to retail/commercial/office at grade (S) [M]  
- Feasibility of each new affordable housing development of three or more storeys for a specific population, and supported by a non-profit organization, should give consideration to having a franchise or other suitable business at grade operated by tenants with profits reinvested into the building and the tenants being the employees (L) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.10 Improve the waiting list for subsidized housing | Appreciating that waiting lists for subsidized housing reflect both Provincial and Local priorities, the City will re-examine Local priorities as well as review the process by which the waiting list is currently managed, to increase responsiveness to community need | • Re-examine local priorities for the subsidized housing waiting list, and the effectiveness of achieving those priorities (S) [M]  
• Conduct a complete review of the waiting list process and pilot revised system (L) [M] |
| 4.11 Mayor’s update on Community Housing Strategy implementation | Ensuring senior leadership to fulfill the directions of the Community Housing Strategy, in addition to existing committee structures, the Mayor of London will remain directly involved in oversight of implementation, and ensure the public is appropriately updated on the Strategy | • Mayor or appointed delegate convene meetings a minimum of two times per year on implementation of the recommendations of the Strategy, with update to include: (S) [M]  
1. Shared accountability. Representatives from all groups—Municipal staff, private sector, non-profit sector—responsible for working to implement recommendations and report on status of implementation, and remove barriers to implementation  
2. Report and briefing from City staff  
3. Information for an annual update report to Council as a whole through the CHLC or similar body on the Strategy implementation, including amendments to strategic direction as influenced by other programs or changes in local circumstances |

**THEME 5: Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 Ensure quality housing where tenants have their needs met | Having invested considerable time and resources into approaches that ensure quality housing, the City will continue to have appropriate policies and programs that ensure that housing is of good quality, and that tenants have community-based programs to appropriately meet their needs | • Continue to implement Residential Rental Unit Licensing By-law and monitor implementation (I) [M]  
• Through by-law, continue to investigate properties when there are complaints (I) [M]  
• Continue investment through grants of having community-based programs meet the needs of tenants related to their housing stability (I) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.2       | Responsive and innovative Special Ontario Works Teams | Respecting the innovation and leadership demonstrated through Community Services, the City will continue to operate Special Ontario Works Teams that seek innovative solutions to meet the needs of people with no fixed address. | • Continue focus on better meeting the needs of people with no fixed address on Ontario Works case load (I) [M]  
• Monitor outcomes of Special Ontario Works Teams and adjust activities accordingly (S) [M] |
| 5.3       | Maintain annual $2 Million City investment in affordable housing | Demonstrating the City’s commitment to a housing continuum, and acknowledging the City’s role as a partner with other orders of government, London will continue to invest money from the Municipal tax base into the creation of new affordable housing, in line with the Community Housing Strategy. | • Continue the investment of $2 Million in the Housing Division operating budget for affordable housing (I) [M]  
• Use Municipal $2 Million investment in affordable housing as leverage with other orders of government (I) [M]  
• Consider indexing the Municipal investment in affordable housing to inflation over time (L) [M] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What is Meant by this Objective</th>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.4       | Continue to nurture the City’s national and provincial profile and expertise | • Continue work with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (I) [M]  
• Continue work with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (I) [M]  
• Continue work with the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association (I) [M]  
• Continue involvement with Provincial conferences such as the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association (I) [M]  
• Continue work in housing and homeless program consolidation and human services integration following the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review (I) [M]  
• Continue involvement in Provincial Municipal Affairs and Housing Consultations on the new long-term Housing Strategy for the Province and submit this Strategy for their consideration (I) [M]  
• Continue involvement with the Homelessness Partnering Strategy (I) [M]  
• Send a copy of the Strategy with covering letter from the Mayor to local MPs, MPPs, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Ministry of Children and Youth Services, Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, the Office of the Premier, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Service Canada and the Office of the Prime Minister (I) [M] |
| 5.5       | Embrace the synergies and opportunities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division working more closely together to achieve mutual objectives | • Consider Strategy first step towards joint accountability and seamless service delivery (I) [M]  
• Create unifying vision and complementary strategies between Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Services (I) [M]  
• Coordinate funding of groups to achieve mutual objectives (S) [M] |

Building upon the success and approach of developing the Community Housing Strategy, London will continue to seek synergistic opportunities across City Divisions to achieve the goals of the Strategy and promote a coherent and comprehensive policy platform and program response that supports the continuum.
Priorities

The “Immediate” Focus of Attention priorities in the Strategy are listed in the table below. These should be acted upon within the first 9 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
<th>Related Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Related Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review all existing housing and/or homeless related committees and terms of reference to determine overlaps and gaps; combine into fewer coherent committee structures aligned with the spirit and intent of the continuum approach in the Community Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Focus on Housing and Homelessness Together</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create unifying vision and complementary strategies between the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division</td>
<td>Focus on Housing and Homelessness Together</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embrace synergies and opportunities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division working more closely together to achieve mutual objectives</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redefine and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create client priorities, establish clear policies, evaluate effectiveness of implementation, develop and enforce standards of service and develop and implement training and coaching for London CAReS and Hostels to Homes, or similar initiative(s)</td>
<td>Central administration within the City for housing and homelessness change initiatives</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review London CAReS for alignment with Community Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program – to the most chronically homeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase supports to people once housed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reinforce need for a specific entity to manage capital projects, requests for proposals, etc. in new affordable housing development</td>
<td>Central administration within the City for housing and homelessness change initiatives</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure request for proposal calls for new development and other housing resources such as rent supplements specifically address needs and pressure points of the Social and Community Support Services Division as part of the capital investment strategy and use of housing subsidies</td>
<td>Central administration within the City for housing and homelessness change initiatives</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reinforce focus on housing as primary objective, with housing as harm reduction</td>
<td>Review London CARES for alignment with Community Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build capacity amongst service providers in delivering an appropriate housing support program through training, coaching and monitoring</td>
<td>Review London CARES for alignment with Community Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invest in supports to people once housed – for 6-18 months – with a strong focus on Stages of Change, a recovery orientation, strength-based and client-centred case planning, and movement towards greater independence, and with those indicating a higher acuity receiving more intensive service</td>
<td>Review London CARES for alignment with Community Housing Strategy Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program – to the most chronically homeless Increase supports to people once housed</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for continuation of Hostels to Homes as part of the Province’s Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program – to the most chronically homeless</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Examine the experience of other Ontario municipalities that implemented a Hostels to Homes program, including Hamilton, and the policy and program structures, and outcomes</td>
<td>Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program – to the most chronically homeless</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledge program refinements necessary to Hostels to Homes – or a similar program - on a Local and Provincial level to be effective (I) [M]</td>
<td>Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program – to the most chronically homeless</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus of Attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
<th>Related Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Related Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establish sustainability plan for Hostels to Homes, including meeting the needs of existing clients</td>
<td>Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program – to the most chronically homeless</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish triage and diversion protocols at shelter intake, leveraging Rent Bank and other community, family and friend resources</td>
<td>Review shelter system and programming</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invest in prevention strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase knowledge and capacity of sector to implement an appropriate support approach with a specific housing stability focus</td>
<td>Increase supports to people once housed</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Examine all housing and homelessness funding programs with an eye towards strategic alignment with the Community Housing Strategy and opportunities for simplified, more efficient processes for service providers</td>
<td>Align all funding to support investment in priorities and needs</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research appropriate approaches to homeless counts and needs assessments that may be relevant to a City of London's size with the make-up of service delivery and composition of the homeless population known to exist within the community, which will provide useful results for planning and decision-making</td>
<td>Determine the number and service needs of persons who are homeless</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult further with service providers on the actions and content of the Community Plan on Homelessness</td>
<td>Community Plan on Homelessness</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a new Community Plan on Homelessness</td>
<td>Community Plan on Homelessness</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to embrace all elements of being a Service Manager and local decision-making, exercising all discretionary powers allowed by current legislation and advocating for changes in legislation as appropriate and necessary</td>
<td>Increase London’s profile as an equal partner, not just another stakeholder with other orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayor to invite local MPs and MPPs to inter-governmental dialogue on housing and homelessness, and the ways in which all orders of government will work together to achieve success in the housing continuum</td>
<td>Increase London's profile as an equal partner, not just another stakeholder with other orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for changes to Provincial legislation that define expected outcomes and service levels rather than how to manage programs, increasing flexibility in local decision-making and meeting local needs</td>
<td>Increase London's profile as an equal partner, not just another stakeholder with other orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for increases in Ontario Works rate of shelter allowance relative to local average market rent, and basic needs relative to local cost of living</td>
<td>Increase income supports</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for increases in Ontario Disability Support Program rate of shelter allowance relative to local average market rent, and basic needs relative to local cost of living</td>
<td>Increase income supports</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for changes that will remove disincentives to work and increase stability in the transition from receiving assistance to being employed</td>
<td>Increase income supports</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for adjustments to rent/utility scales that reflect the present year, not 1993 (their current base year)</td>
<td>Adjust shelter allowance and rent/utility scales</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for changes in social housing rent calculations to be the same as the maximum shelter allowance used in the private sector rather than the current legislated rent scales which leave social housing providers at a gross disadvantage</td>
<td>Adjust shelter allowance and rent/utility scales</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess the impact on administration costs and seek cost recovery if implemented by the Province</td>
<td>Adjust shelter allowance and rent/utility scales</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Focus of Attention** | **Related Recommendation(s)** | **Related Theme(s)**
--- | --- | ---
• Advocate for a reinvestment of expenditure reductions from maturing mortgages into preserving existing social housing stock, addressing the backlog of capital repairs within social housing, and developing new housing to address emerging and pressing needs | Continue Federal Investment in Social Housing | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Advocate that rental subsidies scheduled to be lost are preserved | Continue Federal Investment in Social Housing | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Advocate for Federal block funding to be indexed to inflation so that Municipal tax dollars are no longer needed to make up the difference | Continue Federal Investment in Social Housing | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Acknowledge the important contributions of other orders of government in making the program possible | Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Contribute to policy and program discussions with other orders of government | Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Participate in the program extension | Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Give consideration to all rent subsidies and supplements being “portable” – attached to the individual, not the specific property | Provide additional rent subsidies and supplements | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Advocate for longer term rental subsidies for Hostels to Homes participants equivalent to current subsidy, plus inflation, using shelter per diems in this flexible, innovative and appropriate manner | Provide additional rent subsidies and supplements | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Advocate for subsidies and supplements to meet targets | Provide additional rent subsidies and supplements | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Continue to support inclusionary zoning in principle, while requesting clear implementation guidelines and policy direction related to Bill 198 | Provide clearer policy direction on planning related matters | Working with Other Orders of Government

• Advocate that municipalities be given the tools necessary to respond to and implement Provincial planning policies | Provide clearer policy direction on planning related matters | Working with Other Orders of Government
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
<th>Related Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Related Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for Provincial funding to research the impacts of Special Priority Policy for victims of domestic violence in social housing</td>
<td>Amend Special Priority Policy</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for pilot or amendments to policy allowing for 70 rent supplements/subsidies over the next five years to decrease concentration within social housing and divert victims from social housing; mixing and integrating into communities throughout London</td>
<td>Amend Special Priority Policy</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct staffing review in Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division relative to achieving the objectives of the London Community Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Redefine and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate the construction and acquisition of affordable rental properties, affordable homeownership dwellings, and rent supplements/subsidies to meet the needs of 700 households (details in section on Targets)</td>
<td>Target for the City of London</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with the Province to provide capital and operating funding for 300 units of supportive or alternative housing</td>
<td>Supportive and alternative housing target for other orders of government</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that a minimum of 25% of all units – rental and ownership – created within the redevelopment of the London Psychiatric Hospital land, South Street Campus or the CPRI lands on Oxford Street West meet or exceed the affordability thresholds as identified in the Official Plan</td>
<td>Create mix within larger scale redevelopments</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stabilize and support existing affordable and social housing communities through</td>
<td>Maintain existing stock</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining investment in community based sector and community development that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meets the needs of those communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to implement <em>Residential Rental Unit Licensing By-law</em> and monitor</td>
<td>Ensure quality housing where tenants have their needs meet</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Through by-law, continue to investigate properties when there are complaints</td>
<td>Ensure quality housing where tenants have their needs meet</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue investment through grants of having community-based programs meet the</td>
<td>Ensure quality housing where tenants have their needs meet</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need of tenants related to their housing stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue focus on better meeting the needs of people with no fixed address on</td>
<td>Responsive and innovative Special Ontario Works Teams</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Works case loads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue the investment of $2 Million in the Housing Division operating budget for</td>
<td>Maintain annual $2 Million City investment in affordable housing</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use Municipal $2 Million investment in affordable housing as leverage with other orders of government</td>
<td>Maintain $2 Million City investment in affordable housing</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue work with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities</td>
<td>Continue to nurture the City’s National and Provincial profile and expertise</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue work with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario</td>
<td>Continue to nurture the City’s National and Provincial profile and expertise</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue work with the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association</td>
<td>Continue to nurture the City’s National and Provincial profile and expertise</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue work in housing and homeless program consolidation and human services integration following the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review</td>
<td>Continue to nurture the City’s National and Provincial profile and expertise</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue involvement in the Municipal Affairs and Housing Consultations on the new Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy for the Province, and submit this Strategy for their consideration</td>
<td>Continue to nurture the City’s National and Provincial profile and expertise</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue involvement with the Homelessness Partnering Strategy</td>
<td>Continue to nurture the City’s National and Provincial profile and expertise</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send a copy of the Strategy with covering letter from the Mayor to local MPs, MPPs, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Ministry of Children and Youth Services, Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, the Office of the Premier, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Service Canada, and the Office of the Prime Minister</td>
<td>Continue to nurture the City’s National and Provincial profile and expertise</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider the Strategy as a first step toward joint accountability and seamless service delivery</td>
<td>Embrace synergies and opportunities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division working more closely together to achieve mutual objectives</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “Soon” Focus of Attention priorities in the Strategy are listed in the table below. These should be acted upon within the first 24 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
<th>Related Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Related Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinate funding of groups to achieve mutual objectives</td>
<td>Focus on Housing and Homelessness Together</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embrace synergies and opportunities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division working more closely together to achieve mutual objectives</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redefine and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Divisions</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pilot mobile Ontario Works workers or satellite offices within more select community agencies or housing providers</td>
<td>Decentralize Ontario Works offices</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assemble strategic roundtables with neighbouring municipalities, and seek acknowledgement of London’s role in meeting housing needs and serving people who are homeless and low-income</td>
<td>Regional identity</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue deliberations and program discussions with health, mental health, justice and other sectors, with an eye to funding programs, supports and integrated policies that reinforce London’s regional identity</td>
<td>Regional identity</td>
<td>Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement service prioritization tool to target those with most acute needs first</td>
<td>Review London CAReS for alignment with Community Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target Hostels to Homes – or similar program – to the most chronically homeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce individual shelter users by 25% compared to the total number of unique individuals served in 2009</td>
<td>Reduce shelter beds and shelter use over the next five years</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give consideration to specialization – different tiers of service – within shelters served by professional supports accordingly</td>
<td>Review shelter system and programming</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement service prioritization tool to target those with most acute needs first, including intensive services to long term and repeated users of the shelters as focus for housing interventions</td>
<td>Review shelter system and programming</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance relationships with other service sectors (e.g., health, mental health, corrections) to broker for appropriate services and provide more complete wrap-around supports</td>
<td>Increase supports to people once housed</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor the effectiveness of the Rent Bank and THAW and make program refinements based upon emerging needs</td>
<td>Invest in prevention strategies</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement policies and procedures to rapidly re-house individuals before they become entrenched in homelessness</td>
<td>Invest in prevention strategies</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement shared client information system as a condition of funding, with due consideration of costs and database compatibility</td>
<td>Shared client information system</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invest in software, user rights and training of one of the many lower cost client information systems available “off the shelf”, as appropriate</td>
<td>Shared client information system</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure information system provides credible data to funder and is used for longer term evaluation, and build criteria for sharing data into contract terms with service providers</td>
<td>Shared client information system</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop appropriate client consent forms for intake and data sharing and storage protocols</td>
<td>Shared client information system</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete Privacy Impact Assessment for the City related to the information system</td>
<td>Shared client information system</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educate service providers on inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes with special attention paid to distinguishing outputs from outcomes</td>
<td>Outcome based funding</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create logic models for each program relative to contract and conditions of funding that emphasize outcomes and the evaluative tools that will be used to know if outcomes are being achieved</td>
<td>Outcome based funding</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consolidate investments in the community based sector to those organizations that achieve long term, positive outcomes relative to the populations they serve</td>
<td>Outcome based funding</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement activity to determine the number and service needs of persons who are homeless</td>
<td>Determine the number and service needs of persons who are homeless</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish City policies and positions related to the housing continuum, not just reactive ones during consultation processes spearheaded by the Federal or Provincial governments</td>
<td>Increase London’s profile as an equal partner, not just another stakeholder with other orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide leadership with neighbouring municipalities, while acknowledging and embracing London’s role as a regional centre</td>
<td>Increase London’s profile as an equal partner, not just another stakeholder with other orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Host a summit on housing and homelessness with Ontario municipalities of similar size to strategically align positions, and learn of promising practices from each other</td>
<td>Increase London’s profile as an equal partner, not just another stakeholder with other orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase awareness of income support levels by hosting an annual week long campaign (e.g., a challenge for people to buy food and live off of the same amount of income that a person on social assistance would receive)</td>
<td>Increase income supports</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for the Province to establish accreditation for persons and companies working in the management of rental properties.</td>
<td>Strengthen capacity of housing providers</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build capacity amongst property managers</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for changes to the <em>Residential Tenancies Act</em> to include mandatory minimum standard for tenant/member property/content insurance</td>
<td>Strengthen capacity of housing providers</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for increase in the number of Federally funded settlement houses</td>
<td>Increase investment in settlement services and culturally appropriate assistance to newcomers</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for continued and increased funding to create more housing specifically for the Aboriginal community</td>
<td>Expand opportunities to meet the needs of Aboriginal people</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for regulatory changes to allow social housing providers to borrow funds against their equity for capital repairs</td>
<td>Permit borrowing against equity of existing social housing</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for extensions in mortgages so that social housing providers can pay back the additional debt</td>
<td>Permit borrowing against equity of existing social housing</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for amendments which limit the leverage of social housing assets for expansions and/or energy retrofits</td>
<td>Permit borrowing against equity of existing social housing</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare a business case showing the importance of protecting public assets, and advocate for new grants for capital repairs of existing stock to ensure all units are in habitable condition and ready for tenancy</td>
<td>Provide new grants to maintain stock</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for increased number of rent subsidies</td>
<td>Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for improved opportunities for affordable homeownership</td>
<td>Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for improvements to the Provincial Policy Statement related to mix of housing types and affordability, respecting deeper levels of assistance with affordability</td>
<td>Provide clearer policy direction on related planning matters</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish cost baseline of interface between London CAReS and Hostels to Homes</td>
<td>Obtain cost recovery from programs that divert people away from hospitals, corrections, etc.</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or similar program) clients with hospitals, walk-in clinics, police, EMS, and</td>
<td>reinvested into new affordable housing capital and affordable homeownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>justice system prior to intervention and in 6 and 12 month period following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with the Federal and Provincial governments to develop a coherent policy on</td>
<td>Acquire buildings and property from all orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the use and/or sale of surplus properties to support the housing needs identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for the Federal and Provincial governments to invest in the City</td>
<td>Acquire buildings and property from all orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquiring and renovating residential apartments and similar buildings such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single room occupancy hotels to provide sustainable and affordable rental housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to single vulnerable populations, single people in the process of being rehoused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and as interim housing and shelter diversion strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for land owned by the Federal and Provincial government that is deemed</td>
<td>Acquire buildings and property from all orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be surplus, economically evaluated and either: a) provided to the Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as sites for affordable housing development – including covering all costs of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site remediation prior to providing London the site; or, b) sold to the private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sector, with the City being the sole beneficiary of the funds gained from the sale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and used exclusively for the development of new affordable housing and/or rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidies/supplements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify roles, functions, priorities to address the needs of people in the</td>
<td>Redefine and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Housing Division and Social</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuum so that they are understood and accepted by partners, clients</td>
<td>and Community Support Services Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase training opportunities for property managers, especially pertaining to</td>
<td>Build capacity amongst property managers</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenant relationship management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Align new affordable housing development with neighbourhood planning</td>
<td>Mix throughout the City</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include in the proposal process a condition that all pro forma and life cycle</td>
<td>Embrace environmental stewardship</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>costing for new affordable housing construction must consider implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of green technology with a green lens towards funding decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include in the proposal process a condition that access to transit and pedestrian</td>
<td>Embrace environmental stewardship</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendliness will be a consideration in all new affordable housing development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subject to resources from other orders of government, protect existing</td>
<td>Maintain existing stock</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordable housing stock by having the ability to borrow against equity, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ensure all social housing units are in a state of good repair and ready to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be rented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feasibility of each new affordable housing development of three or more storeys</td>
<td>Examine economic development opportunity with each new affordable housing development of</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should give consideration to retail/commercial/office at grade</td>
<td>three or more storeys on a major or minor arterial road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-examine local priorities for the subsidized housing waiting list, and the</td>
<td>Improve the waiting list for subsidized housing</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness of achieving those priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus of Attention | Related Recommendation(s) | Related Theme(s)
--- | --- | ---
- Mayor or appointed delegate to convene meetings a minimum of two times per year on implementation of the recommendations of the Strategy, with the update to include: a) Shared Accountability – representatives from all groups including Municipal staff, private sector, non-profit sector, responsible for working to implement recommendations and report on status of implementation and remove barriers to implementation; b) Report and briefing from City staff; c) Information for an annual update report to Council as a whole through the Council Housing Leadership Committee or similar body on the Strategy implementation, including amendments to strategic direction as influenced by other programs or changes in local circumstances | Mayor’s update on Community Housing Strategy Implementation | Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing
- Monitor outcomes of Special Ontario Works Teams and adjust activities accordingly | Responsive and innovative Special Ontario Works Teams | Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise

The “Later” Focus of Attention priorities in the Strategy are listed in the table below. These should be acted upon in years three, four and five of the Strategy.

Focus of Attention | Related Recommendation(s) | Related Theme(s)
--- | --- | ---
- Conduct feasibility study to separate the primary downtown Ontario Works office into three or more additional community offices (L) [M] | Decentralize Ontario Works Office | Organizational Changes for Effective Strategy Implementation
- Reduce the number of shelter beds by a minimum of 15% compared to the number of permanent shelter beds, as of April 2010 | Reduce shelter beds and shelter use over the next five years | Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
<th>Related Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Related Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Adjust shelter reduction targets relative to effectiveness of London CAReS, Hostels to Homes and/or other related programs</td>
<td>Reduce shelter beds and shelter use over the next five years</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study the opportunity to begin conversion of existing shelters into interim or permanent affordable housing</td>
<td>Reduce shelter beds and shelter use over the next five years</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate to the Province of Ontario to examine its funding mechanisms and the use of per diem funding for other program purposes that focus on providing permanent solutions to homelessness</td>
<td>Reduce shelter beds and shelter use over the next five years</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop multi-disciplinary team of professionals – or similar approach – to more appropriately serve those with complex needs</td>
<td>Increase supports to people once housed</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop expertise in the delivery of Supported Employment, as a proven evidence-based practice</td>
<td>Consider Supported Employment</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pilot Supported Employment with a minimum of 10% of Ontario Works recipients that are served through the next phase of London CAReS</td>
<td>Consider Supported Employment</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a data review committee which includes community partners</td>
<td>Shared client information systems</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use information for policy development, client priority setting and program refinements</td>
<td>Shared client information systems</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthen community education and awareness through aggregate findings</td>
<td>Shared client information systems</td>
<td>Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Adjust Sub-Targets and inform investment of new housing initiatives | Shared client information systems
Determine the number and service needs of persons who are homeless | Focus on Permanent Solutions to Homelessness |
<p>| • Study the ability to – and mechanisms to – subsidize transit passes for low-income residents | Increase income supports | Working with Other Orders of Government |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Attention</th>
<th>Related Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Related Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop strategies to improve food security, and use a healthy food basket measure to determine baseline</td>
<td>Increase income supports</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from hospitals, mental health and addiction facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary</td>
<td>Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from Provincial correctional facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary</td>
<td>Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from Federal correctional facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary</td>
<td>Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons who are being released after being held on remand, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary</td>
<td>Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for sustainable, predictable funding with reduced “red tape”</td>
<td>Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a business case reflecting the cost savings through diversion</td>
<td>Obtain cost recovery from programs that divert people away from hospitals, corrections, etc., and reinvest into new affordable housing capital and affordable homeownership</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for cost recovery from Provincially funded systems as a direct result of supports and diversion</td>
<td>Obtain cost recovery from programs that divert people away from hospitals, corrections, etc., and reinvest into new affordable housing capital and affordable homeownership</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Attention</td>
<td>Related Recommendation(s)</td>
<td>Related Theme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bank land not immediately needed for affordable housing initiatives for a later point in time</td>
<td>Acquire buildings and property from all orders of government</td>
<td>Working with Other Orders of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the anticipated larger scale redevelopments such as London Psychiatric Hospital land, South Street Campus of Victoria Hospital or the CPRI lands on Oxford Street West embrace Smart Growth principles by way of compact, mixed housing with increased yield and improved affordability</td>
<td>Create mix within larger scale redevelopments</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Apply Smart Growth principles in all Greenfield development and larger scale redevelopments that include a component of units related to this Strategy, while staying aligned to the policies of the Official Plan</td>
<td>Embrace environmental stewardship</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feasibility of each new affordable housing development of three or more storeys for a specific population, and supported by a non-profit organization, should give consideration to having a franchise or other suitable business at grade operated by tenants with profits reinvested into the building and the tenants being the employees</td>
<td>Examine economic development opportunity with each new affordable housing development of three or more storeys on a major or minor arterial road</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct a complete review of the waiting list process and pilot a revised system</td>
<td>Improve the waiting list for subsidized housing</td>
<td>Future Development Targets and Considerations for Existing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider indexing the Municipal investment in housing to inflation over time</td>
<td>Maintain $2 Million City investment in affordable housing</td>
<td>Continuation of Policies and Programs that Hold Promise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Order of Government Responsible for Actively Facilitating or Working to Resolve the Actions

The City of London will take responsibility for actively facilitating or working to resolve the following actions:

• Reviewing all existing housing and/or homelessness related committees and terms of references to determine overlaps and gaps; combine into fewer coherent committee structures aligned with the spirit and intent of a continuum approach to the Community Housing Strategy
• Creating a unifying vision and complementary strategies between Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division
• Coordinating funding of groups to achieve mutual objectives
• Creating client priorities, establishing clear policies, evaluating effectiveness of implementation, developing and enforcing standards of service and developing and implementing training and coaching for London CAReS and Hostels to Homes, or similar initiative(s)
• Reinforcing the need for a specific entity to manage capital projects, RFPs, etc. in new affordable housing development
• Ensuring Request for Proposal calls for new development and other housing resources such as rent supplements specifically address needs and pressure points of Social and Community Support Services Division as part of the capital investment strategy and use of housing subsidies
• Conducting feasibility study to separate main Ontario Works office into three or four community offices
• Piloting mobile Ontario Works workers or satellite offices within select community agencies or housing providers
• Assembling strategic roundtables with neighbouring municipalities, and seeking acknowledgement of London’s role in meeting housing needs and serving people who are homeless and low-income
• Continuing deliberations and program discussions with health, mental health, justice and other sectors, with an eye to funding, programs, supports and integrated policies that reinforce London’s regional identity
• Creating client priorities, establish clear policies, evaluate effectiveness of implementation, and develop and enforce standards of service
• Reinforcing a focus on housing as the prime objective, of London CAReS with housing as harm reduction
• Building capacity amongst service providers in delivering an appropriate housing support program through training, coaching and monitoring
• Implementing a service prioritization tool to target those with most acute needs first
• Investing in supports to people once housed – for 6-18 months – with a strong focus on Stages of Change, a recovery orientation, strength-based and client-centred case planning, and movement towards greater independence, and with those indicating a higher acuity receiving more intensive service
• Examining the experience of other Ontario municipalities that implemented a Hostels to Homes program, including Hamilton, and the policy and program structure and outcomes
• Acknowledging program refinements necessary to Hostels to Homes – or a similar program - on a Local and Provincial level to be effective
• Reducing the number of shelter beds by a minimum of 15% compared to number of permanent shelter beds as of April 2010
• Reducing individual shelter users by 25% compared to total number of unique individuals served in 2009
• Adjusting shelter reduction targets relative to the effectiveness of London CAReS, Hostels to Homes and/or other related programs
• Studying the opportunity to begin conversion of existing shelters into interim or permanent affordable housing
• Establishing triage and diversion protocols at shelter intake, leveraging Rent Bank and other community and family & friend resources
• Giving consideration to specialization – different tiers of service – within shelters served by professional support accordingly
• Implementing service prioritization tool to target those with most acute needs first, including intensive services to long term and repeated users of the shelters as focus for housing interventions
• Sub-dividing the City into geographic areas to coordinate support and establish neighbourhood/community leadership for identified areas, and focus on neighbourhood/community integration
• Enhancing relationships with other service sectors (e.g., health, mental health, corrections) to broker for appropriate services and provide more complete, wrap-around supports
• Developing multi-disciplinary team of professionals – or similar approach - to more appropriately serve those with more complex needs
• Increasing knowledge and capacity of sector to implement an appropriate support approach with a specific housing stability focus
• Monitoring the effectiveness of the Rent Bank and The Heat and Warmth program and making program refinements based upon emerging needs
• Implementing policies and procedures to rapidly re-house individuals before they become entrenched in homelessness
• Examining all housing and homelessness funding programs with an eye towards strategic alignment with the Community Housing Strategy and opportunities for simplified, more efficient processes for service providers
• Developing expertise in the delivery of Supported Employment
• Piloting Supported Employment with a minimum of 10% of Ontario Works recipients that are served through the next phase of London CAReS
• Implementing shared client information system as a condition of funding, with due consideration of costs and database compatibility
• Investing in software, user rights and training of one of the many lower cost client information systems available “off the shelf”, as appropriate
• Ensuring information system provides credible data to funder and is used for longer term evaluation, and building criteria for sharing data into contract terms with service providers
• Creating a data review committee which includes community partners
• Developing an appropriate client consent form for intake and data sharing and
storage protocols
- Completing Privacy Impact Assessment for the City related to the information system
- Using information from the client information system for policy development, client priority setting and program refinements (e.g., examine where services are accessed, by whom, frequency of use, recidivism, etc.)
- Strengthening community education and awareness through aggregate findings of the client information system
- Adjusting Sub-Targets and informing investment of new housing initiatives
- Educating service providers on inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes, with special attention paid to distinguishing outputs from outcomes
- Creating logic models for each program relative to contract and conditions of funding that emphasize outcomes and the evaluative tools that will be used to know if outcomes are being achieved
- Consolidating investments in the community based sector to those organizations that achieve long term, positive outcomes relative to the populations they are serving
- Researching appropriate approaches to homeless counts and needs assessments that may be relevant to a City of London’s size with the make-up of service delivery and composition of the homeless population known to exist within the community, which will provide useful results for planning and decision-making
- Implementing an activity to determine the number and service needs of persons who are homeless
- Consulting further with service providers on the actions and content of the Community Plan on Homelessness
- Creating a new Community Plan on Homelessness
- Continuing to embrace all elements of being a Service Manager and local decision-making, exercising all discretionary powers allowed by current legislation and advocating for changes in legislation and regulation as appropriate and necessary
- Establishing City policies and positions related to the housing continuum, not just reactive ones during consultation processes spearheaded by the Federal or Provincial governments
- Mayor to invite local MPs and MPPs to inter-governmental dialogue on housing and homelessness, and the ways in which all orders of government will work together to achieve success in the housing continuum
- Providing leadership with neighbouring municipalities, while acknowledging and embracing London’s role as a regional centre
- Hosting a summit on housing and homelessness with Ontario municipalities of a similar size to strategically align positions, and learn of promising practices from each other
- Studying the ability and mechanisms to subsidize transit passes for low-income residents
- Developing strategies to improve food security, and use a healthy food basket measure to determine baseline
- Increasing awareness of income support levels by hosting an annual week long campaign (e.g., a challenge for people to buy food and live off of the same amount of income that a person on social assistance would receive)
• Assessing the impact on administration costs for Ontario Works [re: Shelter Allowance and Rent and Utility Scales] and seeking cost recovery if implemented by the Province
• Acknowledging the important contributions of other orders of government in making the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program possible
• Participating in the program [re Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program] extension
• Establishing cost baseline of interface between London CAReS and Hostels to Homes (or similar program) clients with hospitals, walk-in clinics, police, EMS, and justice systems prior to intervention and in 6 and 12 month period following supports
• Creating a business case reflecting the cost savings through diversion from hospitals, walk-in clinics, police, EMS and justice system
• Banking land not immediately needed for affordable housing initiatives for a later point in time
• Conducting staffing review in Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services relative to achieving objectives of the London Community Housing Strategy
• Increasing training opportunities for property managers, especially pertaining to tenant relationship management
• Facilitating the construction and acquisition of affordable rental properties, affordable homeownership dwellings and rent supplements/subsidies to meet the needs of 700 households (details in section on targets)
• In the anticipated larger scale redevelopments such as London Psychiatric Hospital land, South Street Campus of Victoria Hospital or the CPRI lands on Oxford Street West embracing Smart Growth principles by way of compact, mixed housing with increased yield and improved affordability
• Ensuring that a minimum of 25% of all units – rental and ownership – created within the redevelopments of the London Psychiatric Hospital land, South Street Campus or the CPRI lands on Oxford Street West meet or exceed the affordability thresholds as identified in the Official Plan
• Aligning new affordable housing development with neighbourhood planning
• Including in the proposal process a condition that all pro forma and life cycle costing for new affordable housing construction must consider implementing green technology with a green lens towards funding decisions
• Applying Smart Growth principles in all Greenfield development and larger scale redevelopments that include a component of units related to this Strategy, while staying aligned to the policies of the Official Plan
• Including in the proposal process a condition that access to transit and pedestrian friendliness will be a consideration in all new affordable housing development
• Stabilizing and supporting existing affordable and social housing communities through maintaining investment in community based sector and community development that meets the needs of those communities
• Ensuring feasibility of each new affordable housing development of three or more storeys should give consideration to retail/commercial/office at grade
• Ensuring feasibility of each new affordable housing development of three or more...
storeys for a specific population, and supported by a non-profit organization, should give consideration to having a franchise or other suitable business at grade operated by tenants with profits reinvested into the building and the tenants being the employees.

- Re-examining local priorities for the subsidized housing waiting list, and the effectiveness of achieving those priorities
- Conducting a complete review of the waiting list process and piloting a revised system
- Mayor or appointed delegate convening a meeting a minimum of two times per year on implementation of the recommendations of the Strategy, with the update including:
  - Shared accountability. Representatives from all groups—Municipal staff, private sector, non-profit sector—responsible for working to implement recommendations and report on status of implementation, and remove barriers to implementation
  - Report and briefing from City staff
  - Information for an annual update report to Council as a whole through the CHLC or similar body on the Strategy implementation, including amendments to strategic direction as influenced by other programs or changes in local circumstances
- Continuing to implement Residential Rental Unit Licensing By-law and monitor implementation
- Through by-law, continuing to investigate properties when there are complaints
- Continuing investment through grants of having community-based programs meet the needs of tenants related to their housing stability
- Continuing focus on better meeting the needs of people with no fixed address on Ontario Works caseloads
- Monitoring outcomes of Special Ontario Works Teams and adjusting activities accordingly
- Continuing the investment of $2 Million in the Housing Division operating budget for affordable housing
- Using the Municipal $2 Million investment in affordable housing as leverage with other orders of government
- Considering indexing the Municipal investment in affordable housing to inflation over time
- Continuing work with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities
- Continuing work with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario
- Continuing work with the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association
- Continuing involvement with provincial conferences such as the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association
- Continuing work in housing and homeless program consolidation and human services integration following the Provincial Municipal Fiscal Service Delivery Review
- Continuing involvement in Municipal Affairs and Housing Consultations on new Long-term Housing Strategy for the Province and submit this Strategy for their consideration
- Continuing involvement with the Homelessness Partnering Strategy
• Sending a copy of the Strategy with covering letter from the Mayor to local MPs, MPPs, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Ministry of Children and Youth Services, Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, the Office of the Premier, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Service Canada and the Office of the Prime Minister
• Considering this Strategy a first step towards joint accountability and seamless service delivery between the Housing Division and Social and Community Support Services Division

The Province of Ontario should take responsibility for actively facilitating or working to resolve the following actions:
• Establishing a sustainability plan for Hostels to Homes, including meeting the needs of existing clients
• Continuing Hostels to Homes as part of the Province’s Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy, and/or the development of a similar program to Hostels to Homes
• Examining funding mechanisms and the use of per diem funding for other program purposes that focus on providing permanent solutions to homelessness
• Changing Provincial legislation that defines expected outcomes and service levels rather than how to manage programs, increasing flexibility in local decision-making and meeting local needs
• Increasing Ontario Works rate of shelter allowance relative to local average market rent, and basic needs relative to local cost of living
• Increasing Ontario Disability Support Program rate of shelter allowance relative to local average market rent, and basic needs relative to local cost of living
• Creating incentives for households to transition from Ontario Works to employment Establishing accreditation or licensed standards for persons and companies working in the management of rental properties
• Changing the Residential Tenancies Act to include mandatory minimum standard for tenant/member property/content insurance
• Improving discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from hospitals, mental health and addiction facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary
• Improving discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from Provincial correctional facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary
• Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons who are being released after being held on remand, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary
• Adjusting rent/utility scales that reflect the present year; not 1993 (their current base year)
• Changing social housing rent calculations to be the same as the maximum shelter allowance used in the private sector rather than the current legislated rent scales which leave social housing providers at a gross disadvantage
• Making regulatory changes to allow social housing providers to borrow funds against their equity for capital repairs
• Extending mortgages so that social housing providers can pay back the additional debt if they borrow against their equity
• Making amendments to address limits on the leverage of social housing assets for expansions and/or energy retrofits
• Providing new grants for capital repairs of existing stock to ensure all units are in habitable condition and ready for tenancy
• Inviting the City of London to policy and program discussions as an equal partner
• Increasing the number of rent subsidies
• Improving opportunities for affordable homeownership
• Providing sustainable, predictable funding with reduced “red tape”
• Providing longer term rental subsidies for Hostels to Homes participants equivalent to current subsidy, plus inflation, using shelter per diems in this flexible, innovative and appropriate manner
• Giving consideration to all rent subsidies and supplements being “portable” – attached to the individual, not a specific property
• Providing supplements and subsidies to meet the targets of the Strategy
• Providing clear implementation guidelines and policy direction related to Inclusionary Zoning (Bill 198)
• Giving Municipalities the tools necessary to respond to and implement Provincial planning policies
• Improving the Provincial Policy Statement related to mix of housing types and affordability, respecting deeper levels of assistance with affordability
• Providing cost recovery for diversion from Provincially funded systems as a direct result of supports
• Researching the impacts of Special Priority Policy for victims of domestic violence on social housing
• Piloting or amending policy allowing for 70 rent supplements/subsidies over the next five years to be used for victims of domestic violence, decreasing the concentration within social housing and diverting victims from social housing, mixing and integrating into communities throughout London
• Engaging with Municipal and Federal counterparts to develop a coherent policy on the use and/or sale of surplus properties to support the housing needs identified within the Strategy
• Investing in the City acquiring and renovating residential apartment and similar buildings such as single room occupancy hotels to provide sustainable and affordable rental housing:
  – to single, vulnerable populations
  – single people in the process of being re-housed
  – as interim housing and shelter diversion strategy
• Examining surplus land, economically evaluating it and either:
  – Providing the land to the Municipality as sites for affordable housing development—including covering all costs of site remediation prior to providing London the site;
  – Selling the land to the private sector, with the City being the sole beneficiary
of the funds gained from the sale, and used exclusively for the development of new affordable housing and/or rent subsidies/supplements
• Providing capital and operating funding for 300 units of supportive or alternative housing
• Protecting existing affordable housing stock by providing the ability for social housing providers to borrow against equity, etc. ensuring all social housing units are in a state of good repair and ready to be rented

The Government of Canada should take responsibility for actively facilitating or working to resolve the following actions:
• Improving discharge planning/shelter diversion of persons with no fixed address from federal correctional facilities, with agreed policies, procedures and program innovations as necessary
• Increasing the number of federally funded settlement houses
• Continuing and increasing funding to create more housing specifically for the Aboriginal community
• Reinvesting the expenditure reductions from maturing mortgages into preserving existing social housing stock, addressing the backlog of capital repairs within social housing, and developing new housing to address emerging and pressing needs
• Preserving rental subsidies that are scheduled to be lost
• Indexing Federal block funding to inflation so that Municipal tax dollars are no longer needed to make up the difference
• Inviting the City of London to policy and program discussions as an equal partner
• Increasing the number of rent subsidies
• Improving opportunities for affordable homeownership
• Providing sustainable, predictable funding with reduced “red tape”
• Giving consideration to making all rent subsidies and supplements being “portable” – attached to the individual, not the specific property
• Providing supplements and subsidies to meet targets in the Strategy
• Engaging with Municipal and Provincial counterparts to develop a coherent policy on the use and/or sale of surplus properties to support the housing needs identified within the Strategy
• Investing in the City acquiring and renovating residential apartment and similar buildings such as single room occupancy hotels to provide sustainable and affordable rental housing:
  – to single, vulnerable populations
  – single people in the process of being re-housed
  – as interim housing and shelter diversion strategy
• Examining surplus land, economically evaluating it and either:
  – Providing the land to the Municipality as sites for affordable housing development—including covering all costs of site remediation prior to providing London the site;
  – Selling the land to the private sector, with the City being the sole beneficiary of the funds gained from the sale, and used exclusively for the development of new affordable housing and/or rent subsidies/supplements
• Protecting existing affordable housing stock and ensuring all social housing units are in a state of good repair and ready to be rented
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It should be noted that according to CMHC, regardless of their circumstances, non-family households led by maintainers 15 to 29 years of age attending school full-time are considered to be in a transitional stage of life and therefore not in core housing need.


Net savings or cost recovery in excess of $450,000 would not be earmarked for this innovation.
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LCHS Research Methodology
In the development of the London Community Housing Strategy, OrgCode used multiple methods to gather, analyze and synthesize the data used for the document. The LCHS was developed by third-party experts with input from a diverse range of London stakeholders.

**Review of Existing Reports and Documentation**

OrgCode reviewed thousands of pages of documents provided by the City of London and by stakeholders from within London. A complete list of reference documents can be found in the Reference List, Appendix D of the LCHS as well as specific references in the endnotes.

The documents included Council reports, presentations, service forecasts, budgets, position papers, briefing notes, speaking notes, letters, consultation submissions, program commentary, service volume data, questionnaires, surveys, research (published and unpublished), documents from other jurisdictions, summaries of other processes and media articles and clips. OrgCode also reviewed City Council decisions and policy documents from the City of London as they pertained to housing, homelessness and the overlap with planning.

**Review of Affordable Housing Development**

OrgCode reviewed documentation related to the 1,134 units of affordable housing that have been developed since 2004, and visited several of the developments. The review included the proponent, the general description of the housing, the number of units developed, length of time of development, the expenditures and the target group to be served by the housing.

**Review of Investments and Outcomes of Homeless Programs and Services**

OrgCode reviewed documentation related to homeless programs and services that receive funding by, associated with or through the City of London. The review looked at amount of funding, policy intent, reported outcomes and outputs, and interconnections across programs and between policies. OrgCode also examined program documents associated with the likes of London CARes and Hostels to Homes, as well as projection and other documents associated with shelter operations and funding.

**Review of Data and Relevant Literature**

OrgCode reviewed data from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Statistics Canada, the City of London Housing Division, the City of London Community Services, and several individual housing providers, developers and service providers. When necessary, and when data was reliable and limitations were understood, OrgCode performed analysis on some of the data relevant to various elements of this report.

In addition, the development of the Strategy used an electronic survey to gather new data from all organizations involved with housing and supporting people in housing from across the City. Altogether, 51 organizations completed the survey, a summary of results are contained within this report.
The review of literature related to the Strategy was connected to the themes and actions emerging from the community consultations, open houses, submissions and reports and documents received from the City and other local stakeholders. It was not a literature review for the sake of conducting a literature review.

A full list of all data and literature used in the background research and development of the Strategy can be found in the Bibliography.

**Pre-Consultation**

Prior to conducting the consultation sessions, OrgCode engaged with a range of stakeholders and committees through presentations, key informant interviews and phone and email requests to gather information about how people from across the continuum from homeless services providers to housing developers to housing providers and tenants identified the “problems” that should be addressed through the Strategy development process, as well as gather data that could be presented as factual “food for thought” in the consultations. Altogether, 20 conversations and group presentations were conducted with more than 120 people. Problem statements that were used in the consultations were provided by the London Homeless Coalition, London Development Institute, Urban League, London Property Manager’s Association, London CAReS, Social Housing Operational Advisory Committee, London Housing Advisory Committee, and City Staff from Planning, Community Services, Finance and Housing.

**Community Consultations**

OrgCode facilitated 12 community consultations to develop the Strategy. Each consultation was three hours in length. Consultations were held during the morning, afternoon and evening in easily accessible locations throughout London. A list of the locations for the consultations can be found in the section, LCHS Community Consultation Process.

Consultation session invitations were sent by City of London staff, and organized by common attendees. Each group of common attendees were invited to a minimum of three consultation sessions in one day – with the option to choose the time and location best suited for them – with an additional “open” consultation session offered for anyone unable to attend on the day their group was invited.

To ensure process integrity, each consultation session used the exact same format, regardless of whether there were two people in attendance or 23 people. The major components of the PowerPoint presentation, included:

- what a Community Housing Strategy is,
- outline of the consultation,
- food for thought and problem statements,
- explanation of each stage of the consultation process,
- idea generation,
- mapping of ideas on a common chart indicating the degree of value and difficulty for each idea,
• clarification of written ideas,
• public voting on degree of agreement and prioritization, and,
• action plan development.

The process was an adaptation to the Breakthrough Thinking prioritization strategy.

Consultations also offered the opportunity for attendees to contribute their ideas on the link between community vitality and housing, between economic prosperity and housing, and the milestones in London's housing history.

All ideas generated during the consultations, including those not used in discussion, as well as the action plans generated and the participants’ thoughts on community vitality, economic prosperity and affordable housing milestones, were all kept from each session, systematically recorded and analyzed by OrgCode.

Members of the Community Reference Group were invited to attend and observe any or all of the sessions. City staff were in attendance at all sessions as a resource to answer questions. Two of the consultation sessions invited City staff from a number of Divisions to be participants. One of the consultation sessions included several people with lived experience of being homeless and/or precariously housed. They accompanied one of the frontline staff members from an outreach organization.

Community Open Houses

Two community open houses were conducted so the public could learn more about the Strategy and provide their input on the emerging themes within the Strategy. The open houses were advertised in the London Free Press. One open house was held on the afternoon of Saturday, March 27 at the North London Optimist Community Centre and the other was held during the evening on Wednesday, March 31 at City Hall. A PowerPoint presentation was available for all attendees to view regarding the Strategy consultation. Also, the public could complete questions that were posted on an interactive wall that was created. The consultants were available to interact with attendees and City staff were available to provide information and clarification.

Altogether, 25 people attended the consultation sessions. Attendees included members of the public with diverse interests in housing and homelessness, people affiliated with specific organizations, elected officials from other orders of government, tenants, Community Reference Group members, service providers, people with past lived experience and people from neighbourhood associations.

In addition, at the request of City staff, two additional open houses were conducted with specific audiences after the conclusion of the consultations. One group was the Child and Youth Network and the other was a special meeting of the London Homeless Coalition.
**Individual Responses**

Any individual unable to attend the consultations or open houses had the opportunity to provide their input directly to OrgCode via email to info@orgcode.com.

Altogether, 17 responses were received via email. The responses included contributions of other existing reports and data, as attachments or links to websites, input from persons with lived experience, input from frontline service providers, follow-up comments and questions from people who attended the consultation sessions, and members of the more general public.

**Key Informant Interviews and Meetings**

Using a semi-structured interview process, OrgCode met with 23 individuals to conduct one-on-one interviews. The purpose of the interviews was to get input from strategic stakeholders, as well as clarify information and positions emerging from the review of reports and documentation, and/or ideas emerging out of the consultations. Those included in the key informant interviews and meetings ranged from the Mayor to developers, frontline direct service providers to City staff – and many others.

**Engaging People with Lived Experience**

Using a semi-structured interview process, OrgCode invested almost seven full days of consulting by engaging with people with lived experience. The approach included engaging with clients who use specific services as well as seeking others to connect with in housing or involved on the streets without the service agency being present. Altogether, OrgCode engaged with 83 people with lived experience.

The persons with lived experience encompassed a broad range of groups: adults who are homeless and using services as well as those who are homeless and not using services; low income tenants; moderate income tenants; youth; seniors; Aboriginal people; persons with disabilities; persons with developmental delay; substance users; persons involved with sex work; working poor; consumer/psychiatric survivors; newcomers; persons with chronic illness; persons doubled up in their housing; and people with a history of incarceration. In several instances, there was overlap of many of the characteristics outlined above.

**Community Reference Group**

City staff assembled a Community Reference Group (CRG) to provide input to the consultants. The CRG consisted of four groups:

1. London Homeless Coalition
2. Urban League
3. London Property Manager’s Association
4. London Development Institute

Two Senior Managers from the City also sat on the CRG: the General Manager, Planning and Development and the General Manager, Community Services.
The Community Reference Group had the opportunity to provide input into the consultation approach, provide feedback on methods, test the consultation approach and participate in the consultations. In addition the Community Reference Group had the opportunity to provide input into the framing and content of this report.

**Steering Committee**

A Steering Committee with the Directors of the Housing Division and Community Services as well as Managers from Finance and Corporate Services, Community Services and Planning, provided oversight and were a resource to the work of the consultants. This included such activities as vetting questions and answers and communication materials, providing input on the consultation strategy and schedule, sourcing and providing reports, documentation and access to key stakeholders within the community, sequencing the work, accessing space for the consultations, and reviewing the Strategy.

---

What is the one thing that should be considered most in developing London's Community Housing Strategy?

- The communities should be walkable and services around these areas affordable.
- Integration throughout the city (north, south, east, west).
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LCHS Community Consultation Process
It was known that the development and implementation of the London Community Housing Strategy would have a long-term impact throughout the City so an appropriate governance structure was assembled to assist and guide the consultants in their planning and activities. Governance consisted of three components:

1. Council Housing Leadership Committee
2. Steering Committee
3. Community Reference Group

The Community Reference Group (CRG) was convened to provide a community-based, representative cross-section of advice to the consultants concerning their work in the City. The CRG had representatives from four organizations, including: the London Property Manager’s Association, London Development Institute, the Urban League and the London Homeless Coalition. The General Manager of the Planning & Development Department, Rob Panzer, was a member of the CRG along with Ross Fair, the General Manager of the Community Services Department. A Steering Committee from the City provided weekly support for the consultants and accompanied them when they reported on a regular basis to Council’s Housing Leadership Committee to provide updates and answer questions.

The consultants also met with the London Homeless Coalition (LCH) on several occasions during the community consultation process so that the leadership of the Coalition could provide current information to their service agency members regarding the progress of the LCHS. The chair of the LHC was also a member of the Community Reference Group.

Over the course of seven days during the period between March 23 and April 1, 2010, a consultation process was conducted regarding the creation of the London Community Housing Strategy (LCHS). The consultation process was tested with the Community Reference Group prior to deployment in the community. The consultations involved a total of 141 Londoners who attended twelve 3-hour sessions. The purpose of the consultations included the following:

1. Leverage existing knowledge and expertise regarding the housing continuum
2. Create meaningful forum for discussion
3. Identify priorities to be included in the strategy document
4. Gather broad range of input from multiple perspectives on the LCHS
5. Develop a Made in London approach

The consultations were designed to engage all people and organizations involved in the housing continuum from homelessness to affordable home ownership. The Housing Division in Planning and Social and Community Support Division from the City sent invitations to over 350 individuals, associations, agencies, companies and groups, including:

- All 64 social housing providers—non-profit, co-op and public housing
- London Property Management Association, including Property Management companies that manage social housing
- London Chamber of Commerce
- London Homeless Coalition and all homeless service providers
- London St. Thomas Association of Realtors
The consultants used a 33-slide PowerPoint presentation deck to guide the participants through a highly structured, informative and entertaining experience. The structure was seamless to the participants and was required to protect the integrity of the information gathering process. The consistency of the consultations ensured that everyone had an equal opportunity to participate and contribute to the outcomes whether the session was conducted for two people or 23 people. The introduction to the sessions took less than 30 minutes and included the purpose of the consultations, an overview of the LCHS project components, a profile of the consultants’ company, OrgCode Consulting, Inc., an explanation of why London needs a community housing strategy and how the consultation process would be conducted during the remaining 2.5 hours.

The 3-hour meetings were conducted—often three times per day—in locations across London that included:

- London Public Library: 251 Dundas Street
- South London Community Centre: 1119 Jalna Boulevard
- North London Optimist Community Centre: 1345 Cheapside Street
- Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre: 656 Elizabeth Street
- Kinsmen Arena: 20 Granville Street
- Nichols Recreation Centre: 799 Homeview Road
- City Hall: 300 Dufferin Avenue

Seated at several tables around the meeting room, the first step in the information gathering process was for the consultants to ask the participants to spend 15 minutes individually and without discussion to capture their “ideas” concerning the key issues, problems and challenges that impacted the housing continuum from homelessness to affordable homeownership. The participants wrote down each of their ideas on large, individual post-it notes that they stuck temporarily in front of themselves on the tabletop. The participants reflected a diverse range of ideas based on their expertise, role and experience in the London housing continuum.
Once the time had expired for the idea generation phase of the session, the consultants asked the participants to place their post-it note ideas on a pre-assembled quadrant on the meeting room wall called, The Strategic Opportunity Grid (see figure 1). No discussion was allowed during this step in the process as the participants walked up to the meeting room wall and, individually, placed their ideas into four quadrants that were formed from two variables: 1) the difficulty of implementation on the horizontal axis, and 2) the value or payoff of their ideas on the vertical axis.

The participants generated 752 ideas during the 12 sessions. During each session, the participants placed their ideas within the boundaries of one of the quadrants indicating the impact of their ideas on the Community Housing Strategy:

1. High Value | Low Difficulty — Big Payoff & Easy to Implement
2. High Value | High Difficulty — Big Payoff & Difficult to Implement
3. Low Value | High Difficulty — Small Payoff & Difficult to Implement
4. Low Value | Low Difficulty — Small Payoff & Easy to Implement

The consultants clarified and confirmed the meaning of each idea with the participants and they were provided with an opportunity to re-position some of the ideas in the quadrants. Following discussion and consensus, those ideas with Low Value and High Difficulty were taken off the grid since they were likely not actionable and of little relative value to the LCHS and not discussed further during the consultation.
Once the participants had a shared understanding of each idea, a group voting procedure called the fist of five was conducted.

Fist of Five

Each participant voted about how they perceived the value and difficulty of the ideas. A show of all five fingers indicated complete support for the placement of the idea in each of the quadrants and one finger indicated no support for the idea. Everybody voted at one time and those ideas with High Value were voted on first. Ideas with High Value and Low Difficulty that had overwhelming support were considered quick wins since the ideas were considered easy to implement and the ideas had a big payoff. There were 56 quick win ideas that had everyone’s support and included the following—in their own words:

- There needs to be more assistance by trained personnel to deal with the problems of special priority tenants
- Create an environment of respect between Council and industry
- Density bonus for affordable housing
- Additional funds for THAW as a prevention strategy
- Promote and enhance housing through a free advocacy service
- Continue H2H program, it really helps keep people housed and out of shelters

Those ideas that were in the Low Value and Low Difficulty quadrant generally migrated into the High Value quadrant following discussion since these ideas were often a subset of other people’s ideas. The participants were asked to work together and group the remaining ideas into labeled, thematic areas. This step in the process never required more than 15 minutes. The speed at which the participants were able to complete this task indicated that they had achieved a high degree of common understanding about the ideas being discussed based upon the ease with which they could organize the ideas—whether their own or someone else’s—into a similar theme.

Once the themes were identified and titled, another voting procedure was conducted to determine the importance of each theme relative to the development of the London Community Housing Strategy. Those thematic categories that achieved an average ranking of 4-5 were isolated so that action plans could be developed for each one. The participants self-organized into smaller groups and selected one or two thematic categories that they would work on together to develop an action plan.

The participants worked for an hour in small groups to develop their action plans. The small, self-organized groups represented people from various points in the housing continuum including people with lived experience, university students/professors, City staff, frontline agency workers, builders and developers—among others. During the 12 sessions, 56 action plans were completed using the following framework:
Following the final session on April 1, the consultants analyzed and synthesized the information from the detailed action plans to inform the development of the LCHS with cross-referenced, evidence-based data. The major categories of housing, supports and affordability were delineated by the action plans into very specific initiatives that would address types of housing, inclusion/mixed zoning, Rent Geared to Income, innovative changes to OW and ODSP, “wraparound” supports for people with mental health or other challenges that were obstacles to complete independent living, incentives to builders and developers, integration of support services, partnership between the City and the private sector, etc. The lists of resources required and who needed to be involved to actualize the ideas were invaluable to help the consultants go straight to the “heart of the problem.” The information from the action plans, once supported with reliable data, informed the development of the LCHS positions and recommendations.

A common “ask” in the list of resources required in the 56 action plans included some version of coordination, integration, partnership or planning as a resource component for the successful execution of their plans. Based on discussions and debates that the consultants witnessed while the action plans were being written, a safe conclusion would be that most of the small groups participating in the sessions thought that at the very least, the success of their initiatives was contingent on a unified effort strengthened by cooperation and communication. To the consultants, this spoke clearly to the need for a shared community vision concerning affordable housing and a clear strategy.

Consultation Statements

One of the activities during the 12 consultation sessions and two open houses was an interactive wall where the participants could write their thoughts on pieces of flip chart paper that were posted on the walls. This activity produced 184 postings under the three statements that required completion by the participants:

1. The link between economic prosperity and housing is…
2. The link between community vitality and housing is…
3. Milestones in our community’s housing history are…

The quality, depth and personal nature of the participants’ statements was impressive and invaluable as Londoners candidly shared their thoughts whether they were a Member of Provincial Parliament or a mother concerned for her 35 year-old daughter suffering from manic depression and threatened with eviction—for the third time.
The first two statements tended to correlate to the action plans as participants displayed their specific roles or interests in the housing continuum from homelessness to affordable home ownership. These statements indirectly informed and reinforced the LCHS recommendations and are woven through the Strategy, especially the discussion about Community Vitality and Economic Prosperity and the limits to both of these in the housing continuum. The third statement concerning milestones, was the inspiration for an illustration that is included in the LCHS entitled, Decade in Review.

**Open Houses**

Two Open Houses were conducted on the afternoon of Saturday, March 27 and during the evening of Wednesday, March 31. These public meetings were advertised in the London Free Press and as part of the presentation during the 12 community consultations. The details of the open houses were also prominent on the City of London website and posters were displayed in municipal buildings.

The purpose of the open houses was to inform anyone who was interested about the LCHS process, to communicate the general themes for the Strategy, to answer questions and to provide an opportunity for general public to have priority consideration for input to the Strategy. The open houses featured a modified version of the PowerPoint presentation from the consultations, interaction with the consultants and City staff and provided attendees with an opportunity to respond to the Consultation Statements concerning the London housing continuum that were posted on the meeting room walls. Twenty-five people participated in the open house sessions.

In addition to the public open houses, separate sessions were conducted for the London Homeless Coalition and the Child and Youth Network on April 1, 2010. Altogether, 197 people participated in the various consultations, open houses and special sessions.

**Housing**

is a right
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Local Initiatives Survey Summary
An online survey was launched on March 22 and was available to be completed for 22 days. The LCHS survey used a “snowball” technique so that interested parties could email the survey link to people in their network who they thought would like to participate but who may not be aware of the survey. The website link was on the first page of the london.ca website. City staff emailed the link to organizations when the survey was launched and they sent a reminder during the final few days. The survey link was advertised in the London Free Press and presented to all attendees of the 14 consultations and open houses that were conducted from March 23 to April 1.

**Purpose for Your Organization to Exist**

The purpose of the survey was to gather information from local organizations that are directly involved in the continuum from homelessness to affordable home ownership. The survey presented 27 questions that included organizational demographics, types of services provided, financial information, staffing, client services, etc. The final question asked the respondents to suggest websites that would be of interest in the context of creating the LCHS—32 people provided information. The people who participated in the survey were well informed about their organizations and included Executive Directors, Chief Executive Officers, Finance Managers, Vice Presidents and Program Directors. The survey introduction and questions can be found later in this Appendix.

Fifty-one organizations participated in the LCHS survey and 39 completed all of the questions. Non-profit organizations comprised 70.2% of the respondents while 19.1% were from the private sector and the others were not registered as a non-profit or for-profit organization. Results should be considered as an order of magnitude, not an exhaustive inventory.

Figure 1 illustrates that 29 organizations are involved in either housing or homeless and low-income support services. This figure is likely higher because over half of the respondents who chose “other” as a description of their primary purpose would, in fact, be categorized as being involved in housing or various homeless services listed.
Description of Funding Source for 2009 Expenditures

There appeared to be some trepidation on the part of many respondents about declaring the sources of their funding since 21 organizations skipped the question. However, of the 30 respondents, 63.3% indicated that they receive Municipal funding as illustrated in figure 2 below. Provincial funding was provided to 53.3% of the respondents and 40% of the organizations cited Federal funding as one of their sources.

figure 2  What best describes the source of funding for your capital expenditures in 2009?

The responses to the question regarding operating expenditures indicated that 46% or 17 of the 30 respondents spent less than $500,000 in 2009 and 8 respondent organizations exceeded $2.5 million in the same year. Of course, figure 3 also indicates that 8 of the organizations had an operating expenditure between $500,000 and $2.5 million.

Range of 2009 Operating Expenditures

figure 3  Which range best describes your 2009 operating expenditures?
There were several additional facts of interest that emerged from the survey results and informed the writing of the LCHS, including:

- 72.7% of the responding organizations engage volunteers in the delivery of services
- 12.1% of organizations operate within a specific geographical area of London so 87.9% responded that their organizations serve people from all parts of the City
- 35.7% had capital expenditures less than $75,000 in 2009
- organizations served 63% of their clients 1-5 times per week and 92.6% of the organizations serve people at least once on a monthly basis
- 58.8% of the organizations responding serve homeless persons while 55.9% serve people with lived experience

What is the one thing that should be considered most in updating London’s Community Plan on Homelessness?
Ways of compelling federal and provincial governments to get back into the affordable supportive housing business.

When people are in a compromised situation from being 2 pay cheques away from being homeless there should be support found through the workplace i.e., sessions on money management) Review the shelter allowance, OW, EI, ODSP, CPP etc. Perhaps there should be a program to top up if an individual is in jeopardy of becoming homeless.
Local Initiatives Survey—March 18, 2010

This survey gathers information about local initiatives in London that have an impact on housing for people who are homeless to home ownership and everything along that continuum.

This is a “snowball” survey. That means that the survey will be forwarded to groups, associations, community agencies, service providers and businesses who are interested in housing, services to people who are not in housing or dealing with people in housing who receive supports. The groups include non-profits, private businesses and self-organized, informal community groups. Throughout the survey, the term “organization” will be used to describe the various types of groups.

Please forward the survey to organizations who you think are involved in any way with housing or to organizations who provide services to people who are not in housing or organizations who work with people who are in housing and receive supports. Do not be concerned that some organizations may receive the survey several times—just pass it on so we can get the “snowball” effect.

As mentioned above, your organization may receive the survey more than once but the survey should only be completed one time per organization. The most senior person within your organization who has the information necessary should complete the survey. The survey seeks information about your organization, the people you serve, staffing, mission, mandate, governance, operating expenses, capital expenditures, services & programs provided, etc. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Although some organizations may have operations that serve areas outside of London, please restrict your survey responses to your operations within the City of London.

If you are an individual interested in matters of housing or homelessness but you are not part of an organization, do not complete this survey! However, we still want your input. You can share your ideas regarding the housing continuum by emailing info@orgcode.com.

The information gathered through this survey will be used as part of the research for the London Community Housing Strategy (LCHS) and Community Plan on Homelessness. Most analysis will be at an aggregate level.

The City of London is a delivery agent under the Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA) and the Ontario Works Act and as such is authorized to operate and manage housing projects as well as establish, fund, and administer programs for the provision of residential accommodations and homelessness prevention and intervention services. Personal information is collected under the authority and guidelines of the SHRA and will be used to inform the London Community Housing Strategy.
UPDATING THE LONDON COMMUNITY HOUSING STRATEGY (LCHS) AND COMMUNITY PLAN ON HOMELESSNESS

1. What is the one thing that should be considered most in developing London’s Community Housing Strategy? NOTE: the Community Housing Strategy will look at a continuum of housing, from emergency shelters to home ownership.

   ○ No comment

2. What is one thing that should be considered most in updating London’s Community Plan on Homelessness? NOTE: The Community Plan on Homelessness outlines the City’s priorities in meeting the needs of its homeless population.

   ○ No comment

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR ORGANIZATION

3. What is the legal name of your organization?

4. Do you operate by any name(s) other than your legal organization name?
   ○ No
   ○ Yes
     If yes, specify the names:

5. What is the primary purpose for your organization to exist? CHECK ONLY ONE (Drop box)
   ○ Housing: building, renting, selling
   ○ Homeless and low-income support services: shelter, drop-in, street outreach
   ○ Hybrid of housing and formal support services: institutional care, supportive housing
   ○ Health, mental health and addiction services: mental health supports, harm reduction supports, withdrawal management
   ○ Other community services: supports to newcomers, food security
   ○ Policy, planning or research: poverty research, policy development, land use planning, community planning, social planning
   ○ Other: Specify

6. Please categorize your organization under one of the following statements:
   ○ Private business
   ○ Non-profit
   ○ Informal organization—not registered as business or non-profit
   ○ None of the above
   ○ Other: Specify
7. What year did your organization begin?

8. What are the contact details for your head office?
   Contact Name:
   Position:
   Mailing Address:
   Contact Phone Number:
   Contact Email:
   General Inquiries Email:
   General Inquiries Phone Number:
   Website:
   Hours of Operation:

9. If you have satellite offices or different program/business locations—locations that
   your organization owns or is the leaseholder—specify with contact details:
   Satellite Office(s) Name:
   Mailing Address(es):
   Hours of Operation:

10. Are there any other locations where your staff provides services? For example,
    a harm reduction worker who spends one day per week at a drop-in centre or a
    private sector employer that spends one day per month providing coaching on
    resume development, etc.
    ○ No
    ○ Yes
    If yes, please name the organizations, locations and brief description:
    Organization(s):
    Location(s):
    Description of Service(s):

**OPERATING AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES**

In this section, we are requesting information about your 2009 Operating and Capital expen-
ditures and, in a general sense, the source of that funding.

We are interested only in that part of your budget that is directly related to supporting
people in housing, helping people access housing, providing (renting) housing or building
housing.

If you are a multi-service organization involved in activities in addition to supporting
people in housing, helping people access housing, providing (renting) housing or building
housing, do NOT include those other parts of your budget related to those other activities.
An example of this might be a staff person of a health centre involved in supporting people
in housing. We are interested in that aspect of your operating expenditures, not the operat-
ing expenditures of the entire health centre.
11. Of the ranges provided below, which range best describes your 2009 operating expenditures?
   ○ $0
   ○ $1 to $75,000
   ○ $75,001 to $150,000
   ○ $150,001 to $225,000
   ○ $225,001 to $300,000
   ○ $300,001 to $500,000
   ○ $500,001 to $1,000,000
   ○ $1,000,001 to $1,500,000
   ○ $1,500,001 to $2,500,000
   ○ > $2,500,000

12. What were the sources of your 2009 operating revenue? (Check all that apply.)
   ○ Membership/Service User fees
   ○ Property revenue (rents, sales, etc.)
   ○ Foundations
   ○ Unsolicited donations
   ○ Fundraising campaigns
   ○ Municipal funding/grants
   ○ Provincial funding/grants
   ○ Federal funding/grants
   ○ Bequests
   ○ Other [specify]

13. Of the ranges provided below, which best describes your 2009 capital expenditures?
   ○ $0
   ○ $1 to $75,000
   ○ $75,001 to $150,000
   ○ $150,001 to $225,000
   ○ $225,001 to $300,000
   ○ $300,001 to $500,000
   ○ $500,001 to $1,000,000
   ○ $1,000,001 to $1,500,000
   ○ $1,500,001 to $2,500,000
   ○ > $2,500,000

14. What best describes the source of funding for your capital expenditures in 2009?
   ○ Unrestricted Reserves
   ○ Restricted Reserves
   ○ Membership/Service User fees
   ○ Property revenue (rents, sales, etc.)
   ○ Foundations
   ○ Unsolicited donations
   ○ Fundraising campaigns
Municipal funding/grants
Provincial funding/grants
Federal funding/grants
Bequests
Other [specify]

STAFF

In this section, we request information about paid staff and volunteers including the Full Time Equivalent (FTE) of paid staff. An FTE is the number of hours that a Full Time employee works over a standard work week of 35 hours. One person working 35 hours is one FTE. Two employees who each work 17.5 hours per week is one FTE. Another example: if one employee works 35 hours per week and another works 17.5 hours per week, this is 1.5 FTE.

15. How many FTE paid staff does your organization have during a standard work week?

16. Does your organization use volunteers in the delivery of services?
   ○ No
   ○ Yes
   If Yes, approximately how many different volunteers were involved with your organization in 2009? __________________________

SERVICE AREA

17. In London, does your organization focus on serving:
   ○ a) all people across the City ;
   ○ b) those within a specific geographic area?
   If b, please describe the geographic area:

SERVICES & ACTIVITIES, MISSION, MANDATE AND GOVERNANCE

18. Please describe your organization’s work and activities:

19. What is your mission statement?

20. What is the mandate of your organization?

21. Please describe the governance model of your organization. For example, describe the size, role and approach of your Board of Directors:

NUMBER OF PEOPLE ACCESSING YOUR SERVICE AND THE FREQUENCY OF THEIR ACCESS TO YOUR SERVICES

In this section we are interested in knowing the number of different people that access your services and the frequency with which those services are accessed. When it comes to different people we are interested in unique individuals. That means that a person that used your service in January, then again in April, then again in October is only counted as one person—not three people.
When asked about frequency of service usage, the question addresses the percentage of people your organization served in 2009 who accessed your service at different frequencies. For example, some clients/tenants/customers may have accessed your services daily, while other people may have only used your services a few times per year.

22. Approximately how many different people were served by your organization in 2009?

23. Approximately how frequently did these different people access your services in 2009?
   - Daily
   - 1-5 times per week
   - Once per month
   - A few times per month
   - Once every 2-3 months
   - 2-3 times per year
   - Once per year

**POPULATION PROFILE**

24. As part of your organization’s mission, mandate, business model or strategic direction, are there any specific populations that you seek and attempt to serve? (Check all that apply)
   - Middle or higher income earners (middle class and higher class)
   - Low income households
   - Homeless persons
   - Previously homeless persons
   - Students
   - Two parent families
   - Single parent families
   - Childless couples
   - Unaccompanied youth: individuals < 18 years without a parent or guardian
   - Youth: individuals < 25 without a parent or guardian
   - Single adults > 18 years of age
   - Older adults/seniors
   - Newcomers, immigrants and/or refugees
   - Ex-offenders
   - Persons with HIV/AIDS
   - Persons with disabilities
   - Persons with chronic diseases, e.g., Hep-C, cancer, etc.
   - Aboriginal persons
   - A specific cultural community: Specify
   - Consumers/Psychiatric Survivors/Psychiatric, Persons with Mental Illness
   - Substance users
   - Persons abstinent in their use of substances
○ A specific faith based community: Specify
○ Persons with developmental delay
○ Persons with brain injury
○ Persons with Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder
○ Affiliated with a specific organization/service: Specify
○ Other: Specify
○ We do not specifically seek and attempt to serve any groups within our housing

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR ORGANIZATION

25. Are there any websites that post information about your organization or should be considered to update the London Community Housing Strategy and/or the Community Plan on Homelessness?
○ No
○ Yes
If yes, provide website addresses:

HOUSING SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

This section is exclusively for those organizations that are directly involved with housing, including: own housing, manage housing, develop housing, construct housing, rent housing, perform real estate transactions or directly provide housing such as supportive housing or transitional housing.

If you are not involved with housing, click here and go to question #28.

26. Of the following descriptions, check all that characterize your organization’s involvement with housing:
○ My organization develops/constructs new subdivisions
○ My organization develops/constructs new condominiums
○ My organization develops/constructs new infill housing
○ My organization is involved in real estate transactions including purchasing land, reselling homes, etc.
○ My organization adaptively reuses existing buildings for the purpose of housing
○ My organization renovates existing housing
○ My organization delivers social housing
○ My organization delivers co-operative housing
○ My organization develops/constructs-operates new affordable rental housing where occupants need not spend more than 30% of their gross monthly income on rent
○ My organization develops/constructs-operates new affordable rental housing where all rents are below the CMHC average market rent for the same type of unit
○ My organization develops/constructs housing for new affordable homeownership—ownership housing for low-income people
My organization delivers alternative or supportive housing—a residence with on-site dedicated professional supports to tenants for most or all of the day.

My organization delivers transitional housing—housing with a fixed length of stay, usually with some programmatic requirements as a condition of tenancy.

My organization delivers interim housing—temporary housing where a household can stay as they await access to other housing. It is usually provided for populations with special needs. There are no programmatic requirements as a condition of tenancy.

My organization delivers boarding homes—a residence where meals are provided as part of the tenancy.

My organization delivers secondary suites—a secondary residence within a house, usually a basement or attic apartment.

My organization delivers rooming houses—a building that usually looks like a single-detached or semi-detached home on the exterior, but on the interior has been subdivided into multiple rooms. Residents tend to rent the room and often share some or all of the other amenities such as the washroom, shower, kitchen and common area with others.

My organization delivers “crash” or “safe” beds—temporary housing, usually within an apartment or supportive living residence, for a person with a mental illness to stay until stabilized, outside of institutional care.

Other: Specify

27. What describes the housing your organization develops, owns, operates and/or manages? (Check all that apply)
   - Single detached
   - Semi detached
   - Rowhouses
   - Townhomes—including stacked townhouses
   - Duplexes
   - Triplexes
   - Quadruplexes
   - Multi-unit residential buildings of three or more storeys with six or more units
   - Other: Specify

28. Is the housing you develop, own, operate and/or manage: (Check all that apply)
   - Independent living
   - Supported/supportive living
   - Institutional living
   - Congregate living
29. Does your organization provide any direct assistance or supports to people in the housing that you develop, manage or own? Note: direct assistance are those activities undertaken by an employee or volunteer of your organization. It does not include staff or volunteers from another organization who come to the housing to provide the services.
   ○ No
   ○ Yes
   If yes, please describe the type(s) of direct assistance or supports you provide?

**Concluding Thoughts**

30. On behalf of your organization, do you have any additional comments in the context of the London Community Housing Strategy and/or the Community Plan on Homelessness?
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The Objective

Development of a Homelessness to Housing Strategy for the City of London

• The London Community Housing Strategy (LCHS) is based on the City’s vision. The LCHS is purposely robust and flexible to accommodate future changes.

• The LCHS plans and prioritized actions are based on research and assessment of needs of those homeless and those accessing and seeking affordable and sustainable housing in London.

• An emphasis on a continuum of services and an integrated approach was critical.

• The intended deliverable was a strategy document not an options paper or needs assessment. Targets are only one component of the overall LCHS.

• The LCHS has a mechanism for review every 18-24 months.
Target Development Process

- Detailed RFP requirements
- Guidance by the Steering Committee
- Input/direction by Council Housing Leadership Committee
- Consult with Community Reference Group

- Background review existing documents
  - reports
  - policies
  - position statements
  - presentations, etc.

- Validation of input in context of information gleaned from background review and initial instructions
- Supporting data and evidence from academic and grey sources
- Assembly of relevant data points

- Input data into model
- Create proxies for missing data elements
- Tweak assumptions
- Validate with directions, background review and inputs
- Create & test scenarios

- 1,000 Units Dec 31, 2015:
  - 700 City facilitated
  - 300 Province of Ontario
- Sub-targets within 700 situated to address multiple needs of specific populations-not mutually exclusive.
- Sub-targets take into account changes in policy required, need for funding & shifts depending on other 300

- Input
  - consultations
  - community submissions
  - open houses
  - key informant interviews
- Context, content & priority setting

- Draft targets shared with Steering Committee for comment, review and validation
- Notes and framing for consideration

Targets to be reviewed every 18-24 months related to changes in needs, new and better data and/or changes in program priorities.
The Homeless to Housing Continuum

3 Integrated Components

1. Life Cycle
   - youth to seniors

2. Needs & Supports
   - range of interventions and housing types

3. Types of Accommodation
   - various housing forms
Understanding the Housing Continuum

Three Integrated Components

**LIFE CYCLE**
- Young Adults
- Childless Households
- Older Adults
- Children & Youth
- New Household Formation
- Households with Children
- Aging Adults with Needs

**NEEDS & SUPPORTS**
- Boarding Homes
- Supportive Housing
- Independent Living
- Housing with Supports
- Institutional Care Living

**TYPES OF HOUSING**
- Emergency Hostel
- Transitional Housing
- Group Homes
- Rooming Houses
- Social Housing
- Market Rental
- Affordable Home Ownership
- Long-term Care Housing
- Domiciliary Hostel
- Boarding Housing
- Supportive Housing
- Secondary Suites
- Residential Hospice & Palliative Housing
- Safe Beds/ Crash Beds
- Interim Housing
- Affordable Rental Housing
London Targets Relative to Other Cities

• Not all cities have targets
• Targets may be the result of in depth analysis and a multi-dimensional understanding of needs; others not so involved
• Results relative to targets have a poor track record; most often target set too high, without priority groups identified and fail to take into consideration key variables or allow for flexibility
• Some targets established as part of Affordable Housing Plans or Strategies; others part of Official Plans or other docs
• Depth of affordability sought in the targets is not always identified
• Some targets are for specific types of housing, such as homeownership and RGI; others are not as defined
### Breaking Down the 1,000 Unit Target

*The Sub-Targets are not mutually exclusive, therefore, they do not add up to 1,000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Minimum of 38 if only 75 homeownership dwellings constructed or acquired will first be made available to households with two or more people that are residing in rental accommodation that was built from 2002 to December 31, 2015 as part of any funding initiative facilitated by the Housing Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% (280)</td>
<td>40% of the rental units created or acquired, receiving rent supplements/subsidies or affordable homeownership dwellings will be prioritized for households at the 30th percentile of incomes or lower within London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 units</td>
<td>300 units will be supportive or alternative housing and funded by the Province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 units</td>
<td>70 units, two or more bedrooms, with at least 23 of these $550 or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 units</td>
<td>305 units, bachelor or one-bedrooms, with at least 102 of these $400 or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% (35)</td>
<td>5% of the rental units created or acquired will be interim or transitional housing for people who are homeless, or people who were homeless and moved into housing but need to be re-housed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% (35)</td>
<td>5% will be prioritized for newcomers, immigrants or refugees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% (70)</td>
<td>10% will be prioritized for Aboriginal specific housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% (105)</td>
<td>15% (105) will be prioritized for persons who have experienced 18 months of homelessness cumulatively within the past 4 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% (105)</td>
<td>15% (105) will be prioritized for youth aged 16-24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% (105)</td>
<td>15% (105) will be prioritized for lone parent households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% (70)</td>
<td>10% (70) of the rent supplements/subsidies will be prioritized for victims of domestic violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% (70)</td>
<td>10% (70) will be prioritized for households where at least one head of the household is 60 years of age or older.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sub targets are minimums
Facts Influencing the Target & Sub-Targets

- 39,545 households spending 30% or more of their gross monthly income on housing
- Vacancy rates for bachelors and one bedrooms more than 3%; rents not going down
- Average rent for one bedroom apartment increased $194 over 10 years to $714
- 11.8% of persons in private households considered low-income; 1 in 4 female-led lone parents households
- 55,650 new households projected by 2031
- Major shifts in local economy, especially in manufacturing and services and professional positions
- Changes in household composition: lone parents, never married and widows increasing
- 58% of tenants in Social Housing on OW or ODSP
- 4,329 households on the waiting list for social housing
- 50% increase in city-funded fixed shelter beds over past decade; now up to 360 beds
- Since 2005, an increase of 2,180 OW cases and 1,610 ODSP cases; now 9,945 and 9,054
- Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program results in 1,134 units; London uses all of its funding
- Population grew 8% over a 10 year period (1996-2006 Census)
- 22,625 households in Core Housing Need in the London CMA
- 46% increase in number of Aboriginal people in the community between 1996 and 2006
Decade+ in Review

1997
- The Report on the Mayor’s Anti-Poverty Action Group

1998
- Affordable Housing Task Force

1999
- Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative (SCPI)

2000
- Report Affordable Housing Task Force

2001
- City Assumed Administration of Social Housing

2002
- Municipal Housing Facilities By-law

2003
- Affordable Housing Reserve Fund By-law

2004
- Local Convert to Rent Program

2005
- Social Policy Framework

2006
- Affordable Housing Strategy for London

2007
- Official Plan Updated

2008
-伦敦 Child & Youth Agenda

2009
- Minister Approved Official Plan

2010
- London Community Housing Strategy

- Social Policy Framework
- Affordable Housing Strategy for London
- Official Plan Updated
- London Child & Youth Agenda
- Minister Approved Official Plan
- London Community Housing Strategy

- Social Policy Framework
- Affordable Housing Strategy for London
- Official Plan Updated
- London Child & Youth Agenda
- Minister Approved Official Plan
- London Community Housing Strategy
The Need for a Strategy

Current State
- Good activities, gaps, no overarching strategy, and outcomes are not integrated.

Future State
- Desired State: Alignment

London Community Housing Strategy
- System Design
- Programs Services
- Political Will
- Deliverables
- Responsive Administration

London CARES
- Home Ownership
- Shelters
- Social Housing
- Homelessness & Housing Funding
- Affordable Housing
- Official Plan
A City of London where all members of the community have access to housing that is safe, secure and suitable to their needs and ability to pay.

A comprehensive continuum of housing solutions based on:
1. Strong system design
2. Evidence based and integrated programs and services
3. Political will and commitment
4. Focused, measurable, and targeted deliverables
5. Strong and responsive administration
THEME 1—STRONG SYSTEM DESIGN

Goal:
A London based approach to integrating homelessness and housing initiatives with stronger central administration

Approach:
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE FOR EFFECTIVE STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Strategic Objectives:
1.1 Focus on housing and homelessness together
1.2 Central administration within the City for housing and homelessness change initiatives
1.3 Decentralize Ontario Works office
1.4 Regional identity
THEME 2—EVIDENCE BASED & INTEGRATED PROGRAMS & SERVICES

Goal:
Alignment and development of outcome based permanent solutions to homelessness

Approach:
FOCUS ON PERMANENT SOLUTIONS TO HOMELESSNESS

Strategic Objectives:

2.1 Review London CAReS
2.2 Target H2H style program
2.3 Reduce shelter use and beds
2.4 Review shelter system and services
2.5 Supports to people once housed
2.6 Invest in prevention strategies
2.7 Align funding to priorities and needs
2.8 Consider Supported Employment
2.9 Shared Client Information System
2.10 Outcome based funding
2.11 Determine homeless numbers/needs
2.12 Community Plan on Homelessness
THEME 3—POLITICAL WILL AND COMMITMENT

Goal:
Establish London as an equal partner with other orders of government

Approach:

WORKING WITH OTHER ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT

Strategic Objectives:

3.1 Increase London Profile
3.2 Increase income supports
3.3 Strengthen capacity of housing providers
3.4 Improve discharge planning/shelter diversion
3.5 Increase investment in services to newcomers
3.6 Expand responses for Aboriginal people
3.7 Adjust shelter allowance and rent/utility scales
3.8 Continue Federal investment in social housing
3.9 Permit social housing to borrow against equity
3.10 Provide new grants to maintain stock
3.11 Continue Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program
3.12 Provide additional rent subsidies and supplements
3.13 Clearer policy direction on related Planning matters
3.14 Cost recovery from programs to new housing options
3.15 Amend Special Priority Policy and local priority rules
3.16 Acquire property from all orders of government
THEME 4—FOCUSED, MEASURABLE, & TARGETED DELIVERABLES

Goal:

1000 new affordable housing units throughout London (a mix of supplements, existing, built form, new units, and specialized units) to begin filling priority gaps within the housing continuum.

Approach:

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT TARGETS & CONSIDERATIONS FOR EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK

Strategic Objectives:

4.1 Continue to redefine and clarify civic administration roles
4.2 Build capacity amongst property managers
4.3 Target for the City of London (700 Units)
4.4 Supportive housing for other orders of government (300)
4.5 Create mix within larger scale redevelopments
4.6 Mix throughout the City
4.7 Embrace environmental stewardship
4.8 Maintain existing stock (public and private)
4.9 Examine arterial economic development opportunities
4.10 Improve the waiting list for subsidized housing
4.11 Mayor’s Update on LCHS every 18 to 24 months
Goal:
Aligning research, community engagement, programs, and service innovations to create a housing continuum that builds *Community Vitality* and *Economic Prosperity* in London.

Approach:
CONTINUATION OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMS THAT HOLD PROMISE

Strategic Objectives:

5.1 Ensure quality housing that meets tenant needs  
5.2 Responsive and innovative special Ontario Works teams  
5.3 Maintain annual City investment in affordable housing  
5.4 Continue building the City’s National and Provincial profile  
5.5 Housing and Social and Community Support Services Divisions working to achieve mutual objectives
Municipal Funding:
$2 million \times \sim 10 \text{ years} = \$20 \text{ million}
which leveraged…

Other Funding:
$65 \text{ million in federal and provincial funding} +$
$74 \text{ million in private equity & mortgages}$

Resulting In…

$159 \text{ million in affordable housing investment in London over past 10 yrs}$
and
$1,194 \text{ affordable housing units*}$:
  131 home ownership
  997 rental (28% were specialized supportive housing)
  70 rent supplements (5 yr program)

*Note: 939 of these units were created from 2006 to 2010

Doing the Math:
The Past 10 Years

$74 \text{ million} / 1,194 \text{ units} = \text{Approx. } \$62,000/\text{unit from private sector investment}$
Flexibility related to the implementation of 250 of the 700 units within the City’s purview to facilitate influences financial implications

Achieving greater affordability will result in greater capital investment upfront for many of the units

In most cases, investment in meeting the targets will require a combination of municipal funding, funding from other orders of government, as well as proponent contributions and mortgage

Scale of Investment up to December 2015:

Order of Magnitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Investment</th>
<th>Order of Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $67,755,000         | • 75 Homeownership @ $8,400 = $630,000  
                      • 375 Rental Construction/Acquisition @ $165,000 = $61,875,000  
                      • 250 Rent Supplements @ $350/month x 5 years = $5,250,000 |
| $77,610,000         | • 150 Homeownership @ $8,400 = $1,260,000  
                      • 450 Rental Construction/Acquisition @ $165,000 = $74,250,000  
                      • 100 Rent Supplements @ $350/month x 5 years = $2,100,000 |
| $103,755,000        | • 75 Homeownership @ $8,400 = $630,000  
                      • 625 Rental Construction/Acquisition @ $165,000 = $103,125,000  
                      • 0 Rent Supplements @ $350/month x 5 years = $0 |
## Doing the Math: The Next 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Provincial + Federal</th>
<th>Private Equity &amp; Mortgages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$67,755,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000*</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>$35,395,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$77,610,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000*</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>$41,998,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,755,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000*</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>$59,515,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: $2,000,000 per year. Based on current annual municipal contribution*
Understanding Financial Implications

- Ongoing affordability of rental accommodation can be greatly impacted by upfront capital investment.
- Greater investment upfront decreases carrying costs, increases affordability.
- Investment from government may increase, however, consistent investment from other sources remains part of the consideration.

Investment of $100,000-$140,000 per unit gets rent slightly below CMHC average market rent.

Investment of $140,000-$180,000 per unit gets a blend of units affordable to those on income assistance and units affordable to working households of lower income.

Investment of $180,000+ per unit increases units that can be rent geared to income; almost exclusively for people of very low income.
Understanding Financial Variables

- Changes in mortgage rates will have an impact; a strong reason to increase upfront investment.

- Projected either new construction prices or acquisition prices is dependent on a number of variables that will shift within a 5 year time frame.

- Part of meeting the targets must be new construction or acquisition to increase the long-term affordable housing stock.

- The 18-24 month strategy review anticipates a changing internal and external landscape.
What’s Next…

• Report Card Design—current report and template for future review and reporting
• Revising a Community Plan on Homelessness
• Structured work plans for implementation in component policy areas
• Sustainability Plan
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Iain J. De Jong
Managing Partner

One Tecumseth Avenue
Mississauga, Canada L5G 1K5
T 416 698.9700
C 416 432.0410
F 416 352.1498
idejong@orgcode.com

John A. Whitesell PhD
Managing Partner

One Tecumseth Avenue
Mississauga, Canada L5G 1K5
T 416 698.9700
C 416 994.9725
F 416 352.1498
jwhitesell@orgcode.com