TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Stephen Dickey, Deputy Treasurer
RESOURCE STAFF: Janis Morrison, Purchasing Coordinator
DATE OF MEETING: 2009-12-01
SUBJECT: Tender and Contract Awards Subject to the Established Criteria for Delegation of Authority for the Month of October 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
This information report is to:
1. Advise council of tenders/RFPs approved and contracts awarded greater than $50,000 that meet the established criteria of delegated authority for the month of October 2009.
2. Report additional information on contracts awarded by senior staff between the $20,000 and $50,000 level for the month of October 2009.

RECOMMENDATION:
This report is for information purposes only.

AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES:

CONSULTATION WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Beach, Sustainability & Growth
Commissioner Thurston, Community Development Services
Commissioner Leger, Corporate Services
Jim Keech, President, Utilities Kingston

(NR indicates consultation not required)
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

In accordance with the reporting requirements of the purchasing by-law, Schedule A to this report provides information on tenders/RFPs approved and contracts awarded greater than $50,000 that meet the established criteria of delegated authority for the month of October 2009. Under section 3.4 of the purchasing by-law, council has approved the delegation of authority to approve tender and award contracts greater than $50,000 to the city commissioners or designate, when all of the following conditions have been satisfied:

- there is sufficient approved budget;
- all procedures for the establishment of prices in by-law 2000-134 as amended, have been followed;
- the lowest tender is accepted;
- at least three tenders have been received.

The purchasing by-law requires that all awards and contracts in excess of $50,000 not meeting these provisions are the subject of separate reports to council for award purposes.

As directed by council motion, Schedule B provides additional information on contracts awarded by senior staff between the $20,000 and $50,000 level for the same period. Section 3.1(iv) of the purchasing by-law identifies the annual budget as financial approval to proceed with a purchase. There is no authority to make purchases that are not within budget parameters. In addition, council receives budget variance reports on a quarterly basis including quarterly budget works-in-progress reports that provide an update on the status of capital works.

October 2009 procurement activities that are not included in this report are as follows:

- value of the purchase, if less than $20,000;
- tenders closing in this time frame that were approved separately by council at previous council meetings.

EXISTING POLICY/BY LAW:


NOTICE PROVISIONS:

Not applicable

ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS:

The Ontario Disabilities Act is a consideration and forms part of the evaluation criteria of all Requests for Proposals administered by the City of Kingston.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Not applicable

CONTACTS:

Not applicable

OTHER CITY OF KINGSTON STAFF CONSULTED:

Ron McKelvie, Chief Information Officer, Information Systems & Technology  Ext. 2221
Mark Campbell, Construction Manager, Engineering Services  Ext. 3139
Lanie Hurdle, Director, Recreation & Leisure Services  Ext. 1231
Deputy Fire Chief Gary Bullock, Fire & Rescue  613-548-4001  Ext. 5220
Damon Wells, Director, Public Works  Ext. 2313
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Ken McGuirk, Supervisor, Public Works
Jamie Brash, Supervisor Facilities Maintenance

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:

Schedule A – Tender/RFP/Contract Summary, October 2009
Schedule B – Signed Contract Summary ($20,000 - $50,000), October 2009
## Winter Control for Bus Stop and Shelter Clearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier/Service Provider</th>
<th>Pricing Received (Including Taxes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant View Greenhouse</td>
<td>$3,990.00 (full bid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Campbell</td>
<td>$4,696.44 (full bid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zomer &amp; Sons</td>
<td>$2,282.18 (part bid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayridge Lawns &amp; Landscaping</td>
<td>$2,693.25 (part bid)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part Bid submissions were not the lowest bids tendered on those portion that they submitted bids for.

## Asphalt Pathways and Amenities for Off Leash Dog Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier/Service Provider</th>
<th>Pricing Received (Excluding Taxes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiley Paving Limited</td>
<td>$108,643.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Knapp Inc.</td>
<td>$134,785.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morven Construction Limited</td>
<td>$180,518.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SIGNED CONTRACT SUMMARY ($20,000-$50,000) OCTOBER 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Order Date</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Successful Vendor</th>
<th>Value (No Taxes)</th>
<th>Group/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2009</td>
<td>20 Full and Mini Field Maintenance</td>
<td>Mountainview Golf &amp; Athletic Turf Specialists</td>
<td>$41,900.00</td>
<td>Public Works Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2009</td>
<td>Roof Repair – Court House</td>
<td>Amherst Roofing</td>
<td>$23,647.00</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2009</td>
<td>Roof Repair – City Yard, Division Street</td>
<td>Ricardo Roofing</td>
<td>$48,823.00</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 2009</td>
<td>To Install a new roof on the Elginburg Firehall</td>
<td>Ricardo Roofing Limited</td>
<td>$49,000.00</td>
<td>Community Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19, 2009</td>
<td>Winter Control for the Police Station, Division Street</td>
<td>Harrison Excavating</td>
<td>$8,000/Month</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21, 2009</td>
<td>Server and Storage</td>
<td>Sun Microsystems of Canada Inc.</td>
<td>$33,351.80</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26, 2009</td>
<td>Crack Sealing on Pavement on Hwy 38 from 401 to Orser Road</td>
<td>Roadlast Asphalt &amp; Sealing Maintenance Inc.</td>
<td>$49,967.50</td>
<td>Public Works Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Gerard Hunt, Chief Administrative Officer
RESOURCE STAFF: Same as above
DATE OF MEETING: 2009-12-15
SUBJECT: City/Queen's Shared Solutions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
This report provides council with an update on the progress of the various working groups established to address common issues of Queen's University and the City of Kingston. In 2008 a steering committee was established to provide leadership for the working groups, to initiate some specific work, and to integrate common issues of the city, Queen's and the community. This committee will also coordinate the efforts of the working groups and set direction for future initiatives.

RECOMMENDATION:
This report is provided for information purposes only.

AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES:

CONSULTATION WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMISSIONERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Growth</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Community Development Services</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leger</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keech</td>
<td>Utilities Kingston</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

Council adopted a resolution at its meeting of November 20, 2007. The specific motion of council is not included here as the work has progressed over the year beyond some of the specifics identified in that motion. The purpose of this report is to provide an information update to council on the status of working groups formed to address the relevant issues. These updates will continue to be provided to council in 2010.

City of Kingston/Queen’s University Steering Committee

Team Leaders
Gerard Hunt, CAO, City of Kingston
Patrick Deane, V.P. Academic, Queen’s University

Frequency of Meetings
The meetings for the steering committee are scheduled as required. The last meeting was held on November 17 to discuss the work accomplished in 2008-2009 and to determine objectives for 2010.

Purpose
In order to coordinate the various working groups a joint steering committee was established to oversee all working groups exploring ongoing issues related to university-city issues.

Student Housing Working Group

Chairpersons
Hal Linscott, Director of Legal Services, City of Kingston
Ann Browne, Associate Vice-Principal (Facilities), Queen’s University

Purpose
A group of university administrators, student government, city officials and landlord representatives, the Housing Working Group was created at the request of council to better understand student concerns about rental housing near campus, and to determine whether these concerns relate in any way to student behaviour. The group was also asked to look at the effectiveness of existing by-law enforcement.

Next Steps
The joint report of the Queen’s University/City of Kingston Housing Working Group was presented to council earlier this year. This report will be used by the university and the city to develop an action plan for future work. The city’s action plan is expected to be completed and reported to council in the first quarter of 2010.
Improving Student/City Relations Working Group

Team Leaders

Therese Greenwood, Manager of Communications, City of Kingston
Tim Laprade, Public Education Coordinator, City of Kingston
Libby Shaker, Municipal Affairs Commissioner AMS, Queen's University

Frequency of Meetings

This committee was formed in February 2008. There have been 29 meetings to date and future meetings are scheduled bi-weekly, in addition to working together via phone and email. The group will be meeting monthly until March 2010 and will then go back to bi-weekly meetings in June 2010.

Committee Composition

Queen's Administration is represented by the Associate Dean of Student Affairs. There are three student representatives, which include the AMS, ASUS, and the Graduate and Professional Students Society. City of Kingston Police, City of Kingston Communications staff and Queen's Communications staff are also members.

Purpose

The purpose of this working group is to improve access to and flow of information between students and city departments. The key principle is to ensure accessibility on all levels as it relates to information sharing between city, Queen's and students. The committee is working collaboratively to seek and develop concrete solutions that will move us closer to achieving our mandate, which includes a plan to:

- identify points of contact for both City of Kingston and Queen's for dissemination of information between the City of Kingston, Queen's Administration and students
- develop information sharing systems to ensure continuity and clarity during transitioning elected executives of Queen's student groups (AMS, ASUS, SGPS etc)
- identify and determine the methods (tools) of communication preferred by Queen's students
- identify what information on services are most important to students
- identify what key city messages are to be communicated regularly to students

Current Projects/Initiatives

Efforts in August and September 2009 were focused on students move-in including:

- updating the city student website
- distributing a welcome back email to students

Support with several Queen’s orientation week events, including:

- Tour of Town: For the first time City Hall was one of the stops on the Queen's tour of the town event. As a welcome to the new students, the City gave out recyclable bags containing important city information. City staff members, who are also Queen’s alumni, assisted in welcoming the students to Kingston and handing out the bags. The event ran from 1:45 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Thursday September 10. Almost 2000 students participated in this event.
- Graduate Students Orientation Day: City of Kingston display providing information about services and programs most commonly used by students
- Queen’s in the Park Event: City of Kingston display providing information about services and programs most commonly used by students
Queen's Sidewalk Sale: City of Kingston display providing information about services and programs most commonly used by students.

Development and inserting of material into City Pak. This reusable cloth bag contained resource information about City services and programs including: road sharing guides, Trim Your Waste guides, In Sir John A.'s Footsteps: A Kingston Walking Tour guide, focus on environment report and transit rider guides. The insertion of material could not have been possible without the support of volunteers through the Youth Diversion program (a United Way agency).

Distribution of the 'City Pak' bags through several orientation week events

Positive feedback received on ASUS Transit Bus tour Initiative

Participation in the Queen's Safety Fair

Roll out and circulation of information for Source Separated Organics Program (Green Bin)
  - Develop joint SSO education plan for students. The city worked collaboratively with the members of the committee to disseminate information to students about the SSO program.

Next Steps

In 2010, the Queen's-City student relations working group will work to

- establish a sub-committee to work on a joint marketing/awareness campaign between the City, Queen's and Kingston Police that would focus on safety awareness
- set committee goals for 2009/2010
- work with student government representatives to expand student representation to other faculties (commerce, engineering, etc.)
- continue to:
  - update the city website for student related information
  - circulate seasonal information to students (student move out, summer employment opportunities, solid waste information, events, etc.)
  - incorporate the recommendations identified from the results of the student survey into the communication mix.
Urban Planning/Official Plan Issues Working Group

Team Leaders
George Wallace, Director of Planning, City of Kingston
Ann Browne, Associate V.P. (Facilities), Queen’s University
Audrey Kaplan, Director, Campus Planning and Development, Queen’s University

Additional members or resources may be recommended to investigate issues or contribute to the discussions (e.g. SURP Students from Queen’s program).

Frequency of Meetings
This working group meets four times a year or more frequently for milestone events such as new, developing or critical information, release of new draft plans, public review of plans, or decisions on the planning documents. Informal communication by phone and e-mail is on an as-needed basis. Both organizations are working on their respective plans (the official plan for the City of Kingston and the campus master plan for Queen’s) and intend to finalize them in 2009. After this is completed, the working group may choose to meet quarterly for the next year to continue the consultation on urban planning issues of mutual interest and the city’s new consolidated zoning by-law until the next major planning cycle when more frequent meetings would be recommended.

Purpose
To investigate and collaborate on strategies to deal with urban planning issues of mutual interest to the city and university. To share current strategic planning initiatives and consideration of construction initiatives that affect areas of interest to both organizations. This ongoing communication is intended to avoid duplication of effort and increase the likelihood that initiatives desired by one or both institutions are compatible with the short and long term intentions of the other. Beyond a courtesy communication, it is intended that the developments by the city and the university will be mutually supportive of and beneficial to their respective organizations and the shared objectives for global needs such as land use planning, energy-conservation, sustainability, barrier-free design, and fiscal responsibility.

Current Projects/Initiatives
Since striking this working group early in 2008, members have met five times. The discussions have familiarized the members with current status of the city’s New Official Plan / Queen’s Campus Master Plan and issues that affect both organizations (e.g., housing to the north of campus, new consolidated zoning by-law, outstanding recommendations of the Downtown Residential Review Committee). As each organization is a major stakeholder in the plan of the other, both have been consulted on the official plan reviews. The City’s new Official Plan was adopted by Council on July 15, 2009, and has been forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for review and a Notice of Decision. Staff will be meeting with the ministry this month to review the one-window comments, after which it is expected the ministry will issue its decision on the New Official Plan and the statutory 20 day appeal period will commence.

Based on recent discussions between the city and university, many of the existing official plan policies respecting Queen’s and the campus expansion area have been carried forward into the New Official Plan. The university has recently staffed the campus planning position and revision to the master plan is underway. Though still in the early stages of assembly, this new revision will rethink strategies that have been in place since 1994 or before. The current financial state on all campuses, indeed the overall economy, is an optimal time to effect change. In the next three to five years Queen’s can rethink how best to provide physical accommodation (outdoor and interior) for learning, instructing, research and housing (students and possibly employees). The recommended changes in the campus plan will reflect the much discussed curriculum reform; providing the physical settings to support innovative learning strategies, as well as sustainable processes, procurement, disposal, and infrastructure. The process will seek collaboration with our stakeholders – our current students, faculty, staff and contractors; alumni and donors; residential neighbours, KGH, the City of Kingston, and businesses. Members of this working group also sit on the Working Group on Housing. Both organizations will seek to integrate components of the recommendations from that working group into their official / master plans or zoning by-Law.
Next Steps

Both organizations will continue the process of reviewing and discussing the respective new official plan and draft campus master plan over the next three to six months in order to refine and recognize the future directions of the university. Strategies to encourage families to move back into student areas will continue to be explored though all parties recognize that this is an area of high-priced real estate. The outstanding recommendations of the downtown residential review committee will be reviewed with a view towards proceeding with implementation of the recommendations respecting the preparation of a secondary plan for the area north of the main campus and the preparation of urban design guidelines (staff is in the process of retaining a consultant to prepare the urban design guidelines). The School of Urban and Regional Planning has initiated a study on the area north of the main campus with an anticipated completion date of December, 2009. The findings (student preferences) of this year’s off-campus housing survey will be reviewed and considered in the preparation of the new comprehensive zoning by-law.

Following the final report of the Student Housing Working Group it may be appropriate to integrate future work of that group with the urban planning/official plan working group and establish a broader mandate that incorporates both integrated campus and community planning with neighbourhood rejuvenation. Discussions on these strategies will be reported to council on the next report.

EXISTING POLICY/BY LAW:
Not applicable

NOTICE PROVISIONS:
Not applicable

ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS:
Not applicable

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:
Not applicable

CONTACTS:
Terry Willing, Director, Building & Licensing ext. 3240
Therese Greenwood, Manager, Communications ext.1156
George Wallace, Director of Planning & Development ext. 3252
Hal Linscott, Director of Legal Services ext.1296

OTHER CITY OF KINGSTON STAFF CONSULTED:
Not applicable

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:
Not applicable
TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Jim Keech, President and CEO, Utilities Kingston

RESOURCE STAFF: Ken Mundell, Conservation and Demand Management Advisor

DATE OF MEETING: December 15, 2009

SUBJECT: Toilet Rebate Program

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At the regular meeting of Kingston City Council held on March 3, 2009, the following resolution, being Clause 2., Report No. 29, was approved:

That Council endorse the following elements of a toilet rebate program for the City of Kingston:

- Eligibility = Multi Residential and Affordable housing units that were built prior to 1996
- Rebate = $60 per toilet for multi residential units and $125 per toilet for affordable housing units
- Prescreen and approve applications
- Proof of disposal
- Rebate provided upon completion of change out

- and further -

That Staff be directed to ensure the fair and equitable distribution of funding amongst the eligible parties (multi residential and affordable housing units).

RECOMMENDATION:

For information only.

AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES:

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY PRESIDENT & C.E.O., UTILITIES KINGSTON
Jim Keech, President and CEO, Utilities Kingston

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
Gerard Hunt, Chief Administrative Officer

CONSULTATION WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMISSIONERS:

| Commissioner Beach, Sustainability & Growth | ✓ |
| Commissioner Thurston, Community Development Services | ✓ |
| Commissioner Leger, Corporate Services | ✓ |
| Jim Keech, President and CEO, Utilities Kingston | ✓ |

(N/R indicates consultation not required)
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

At the time of writing over 95% of the budgeted $156,000 has been committed through the pre-approval process. A total of 1690 toilet units have been pre-approved for replacement under the program, 61% of the allocated funding has been approved for the social housing sector (723 toilets), 39% for the multi-residential sector (967 toilets). Rebates have been issued for 18 toilet replacement projects, representing 354 replacement toilets, typically within two weeks of the completion of the installation.

Meetings were held with the City’s Social Housing managers, information was distributed to the Social Housing providers by these managers.

A presentation was given to the Kingston Rental Property Owners Association as well as notification and a program description in their monthly newsletter. Information has been posted to the Utilities Kingston web site. A short follow-up presentation and a question and answer session will be planned for a Kingston Rental Property Owners Association meeting early in 2010.

Advanced pre-approvals have been given for the next budget year for projects that will be completed in 2010.

Based on the positive response to this program in its initial year, the program will continue under the current format for 2010.

EXISTING POLICY/BY LAW: N/A

NOTICE PROVISIONS: N/A

ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS: N/A

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS: Discussed in the report.

CONTACTS:
Ken Mundell, Conservation and Demand Management Advisor – 613-546-1181, Extension 2247

OTHER CITY OF KINGSTON STAFF CONSULTED: N/A

EXHIBITS ATTACHED: N/A
To: Mayor and Members of Council
From: Lance Thurston, Commissioner, Community Development Services
Resource Staff: Jim de Hoop, Director, Community and Family Services
Date of Meeting: 2009-12-15
Subject: Barriefield Village, Potential Acquisition of Federal Surplus Land for Affordable Housing

Executive Summary:
The purpose of this report is to provide an update to council on efforts to date to investigate the possibility of constructing affordable housing on available surplus Federal lands within the limits of the Barriefield Village Heritage Conservation District. Staff members from a number of city departments along with other parties have been working on a number of aspects of this proposal, seeking information, clarifying understanding on issues and meeting with a number of interested parties. These efforts have deepened our understanding and widened the scope for discussion of the issues surrounding the possible development of affordable housing in the Village of Barriefield.

There is no recommendation in this report. Staff requires additional time to complete our research and investigations before submitting recommendations to Council on next steps in considering this matter. We anticipate being able to report back to Council at its second meeting in January.

Recommendation:
This is an information report; there is no recommendation.
InformaUon Report to Council:
Possible Acquisition of Surplus Federal Land for Affordable Housing

2009-12-15
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Authorizing Signatures:

Original Signed by Commissioner:
Lance Thurston, Commissioner, Community Development Services

Original Signed by Chief Administrative Officer:
Gerard Hunt, Chief Administrative Officer

Consultation with the Following Commissioners:

| Commissioner Beach, Sustainability & Growth | ✓ |
| Commissioner Leger, Corporate Services | NR |
| Jim Keech, President and CEO, Utilities Kingston | NR |

(N/R indicates consultation not required)
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

Background
On October 20, 2009 Council passed the following motion, being Clause 1, Report No. 102:

THAT Council continues to pursue the purchase of Federal Surplus lands identified as Parcel 3 Parts 2 & 3 through the Surplus Federal Real Property for Homelessness Initiative (SFRPHI) for the creation of affordable housing;

AND FURTHER that staff continue with the necessary research, planning, and public consultation to bring these parcels of land to construction ready status; and that a Council report be prepared to identify partnership options and potential funding sources and community concerns;

AND FURTHER that staff pursue an investigation as to whether lands can be purchased to buffer Barriefield Village.

On November 3, 2009 Council deferred consideration of the following motion until staff is prepared to report back after consultation with the public, or to the second meeting of Council in December (December 15, 2009), whichever is earliest:

THAT subject to its approval of Clause 1, Report No. 102 on the October 20, 2009 Council agenda, (Barriefield affordable housing concept) Council hereby:

1. Receives the preliminary affordable housing development concept plan prepared by Hughes/Downey Architects attached to report no. 09-312 of the Commissioner of Community Development Services as Exhibit A, for lands described as Part 3 on Plan 13R-18296 as shown on the map contained in the concept plan report, showing 32 units in 8 buildings

2. Directs staff to undertake a broad and inclusive public consultation process to seek neighbourhood and community input into the question of developing the subject lands for affordable housing purposes in accordance with the concept plan developed by Hughes/Downey Architects

3. Directs staff to investigate and report back on development partnership opportunities with a local housing provider

4. Earmarks up to $2.46 million from the city's DOOR Affordable Housing Construction Reserve towards the possible development of twenty (20) housing units as phase one on lands labeled as Part 3 consistent with the concept prepared by Hughes Downey architects;

5. Authorizes staff to submit an application for funding through the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Extension 2009 – Year Two, or subsequent funding programs as they may become available, for an additional twelve (12) housing units on the remaining portion of land described as Part 3 on Plan 13R18296, consistent with the concept prepared by Hughes Downey architects. DEFERRED
Finally, on November 17, 2009, council passed the following resolution of the Heritage Committee:

Report No. 122 of the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee (LACAC)

1. Request that Staff be directed to hold at least one public meeting regarding the Barriefield Heritage Matter with a suitable panel of expertise to provide briefings, and then to hear public comment and discussion in order to inform staff of any recommendations that may subsequently be forthcoming and referred to the Heritage Committee for comment and advice to Council

WHEREAS three members of the Heritage Committee have declared a potential Conflict of Interest with respect to the Barriefield Heritage question now before Council; and,

WHEREAS these three members represent an important part of the Committee's Barriefield expertise; and,

WHEREAS the advice that Council may therefore receive may be accordingly compromised;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Heritage Committee request that Staff be directed to hold at least one public meeting, with a suitable panel of expertise to provide briefings, and then to hear public comment and discussion;

- and further -

THAT this meeting (or meetings) be used to inform staff of any recommendations that may subsequently be forthcoming and referred to the Heritage Committee for comment and advice to Council.

What Has Been Accomplished to Date

Following the direction of Council of October 20, 2009, staff members from a number of city departments have been gathering information to help inform the decision-making process around the proposed affordable housing concept. Below is a brief summary of the activities to date:

1. Affordability of Housing

Central to this proposal is the issue of affordability; can a 20 unit housing project as outlined conceptually by the architectural firm of Hughes Downey be built to meet the definition of “affordable” in accordance with the definition established by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)? We are gathering information regarding all land use planning approvals, heritage investigations, development fees, servicing capital costs, construction and operating costs that would reasonably be expected to be incurred by a 20 unit housing project of this nature on the subject lands. That information will then be applied against the affordable business model to determine if such a project can be affordably built and operated. Work on this question is progressing well, however more time is required to complete our consultation with industry experts including staff from other departments such as Planning & Development, Building, Engineering, Utilities Kingston and others. When we report back in January we will provide an itemized listing of such costs.
2. Land Use Planning and Cultural Heritage Considerations

The Planning and Development Department, which includes Heritage, has been consulted with respect to what planning and heritage approvals will be required to implement the conceptual development proposal for the subject property. Information regarding approval processes and anticipated timelines together with requirements for supporting studies and documentation has been provided. As the concept is further refined, the need for additional supporting studies or peer reviews may be determined.

Should this proposal receive council endorsement to proceed to the formal application process, some of the planning and development documentation and studies that will be required include:

- Technical staff pre-consultation (mandatory)
- Servicing brief and storm water management plan
- View plane analysis
- Noise and Traffic impact analysis
- Planning Rationale report
- Official Plan and zoning amendment applications
- Site Plan approval/subdivision approval
- Peer review of supporting documentation as required
- A review of cultural heritage issues (discussed further below)

The cultural heritage issues are sensitive and highly complex; they must be fully explored and understood before staff is able to provide definitive advice to council. The subject lands are located within the Barriefield Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD). The intent and policies of the HCD plan are being reviewed carefully. Changes to provincial heritage legislation and the recent UNESCO designation of the Rideau Canal are being examined by Heritage staff to determine how the layers of local, provincial, and federal legislation and UNESCO designation affecting this area of the city may apply to the current HCD plan and community expectations. A number of government agencies, both federal and provincial, and non-government agencies, such as the provincial Ministry of Culture, the Ontario Heritage Trust, the Heritage Canada Foundation, Parks Canada, the Frontenac Heritage Foundation, and Community Heritage Ontario, have expressed interest and concern regarding this proposal and wish to be kept apprised of developments. This response is due, in part, to Barriefield HCD being the first HCD established in the province.

Heritage considerations fall under both the Planning Act and the Ontario Heritage Act. Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) clearly indicates that cultural heritage issues must be addressed in the Planning approvals process; this is further articulated in the new Official Plan. In addition, any works would also require Ontario Heritage Act approvals from council via the city’s heritage committee.

Some of the documentation and studies that will be required if this proposal proceeds to the formal heritage application stage include:

- Application for Alteration under the Ontario Heritage Act for each parcel
  - This would include pre-consultation with Heritage Committee and Planning and Development staff
- Archaeological assessments (minimum Stage 1 and 2 Assessments would be required)
- Heritage Impact Statement
- Conservation Plan analysis, including cultural heritage landscape and visual impact analysis integrating a heritage planning analysis
It must be noted that a peer review of documents and reports may be required. In addition, an update to the Heritage Conservation District Plan, a public process which would take approximately 18 months, would most likely be required. Any update is appealable to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Staff is also undertaking some research into examples of where affordable housing has been introduced successfully into heritage conservation areas. There have been suggestions made that warrant examination to determine applicability and context to the Barriefield situation.

3. Community Consultations
   There are a number of considerations that must be carefully assessed in developing a consultation process. First and foremost, we want to ensure that the consultation/engagement process chosen is inclusive, accessible, meaningful and transparent. While the level and scope of consultation may exceed the minimum requirements set out in legislation (e.g. the Planning Act, Ontario Heritage Act) owing perhaps to the unique neighbourhood considerations posed by the location of the subject lands, care must be given to properly balancing planning concerns (including cultural heritage issues) with the social development and affordable housing considerations of this proposal. Any concerns about the appropriateness of developing affordable housing on the subject lands must be legitimately anchored in community planning issues rather than assumptions about the people for whom the homes might be built. Opposition to affordable housing communities have been found in other jurisdictions to violate the Ontario Human Rights Code when that opposition results in changes to existing planning processes or serves to limit access to housing by exposing proposed residents to discriminatory comment or conduct. We are mindful of these issues as we undertake our research.

   Members of staff have had initial conversations with a number of parties to begin developing an appropriately inclusive and meaningful community and neighbourhood consultation/engagement process. We have had cursory discussions with some representatives of the Round Table on Poverty Reduction, the Barriefield Village Residents Association and other individuals in this regard. It has been suggested, and we agree, that broad consultation ought not to take place until the New Year, to ensure equitable opportunities for interested people to participate. A number of preliminary ideas are being considered regarding the type of consultation, locations, timing, use of facilitation, etc. More discussion will take place with various parties over the next few weeks to firm up ideas and details around recommendations for the consultation process.

4. Acquiring Lands for Other Purposes
   Council’s direction to undertake further research and analysis of options, opportunities and constraints includes examining the potential of acquiring the surplus Federal lands for uses other than affordable housing, to serve as a buffer between the village and adjoining land uses. Staff has been in contact with our Federal contacts to determine the appraised value of the lands in question. Staff also has initiated contact with a number of government and non-government organizations to explore any available partnerships or grant opportunities that could reduce or eliminate the need to purchase the subject lands at full market value. You will recall that in the absence of alternative funding arrangements (such as the homelessness and housing grant program we are contemplating) the Federal government by policy must divest itself of surplus lands at fair market value.

   In addition to informal conversation with a variety of cultural heritage organizations, staff has reached out to the Ontario Heritage Trust, Ministry of Culture, Heritage Canada Foundation to explore opportunities and
seek advice on partnerships and funding availability. Another option noted and being explored further is making application to Trillium Foundation through a partner organization (as municipalities cannot apply directly).

**Conclusion**

Consulting the public and providing good information are vitally important to this and any other public policy deliberations that Council undertakes. Ensuring that the consultation process offers meaningful opportunities for interested parties to become informed on the issues and voice their opinions is an obligation we do not take lightly. Before proceeding to consult the public on the merits of this proposal, as noted above there are a number of issues requiring further analysis and consideration by staff in order that we can offer council sound advice. A team of city staff in consultation with a number of groups and individuals in the community is working diligently on the task assigned and will be in a position by mid January to make recommendations to Council on next steps in considering this proposal. It is our intent to provide council at that time with a recommended public consultation process and additional information that will assist in arriving at an informed public policy decision on the proposal at hand.

**EXISTING POLICY/BY LAW:**
Not applicable

**NOTICE PROVISIONS:**
Not applicable at this time.

**ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS:**
This report is available in alternative formats and in French upon request.

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:**
Not applicable at this time.

**CONTACTS:**
Jim de Hoop, Director Community and Family Services 546-2695, ext. 4957
George Wallace, Director of Planning and Development 546-4291, ext. 3252

**OTHER CITY OF KINGSTON STAFF CONSULTED:**
A group of city staff from a number of departments has been working on this issue. Others will be consulted as required as this matter proceeds. To date the following staff have been involved in discussions at some level or research on a variety of issues related to this topic:

George Wallace, Director of Planning & Development
Jim de Hoop, Director of Community & Family Services
Marnie Venditti, Manager of Development Planning
Marcus LeTourneau, Senior Heritage Planner
Mary McIntyre, Housing Administrator
Cynthia Beach, Commissioner of Sustainability and Growth
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Lance Thurston, Commissioner of Community Development Services
Alan McLeod, Senior Legal Counsel
Speros Kanellos, Director of Real Estate and Construction
Jim Miller, Director of Technical Services, Utilities Kingston

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:
Not applicable