

Toronto City Summit Alliance



Proceedings Document

ROUNDTABLE ON NEIGHBOURHOODS AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

OCTOBER 14, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE.....	1
2. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	1
3. ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS.....	3
4. AGENDA	4
5. SESSION 1: HANGING IN THE BALANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE GTA.....	4
5.1 Summary of the Presentation.....	4
5.2 Summary of the Discussion.....	5
6. SESSION 2: THE REUNION: REFLECTIONS ON THE REGENT PARK REVITLIZATION PROCESS.....	7
6.1 Transcript of the Conversation	7
6.2 Summary of the Discussion on Neighbourhoods	17
7. SUMMARY OF CLOSING REFLECTION	19
APPENDIX 1	21

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Roundtable was to bring together regional stakeholders from business, government, labour and the community sector to generate ideas for actions that will help realize our vision of a *Toronto region where complete neighbourhoods, with all their benefits, are the norm in all areas and for all residents*. Through our discussions, we aimed to identify the policies, planning, resources and other elements that are required to enable innovation in engagement of people and for investments of all kinds. This roundtable was one of a series of issue-specific events the Alliance has been convening to inform the 2010 municipal elections and set the agenda for the Alliance's February 2011 Summit of 600-700 regional leaders from all sectors.

2. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Toronto City Summit Alliance would like to thank Toronto Community Housing for providing the venue as a gift in kind for this event.

We would also like to thank our Neighbourhoods & Affordable Housing Working Group Members for their input into this important process.

2.1 Working Group Members

Wendell Adjetey, JVS Toronto
Jehad Aliweiji, Thorncliffe Park
Derek Ballantyne, Build Toronto
Joe Berridge, Urban Strategies Inc.
Rahul Bhardwaj, Toronto Community Foundation
Jill Black, J.E. Black & Company Ltd.

Chris Brillinger, Social Policy, Analysis & Research,
City of Toronto
Jeb Brugmann, The Next Practice
John Campey, Social Planning Toronto
Linda Chamberlain, Voices from the Street
Linda Coltman, Voices from the Street
Brian Conway, Ontario Trillium Foundation

Sue Corke, City Manager's Office, City of Toronto
Steve Diamond, Diamondcorp
Diane Dyson, WoodGreen Community Services
Barbara Emmanuel, Toronto Public Health
Maureen Fair, St. Christopher House
Sean Gadon, Affordable Housing Unit, City of Toronto
Renee Gomes, Waterfront Toronto
Vincent Gasparro, Primanagement Inc.
S. Gopi Gopikrishna, Scarborough Housing
Pamela Grant, Youth Challenge Fund
Paul Hess, Department of Geography and Program in Planning, University of Toronto
Neil Hetherington, Habitat Toronto
Rob Howarth, Toronto Neighbourhood Centres
Shirley Hoy, Toronto Lands Corporation
J. David Hulchanski, Cities Centre
Mitzie Hunter, Toronto Community Housing
Ahmed Hussein, Thorncliffe Park
Shemina Karmali, Ismaili Muslim Council for Ontario
Susan MacDonnell, United Way Toronto
Medhat Mahdy, YMCA
Gillian Mason, United Way Toronto

Heather McGregor, YWCA
Mayzar Mortazavi, TAS DesignBuild
Keiko Nakamura, Toronto Community Housing
Marisa Piattelli, Waterfront Toronto
Susan Pigott, Centre for Addiction & Mental Health
Jenny Poulos, Royal Bank of Canada
Lindsey Reed, Social Housing Services Corporation
Sarah Rix, Social Policy, Analysis & Research, City of Toronto
James Robinson, Downtown Yonge Business Improvement Area
Brian Smith, WoodGreen Community Services
Opal Sparks, Voices from the Street
Graeme Stewart, ERA Architects
Nicole Stewart, Affordable Housing Unit, City of Toronto
Gary Switzer, MOD Developments Inc.
Jasmine Tehara, TD Wealth Management
Keith Ward, Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association
Shelley White, United Way Peel
Susan Wright, Neighbourhood Arts Network (TAC)
Daniele Zanotti, United Way York Region

2.2 Toronto City Summit Alliance Members

Julia Deans, TCSA
John Tory, TCSA
Michelynn Lafleche, TCSA
Naki Osutei, TCSA

Tiffany Blair, TCSA (School of Public Policy and Governance, University of Toronto)
Joanna Flatt, TCSA (School of Public Policy and Governance, University of Toronto)

2.3 Speakers

Martin Blake, The Daniels Corporation
Debra Dineen, Toronto Christian Resource Centre
John Fox, Toronto Community Housing
Sean Gadon, Affordable Housing Office, City of Toronto

Adonica Huggins, Christian Resource Centre, Downtown East Community Development Collective
Royson James, Toronto Star
Jenny Poulos, Royal Bank of Canada
Mary Rowe, Consultant

2.4 Facilitators

Diane Dyson, WoodGreen Community Services
Maureen Fair, St Christopher House
Sean Gadon, City of Toronto
Pamela Grant, Youth Challenge Fund
Rob Howarth, Toronto Neighbourhood Centre

Gillian Mason, United Way Toronto
Marisa Piattelli, Waterfront Toronto
Graeme Stewart, ERA Architects
Nicole Stewart, City of Toronto
Jasmine Tehara, TD Bank

2.5 Note-takers

Tamara Balan, Toronto City Summit Alliance
Tiffany Blair, Toronto City Summit Alliance
Joanna Flatt, Toronto City Summit Alliance
Julia Lo, Toronto City Summit Alliance
Adrian Lightstone, University of Toronto

Sarah Rix, City of Toronto
Cindy Tan, Toronto City Summit Alliance
Melissa Tapper, South Riverdale Community Health Centre
Tiffany Vong, Toronto City Summit Alliance
Ellen Zarchin, Volunteer

3. ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS

There were 84 participants from the following organizations who took part in the Roundtable on October 14th, 2010.

- Advocacy Centre for Tenants/ Housing Network of Ontario
- Affordable Housing Unit, City of Toronto
- The Atkinson Charitable Foundation
- Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation
- Centre For Independent Living in Toronto
- Cities Centre, University of Toronto
- City of Toronto, Affordable Housing Office
- City of Toronto, Social Policy, Analysis and Research
- Canadian Urban Institute
- Daniels Corporation
- Diamondcorp
- Dixon Hall
- Dowling Consulting
- Downtown East Community Development Collective
- Durham Region
- ERA Architects
- Habitat Toronto
- Halton Region Health Department
- HOK Architects
- Home Ownership Alternatives
- Houselink
- Human Services - Region of Peel
- Jane's Walk
- Labour Community Services
- LAMP (Lakeshore Area Multiservice Project)
- Laurence Heights Tenants
- Mainstay Housing
- Martin Prosperity Institute
- Ontario Council of Alternative Businesses
- Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association
- Ontario Trillium Foundation
- Operation Springboard
- Paul Bedford & Associates
- People Plan Toronto
- Regent Park Community Health Centre
- Scarborough Housing
- Seeds of Hope Foundation
- Social Planning Toronto
- South Riverdale Community Health Centre
- Spacing Magazine
- St. Christopher House
- St. Stephen's Community House
- TD Wealth Management Operations & Technology
- The George Cedric Metcalf Charitable Foundation
- The Next Practice
- Toronto Children's Aid Society
- Toronto Christian Resource Centre
- Toronto Community Housing
- Toronto Neighbourhood Centres
- UNITE/HERE Local 75
- United Way Peel Region
- United Way Toronto
- University Settlement
- Voices from the Street
- Waterfront Toronto
- WoodGreen Community Services
- YMCA
- York Region
- Youth Challenge Fund
- YouthLEAPS
- YWCA

4. AGENDA

09.00	Welcome and opening remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Tory, Chair, Toronto City Summit Alliance
09.10	Outline of structure of day <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gillian Mason, United Way Toronto & Mitzie Hunter, Toronto Community Housing and Co-chairs of the Toronto City Summit Alliance Neighbourhoods and Affordable Housing Working Group
09.15	Session 1: Hanging in the Balance: Affordable Housing in the GTA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sean Gadon, Director, Affordable Housing Office, City of Toronto
09.25	Small group discussion
10.20	Break
10.30	Session 2: The Reunion: Reflections on the Regent Park Revitalization Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Blake, Vice President, The Daniels Corporation • Debra Dineen, Executive Director, Toronto Christian Resource Centre • John Fox, Acting Vice President of Development & General Counsel Development, Toronto Community Housing • Adonica Huggins, Asset Mapping Project Co-ordinator, Christian Resource Centre and Co-ordinator & Chair, Downtown East Community Development Collective • Jenny Poulos, Regional Vice President, Royal Bank of Canada • Moderator: Royson James, Journalist, The Toronto Star
11.15	Small Group discussion on neighbourhoods
12.45	Closing presentation / reflections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mary Rowe, Consultant
13.00	Networking Lunch
14.00	(Optional) Guided Tour of Regent Park

5. SESSION 1: HANGING IN THE BALANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE GTA

5.1 Summary of the Presentation

SEAN GADON, DIRECTOR, AFFORDABLE HOUSING OFFICE, CITY OF TORONTO

Sean Gadon's presentation outlined recent investments in affordable housing in the Toronto region and the upcoming challenges of housing and homelessness program and funding renewal. Federal funding for three key housing and homelessness programs (Affordable Housing Initiative, Social Housing Renovation and Retrofit Program, Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program) will expire March

2011. The Province has also not confirmed the renewal of its program funding after March 2011. A regional approach was suggested to encourage continued government engagement in housing and new research suggests thinking in a regional manner can be beneficial for all stakeholders. Socio-economic trends demonstrate that there is further work to be done to address affordable housing and these objectives can be achieved through better coordination with a people-first regional approach. A regional approach may facilitate collaborative learning and the ability to build on and replicate existing local strategies and best practices, allowing governments to better meet the needs of people. To further working as region, the City of Toronto is working on a Regional Housing Data Bank which will create a snapshot of the region, highlight the health of housing stock and provide the evidence base needed to guide decision making. On November 24th, the Toronto City Summit Alliance, the City of Toronto and the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association will host a Regional Housing Forum to bring together stakeholders to further discuss the development of a regional agenda.

See [Appendix 1](#) for slides accompanying Sean Gadon's presentation.

ABOUT SEAN GADON:

Sean Gadon lives with his family in the "Little Malta" neighbourhood in the west end of Toronto. He cares deeply about our city and has been active in Toronto politics and housing advocacy since the late 1970's.

As a citizen in the 1980's he served as a member of Toronto's Economic Development Committee and the Housing Standards Appeal Committee. From 1985 to 1988 as the Executive Assistant to two Ontario Housing Ministers he was instrumental in rolling out major nonprofit housing initiatives to create over 25,000 new homes in the province. From 1989 to 1993 he co-ordinated the creation of some 2,000 non-profit and co-operative homes for the Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto and York Region. Over the past 15 years Sean has been called upon as a senior advisor to Mayors Barbara Hall, Mel Lastman and David Miller.

Sean is currently the Director of Toronto's Affordable Housing Office responsible for working with the non-profit and private sectors to delivery new affordable housing. He is also facilitating the implementation of the city's recently adopted 10 year housing plan: Housing Opportunities Toronto.

He is a graduate from the University of Toronto's Urban Studies Program where he acquired his love of all things urban. In his spare time, when not with his family, he is the volunteer president of Raising the Roof, Canada's national homelessness charity.

5.2 Summary of the Discussion

Following Sean Gadon's presentation, the Roundtable participants engaged in 10-person conversations to explore two main questions (below).

1. What are the challenges and opportunities of a regional approach?

There was strong support for a regional approach. Participants thought this approach would allow for greater coordination between different municipalities and help to bring new actors to the tables who have been previously left out of these discussions. Such a coordinated approach would also help break down institutional silos and foster more holistic planning in the region. Participants also highlighted the positive benefits that could result from incorporating more affordable housing in outlying regions and creating more mixed communities. Participants suggested there are opportunities to learn from existing initiatives and potentially build on their successes.

Participants expressed concern that there may be challenges trying to get municipalities to work together. To ensure this was done effectively, it would be necessary to make a case highlighting the benefits that each municipality would obtain from such a regional collaboration. The development of a common vision or narrative is critical, however a viable regional approach should also provide municipalities with the opportunities to vocalize their particular concerns. There is currently no framework for municipalities to share information so a collaborative process would require the development of new governance mechanisms. Additionally, it would be necessary to build a business case to garner interest from the private sector.

A further challenge is the different views about affordable housing throughout the region. Many explained that affordable housing is not perceived as a problem in certain municipalities and residents may therefore be apprehensive to the idea of enhancing the availability of affordable housing in these neighbourhoods. Participants expressed the need to enhance education and awareness about affordable housing in the region in an effort to combat prevailing stigma and negative stereotypes. Participants discussed the piecemeal approach to housing in the region and highlighted the lack of an overarching framework for collaboration. To address this, they suggested the possibility of creating a formal structure, akin to the role that Metrolinx plays for transit, which could oversee housing in the region.

2. What are the key issues for discussion at a regional forum?

Participants highlighted a broad range of issues to be discussed at a regional forum:

Holistic Planning

Many participants emphasized the need to discuss linking housing with other urban issues such as transit and access to employment. Participants also discussed the need to potentially reform certain bylaws such as those regulating the allowance of basement apartments.

Accessibility and Affordability of Housing

The prevalence of long wait lists to gain access to affordable housing was also identified as a significant problem. Participants discussed the need to develop new social housing units and revitalize or replace aging housing stock. Participants also discussed the need to better define 'affordability' and identify specific goals. It is important to distinguish between affordable rentals or affordable ownership.

Recognition

Some participants highlighted the need to acknowledge the challenge of addressing stakeholders who are disconnected. Recognizing structural inequalities is necessary to overcoming barriers between different groups. Participants stressed the importance of ensuring that multi-sectoral collaboration allows for different voices to be heard. In addition to this, it was suggested that there is a need for a 'rebranding' or 'repackaging' of housing issues. Such a campaign would aim to appeal to a broader audience outside of the 'usual suspects' and market housing issues as relevant to everyone within the region.

Demand-side Approach

Several participants discussed the importance of addressing the demand-side issues of housing and recognizing the link between housing and income security. The importance of recognizing hidden homelessness was also mentioned. Participants also highlighted the idea of creating a portable housing benefit as an income supplement.

Funding Models

Questions emerged about the kind of incentives required to get the private sector more involved in social housing developments. Public private partnerships were proposed to encourage greater cross-sectoral collaboration in this area. Participants identified the Alliance as well positioned to foster such partnerships.

Data and Information

The Growing emphasis on evidence-based policy making and planning highlighted the need for reliable data on current housing trends in the region. The Working Group's Regional Housing Data Bank will be a good starting point but further investments in gathering information are required. Participants suggested utilizing existing resources such as universities conducting research in this area and perhaps encouraging the Province to develop some form of informational tool.

Best Practices

Many participants discussed the need to identify and examine best practices from regional, national and international experience and examine whether particular initiatives could be replicated or scaled-up.

6. SESSION 2: THE REUNION: REFLECTIONS ON THE REGENT PARK REVITALIZATION PROCESS

The Session 2 panel followed the format of a popular BBC radio program in the UK called The Reunion. The objective of the program is to bring together a number of the players who were involved in key moments in modern history. The purpose of this discussion was to reflect on learning that emerged from the initial stages of the Regent Park Revitalization. Highlighting both the successes and the challenges that various partners faced throughout this process helped inform whether and how to undertake and promote similar projects throughout the GTA today and into the future. This discussion also illustrated the viability of this model of redevelopment and the preconditions necessary to ensure that the adoption, adaptation and/or innovation of such a model is successful. The panel was made up of Martin Blake of the Daniels Corporation, Debra Dineen of the Christian Resource Centre, John Fox of Toronto Community Housing, Adonica Huggins of the Christian Resource Centre and Downtown Eastside Community Development Collective, Jenny Poulos of the Royal Bank of Canada and was moderated by Royson James of The Toronto Star. The audience used learning from this interview conversation to inform their small group discussions on neighbourhoods following the panel.

6.1 Transcript of the Conversation

ROYSON JAMES – Thank you! Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to The Reunion! We are trying to get to the heart of the matter. How did this whole revitalization of Regent Park come about? What were some of the original factors involved? Why did we even need to re-do this place? I thought it was built as one of those wonderful places that was hailed and revered and praised all over Canada – this wonderful housing project in the 1950s. So tell us, what needed to be fixed? How was it? You're one of the originals, Debra, so tell us what it was like living here and why there was a need to make changes?

DEBRA DINEEN – I came into the Regent Park community in 1989 and quickly got involved with advocates who were working to change the community, and the rationale behind those discussions was because there were no through streets. Simple things like ordering a pizza, you were lucky if it ever

came to your door, if they ever found where you were living. That this community, Regent Park, didn't look like any other area of the city, it kind of looked in towards itself.

ROYSON JAMES – That was supposed to be good, no?

DEBRA DINEEN – It was supposed to be good and it probably was in 1948 when Regent Park was built. The reality is because there was no commerce here in Regent Park, there were no through-streets – residents here had felt very strongly that because it looked separate and different from any other part of the city, that it was separate and different from any other part of the city. And the criminal elements started to come in and set up shop in some areas where the community didn't feel ownership. So the need for the revitalization, redevelopment at that point, was a response to make this a safe and nurturing place for our kids.

ROYSON JAMES – Safety was a major concern.

DEBRA DINEEN – Absolutely.

ROYSON JAMES – Any other concerns?

JOHN FOX – This is not the first attempt to revitalize Regent Park. There had been previous attempts and discussions, but in the course of the early part of the 2000s, a number of things happened to come together which allowed a greater chance of success, one of which was the readiness of the tenancy to have the discussion about revitalizing their community. A lot of the drive was coming directly from tenants. But as an asset manager for TCHC, there was also an important consideration in replacing old stock, which is expensive to maintain, expensive to keep heated and cooled, etc. There was also a stronger real estate market in Toronto with condos going up. When we were able to run a competition for a development partner, we had a very strong response from across the development industry telling us that we would be able to attract buyers and be able to do the kind of revitalization that you're seeing. So I think that those three things have helped lead us to this point.

ROYSON JAMES – So the community members themselves, the tenants, they felt the need for change. TCHC also felt the need for change. What actually was the catalyst to get this thing really moving? I would imagine that in addition to the tenants saying they want change, there were also some concerns about too much change?

JOHN FOX – Of course the answer is yes. So before we had the first demolition of a building in Regent Park in 2006 we had a great deal of consultation with tenants to discuss what kind of change was sought and where the housing companies needs and the tenants needs could both be met, sometimes where the couldn't be met. Now, there are many tenants who can walk around even the first phase and point to things that they had articulated as wanting in those initial discussions. You can look around because you're sitting in one of them. Tenants wanted to have spaces in which they could get together and have meetings and do things that help build a community, both here in a community room and in spaces in the front of buildings (seniors building next door). I think that there was certainly concern. There is also a natural concern associated with the fact that it takes political leadership and a lot of work on the part of the public and private sector, staff who are involved and it takes buyers etc. Only our tenants have to get relocated; only our tenants are having their homes demolished through the process. So they obviously have a fair amount of concern about that. 'Where will I go? How long will it take?' I think that, and Debra maybe you can comment, that dynamic has changed through the course of the first phase, whereas at the beginning of the first phase it's kind of a desire to be in phase three or four because you want to see how it goes. Now people tend to say more 'I hope it goes faster because I hope I'm in phase two.'

ADONICA HUGGINS – Right. But also part of the buy-in for tenants was definitely employment. People saw the demolition and the construction as a way for them to get a job for people who hadn't had a job for some time or who were unemployed or under-employed. One of the first pieces of work with the demolition was 30 Regent, the former police services building. A lot of people wanted to get in on that project. The Downtown East Community Development Collective, which is a network of 26 employment organizations or programs in this community, facilitated that first local resident training and employment program in partnering with TCHC. TCHC really provided an excellent opportunity by coming to the table enthusiastically, willingly. The commitment was that the winning contractor had to, as part of their tender, promise 20% employment to local residents. And we continue to use that as a measure for future projects.

ROYSON JAMES – Demolition contractor?

ADONICA HUGGINS – The first demolition contractor, that was before Daniels. It was a small project and maybe that assisted in terms of that higher percentage of local resident employment.

ROYSON JAMES – What types of jobs would those be?

ADONICA HUGGINS –The residents had to go through a lengthy training process in collaboration with Local 516 at that time. Of the first group of eight residents - this was men and women because we definitely wanted women to have opportunities as part of the development - seven successfully completed the training and not only went on to work on that first project within Regent Park, but had the opportunity some months later to get other employment outside of the Park that wasn't connected to the redevelopment. That is a key part.

ROYSON JAMES – So these were skilled, construction jobs?

ADONICA HUGGINS – Some of the folks had some previous training in demolition and construction and others had never done that kind of work before. But many of them continue to work in that industry.

ROYSON JAMES – So why didn't TCHC just up and fix-up the place? Do the maintenance or tear buildings down and re-build them? The government has as much money as it wants. Deep pockets...you know?

JOHN FOX – Actually one thing that the Housing Company sought to do was to try to minimize the impact of the redevelopment on the tax payers. So when you look at a place like Regent, you would see that it's very different than the fabric of the surrounding community. Part of what we were trying to do was to revitalize Regent so that it returned to being a part of the normal Toronto fabric - mixed uses. We talk about this like we've invented this - mixed tenure, mixed income - but in fact most of the communities you live in are mixed income, mixed use, mixed tenure. All we're doing here, with some added flare I would say, is putting that kind of thinking back in. But we didn't have the money to just knock everything down and rebuild. We do have an important asset here in the amount of density and land that's available. Part of the economic strategy for redeveloping was to attract private sector investment in the form of condominium buyers. That profit is part of what finances the construction of buildings like the one you're sitting in now.

ROYSON JAMES – I don't remember the first editorial that was written, first story, and the first columnist that commented on the possibility of the public-private partnership or bringing in a developer to do this. But I imagine that it would have been quite skeptical. Bring a developer in, they're going to rob us blind, get rich off the tax payers and the poor tenants are going to suffer in the end. So, how did

you guys address that fear and concern? And how is that built into the whole process so that doesn't happen?

JOHN FOX – The process of how do we not get taken to the cleaners – we go through a competitive process in order to select a developer partner. But we are also entering into a negotiation which allows us to measure how we're compensating the Daniels Corporation against other measurable things. We know how much it costs to pay a construction manager to build a building, because this is not the only place that we're doing it. An important part of that is over the past five or six years as Toronto Community Housing has gone through this, the Housing Company knows how to assemble a sufficiently strong group of professionals within itself to be able to do the kind of analysis that is necessary to enter into this kind of business arrangement. So we do that. Martin may have a different view as to how that negotiation went, but it went fairly well. When we went out we said we want two things really from our development partner. First, we obviously want to make money. That means you are going to have to be able to build great homes. So we wanted a partner who had a reputation for building great homes and for being able to bring people to a community. The second one was we wanted a partner who would embrace the economic development ambitions that the Housing Company had. Daniels certainly stood out in that regard. We have not had to chase them. We have a provision in the contract that defines the amount of economic development in terms of jobs that we are attempting to achieve – and we run over that regularly. We look at other ways of bringing that, too. Across the street we see a hole that is the site of a future arts and culture centre. To us, it is also economic development. We're attracting permanent economic infrastructure where people will come to Regent Park to go to work in the morning and then go home, by transit of course. A lot of those jobs will end up being part of the job base here locally at Regent. When I was talking to the president of Sobeys about employing locally – he turned to me at one point and said 'John, I don't want people late for work, so of course we are going to hire locally.' And he did, about 80% of his staff come from Regent Park. That kind of creation of economic development within Regent restores some of the normal connections that people have that doesn't really exist in Regent as it is laid out today. That's a really important part. The fact that people see both TCHC and a private sector partner engaged in a collaborative effort inspires a lot of confidence in that (a) we will complete, and (b) we will deliver. When we were up at Lawrence Heights and somebody stood up to say, 'no you wont, we've heard that before,' I didn't have to answer because somebody else responded, 'well actually I'm here from Regent and I'm visiting my mother and I have one of those jobs.' That is a great thing for the Housing Company to be able to look to.

ROYSON JAMES – I want some of you people to tell me how is it that the tenants, residents were able to get that type of guarantee built into a process from day one?

DEBRA DINEEN – I think it goes back to the redevelopment in the early 2000s, when residents were deeply involved in discussions around the redevelopment and the economic opportunities. And being able to clearly say that employment opportunities were important, training and employment opportunities were important. And I emphasize training and employment opportunities because quite often some members of our community have no Canadian work experience, and so we need to be mindful of that and put in place systems that enable them to become employable. We looked at how we could partner with Daniels, TCHC and welcome RBC to come into the community and do job fairs and made sure that in every discussion employment and training were (and are) on the agenda.

ADONICA HUGGINS – But also those organizations in the community who are providing the education, training, employment services – they need to be increasingly at the table and that would be one thing that we would really champion happening. As much as we have employers right now and are looking to individuals to develop small business, economic development opportunities – people may have entry level positions, but what's the next job going to be? We need to be looking at that right now. What is it that we need to create in order to make that happen?

ROYSON JAMES – You are a step ahead of me there. I'm thinking you're a tenant in Regent Park and you're having discussions about tearing down your home and rebuilding it and somebody talks about 'We need jobs.' Jobs doing what? Tearing down buildings, and building them up?

ADONICA HUGGINS – In part, but especially jobs for people who have the greatest barriers to employment. Many of them live here in Regent Park.

ROYSON JAMES – I am trying to understand, when you say jobs, what were you thinking? How did you actually go about this process to develop those jobs? We've heard that Sobeys are coming, tomorrow? RBC, Tim Hortons, Rogers... So how do those things come about? You're a tenant, you're starting the process – how do we get to the point of talking about those?

MARTIN BLAKE – As a developer you are trying to bring to the project the best possible commercial partners who want to embrace the changes that are happening in a section of the city. We sit down and talk to groups like RBC and say there is an opportunity here for you, not just an opportunity about next year, but an opportunity about an evolution of a portion of the city that will change over a course of 15 years. Here's what we can offer you, its not going to be easy if you put it into the same box that you always put every possible RBC branch into, but you have to start thinking outside of that box. Before you do that though, we also want to think about what type of opportunities you can create for people who live here. In RBC's case that may be 'I am a recent immigrant moving into Regent Park, I have banking experience from somewhere else in the world. Why can't that be applicable to a RBC that is coming in here?' The rest of the partners go into the same mix. Sobeys, Tim Hortons and Rogers. But to John's point earlier, it's finding organizations who say 'I actually want to locate and make Regent Park where I have my business. So what opportunities are there to find commercial spaces where I can have my offices here?' This is one of the things that we are doing in phase two: spaces for offices so we can bring people into Regent Park to actually work during the day, and then go to the RBC and do their banking, etc. Having commercial partners like RBC has been great for the community because they have so embraced all of the changes that have been happening.

JENNY POULOS – That was one of the commitments that we definitely made going into the development, hiring local. We opened up our brand new branch just a couple doors down. Half of our staff were from Regent Park. Knowing that we have our shop here now, it continues to attract hiring opportunities. We continue to source talent and hire from within the community for other local branches. That has been a continued commitment that we've had, not just for the branch here but within RBC in the GTA. On top of that was the commitment that we also had around supporting small business. We touched on that a little bit earlier. That was something that we wanted to support as well and we have been working with TCH with a small business incubator project that has been going on.

ROYSON JAMES – So, did we have all the big banks lining up to come into Regent Park or did you have to make some concessions? Obviously it's not going to be one of your highest performing branches.

JENNY POULOS – We were approached by Daniels Corporation and definitely we looked at the opportunity and we decided to enter it from a perspective of social and economic development support for the community. We made the decision to enter knowing that it wasn't going to meet the standard numbers/expectations of other branches. But we have actually been very pleased with the results, especially with the success of adding basic banking for many of the residents here.

ROYSON JAMES – Would you do it again? Lawrence Heights is coming up. CIBC is apparently looking at it...

JENNY POULOS – We would welcome the opportunity.

ROYSON JAMES – So RBC is on. What about Tim Hortons and Sobeys? What has been their experience?

JOHN FOX – Their experience has been very good. About 90% of the people who worked at Tim Hortons were from Regent Park but it was actually a better story than that. There were so many qualified candidates that came forward that residents from Regent Park were actually taken and given jobs outside of Regent Park in other Tim Hortons that were looking for staff, a very positive thing. For Sobeys, they have had a tremendously successful job fair and I am really looking forward to 8am tomorrow when we open up the first grocery store in Regent Park, where we will walk in and see these people who are not only serving us but also living here.

ADONICA HUGGINS – I think we need to look at not only inviting individual businesses and organizations to come in to provide training and employment opportunities but looking at entire sectors. What are the employment sectors that we need to attract to the table to talk about how people get that first job, or the next job, or a job that pays fair wages and is going to support them and their families? What are those special mechanisms that we need to put in place to support people to get those jobs? For instance, during the early training programs, training providers were asked to provide transportation. If the training wasn't happening in Regent Park, we needed to identify those supports that people needed in order to get access to them. So transportation was provided, people were transported to Richmond Hill for that training. We know that Daniels has contractors that are offering jobs not necessarily only here, but also outside of Regent Park. What do we need to address with respect to transportation to help people access those jobs? They're highly paid and yet people are blocked in terms of being able to access them.

ROYSON JAMES – There is the issue of the housing mix. That's on several levels. The first one, obviously, is whenever you have too many people of the same economic strata living in the same place, it doesn't quite work, like Rosedale for instance. So when building a successful neighbourhood you want a mix. I imagine that was one of the goals of this - to bring other people of other economic status into Regent Park. I want you also to address the issue of if you bring those and put them in separate buildings are you then achieving the type of social mixes? That is still one of the criticisms I hear: you're bringing this building, this is for condos, TCHC building here, so you are really not connecting in the community. So please address that.

JOHN FOX – When TCHC sat down and started talking about Regent Park and it didn't sit down with the main objective of bringing high income to Regent Park. The objective was a replenishment of the stock, and what flows as a function of that is the mixed community, mixed use. So because we are going to try and pay for part of this through profits associated with condominiums and townhouses, clearly we wanted people to move here and buy those things. One of the challenges that we have and one that I think we have met very successfully, is not only do we sell individual units here, we also have to sell the entire redevelopment when we are marketing. It is not just about this building. It's about this building and the next, so it matters that we've started the next building when we're selling this one. And it matters that we did well in this one, because we can take those lists and transfer them to the next one. The issue of how to do the mixing – first of all it is not entirely accurate to say that there is no mixing within the condominium building here. We were able to create a foundation program so that nine of our tenants were able to purchase units within 1 Cole. That is not the mixing that you have in mind, in the sense that THCH will retain ownership of a group of units within a condo and there will be a tremendous range. I think that we did want to establish ourselves as a good real estate place to buy a condominium before we went into that kind of mixing. If you are following the Lawrence Heights redevelopment you will know that one of our mandates from the City of Toronto is to try and create a

mix within the condominium building. So, we are attempting in that context to look at how we can actually try and achieve that. Ownership is one way of expanding the program that we've started here, to fund it in a way that we can have more recycling of money as people actually leave the unit and their second mortgages are paid off and we take that back. There is more than one way of trying to achieve that.

ROYSON JAMES – Will it be possible to sell condominium units knowing that next door is somebody who has a subsidized unit?

MARTIN BLAKE – The short answer is yes.

ROYSON JAMES – So why aren't we doing it here?

MARTIN BLAKE – The short answer is yes but there are still some steps you have to take to establish how to do it properly. If you think about a condominium in Toronto, every single person who owns in there is equal. So, I own one unit in a building of one-hundred, I own 1% of the building. And I have a voice. If TCHC were to own 10% of the building, then TCHC effectively has control of the building. So what goes through someone's mind changes from 'hey, this is a condominium in downtown Toronto,' to 'hey, I own in this building but I really don't have control because if a board is going to make a decision, maybe Toronto Community Housing can basically win every single vote.' So we have to find the ways and the means to be able to create an opportunity where people are equals. If someone who happens to own more in a building than somebody else, the other doesn't feel they are being bullied into decisions.

ROYSON JAMES – So TCHC could have one voting share?

MARTIN BLAKE – Exactly. We have been talking to Toronto Community Housing about how we do this, and how we find ways to introduce it. We think that it should be done. We don't have a concern, we're not running away from the integration of different people within a building. The Daniels Corporation built a project in Etobicoke and on the project we had town houses owned by individual condominium owners and we also had town houses that were owned by Habitat for Humanity. Within the high rise building itself we had regular condominium owners and people who had bought through Habitat for Humanity. Mixing of incomes and mixing of people is a successful project. I think it is something that you will see evolve over the next little while.

ROYSON JAMES – So Mr. Fox, is that coming in phase two or three?

JOHN FOX – It's certainly coming in phase one of Lawrence Heights. What we are doing here is trying to figure out a process under which we can do that. We have to balance the fact that we want to do that kind of integration and want to make sure we do it in a thoughtful way. The premise of your thought about knowing who your neighbour is, is not necessarily so. I don't think we would be posting 'this is the condo which is subsidized beside the condo that's not.' I don't think that's necessary or part of the equation. Clearly what we would like to do is to have some units where we have tenants who are just going in the condominium like everybody else, and they just happen to be in units that were owned by us at some point in time. We don't have any real science on whether or not that creates issues. There are very few examples of that. There is one at 640 Lawrence where we own fourteen units within a condominium building that was developed by Options for Homes. We have to look at the experience of that. But a single building is not the only review we would do. So the question becomes, how much? 3%, 5%, 10%, 15% or 50%? Those are things that we need to think about.

MARTIN BLAKE – The goal is not to scare away people who want to embrace Regent Park as their home. That is something that we always have to be concerned about. Effectively, for the project to continue to be successful here, people have to bring a desire to make Regent Park their home. Because if we can't sell condominiums, TCH can't just put up rental buildings, it has to be the mix. Trying not to make it a scary proposition is the thing that we have to focus on.

ROYSON JAMES – We're about to do Lawrence Heights. What should those people be aware of? Based on your experiences here, what should they be doing right now to make sure that their redevelopment is as successful as this one seems to be?

MARTIN BLAKE – From a private development point of view you have to make sure that the partnership that is going to be created will be successful. We've referred to this as a reunion of people who are getting together – when in fact, we are together all of the time. Because everything that goes on in Regent Park is a mix of both private and public, the community, the commercial tenants, all of those people coming together all of the time. It is a constantly evolving landscape. If you think about Lawrence Heights there will not be a singular point in time where you say, 'Okay, here is what we are going to do and here is their business plan for the next fifteen years.' As John always says, no one would ever go forward and fix that as a point in time. These things will evolve. But the relationship between the private developer and the public agency has to be one where common interests are aligned and where they are both going towards the same goals. If that is not the case, you get friction right from the start that will continue all the way down to a point where I think you will break down.

ADONICA HUGGINS – One thing I would say to make that mix of private, public, community and commercial successful is the community agencies need more support to be at the table. The City needs to fund these discussions. These projects take a lot of resources that community agencies mostly don't have to give. So, it is hard to make sure that the targets and the goals that we might see as desirable are followed through to the end, because we're not able to be there as much as we need to be.

DEBRA DINEEN – Absolutely. As a social service agency we're not only dealing with the present and what's happening today, but we're also planning for what the future of our community is going to look like and is going to be. We all invested in the writing of the Social Development Plan, which is quite a hefty document. For us, it is more than three pounds of paper. We take it out, we refresh it, we review it and we monitor it. I think that as an agency, and I think I can speak fairly for my partner agencies, we aren't resourced enough to lift our heads off our desks today and get away from what we're seeing and doing today, to rightfully and methodically plan for tomorrow. We are all invested in social cohesion and social inclusion. We know that we need to ensure that our programs are open, respectful and meet the needs of the existing community, but also meet the needs of the new and emerging community that is coming together. We need to create places where people can come together. I agree absolutely that we have the condominium building and then we have the rent-geared-to-Income building, mixing might be less. It is unfortunate that it was established that way, but the reality is that it means that it is even more important to create those places where that kind of cohesion can happen. As agencies we need to be properly resourced to do that, and we're not. So that is the piece that, for me, is the most concerning, because we are the social safety net for folks who are having the most difficult time. If we are not resourced to meet their needs, as they are today, then how are we going to be prepared to meet the changes in the community?

ROYSON JAMES – And who is supposed to actually resource you?

DEBRA DINEEN – That is a good question. Quite often with an agency such as the CRC, 50% of our annual budget is individual donations. That is an exhaustive amount of shaking hands and kissing babies. It's a lot of work to bring that money in, just to meet our budget at the end of the year. There is

no one agency that is solely funded by one funder. We're going out to multitudes of funders to try and weave together some kind of financial plans that allows us to move forward. The reality is, not too many people fund change. And what we're talking about is change.

ROYSON JAMES – Do you have enough disciples to go over to Lawrence Heights to create disciples over there, so that they can develop the type of capacity that you seem to have done here? How resourced are the people in Lawrence Heights?

DEBRA DINEEN – We have to factor in the density of the two communities as well. In Regent Park there are more agencies, but there are a lot more people. When we're talking about people living here, we're not often talking about just the people who are on the lease. We are talking about people who are living with family members, people who are couch surfers, the homeless men and women who come into our community for services. The numbers exceed ten-thousand. We're not well resourced and that's what makes me nervous about Lawrence Heights. If we're not resourced enough, I worry that in the future of Lawrence Heights, this process can overtake the community, and the community's voice does not get heard.

ROYSON JAMES – Thank you very much everyone. Great Reunion, I hope that you all got something from this. Those of you who are in Lawrence Heights, we are with you and keep bugging the press and all of the people to make sure that you are resourced so that becomes a successful revitalization project as well.

ABOUT THE DISCUSSANTS:

MARTIN BLAKE, VICE PRESIDENT, THE DANIELS CORPORATION

Martin Blake, a Vice President with GTA-based The Daniels Corporation, is a developer who is actively involved in the creation of housing within the GTA, with a specific interest in environmental and affordable housing within Toronto.

On behalf of the Daniels Corporation he is managing the Revitalization of Regent Park in a partnership with the Toronto Community Housing Corporation. This Revitalization is being designed as the first LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Gold community and will include a number of innovative designs aimed at reducing homeowners dependence on fossil fuels.

He is also involved in implementing a number of Daniels affordable housing initiatives including the first Rent-to-Own condominium community, and a number of affordable condominium communities that allow homeowners to take advantage of the 'Affordable Housing Program' initiative from the Federal and Provincial Governments. He currently serves as Vice-Chair on the Board of Directors for Habitat for Humanity - Toronto.

DEBRA DINEEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TORONTO CHRISTIAN RESOURCE CENTRE

Debra moved into the Regent Park community in 1989 with her husband and two young children. Debra had believed what the media had told her about the community, that it was crime infested and unsafe to raise children, but alas she had no choice to move somewhere else and she desperately needed a home to raise her family.

Shortly after moving into the community, Debra was introduced many community activists, women who stood up for themselves and their community, who graciously shared their individual struggles...all who had worked tirelessly to make the Regent Park community a safe place for families.

In 1995, Debra was approached by John Sewell to form a committee to look at redeveloping the

community, Debra quickly signed on, because along with her neighbours they recognized that the physical design of the community created an unsafe environment.

From 1995 to 2001, Debra along with other tenants worked endlessly on the redevelopment, first looking at a small section of the community, and then eventually looking at the whole community.

Debra has worked in many of the agencies in many capacities, and today is the Executive Director of the CRC, a local Outreach Ministry of the United Church of Canada, providing a multitude of services to those experiencing homelessness and the residents of Regent Park.

Debra always brings in her intimate knowledge of the community into discussions regarding future service planning in the new Regent Park.

**JOHN FOX, ACTING VICE PRESIDENT OF DEVELOPMENT & GENERAL COUNSEL
DEVELOPMENT, TORONTO COMMUNITY HOUSING**

John is the Acting Vice President of Development and General Counsel (Development) at Toronto Community Housing. He manages the Development division, which is responsible for major urban development initiatives like the revitalization of Regent Park. He also advises and represents Toronto Community Housing in a range of land-related transactions including the purchase and sale of commercial properties, the development of both residential and commercial sites, as well as negotiations with and appearances before government agencies. Prior to joining Toronto Community Housing, John was a partner in the commercial real estate group of McMillan LLP. John is a past chair of the Daily Bread Food Bank.

**ADONICA HUGGINS, ASSET MAPPING PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR , TORONTO CHRISTIAN
RESOURCE CENTRE AND CO-ORDINATOR & CHAIR, DOWNTOWN EAST COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT COLLECTIVE**

Adonica Huggins is a Black African feminist who began working in Regent Park when she was a Community Housing Worker for Central Neighbourhood House in 1992. Though not a Toronto Community Housing resident, she lived in Regent Park from 1997 – 2005. Currently she works as the Asset Mapping Project Co-ordinator at the Christian Resource Centre, training and supporting homeless and marginally housed women in and around Regent Park as community-based peer researchers addressing the social determinants of health; and as the Job Coach in the Step Up housing and employment program. She is also Co-ordinator and Chair of the Downtown East Community Development Collective, whose 26 members including grassroots organizations, agencies and institutions, have collaborated on numerous projects, including the “Career Ladders in Health”, and in demolition and asbestos removal, to create opportunities for local youth and adults who face the greatest barriers to education, training and employment.

Adonica has also worked as a Job Coach and Community Liaison for several George Brown College training and employment and pre-apprenticeship programs with Regent Park residents in particular; and as a Principal Researcher and Program Co-ordinator of the Youth Science and Technology Outreach Program at St. Michael’s Hospital, recruiting and supporting Pathways to Education – Regent Park participants and other high school students in an innovative co-operative placement program for “Youth-at-Risk” wanting to explore a career path in health care.

Adonica is committed to access, equity and inclusion, and has done years of anti-racism work in and outside the community. She is also Founder and Program Director of Mpenzi: Black Women’s International Film and Video Festival.

ROYSON JAMES, JOURNALIST, TORONTO STAR

Royson James is the Urban Affairs Columnist for The Toronto Star. Much of his writing centres around community and city building and celebrates the people and ideas that improve and sustain the livable city. His column usually appears Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday.

JENNY POULOS, REGIONAL VICE PRESIDENT, ROYAL BANK OF CANADA

Jenny Poulos is a Regional Vice President with RBC, managing a network of 17 branches including financial planning and small business in the East York Beaches market. She's been with RBC for over 20 years, and worked in many diverse areas of RBC including recruitment and training. Jenny is also on the Board of the Geneva Centre for Autism.

6.2 Summary of the Discussion on Neighbourhoods

Prior to the Roundtable, preparatory materials were distributed to participants that outlined a series of potential action items identified by the Working Group over the course of the summer which could be developed to encourage further investments in communities. Following the panel discussion, the Roundtable participants engaged in small table conversations to examine these proposals and discuss their potential usefulness and impact.

- a. Knowing and using what we've got:** Identify top systemic barriers to private sector development and create tools (a toolbox) to address them. There are a range of existing instruments and/or powers in the Planning Act that are simply not used as much as they could be, there are others that are overused or used inappropriately.

Participants reinforced the message that, while there are a variety of tools available, they are not being used effectively. With regards to planning, they suggested the need to enhance the capacity of city planners, who participants suggested were currently highly under resourced, and to democratize the planning process. It was suggested that residents need to be better informed about how the planning process works and have greater opportunities to influence planning decisions. People Plan Toronto was cited as a potential model to build on. The community sector must also be adequately resourced to meet the needs of constituents. Participants suggested the potential of a hotel tax and enhancing section 37 to funnel resources to the community sector. Participants also discussed the potential for enhancing training and literacy in relation to planning processes.

- b. Assess need for and promote regulatory change:** Potentially rethink and redesign the planning process; design incentives (from tax relief to reduced planning fees to subsidies, etc.) with a developed, indisputable business case to encourage government to view spending (or loss of revenue) today as investment with a future return.

Participants expressed the importance of engaging a broad range of actors in the planning process, specifically councilors, entrepreneurs and local businesspeople. The need to rethink planning incentives such as density bonuses and implement inclusionary zoning was also discussed. Municipalities should explore more creative development changes and not simply adopt a one-size fits all policy. Participants also highlighted the need for specific regulatory changes such as those governing basement apartments, rooming houses and commercial spaces in residential buildings. It was suggested that municipalities undertake better holistic asset mapping to identify interesting social and investment opportunities.

- c. Promote and build capacity for Resident Action Plans/Councils or Neighbourhood Improvement Plans:** Assess and suggest models for vibrant and engaged neighbourhood councils (and/or other forums/structures/practices) that plan for their community and marry the interests of

the various parties, such that neighbourhoods themselves could even pitch their ideas to the developers rather than the other way round; that counteracts NIMBY-ism by creating informed representatives/residents; and, that educates residents and councillors alike (taking a leaf from the voluntary processes that have been put into place in Ward 20 Trinity/Spadina). Alternatively, assess existing neighbourhoods that seem to be getting it right (and some that seem to be getting it wrong) and extract a set of learnings (processes, practices) for replication.

Participants highlighted the need for capacity building to strengthen the impact of residents and give communities more resources and responsibility in local planning and policy making. It would be important to limit 'majority bullying' and allow different actors from tenants, residents, private builders, marginalized populations and political leaders an equal voice in the process. Meetings must be made accessible to all stakeholders by recognizing the opportunity cost of people's time. It was suggested that successful models be replicated or scaled-up such as the Vancouver planning model, New York City's Community Boards, the Regent Park revitalization process and Adam Vaughan's Ward 20 approach which divorces planning from the municipal government. The Toronto City Summit Alliance was identified as a potential enabler that could create the space for further consultation on this process.

- d. Try it out, prove the model:** Test models for developing and enacting resident action plans or multi-stakeholder neighbourhood development and investment plans – take a couple of neighbourhoods and actually create a pilot project or demonstration project building on emerging practices/successes (e.g. Regent Park, King & Spadina, Waterfront Toronto).

Participants suggested that there is an appetite for the creation of more complete communities. Participants were largely in favour of developing pilots or using existing work as pilot projects to prove the viability of different options. The need to create further incentives for further social bottom line developments was also highlighted. Certain tables discussed potentially creating an inter-jurisdictional study to identify existing gaps and help determine what kind of programs/projects might be most appropriate. Suggested examples to draw from and work on were the Distillery District, King West, Village by the Park, Regent Park, South Etobicoke, ACORN youth engagement project in Mississauga, the areas around Guildwood Go Station and Galloway.

- e. Contribute to the review of the Official Plan** with finely crafted policy proposals that are regionally orientated in order to affect the development and alignment of the official plans of the GTA municipalities.

Participants said that community building should be considered part of the Plan. The need to democratize and better educate people about the planning process was highlighted. Participants pointed out that many feel they lack the capacity to influence the Official Plan and suggested that advocacy would be a good starting point to help people get more engaged. Communities need to be consulted to determine their needs. While participants were unsure whether this should be undertaken by the Toronto City Summit Alliance, they emphasized that the Alliance would be well positioned to leverage its relationships and convene a multi-sectoral group to discuss this further.

- f. Work regionally as a matter of everyday practice:** establish effective regional networks of community/residents groups, developers and other private sector investors, to share knowledge about and solutions to common challenges, good practice in multi-stakeholder working and planning, etc.

Adopting a regional approach was favoured by many participants as a way of connecting people, learning collectively, and sharing best practices between municipalities, residents and academics. Participants said that such an approach would require a new mechanism for gathering and sharing

information, particularly following cuts to the long-form census. There were, however, concerns that there would be the need to establish a stronger, multi-sector local base before solidifying regional networks. Reservations were also expressed that some communities have different needs and require different incentives. Participants highlighted the need to identify champions to promote the idea of working regionally further. A regional approach would require an open dialogue and process in which different participants were viewed as equals. There would need to be mechanisms which encourage people to participate and minimize barriers, including through the provision of financial incentives or subsidies. It was suggested that a regional alliance could be established to raise and advocate for resources and support regional decisions.

- g. Develop opportunities for more private sector leadership:** develop and replicate learning from best/good practice examples of private sector leadership resulting in investment and unlocking other spin-off investment in neighbourhoods, for example, RBC in Regent Park; research and build a strong business (and public good) case to motivate more and greater private sector engagement, including, for example, demonstrating the real buying power of residents, utilizing existing tools such as section 37 to direct/encourage investment into particular areas or projects, exploring possible incentives for promoting social hiring and coordinating public funding/investment with private investment.

Participants emphasized the need to build a strong business case to further engage the private sector in this area. The use of appropriate business language and emphasis on success stories were viewed as pivotal for highlighting the potential of triple bottom line approaches. Emphasizing the return on investment was also viewed as important. Getting more private sector representatives to the table also requires that they be approached with specific rather than broad requests. Different approaches would be required to engage small and medium businesses. Participants also discussed the need for strong leadership on the part of particular businesses and the need for business to lead by example. One table also suggested adopting a 'LEED' like certification model which establishes city building standards and goals for both the private and other sectors to aspire to. Many participants highlighted the importance of fostering partnerships with the private sector so that risks can be effectively shared between different parties. Finally, the need to reform existing bylaws inhibiting development, for example commercial spaces in residential buildings, was also viewed as important.

- h. Establish cross-industry innovation hubs:** expanding the (often) limited capacity of small and medium-sized business owners to address certain needs in communities (e.g. open retail business in Towers) through greater collaboration between small and medium-sized businesses and larger companies and banks with greater influence and access to capital could be greatly beneficial.

Participants recognized the need to enhance the supports to small and medium sized businesses to contribute to capacity and economic development in neighbourhoods. The ability of small and medium businesses to better meet the needs of communities was also highlighted. Many emphasized the importance of scaling up successful projects such as Tower Renewal. The financial sector would also have an important role to play in the provision of financing.

7. SUMMARY OF CLOSING REMARKS

MARY ROWE, CONSULTANT

Mary Rowe identified several lessons to be drawn from the conversations throughout the day. Mary suggested that creating strong communities requires a four "L" approach: Listen, Local, Lead and Leverage. There needs to be a particular focus on collaboration and investing in people rather than

simply places. Governments need to be more consultative in their policy making and take account of local realities. She emphasized the need to be additive by introducing new ideas and enhancing those that have been successful. Finally, she highlighted the importance of paying attention to the particulars and moving away from attempts to make a model that fits all.

ABOUT MARY ROWE:

Mary W. Rowe has recently returned to the northeast after several years working in the philanthropy, most recently coordinating the New Orleans Institute for Resilience and Innovation, a loose alliance of initiatives that emerged in response to the systemic collapses of 2005. Her initial engagement was as part of a fellowship awarded to her by the blue moon fund of Charlottesville, Virginia, to focus on self-organization in cities as the underpinning of urban and regional social, economic and environmental resilience. With the support of the fund, Mary developed a community investment program to support various self-organizing initiatives that crossed race, class, neighborhoods and sectors. New Orleans and its region are addressing challenges and opportunities common to cities around the continent and beyond, where urban practitioners are building communities of practice in resilience across the country. Her work in New Orleans included supporting a broad array of local, connected initiatives that include building the local economy, creating more open governance and data collection and sharing, fostering entrepreneurship, creating a culture of planning that supports transparent decision making and land-use, the emerging role of social media, and creating peer-to-peer learning in the emerging civil society-led innovation in the Region. As Director of the Urban Program at *blue moon*, Mary also oversaw investments in holistic community revitalization in other cities, including Common Ground's pioneering work in Brownsville, Brooklyn.

Earlier this year Mary was awarded a Bellagio residency from the Rockefeller Foundation, to develop her writing on self-organization in cities and in October 2010 she became associated with MAS as Urban Fellow. She is a contributor to several volumes on urban life, most recently having written the Epilogue to *What We See: Advancing the Observations of Jane Jacobs* (New Village Press). Prior to joining the *blue moon fun*, Mary coordinated a variety of multi-stakeholder projects in Canada and the US, including *Ideas that Matter*, a convening and publishing program based on the work of Jane Jacobs.

Mary currently divides her time between New York City, where she is an Urban Fellow with MAS NYC, and Toronto where she is working with Urban Space Property Group and People Plan Toronto to develop a resource centre/co-location initiative focused on city building and urban practice.

APPENDIX 1

Hanging in the Balance: Affordable Housing in the Toronto Region

NEIGHBOURHOODS AND
AFFORDABLE HOUSING
ROUNDTABLE
THURSDAY OCT 14TH, 2010
TORONTO COMMUNITY HOUSING,
REGENT PARK

Presentation Outline

- How much are we investing?
- How are we doing as a region?
- Why a regional approach and why now?
- How can we use a regional approach?
- What's next?

How much are we investing?



- In just two years (2009 to 2011) governments have invested over half a billion dollars in housing through economic stimulus funding in the Toronto region
- These investments are:
 - Creating 2,200 new affordable rental homes
 - Assisting over 800 low- and moderate-income people become homebuyers
 - Repairing and renovating social housing buildings
 - Creating and supporting employment

How are we doing as a region?



There are significant housing challenges for the Toronto region today and in the future:

- 19% (322,415) of households are in core need
- Costs of renting and owning are on the rise
- New market development is mostly (93%) ownership housing
- Low rent apartments are being lost every year
- More people are using rent banks and food banks
- Social housing waitlist numbers have grown by almost 10,000 households in one year
- People now wait from 2.5 to 21 years for social housing
- Shortage of resources and services for vulnerable people in their housing
- Population will grow and change over the next 20 years

Why a Regional Approach?



- Regional governments have developed housing plans and official plans
- Currently other initiatives such as Metrolinx's, *The Big Move* and the Regional Smart Growth Plan reflect the need to think at a regional scale
- Social, economic and demographic trends make it clear there is more work to be done
- The conditions are present to stitch together our separate efforts into a regional approach

Why a Regional Approach?



- Coordination of efforts will bring together best practices and ideas from across the spectrum of housing needs and solutions
- Supports a 'people first' approach and addresses regional variation by envisioning housing opportunities for everyone within the Toronto regional housing market
- Development of a regional approach can support the case for ongoing federal and provincial investments

Why now?



- Also critical time as economic stimulus is ending
- 3 key housing & homelessness programs expire March 31, 2011 (AHI, SHRRP, RRAP)
- Federal government has committed \$387 million per year until 2014 but not confirmed renewal of programs
- Province has not confirmed funding or program renewal after March 31, 2011

How Can We Use a Regional Approach?



1. Regional Housing Data Bank
 - Information tool and resource with over 20 housing indicators
 - Evidence base to guide decision making
2. An Integrated Approach to housing
 - Build upon existing local and regional strategies

What's next?



Regional Housing Forum

Wednesday November 24

9:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.

BILD Awards Hall

20 Upjohn Rd., North York

Purpose: To bring together housing stakeholders to discuss the need for and creation of a regional agenda

Questions:

1. What are the challenges and opportunities of a regional approach?
2. What are the key issues to discuss?
3. Who should be invited from public, private and community sectors?
4. Are you interested in commenting on the draft Data Bank before the Regional Housing Forum?