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Setting the context for Transit Oriented Affordable Housing Development (TOAHD)

Bare land has no market value. It is the public decision to endow that land with a right to use and to develop for certain uses and density that creates the value.

Permitting the landowner to park cars establishes a value based on the value of future income from parking revenues. Increasing the use from a parking lot to a ten-storey condo tower further enhances the value. The new value is the potential profit from developing and selling condo units (and the land value = gross sales proceed, less all development costs including developers profit margin).

And if that zoning dictated that two of the storeys must be used only for affordable housing at some established rent, the potential receipts would be reduced, and accordingly the land would have a slightly lower value.

So, it is the process of a public decision to permit or increase use that creates and increases value. This is a concept labelled “planning gain” in the UK and “land value capture” in the US.

There is a strong argument to share part of that gain between the landowner and the community or public, because in the absence of the public decision the landowner would not have achieved any increase in value. It is effectively a win–win and actually creates new value at no cost. The existing landowner benefits and so does the community, at no cost to either.

The case of new transit infrastructure further endows new high value on the selected transit corridor, and more particularly land adjacent to stations along that corridor. This typically involves a major infrastructure investment decision, again a public decision that creates additional value to locations along the corridor. A recent study in Montreal showed property increasing in value by 13% within 500m of a metro station, 10% within 1 km and 5% within 1.5 km (Metrolinx, 2013).

So transit corridors involve two separate sets of public decision processes, that act together to substantially underpin new development, increased density and increase land value.

In the absence of thoughtful planning regulations or some form of public land banking to acquire and control the sites, the substantial benefits of these decisions flow entirely to private landowners, who own adjacent lands (or others who anticipated the decisions and acquire land in advance to capitalize on the opportunity). In the absence of sound planning policy with specific inclusionary requirements, there is no potential to realize a community benefit from this planning and public investment gain.

In Ottawa the Light Rail Transit (LRT) involves a very substantial public investment, in excess of $5 billion for Phases 1, 2.

Together with sound planning mechanisms this public investment can enable the implementation of a progressive and effective policy framework to ensure that substantial value uplift is shared fairly between land owner-developers and the residents of Ottawa. Part of this community benefit can be in the form of providing a supply of affordable housing to low-moderate income households that make up an important part of the labour market and sustain the economy of the city.
Objective of workshop

This workshop was convened by the City of Ottawa Planning Infrastructure and Economic Development Department and City of Ottawa Housing Services Branch in partnership with the Alliance to End Homelessness Ottawa, Centretown Citizens’ Ottawa Corporation, and Healthy Transportation Coalition.

It was structured as a brainstorming session to identify potential supportive policies that can facilitate and enable construction of new affordable housing along Ottawa’s Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and LRT corridors and stations.

The objectives identified in the agenda were to:

- Identify opportunities & challenges related to building more affordable housing close to rapid transit;
- Learn more about the City’s position, that of social housing providers, and community concerns;
- Prioritize the top 5 solutions and/or promising ideas that could be pursued.

Who was there?

The audience included a cross-section of over 50 people including seven City Councillors, City staff from transportation, economic development, planning, public health, and housing, representatives from the affordable housing and private development sector, Ottawa ACORN and homelessness advocacy groups and other interested citizens.

Opening framing remarks were provided by Kristen Holinsky, Executive Director of the Alliance to End Homelessness and Saide Sayah, Program Manager, Affordable Housing Unit, City of Ottawa Housing Branch.

Their remarks highlighted:

- A lack of supply and erosion of the existing limited stock of affordable rental housing, exacerbated as transit-oriented intensification displaces and gentrifies existing affordable housing options in LRT corridor areas.
- The vital importance of a sufficient stock of low rent affordable housing both to support general well-being, the local labour market, and to help address homelessness.
- The LRT represents an opportunity to expand supply but also a challenge to ensure new development includes affordable housing, even when largely a private market investor driven process.
- The market does not create the right type of housing at an affordable price in appropriate locations—thus the need for a sound policy framework and incentives with council leadership.
• The city has little control and only a limited budget to fund affordable housing supply, so it is important to leverage the public approval process and transit investment to increase outcomes, including a range of community benefits as well as increased supply of affordable housing.

Three council members also provided welcome opening remarks.

- Deputy Mayor Mark Taylor (& Special Liaison on Housing and Homelessness)
- Diane Deans, Chair of Community Protective Services Committee
- Councillor Jeff Leiper

Councillor Taylor, spoke to what would happen if we get Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) wrong, with benefits only to wealthy vs. what if we get it right to ensure an inclusive community for all. He introduced the concept of Equitable Transit-Oriented Development (ETOD), intended to convey the idea that both the system and adjoining land use should be inclusive of the needs (and fiscal capacity) of low-moderate income households. This is
particularly important in the face of gentrification and redevelopment that is already occurring in many parts of the city, as increased property values lead to increased rents and this reality can be an undesired outcome of transit-based intensification.

Without sound public policy connecting transit planning, community development plans, and affordable housing strategy, the risk is that the LRT related development activity will simply drive up land values and make housing less affordable especially to those most in need. This can constrain options for lower income households, for whom public transit is often their main form of transportation. Over time as land and housing values increase, the lower income residents, often more dependent on transit, may be pushed further away from this amenity. Accordingly, Councillor Taylor voiced his support for the creation of a high-level working group across multiple city departments to break down silos and ensure coordination of activities toward a common goal of inclusion.

Councillors Deans and Leiper further reinforced this need for integrated planning (with example of the Building Better and Revitalized Neighbourhoods projects).

All councillors identified public lands as key assets where the City, in partnership with other orders of government, can show leadership in affordable inclusive transit-oriented development. But it is not solely a city responsibility. By leveraging the land use development approval process and significant public transit investment from all levels of government, and drawing on new tools such as inclusionary zoning authorities, it is possible to achieve positive outcomes and ensure Ottawa has inclusive neighbourhoods.
LRT Update

The context was then framed in a presentation by city staff (Chris Swail) Director, O-Train Planning, Transportation Services Department, on the Phase 2 alignment and planned stations. The presentation highlighted significant areas that are currently undeveloped. Creating substantial opportunity for future development and intensification.\(^1\)

An audience question asked Chris to identify the stations that might offer significant potential for affordable housing development. He suggested there is strong potential at the following sites:

- **Baseline** – Algonquin, land city leases, lots of free parking that may make sense to convert to housing
- **New Orchard/Pinecrest** – lots of lands, City will hold that land and Ottawa Community Housing may have plans for it
- **Major commercial/retail malls undergoing redevelopment including Lincoln Fields, South Keys**
- **Hurdman** has massive brown fields offering significant redevelopment possibilities
- **Gladstone** – this site has been acquired by City through Ottawa Community Housing who will manage a mixed used redevelopment, inclusive of affordable housing.
- **Westboro/Tunney’s Pasture** – significant potential infill/redevelopment of the federal campus lands north of line.
- **Cyrville** is currently a mixed area with residual industrial land use, lower values and potential for redevelopment

As Councillor Deans previously observed, there are plenty of new and redevelopment opportunities, we have the know-how, its simply a matter to create the necessary policy framework incentives and development regulation needed to require and support inclusion of some affordable development.

It was noted by an audience member that the policy framework must align with the practices of the development-investor community – most purchase or option land well ahead of development, and the price includes the value of anticipated change in use and increased development density. If social outcomes, like including some percentage of affordable housing, are not established as transparent policy early in process it frustrates the development sector and creates both push back and stalled development. It is critical to send clear signals to the market, if the intent is to encourage market-based partnerships.

---

\(^1\) The presentation slides can be viewed here:
English: stage2lrt.ca/resources; French: etape2tlr.ca/ressources
Presentations

This context piece was followed by brief presentations from a cross section of eight individuals, reflecting different perspectives who each provided general remarks as well as identified what they feel are three key ideas for consideration on advancing the potential for affordable housing near BRT and LRT. Speaking notes, where available, are appended to this report (Appendix A):

**Cliff Youdale, Ottawa Community Housing**

In recent years the affordable housing sector has fought over the crumbs – limited funding allocated through the City run Action Ottawa program. Its now time to think bigger and lever new opportunities like TOD. New development should include a mix of rent-price levels to create more inclusive and financially sustainable communities. This approach is being used by OCH on Gladstone Village.

**Suzanne Le, Exec. Dir., Multifaith Housing Initiative**

Land and the approval process is a valuable resource. Its time to explore land banking for community use and allocate part of sites for affordable housing in the way dedications are given for park and school sites. It’s also important to get land (share of development) rather than cash in lieu. For public sites, disposition should prioritize land for affordable housing. Greater use could also be made of building on air rights – e.g. over libraries, firehalls, community centres, transit stations.

**Ray Sullivan, Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corporation**

In promoting inclusion of affordable housing it is necessary to broaden the definition of affordable. Targeting only very low rent housing is not financially sustainable and doesn’t create healthy mixed communities. Better to advocate for broader mix of rents. City Official Plan policies (on affordable housing) should be updated and refined. Recent provincial legislation creates a new opportunity to implement thoughtful inclusionary policy. We will need a broad mix of tools, and can’t just rely on inclusionary zoning at transit stations – different sites need and fit different tools – but inclusionary zoning policy can be one of these.

**Dennis Carr, Centretown Affordable Housing Development Corp.**

Existing City planning policy documents (including its affordable housing strategy) have only vague priorities, lack targets to measure progress, and are weak on affordable housing policy. By comparison Vancouver has detailed explicit requirements, invests heavily and creates much larger outcomes (re affordable housing as well as other community benefits). He cited as an example of lack of affordable housing in Glebe: In the early 1990’s CCOC and OCH built 160 social housing units over a parking garage on Gloucester and Nepean Street downtown; in comparison new parkade in Glebe missed opportunity to include housing above.
Vivian Chih, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp.
The National Housing Strategy (NHS) released in November 2017 creates a number of new opportunities, the details of which are still being developed. These add a number of funding programs that can assist the City in its affordable goals, including along LRT corridors. NHS funding outcomes include benchmarks for affordability, energy efficiency and accessibility, all outcomes that align well with TOD.

Trevor Haché, Healthy Transportation Coalition
Affordable housing should be a priority across full range of city planning/policy documents – it's not enough just to put in a separate, disconnected, housing plan (policies should be in Official Plan, Community Design Plans), TOD plans, Transportation Master Plan). There is a need for explicit targets (e.g. 15-20%) – ideally linked to council term, so there is stronger political accountability. Housing is a human right and there should be aggressive affordable housing inclusion targets to implement this right. All the tools available (Community Benefits Agreements, Inclusionary Zoning, Section 37, site plan approvals) should be used to achieve the targets. We might have missed the bus on phase 1, but must get it right for phases 2 & 3.

Alain Miguelez, Planning Dept., City of Ottawa
There are, and will be more, significant opportunities: things like air rights, opportunity to infill extensive surface parking areas when near transit, sensitive infill with small unit additions, especially if street right of ways can be narrowed/repurposed near transit. The combination of housing and transport costs are a big factor in affordability problems, combining solutions near transit is a more integrated impact, addressing poverty, transit cost and housing.

Delores Peltier-Corkey, Gignal Non-Profit Housing Corporation
Indigenous housing providers work with very low-income families. Currently no Indigenous housing is near transit. So new policy should seek to be more inclusive. LRT lines traverse Algonquin lands – has there been meaningful consultation and informed consent?

Jill Wiggle, board member, City for All Women Initiative
We know what needs to be done; the missing piece is political leadership. Need affordable housing near transit. Need to prioritize integrated planning, including gender equity lens – e.g. woman’s mobility patterns are different because they are caregivers. Pay attention to equity and inclusion.

David Renfroe, Domicile Developments
A key issue for both market and affordable developers is community opposition/NIMBY especially when intensification is involved. The development process is fraught with uncertainty and risk. The city can help to de-risk the process through pre-zoning (versus requiring extended negotiated process, and potential appeals) around LRT stations. Policy should also allow opportunity to negotiate density bonus in exchange for community benefit. Potentially allocate
100% of any Sec 37 benefits to affordable housing use. Strategically use development and permit fee waivers to encourage inclusion of affordable units.

Following the presentations, audience members were invited to add additional ideas or seek clarification. General discussion elaborated on some of the suggested ideas. Some ideas were augmented or reinforced – especially the need for strong political leadership.

**Dotmocracy - identifying most promising ideas.**

During presentations from councillors and other presenters, specific ideas were recorded on large flipchart sheets and displayed on the wall. Where the suggestion/idea was highlighted by more than 1 speaker it was not repeated (but repeated ideas were highlighted). There remains some overlap so all listed ideas (in table below) are not mutually exclusive.

The dotmocracy exercise then asked audience members to place stickers on ideas they wish to prioritize. The top 10 ideas prioritized were:

1) Term of Council Priority targets
2) Use all tools (inclusionary zoning, Section 37, site plan approval)
3) Plan for people not buildings
4) Air rights and co-location (housing above libraries and other public use)
5) Set targets for affordable housing (TODs, Official Plan, etc), track accountability
6) Affordable housing for Indigenous people
7) 5-year plan with targets, resources and accountability
8) Broaden definition of affordable (housing affordable for people with a mix of incomes can help build more affordable housing)
9) Macro strategy for affordable housing and micro strategy for areas around stations
10) Land banking (public lands near transit), reserving the land for affordable housing
The complete dotmocracy prioritization is presented in the table below.

Extracting key priorities from this list suggests that the participants placed a high priority on strong political leadership, and greater council accountability. The single largest vote identified the need for a clear set of target outcomes, and more importantly linked to council term to ensure political accountability.

It was recognized that a variety of tools would be needed to enable and encourage transit oriented affordable housing development (TOAHD). This should include planning policies such as inclusionary zoning policy and density bonusing (sec 37), incentives, such as development cost fee waivers, permit waivers, and when available, financial support via program specific grant or financing programs.

Another high priority was the idea of leveraging existing public investment and using air-rights to add affordable housing over other public use sites (libraries, community centres, parkades and potentially over transit right of ways and over stations).

Certain constituencies, notably indigenous and low-income persons dependent on transit, were highlighted as potential target groups for affordable housing development near transit. It was also stressed that policies should emphasis planning for people, suggesting appropriate design and amenities – its not just about more units, its about more homes, appropriate amenities, and the quality of life of residents.

Participants also highlighted the absence of policies relating to affordable housing in other city plans. There is a need for more cross-sectoral integrated planning (i.e. include afford housing objectives and principles in Transportation Master Plan, TOD plans not just in Official Plan and the Housing and Homelessness Plan). Without explicit policy recognition in these non-housing specific documents the potential and opportunity to pursue affordable housing outcomes is easily overlooked.

Next Steps

This event was conducted as a brain storming exercise intended to begin a dialogue on how to elevate the discussion about opportunities for affordable housing development in conjunction with BRT and LRT investments – both of which is creating and will continue to create significant uplift in land values for land owners. Given the degree of public investment and public decision authority in the planning and development process that create this value uplift, serious thought is required about how to leverage this investment and decision-making process to generate meaningful community benefits, beyond the linkages of light rail itself.
The morning generated a wide range of suggestions and opportunities, most notable the need for strong political leadership and sound policy development, with meaningful objectives and targets.

It was suggested that we might have already missed the train with respect to planning for affordable housing along the LRT Phase 1 part of the transit corridor and stations. However now is the time to identify opportunities and develop a regulatory and planning framework to encourage, incent and enable transit oriented affordable housing development (TOAHD) on Phases 2 and 3.

A critical part of the process is to identify public lands that could be utilized for this purpose and to ensure that land disposition policies support TOAHD (i.e. lands are not sold off for highest and best use to maximize real estate return without any requirement for affordable housing inclusion). This will require collaboration between the City Housing and Real Estate branches, together with necessary political leadership to direct staff.

It may be appropriate to explore the potential of land banking of public lands to ensure that future development includes integrated development, with inclusion of affordable housing. Public or community control of the lands can be an effective way to ensure these outcomes (Gladstone Village, being developed by Ottawa Community Housing is a good example of this approach).

In the case of privately owned land it is extremely difficult to add inclusionary requirements after the fact, that is, after investor-developers have purchased land at prices that already capitalize potential future higher density. It is critical that any such requirements should be identified early and embedded in any official plan updates, in Community Design Plans (secondary plans), TOD plans and in the zoning bylaw (potential as conditional use provisions).

It was noted that Ontario recently enacted legislation that enables municipalities to adopt inclusionary bylaws. The new authority should be used to develop an appropriate regulatory framework to encourage TOAHD in Ottawa.

The city should embark on the creation and implementation of an inclusionary bylaw, drawing on new legislative authority. TOD sites should be prioritized for inclusion of affordable housing.

These requirements should be embedded in the planned official plan update, in Community Design Plans (secondary plans) and in the zoning bylaw (potential as conditional use provisions).

Workshop participants proposed the creation of a TOAHD working group to assist and advise the City in developing and implementing a TOAHD framework.

Event organizers and sponsors have high hopes that these ideas and opportunities will gain momentum over the coming months, and that a new council will provide the critical leadership to create increased options for affordable housing to support a more inclusive city.
### Results of dotmocracy prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion/idea</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term of council priority targets</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use all (tools inclusionary zoning section 37 site plan approval)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for people not buildings/create complete communities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air rights and co-location (housing above libraries and other public use)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set targets (TOD, OP etc.) track, accountable</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable for indigenous people</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yr. plan with targets, resources and accountability.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden def’n of affordable (other levels of afford)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro strategy for afford hsg and micro strategy for stations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land banking (public lands near transit)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include housing for larger families</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afford housing first from public land sale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgive development charges and permit fees for afford hsg</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules for land close to transit (not just adjacent) – e.g. Coach houses/ secondary apts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication of land for AH (not just $ in lieu)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working group – partnership collaboration between all stakeholders</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include meaningful vision in city strategic plan and TOD plans</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think big (tower in park rethink, CPD Pinecrest/Queensview interchange)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued funding from 3 levels of government (pilot conversation with feds re eligible land for AH)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize in plans (update def’n – OP, TODS secondary CPD plans</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity inclusion lens (apply to planning tools)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move from RT3 to RT4 zoning of side streets within 1.5 km of transit to allow low rise infill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage municipal land use approvals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community benefit agreements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental replacement bylaws</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication – tell the story better link btw housing and transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reconciliation commission (recommendation #92) includes calls to action (e.g. Consultation)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with afford hsg developers to build secondary dwellings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-zone lands along LRT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrace smart grow planning principles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated planning – transport, TOD, OP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support partners to build afford hsg using public land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable TOD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 opportunities – work with partners for certain parcels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add contractual obligations in stage 3 LRT covenants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep existing afford housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National housing strategy – RDFI, Co-investment fund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add afford housing criteria related to infrastructure/transport funding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access and planning for access with inclusivity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women partnerships</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live and make a decent living</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow coach house and secondary dwellings at same time</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen TOD and other planning tools</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think small (rethink setbacks, better utilize surface parking)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong committed council</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing what supports are going in in advance (e.g. Community services accessibility etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don Riley is a commercial property developer and owner based in London, UK who made millions of pounds from the building of the Jubilee Line Extension in south London. He owned a significant amount of property in a run-down part of Southwark that dramatically rose in value when the new underground line opened.

The increase was due to the fact that Southwark was now connected to central London and the Financial City, Canary Wharf and Docklands, and City Airport.

He wrote a book called “Taken for a Ride” in which he set out the gains in land and rental value generated around all the new stations from the building of the line. He had monitored these values over time. Although glad of the windfall generated, he powerfully argues that at least part of this wealth creation should return to the people who created it – i.e. the providers of the Jubilee Line - ultimately the taxpayers.

Cited in Havel George, 2013, Land Value Capture Discussion Paper, Metrolinx
Appendix: Presenter Speaking Points

Note: while speakers were asked, following the event, to share notes, not all have formal speeches, and were not able to provide background notes. This appendix includes those that were available (bold).
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- Saide Sayah, City of Ottawa Housing Branch
- Cliff Youdale, Ottawa Community Housing
- Suzanne Le, Exec. Dir., Multifaith Housing Initiative
- Ray Sullivan, Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corporation
- Dennis Carr, Centretown Affordable Housing Development Corp.
- Vivian Chih, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp.
- Trevor Haché, Healthy Transportation Coalition
- Alain Miguelez, Planning Dept., City of Ottawa
- Delores Peltier-Corkey, Gignal Non-Profit Housing Corporation
- Jill Wiggle, board member, City for All Women Initiative
- David Renfroe, Domicile Developments
**Opening Comments from Kristen Holinsky, Alliance to End Homelessness**

**Building more Affordable Housing near Rapid Transit Stations in Ottawa – April 20, 2018**

8:15 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., Colonel By Room, City Hall, 110 Laurier Ave. W.

**Sponsors:**

The City of Ottawa Planning Infrastructure and Economic Development Department and City of Ottawa Housing Services Branch in partnership with the Alliance to End Homelessness Ottawa, Centretown Citizens’ Ottawa Corporation, and Healthy Transportation Coalition are pleased to invite you to this series.

**Objectives:**

- Identify opportunities and challenges related to building more affordable housing close to rapid transit
- Learn more about the City’s position, that of social housing providers, and community concerns
- Prioritize the Top 5 solutions and/or promising ideas that could be pursued

**Kristen’ Speaking Notes:**

Thank you. I am very pleased to be here, representing the Alliance to End Homelessness Ottawa as one of the participating supporters of this event.

Without an adequate supply of affordable housing, we will continue to see increases in homelessness, like the 5% increase in shelters use we saw this past year.

We desperately need more affordable housing options to meet the needs of the low to moderate income households who make Ottawa their home.

We know that ensuring housing affordability significantly increases housing stability, and improves outcomes in health, employment, education, and wellbeing for individuals and families.

The opportunity is right in front of us. We can do something to address the lack of affordable housing supply and the low rental vacancy rates in our city.

With the building of Ottawa’s Light Rail Transit, we have an opportunity to ensure that development near Ottawa’s 57 rapid transit stations include affordable housing.

We are very happy to be here today, with City staff, to convene a conversation on the urgency, the need, and the opportunities to ensure that as our city continues to grow, our neighborhoods remain inclusive, accessible and equitable.

Five billion dollars of public money is being invested in Ottawa’s Light Rail Transit system. We need to ensure that community benefits flow from that investment – into all neighborhoods – for all community members.
We thank the City for being here with us today to identify the opportunities available to build high-density, mixed-use neighborhoods, close to rapid-transit. And further, to clearly define targets for all new housing built that will meet our city’s affordability needs.

The Alliance is producing a “What We Heard” report stemming from today’s discussions.

We look to the City to take the outcomes from today’s event – and take the lead on developing responsive and accountable outcomes for transit-oriented development, that clearly define affordable housing targets.

Today’s event is a great start! Thank you for being here with us, and we look forward to the conversations ahead.

Thank you

******

Background Facts

There are currently 10,000 people on Ottawa’s Centralized Waiting List for affordable housing, while the length of time to receive an offer of housing remains 5 years or more. There are currently 26,000 affordable housing units in Ottawa, but another 14,000 units are needed to meet current demand.

There will be 57 rapid transit stations in Ottawa, and the majority of those stations have the potential to accommodate Transit-Oriented Developments.

Our preference is to see high density mixed use neighbourhoods in Transit-Oriented Developments (TODs), with a minimum of 10% of all housing built in TODs being affordable non-profit rental housing. At present the term "affordable housing" does not appear in the City' Transit-Oriented Development Plans.

Five billion dollars of public money is being invested in Phases 1, 2 of Light Rail Transit, and we need to ensure community benefits flow from that investment. We must ensure a strong emphasis is placed on building affordable housing close to rapid transit stations.

The City needs to work with the community to decrease the amount of urban displacement of people living on low incomes, who are being pushed out of the downtown core to access affordable housing, and further away from public transit.

We thank the City for being here with us today, to open dialogue on this important issue, and begin to identify the opportunities moving forward. We further look to the City to lead the formation of a Working Group, involving community members, and City staff working across transit, planning and housing departments to identify a path forward on this issue.
Comments by Suzanne Le, Executive Director, Multifaith Housing

1. Land Banking

Once public land is gone, it is gone forever – so, as a city we need to be deeply thoughtful about our land BEFORE it is disposed of – And affordable housing MUST be part of that conversation – not an afterthought. And not something that “maybe/ might” benefit from the sale of our public land.

Acquisition of actual land, not $$$ in lieu of land:

➢ When the most ideal land is sold for top dollar, and then some money is set aside from that amount for us to buy land, the amount we are given is never enough to buy land in the preferred location because it is too expensive.

➢ We just end up having to move further and further away from transit and other services to accommodate the amount of money we have received.

➢ Money alone will not fix the problem. First we need land – THEN we need money.

➢ City’s Affordable housing department rarely can afford to fund both land acquisition & housing development. But both are needed to make housing happen.

➢ If land was provided (already there) a significant amount more of housing could be developed than what we are doing right now.

2. Affordable Housing first:

➢ Following point #1. When publically owned land is considered for development, it’s potential use for the public good should be ruled out BEFORE it is sold off to private developers.

➢ Affordable Housing needs to be considered as part of the public good in the same way schools, libraries, and community centres are. Only when a piece of land is deemed unfit or unnecessary for the development of affordable housing should it be considered for potential sale sold to private developers.

3. Air Rights / Co-Location

➢ Multi-use land. Breaking down the silo’s of residential & other kinds of zoning where and when appropriate.

➢ Consider what can be built with what the city already owns. i.e. building above ambulance & fire stations. Incorporating affordable housing onto the same land as community centres and libraries.

➢ intensifying. Building up rather than always building out - Especially around rapid transit stations.
Dennis Carr: **Building more Affordable Housing near Rapid Transit Stations** -

- Ottawa is responsible for affordable housing and some social infrastructure
- City Strategic Plan says everything to everybody and therefore doesn’t speak to an overall vision of the kind of City we want to be
- TOD references increased density around stations but no reference to providing affordable housing or social amenities

**Ottawa Losing Resources**

- Recent sale of social housing and mixed-use development sites
- $25M over 5 withdrawn from the fund for new affordable housing

**2014-2024 H and H Plan**

- No 10-year supply target
- The limited identified resources have disappeared

**Slide 2: City of Vancouver High Level Priorities**

- Housing, affordability and homelessness
- Safety, inclusion and creativity
- Economic development
- Greenest city

**YVR Public Benefit Strategy**

- Housing
- Childcare spaces
- Parks, plazas and public realm improvements
- Civic, non-profit and cultural spaces
- Public art

**Slide 3: Cambie Corridor Plan Transit Hub Policy**

- Land uses that optimize the investment in transit
- Walkable and cycleable neighbourhoods linked to public transit
- A range of housing, tenures and affordability
- Job space and diversity
- Density focused at transit stations
Oakridge Centre
- Retail, office, residential
- 290 social housing units
- 290 market rental units;
- 70,000 sf civic centre with:
  - Community centre
  - Library
  - Seniors centre
  - 69-space childcare facility
- Public park

Slide 4: Vancouver Housing Initiatives

Library and Housing
- 22 supportive family units with amenities and community space
- City land at no cost

Vancouver Fire Department/YWCA
- 31 supportive units for families
- City land at no cost
- City grant

Slide 5: City of Ottawa and Social Infrastructure

Gladstone Village Transit Hub Exception
- Mixed income housing
- School
- Commercial and retail spaces
- Greenspace

Connect the Dots
- Land bank for affordable housing and social amenities
- Include affordable housing and social amenities in new neighbourhood plans
- Maximize use existing zoning tools
- Inclusionary zoning in area plans
- Consider bonus density for affordable housing and social amenities

Connect the Dots; Transit and Social Infrastructure
Co-locate social facilities with transit stations and other municipal facilities

Ensure social facilities at transit hubs by:

- Inclusionary zoning and density bonusing
- Relief of municipal fees and charges
- Using ‘Section 37’ public benefits
- Using the City’s air-rights

**Top 3 ideas**

- Meaningful vision in the city Strategic Plan and TOD plan
- A 5-year plan for affordable housing with targets and resources
- Plan for people not buildings
See separate presentation
Rental Construction Financing initiative

$3.75B
In low-cost loans to municipalities and housing providers for the construction of affordable rental housing in Canada

4-year initiative

$1M minimum loan amount, minimum 5 units

CMHC insured from the onset
$15.9 billion National Housing Co-Investment Fund

National Housing Co-Investment Fund Outcomes

- **60,000** New Units
- **240,000** Repaired Units

At least 7,000 shelter spaces created or repaired for survivors of violence:
- 4,000 (Budget 2017) + 3,000 (Budget 2016)

At least 12,000 new affordable units created for seniors:
- 7,000 (Budget 2017) + 5,000 (Budget 2016)

At least 2,400 new affordable units created for persons with developmental disabilities

Applications for the National Housing Co-Investment Fund will be accepted starting April 1, 2018.

placetocallhome.ca
## NHS Minimum Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Renewal &amp; Repair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>30% of units must have rents at less than 80% of median market rents, for a minimum of 20 years</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy efficiency</strong></td>
<td>At least 25% reduction in energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions over national building and energy codes must be achieved</td>
<td>At least 25% reduction in energy use and greenhouse gas emissions relative to past performance must be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td>20% of units must meet accessibility standards and projects must be barrier-free or have full universal design</td>
<td>20% of units must meet accessibility standards and projects must be barrier-free in common areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vivian Chih
Affordable Housing Consultant
vchih@cmhc.ca
(613) 748-4632
Comments from Trevor Haché, vice-president, Healthy Transportation Coalition

www.healthytransportation.ca

Make it a priority, in writing, Budgets

- update Transit-Oriented Development Plans, Official Plan, Secondary Plans, Transportation Master Plan, Strategic Capital Plan for Affordable Housing, and explicitly state in each that it is a priority
- make the next Term-of-Council the best-ever in terms of spending City of Ottawa $ on building deeply affordable housing

Set aggressive commitments/targets

- 15-20% of all housing added to Transit-Oriented Developments, near stations, along transit lines should be deeply affordable housing units (housing is a human right)
- put contractual obligations in Stage 3 LRT, utilize land expropriation & create covenants on the land for deeply affordable housing

Use all tools to achieve the targets

- Tools include Community Benefits Agreements, Inclusionary Zoning, Section 37 of Planning Act, site plan approvals, & use creative thinking to urgently respond to this crisis
- report annually on achievement of 15-20% target
Comments from Delores Peltier-Corkey, Gignal Non-Profit Housing Corporation

Gignul Housing:
162 rent geared to income housing
- 60% in Vanier/Overbrook area
- none of which are near major bus routes
- the other 40% are scattered (Orleans, Bells Corners, Nepean – Merivale/Meadowlands, Gladstone, Lowertown, Bank/Heron)
- 40% of these units are single female parents
- approximately 60% of these units are those whose income is well below poverty line
- about 50% are tenants are on assistance (OW and ODSP)

11 unit Seniors building (independent living) – located in Overbrook/Vanier

Madawan Management & Dev Inc:
28 unit affordable housing – 1043 Cummings Ave – located near St. Laurent mall

Inuit Non Profit Housing is a smaller provider with approximately 40 buildings.

The majority of tenants rely on transit whether it is for employment, appointments, school or programs and services.

Location of Aboriginal Service agencies:
Wabano Centre for Aboriginal Health – 299 Montreal Rd
Minwaashin Lodge – 1155 Lola Street
Tewegan Youth Housing – 65 Harvey St
Ottawa Inuit Children’s Centre – 230 McArthur Rd
Odawa Native Friendship Centre – 255 City Centre
Tuungasuvvingat Inuit – 1071 Richmond Rd (West)
- 297 Savard Street (East)
- 604 Laurier Ave (Central)
Kagita Mikam – 456 McArthur Rd

A majority of services are located in the east end of the city whereas limited services for those living in the west end let alone none for the south end of the city therefore accessing these services by transit is important.

Indigenous People coming from small communities/reserves face culture shock when moving to a big city, whether they come here for school, medical, employment or a new start. Where does one fit in or how does one fit in to make that new start? Limitations are due to lack of affordability, racial discrimination and access to services – by having these limitations reduces the hope, self esteem/self worth.
The smaller housing providers do have the resources which means the potential of missed opportunities such as this.

Three top ideas:

1. Affordable Housing for Indigenous People needs to be first and foremost under the National Housing Strategy and must be considered to be located in areas that are near rapid transit stations for the sake of inclusivity. I want to feel part of the community!

2. Barriers that affect many Indigenous People include access to mental health services, access to community supports – i.e. libraries, sports centres, Social Services and not having direct link to rapid transit will continue to be a barrier therefore better planning of affordable housing and community services along the rapid transit routes. Having parks and bike lanes in low income neighbourhoods would increase the viability of community

3. Are the Truth and Reconciliation calls to action being recognized in the planning process of affordable housing and where these units will be located? Have the Algonquin People of this territory been consulted or informed?

Business and Reconciliation

92. We call upon the corporate sector in Canada to adopt the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a reconciliation framework and to apply its principles, norms, and standards to corporate policy and core operational activities involving Indigenous peoples and their lands and resources. This would include, but not be limited to, the following:
   i. Commit to meaningful consultation, building respectful relationships, and obtaining the free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous peoples before proceeding with economic development projects.
   ii. Ensure that Aboriginal peoples have equitable access to jobs, training, and education opportunities in the corporate sector, and that Aboriginal communities gain long-term sustainable benefits from economic development projects.
   iii. Provide education for management and staff on the history of Aboriginal peoples, including the history and legacy of residential schools, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Treaties and Aboriginal rights, Indigenous law, and Aboriginal–Crown relations. This will require skills based training in intercultural competency, conflict resolution, human rights, and anti-racism.
Comments by Jill Wigle, Carleton University

My proposals address the need to integrate social and spatial planning to create a more inclusive city, in both form and process.

3 Ideas:

1. Prioritize an integrated approach to affordable housing and transit accessibility to ensure that public investment in transit produces public benefits. Revamp the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Guidelines and other relevant planning policies in the City of Ottawa to incentivize the inclusion of social and affordable housing near rapid transit through the application of provincial inclusionary zoning regulations, Section 37 of the Planning Act or new funding available through the National Housing Strategy. Aim for 10-20% of all housing in proximity to rapid transit stops to be deeply affordable.

2. Address gendered mobility patterns/needs in conjunction with rapid transit. Consider that women’s daily mobility patterns/needs can be more complex than the linear home-work-back again commuting trajectory. In many cases, women’s mobility patterns pivot around their multiple roles as care-givers and wage-earners. Even if/as these roles are assumed or shared by others, a city designed around such mobilities is more inclusive and accessible.

3. Apply the Equity and Inclusion Lens to decision-making processes related to Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) in the City of Ottawa. This goes beyond the already-included Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED), with its emphasis on designing for personal safety in the public sphere, by considering and encouraging the co-location of private and public services (e.g. libraries, community centres, medical offices, grocery stores), amenities (e.g. daycare), and affordable housing for marginalized or vulnerable communities.
Comments by David S. Renfroe, Director of Business Development and Planning, Domicile.

Challenge #1 – NIMBY
- The NIMBY culture around affordable housing and intensification close to public transit needs to change.
- Without this shift, we will never solve the affordable housing problems in Ottawa.
- We’ll all spend enormous energy and resources fighting those who say no.
- As leaders of our City, we need to provide a vision for the future of intensification around transit.
- We need to define objectives and create a UNITED strategic plan for affordable transit intensification.
- A plan that takes the “NO” out of who, what, where and why.

IDEA #1 – Pre-Zone Lands along the LRT
- The City of Ottawa, through the Official Plan, should pre-zone lands that are in close proximity to the LRT corridor.
- The LRT is not sustainable without ridership.
- The only way to consciously ensure ridership...is intensification.
- City building at its core: put people in the right places.
- Benefits of pre-zoning land including:
  - Municipal approvals quicker
  - Development decisions would be predictable
  - Removes uncertainty w/ the approval process
  - Eliminates political struggles
  - Kills NIMBYism as zoning is pre-determined
  - Takes the emotion out of intensification
  - Holistically, the approval process is more affordable
  - Further, increased density equates to DC revenue, increased taxes and Section 37 benefits.
  - All of which directly help affordable housing.

IDEA #2 - Embrace Smart Growth Planning
- We need a strategic plan that lives and breathes smart growth planning principles.
- Benefits of smart growth planning near LRT include:
  - Promotes LRT ridership
    - Less car dependency
    - Promotes sustainable building forms - up vs out
  - Promotes walkable and safe neighbourhoods
  - Promotes mixed-use developments to help revitalize neighbourhoods
  - Allows people to live close to where they work
  - Re-using existing infrastructure
  - Net density efficient use of land
  - Creates DC’s to help affordable housing
  - Creates tax revenue to help affordable housing
  - This is called smart growth planning.
  - We as a leadership group should support it.

Challenge #2 – Cost of Development
- Land development is not affordable
- Soft costs, meaning before the shovel goes in the ground, include:
  - Cost of the land purchase
  - Bank financing
  - Administrative costs
  - Land carry costs
  - Municipal approvals
  - Consultant reports
  - Due diligence
  - CIL
  - DC’s
  - Section 37
- Then you have to build the building!!
- It’s a very difficult process
- How can we make it affordable?
IDEA #3 – Partnership w/ all stakeholders

- A solution is to engage with all stakeholders, including the housing industry, to create a YIMBY culture.

Developers play a crucial role in City building
- We create jobs and employ trades
- We navigate the political and municipal policies
- We understand the approval process
- We understand project costs.
- Who better to help build affordable homes?
- Who better to value engineer projects?
- Who better to police the economic viability of projects...before the units go to the market?
- Who better to ensure there is enough market supply?

Federal Government / Provincial Government / NCC
- Land is the largest obstacle in the entire process.
- The Federal government is the largest landowner in Ottawa.
- Why is inclusionary zoning only for new homeowners?
- The Provincial government collected over 3 billion dollars in land transfer tax last year.
- Connect the dots:
- Federally - Why not donate some land?
- Provincially - 1% of the land transfer tax is $30 million

City of Ottawa has a role as well:
- They could expedite the review process
- Require all Section 37 funds to go directly to affordable housing
- Align Energy Evolution goals with affordable housing goals
- Incentivizes projects that achieve these goals:
- Provide density bonuses for Affordable units
- Waive Development Charges
- Waive application fees
As a final point,

- We’re here to talk about affordable housing near rapid transit.
- We need to be cautious that Inclusionary Zoning keeps other forms of housing affordable.
- Failure to do so will only further strain affordable housing demand.
- Others may advocate that Inclusionary zoning is the solution.
- I would argue that it's a tool in the toolbox that is not free.
- A tool that on its own will not work, we need a complete, smart, united solution.