EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a summary of the information gathered to date by staff concerning an opportunity for the City to acquire surplus federal lands within the Heritage Conservation District of Barriefield.

Direction was provided to staff at the October 6, 2009 Council meeting as follows:

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 at the October 20, 2009 Council meeting as follows:

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 with respect to these parcels of land and that a Council report be prepared to identify partnership options and potential funding sources and community concerns;

-and further-

THAT staff be directed to also pursue an investigation as to whether lands can be purchased to buffer Barriefield Village.

Further technical information will need to be prepared prior to the acquisition of the lands from the federal government. This report outlines the potential next steps to determine public uses for the property including the feasibility of proposed uses such as affordable housing. Staff recommends that a budget be established for the professional and technical services necessary to prepare a feasibility study for municipal uses on the property prior to making a final determination on the acquisition of the lands and that this work be undertaken by October 2010 for Council to make a decision regarding the acquisition of the property. The feasibility study will also have to examine the appropriate role for the City in any alternatives related to development, financing or other partnership potentials.

In May 2009, the City became aware of an opportunity to purchase surplus federal lands located within the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District. At that time the concept of use of those lands was for the creation of some form of affordable housing. A federal grant program exists that would allow for the transfer of the lands for one dollar provided a viable affordable housing project has been approved. The feasibility study will include an analysis of the risks and benefits of proceeding with an affordable housing project in addition to other public policy objectives that may be achieved through acquisition of the property.

A preliminary analysis has been done to determine the technical studies that would be required to evaluate the potential of a housing development on the property. A number of concepts have also been put forward that there are potential municipal uses other than affordable housing and these options should also be evaluated along with the ability to research funding sources that might be available. Information will also be required with respect to the normal due diligence for purchasing property. City staff does not have sufficient time or resource capacity to complete the necessary work and will require additional expertise in specialized areas to prepare a comprehensive analysis. This report outlines the resources necessary to complete an initial feasibility analysis as well as a proposed timeline that would be required to complete the necessary technical studies. A number of motions have also been approved by Council directing staff to proceed with a consultation process with respect to the heritage issues and affordable housing and green space. Prior to bringing a recommendation on the preferred municipal uses for the property, focused consultations will be undertaken to ensure that the intent of the Heritage District Plan and the Affordable Housing policies are realized and that all public benefits are summarized for Council prior to making a decision on the appropriate municipal uses for the property.

If Council approves the recommendations in this report, the more detailed feasibility of locating housing, affordable housing or other potential options for green space or other public uses within Barriefield will take place over the next few months. The scope of the feasibility report will include the lands to be considered for various uses, the form of any housing proposed and whether it is feasible from a broader heritage, land use planning and financial perspective to pursue the acquisition of the lands for affordable housing.

It is important to note that the timelines for this project will not allow for the submission of a complete application for the Surplus Federal Real Property for Homelessness Initiative in the timelines for this federal fiscal year. It is proposed that the City request consideration for the program in a future fiscal year. The program has been funding over a number of consecutive years and it would be desirable to work with the federal government agencies to consider funding in a future year when the City could complete the necessary work rather than missing the deadline and losing the potential of future funding.
Tentative timelines have been provided to give a general sense of the time necessary to complete the analysis and to undertake the consultation that would be necessary to review potential municipal uses. It can also be noted that at this point, there are other options for the property that could be proposed that would provide reasons to retain the land in municipal ownership. Depending on the potential uses for the property, there may be a requirement to seek out equity partners for funding. There may be options available for investments related to potential green space, protection of heritage and construction of affordable housing. The feasibility will review options for other financial contributions other than municipal tax dollars in addition to the potential of the federal grant for affordable housing.

Table 1: Barriefield Federal Surplus Lands - Tentative Timelines to Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initial Expression of Interest to Purchase for Surplus Federal Lands for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff contact with Federal Department re: Affordable Housing Grant; Background Research</td>
<td>June to September 2009</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Council Direction to Staff to Investigate</td>
<td>October to February 2010</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff Steering Committee finalizes terms of reference for Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Mid March 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community Consultations – with aid of feasibility team and steering committee</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Receive, evaluate and refine concept options &amp; budget based on consultation and feasibility review</td>
<td>May to August 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Undertake Stage 2 &amp; 3 Archaeological Fieldwork &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>April to August 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Report to Council on Feasibility, Decision to Proceed, Modify or Discontinue GO/NO-GO</td>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next steps will depend on the results of the feasibility study

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That Council authorize staff to undertake a comprehensive feasibility study to determine whether or not the City should acquire the subject lands, including but not limited to:
   a) the potential to acquire the surplus lands for municipal purposes, including affordable housing;
   b) the potential recommended uses of the land, complete with costs associated with each use, identification of equity contribution options, and timelines for implementation
   c) the review of options to ensure that any development of the property would meet requirements of the Heritage Conservation District Plan
d) the completion of a stage 2 & 3 archaeological assessment, environmental assessments and technical studies that may be necessary to determine the potential future uses that are viable for the properties and to complete the necessary due diligence for purchasing the property

e) the necessary public meeting(s) facilitated as outlined by Council motion of Nov. 17, 2009 addressing both affordable housing and heritage preservation matters

2. That the feasibility study report be completed no later than September 2010.

3. That a budget of $250,000 be approved with funding from the Working Fund Reserve for the work.

4. That staff express the City’s interest in acquiring the property for municipal purposes to Public Works & Government Services Canada (PWGSC), subject to the information determined by the above process.

AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES:

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Gerard Hunt, Chief Administrative Officer

CONSULTATION WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMISSIONERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner, Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Beach, Commissioner, Sustainability &amp; Growth Group</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Willing, Acting Commissioner, Community Development Services</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Leger, Corporate Services</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Keech, President, Utilities Kingston</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Background:
The following motion (Clause 3, Report 104) was deferred by Council on October 20, 2009:

**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. Receive 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. Direct 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. Direct staff to investigate and report back on development partnership opportunities with a local housing provider;
4. Earmark 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. Authorize 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.

The following motion (Clause 2, Report 111) was deferred by Council on November 3, 2009:

**THAT** subject to its approval of Clause 1, Report 102 on the October 20, 2009, Council agenda (Barriefield affordable housing concept), Council hereby:

1. Receive the preliminary affordable housing development concept plan prepared by Hughes/Downey Architects attached to Report 09-312 of the Commission 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. Direct 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. Direct staff to investigate and report back on development partnership opportunities with a local housing provider;
4. Earmark up to $2.46 million for the city’s DOOR Affordable Housing Construction Reserve towards the possible development of twenty (20) housing units as phase one on the lands labeled as Part 3 consistent with the concept prepare by Hughes/Downey architects;
5. Authorize staff to submit an application for funding through the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Extension 2009 – Year 2, 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.

The following motion (Clause 1, Report 122) was carried on November 17, 2009:

**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.

The following motions were deferred on December 15, 2009:

1. WHEREAS the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan has not been reviewed since 1992;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Heritage Committee recommend to Council that staff be directed to review the zoning with respect to natural and cultural heritage on the Department of National Defense land in Barriefield;

-and further-

THAT should it be deemed desirable to amend the current zoning, that the process for doing so also be examined;

-and further-

THAT staff report back to the March meeting of the Heritage Committee on the zoning and Heritage District Plan recommendation;

-and further-

THAT the Planning Committee be advised of this direction to staff.

2. WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act requires Heritage Conservation District Plan to be updated; and

WHEREAS a review of the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan has been scheduled for 2011; and

WHEREAS the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District has changed significantly since the previous review in 1992;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee request that Council give consideration to the urgency of updating the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan.

Staff have reviewed the various motions before Council including those that have been deferred. We believe that the course of action recommended in this report addresses the intent and concerns of those motions and provides a way forward for decisions on this important matter.
Should Council decide to not proceed further at this point, then a motion to discontinue the project analysis would be necessary.

This report is intended to provide Council and the community with a summary of the information gathered to date by staff concerning an opportunity for the City to acquire surplus federal lands within the Heritage Conservation District of Barriefield, and to provide a framework or terms of reference for the public consultation and feasibility phase of this opportunity. A key component of the feasibility review will include the analysis of the appropriate role for the City in owning or developing the property for affordable housing or other municipal uses.

The report is connected by the following content summary headings with corresponding Exhibits that are appended in sequence:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Subject Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The Opportunity to Acquire Surplus Federal Land – Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Affordable Housing Public Policy Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Location Considerations in Developing Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) A Development Concept for Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Cost Estimates for a 20 Unit Affordable Housing Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Comparing Costs for Developing Affordable Housing Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Funding Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Affordable Housing in Heritage Districts – Some Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) Planning and Development Public Policy Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Development Approvals Studies and Background Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Opportunity to Acquire the Lands - Other Public Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Community Consultations – Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Description of The Subject Lands**

Barriefield Village throughout its history has provided modest housing to residents of modest income. The subject lands are described as Parcel 3, Parts 1, 2 and 3 on Plan 13R-18296 and shown on the location map contained in Exhibit A to this report. These lands are located generally along the eastern perimeter of the existing built up area of Barriefield Village, within the boundaries of the Barriefield Village Heritage Conservation District. These lands are currently owned by the federal government and form part of Canadian Forces Base Kingston, although they are physically separated from the rest of CFB Kingston by Highway 15.

Apart from underground services and their associated access structures, the subject lands are vacant, with a variety of grassed fields, thickets of dense brush, trees and open areas. A federal land title search indicated that the property was transferred to the Crown in March 1840 as part of the military reserve Barriefield firing range. Part of the feasibility study will include land title searches and other investigations such as environmental site assessments and potential munitions remediation review to determine any factors that may limit potential future uses. Even when acquiring land from another level of government, the City of Kingston will complete the necessary due diligence investigation to ensure the land can be used for intended uses and to confirm if there are any liabilities associated with the acquisition of the property.

The lands are not subject to Provincial law and only through divestiture to an organization outside of the federal jurisdiction will become subject to provincial legislation related to heritage, planning and the environment. With the City considering ownership, the following land related policies will apply.
Archaeology - According to the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment conducted in 2006, there are several areas on the base that are identified as having high archaeological importance, and the Stage 1 assessment confirms that Parcel 3, Part 3 is one of them. All of the lands within Barriefield are classified as Archaeologically Sensitive Areas within the draft Archaeology Master Plan.

The “high potential” areas are categorized into the following two groups:

a) Areas within 300 metres of the original shoreline, other primary water sources or ancient water courses, especially on high ground, represent areas with considerable potential for prehistoric aboriginal occupation; and

b) Areas with specific documented historic period land use, primarily civilian farmsteads but also a grave location. Early to mid 19th century farmsteads were located along the ridge parallel to the St. Lawrence River, the northern portion of the original military reserve, and civilian land grants including in those areas east of the Great Cataraqui River.

Land Use Designation - The lands subject to this review are designated as Residential within the new Adopted Official Plan for the City of Kingston which provides direction for how new zoning provisions should be formulated, among other things. The new Official Plan has a number of specific matters that must be addressed in any residential development. For example, the types of residential development permitted are single detached dwellings and a limited number (not more than 10%) of semi-detached dwellings, along with up to three residential dwellings as an accessory use above a main floor commercial establishment. Under the previous Plan for the former Pittsburgh Township the lands were designated as Heritage Residential/Institutional and Heritage Residential.

Zoning - The subject lands are zoned Institutional (I) in Zoning By-Law 32-74 for the former Pittsburgh Township. This zone permits an accessory dwelling house and various non-residential uses such as a cemetery, church, clinic, nursing home, private club or school. In order to permit any residential use of the lands a zoning amendment would be required.

2. The Opportunity to Acquire Surplus Federal Land for Affordable Housing Purposes

In 2009, the City became aware of the federal government’s intention to divest of the subject lands. The fair appraised market value of the lands according to the federal government is $1,037,000 (2007 federal government appraisal). City staff also became aware of a federal program to which municipalities could apply to acquire surplus federal lands at nominal cost but only for the development of affordable housing. Council directed staff to indicate the City’s interest in possibly acquiring these lands for affordable housing and to explore the merits of developing affordable housing on the lands.

The Surplus Federal Real Property for Homelessness Initiative (SFRPHI) - The City may be able to acquire the property pursuant to a federal program focussing on social and affordable housing initiatives. SFRPHI is a funding stream that makes surplus federal real properties available to community organizations, the not-for-profit sector and other levels of government for projects to help prevent and reduce homelessness. Eligible recipients include provincial, territorial and municipal governments and agencies, public health and educational institutions, community organizations and, in some cases, housing cooperatives with valid not-for-profit charters.

Eligible activities include investments in transitional and supportive housing, longer-term housing (rental and home ownership) and related support/emergency services. The primary purpose of these investments is to help individuals obtain access to longer-term housing. All contributions of real property contain a covenant, applicable for a minimum of 15 years from the date of commencement of the operation, restricting the use of the property to the affordable housing uses outlined in the recipient's proposal.
Project proposals require federal government approval through a National Tripartite Committee, composed of Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC), Public Works and Government Services Canada and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The committee will complete a thorough assessment of the potential recipient's capacity to implement the proposed project. The inclusion of an environmental or social component in the development of a project is encouraged (projects adapted for people with physical disabilities, projects with an energy efficient component, etc.). HRSDC, with help from its partners, provides guidance, feedback and assistance throughout the proposal and submission processes.

The current funding allotment for this program is scheduled to expire in the federal fiscal year ending March 30, 2011. To date a total of 85 projects have been completed under this program across the country, resulting in the creation of 422 new homes. Past projects have varied widely in their location, scale and cost. For example, a Kingston housing provider, Tipi Moza (Iron Homes) was a 2004 recipient of a former RCMP detachment building on Johnson Street in the City. The building was renovated to offer a home to people with mobility challenges and to low-income aboriginal families. Examples of larger recipients include:

- McLevin Woods in Toronto; in 2004 the SFRPHI contributed $2,300,000 as transferred vacant land to Habitat for Humanity for the construction of home-ownership housing for 37 low income families
- The Benny Farm in Montréal; in 2006 the SFRPHI contributed $1,635,000 to build 113 affordable home-ownership units for families with children and adults with reduced mobility or physical challenges.
- Pleasantville in St. John’s; this new development will be comprised of a 21-unit rental apartment building for the City of St John’s, a 12-unit rental apartment building for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation (NLHC), a block of eight (8) fully accessible rental townhouses for Easter Seals, and two duplexes containing four (4) owner-occupied units for Habitat for Humanity.

Given the timelines provided for the analysis of the options for this project and given the approvals that would be necessary to proceed with any housing project on the site, it is suggested that the City request consideration in a future program allotment for this program if the preferred use of the property includes affordable housing. The City cannot meet the technical requirements of submitting a complete application by March 2011. If the City confirms it is not able to meet this year’s funding deadline, it may be possible to move the funding to a future year allotment. If the City does not meet the timeline and the funding is not awarded, the City’s ability to get future funding will not be favourable. It is recommended as part of this report that the City request moving this property acquisition to a future fiscal year program to allow for sufficient time to analyze the potential of an affordable housing project.

a) Affordable Housing Public Policy Considerations

The Need for Affordable Housing in Kingston

The need for more truly affordable housing in Kingston has been well documented by a number of agencies in recent years. The most recent was the May 2009 report of the United Way and its Community Plan on Housing and Homelessness in Kingston. The executive summary of that report is included as Exhibit B of this report. The chart below supports the conclusions of the United Way report and reflects data from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) Quality of Life Project for which Kingston is one of 24 Canadian member municipalities representing large and medium sized communities. The chart highlights a number of housing need indicators for Kingston compared with the nation.
Need Indicator | Kingston | Canada
--- | --- | ---
Average Income (2006) | 67,622 | 69,548
Median Income (2006) | 53,072 | 53,634
Working Poor ** (2005) | 7.4% | 7.2%
Households in Core Housing Need *** (2006) | 13.9% | 12.7%
Rental Housing Affordability (2005) | 48.8% | 40.1%
Renter households spending 30% or more on housing costs | 8,950 | 697,405
Renter households spending 50% or more on housing costs | 4,070 | 1,546,985
Homeownership Affordability (2005) | 16.5% | 17.8%
Owners spending 30% or more on ownership | 5,005 | 1,491,265
Owners spending 50% or more on ownership | 1,695 | 577,275
Vacancy Rates (overall - Fall 2009) | 1.3% | 2.8%
Substandard Units (requiring major repair) (2006) | 6.55% | 7.47%
Average 2009 Rent for 2 bedroom apartment | $909 | $836

Notes:
** Working Poor - The working poor is defined as economic families (couple families, lone-parent families and non-family persons) in which their income comes from more sources than only government transfers, that is below the after-tax low income cut off threshold for families.
*** A household is in Core Housing Need if its dwelling falls below one or more of the adequacy, suitability, or affordability housing standards; and it would have to spend 30% or more of before tax household income to pay the median rent of alternative, acceptable market housing meeting all three housing standards. Affordability means that a household must be able to pay for adequate housing needs using no more than 30% of total before-tax household income.

The Kingston Model for Affordable Housing

In 2005 the City of Kingston adopted an affordable housing strategy, called The Kingston Model for Action, Affordable Housing Supply. The strategy was developed to provide a practical action-oriented approach through which the city and its community partners could take positive steps to meet the range of affordable housing needs facing the community. A particular emphasis was placed on expanding the supply of various forms of housing to address the full continuum of housing needs in the area. Elements of the housing strategy include:

- **Working with private and non-profit housing developers to ensure a supply of designated lands close to services for affordable housing development.**
- **Working with federal and provincial governments to identify lands and investigate the availability of any surplus parcels for affordable housing.**
- **Taking advantage of as many sources of federal and provincial funds as possible to support an active affordable housing development program and regularly monitor federal, provincial and other funding sources to identify emerging opportunities.**
Additional excerpts from the City’s Affordable Housing Strategy are contained in Exhibit C to this report.

b) Location Considerations in Developing Affordable Housing

Previous staff reports to the Planning Committee have cited the location considerations in situating new affordable housing projects. In those reports, the following general parameters were used when considering the potential location of affordable housing developments:

- Low income households, and the City as a whole, would benefit from the creation of more affordable housing opportunities in a wider variety of locations than is presently available. In principle, access to such housing should be made available for low income households in every residential community in the city. Social (rent geared to income) housing in particular is in very short supply in the west end of the City and is non-existent in the east end.

- Most low income households, particularly families, must rely on the automobile (although usually to a lesser degree than higher income households) in order to access high order goods and services in the community. Notwithstanding this reality, other elements should be considered in terms of location preferences:
  - Availability of transit and proximity of transit stops
  - Availability of lower order goods and services, such as convenience stores, parks, green space, and other recreational and community amenities
  - Ease with which households could access higher order goods and services, typically available in a downtown or at regional shopping nodes connected by transit

- Residents reliant on social assistance typically use public transit, walking, bicycling, taxi-cabs or hitching rides with friends or family to get around. A quick canvass of Ontario Works, Housing Registry, and Housing Corporation case worker staff indicated that an average of 25% of clients rely on the automobile regularly, and this number climbs to 80% for clients in rural areas.

As part of the analysis for affordable housing, finding the right fit for the neighbourhood will be required along with a sustainable financial model; these will be determined as part of the feasibility study. The feasibility study will include the assessment of proximity to community amenities and the issue of social development as well as making use of existing serviced infrastructures.

c) A Development Concept for Affordable Housing

An initial illustration of a concept for developing the subject lands for affordable housing development was created by the architectural firm of Hughes Downey. The initial concept was created only for discussion purposes. The initial concept was created to: (a) meet federal – provincial guidelines for affordable housing development and (b) fit into the heritage fabric of Barriefield village. The Hughes Downey report and concept plan is attached as Exhibit D.

The concept was created for discussion purposes primarily and a more fully developed concept needs to be formulated that considers alternative planning approaches for Council’s consideration. A broader discussion of all relevant issues such as blending of the housing development with the existing neighbourhood must still take place if the City proceeds with a housing concept for the land. It is important to note that while this concept has been prepared in order to provide a estimate for the costs to build housing in heritage district area, any development of housing will require the completion of technical studies and policy analysis to ensure that the final form meets the requirements of the Barriefield Heritage District in addition to the zoning requirements for the property. Technical
studies for the site may require changes to the building concepts and public consultation that is required as part of any project may alter the cost estimates provided.

d) Cost Estimates for a 20 Unit Affordable Housing Proposal

High level (level “C”) cost estimates based on the Hughes Downey concept are provided below. The calculations are based on the development of 20 units (in five buildings of wood frame construction as a partial build of the concept plan attached as Exhibit D). A Class ‘C’ estimate is indicative of true costs based on a concise description of the design option, construction/design experience, and market conditions. As development proceeds to the feasibility stage, estimates are refined to what is called a “B” and then “A” level of accuracy.

The concept created may not meet all requirements of the Barriefield Heritage District Plan or requirements of zoning and may need to be significantly modified based on the information obtained in preparation of the feasibility study. Changes to the density and the servicing requirements may significantly affect the costing estimates provided below.

Cost Estimates for a 20 Unit Affordable Housing Proposal – Part 3 Parcel 3 Barriefield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level C Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Cost Per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Construction ($165/ sq. ft)</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees and Project Management</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Review costs for various planning and heritage related studies, fees, public engagement, etc. (*more than half these costs could apply to all 3 parcels)</td>
<td>$ 700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Consultant</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Contingency</td>
<td>$ 385,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 4,000,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Land Purchase Price (Parcel 3 Only)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$ 225,000/unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above estimate demonstrates the relative cost per unit to develop the City’s current housing proposal assuming medium and high costing estimates. The cost of land adds between 12% and 14% to the estimated cost of the development proposal.

e) Comparing Costs for Developing New Affordable Housing Communities

To put the above cost estimates into some perspective, we have compared the cost estimates of the Barriefield proposal with housing development concepts that may be considered on vacant lands within the downtown core and a traditional low rise apartment project underway in the west end of the city with funding for some units through the provincial Affordable Housing Program. Other models for the development of affordable housing may impact the final costs including the donation of materials or labour by other organizations.

Whereas the above costing for Barriefield on a per unit basis is estimated to be $200,000, downtown sites that have been recently investigated range from a low of $200,000 to a high of $255,000. In contrast, a traditional low rise apartment style development can be considerably lower, with recent prices from between $145,000 and $167,000, on a per unit basis.
Regardless of the location, each and every development is subject to variation in pricing with dependency on many factors. However, what this information demonstrates is the significant costs associated with building housing in specialized situations such as the urban core or heritage areas. For a number of reasons, most available or potentially available sites in the downtown core are challenging, which escalates the cost of development (parking structures, possible contamination remediation, servicing complications, parcel size and configuration, legal limitations such as rights-of-way, zoning, etc) compared to a suburban development beyond the core. However, suitably zoned, available for sale, serviced Greenfield sites are not in plentiful supply. The Barriefield proposal, while not within the core area, does have special site considerations that escalate the costs (heritage architectural considerations and analysis, potential archaeology, servicing, small number of units, choice of construction materials, etc). Typically in a downtown location, construction costs would amount to about 60% of the overall project costs, the remaining 40% being soft costs (fees, studies etc). In the Barriefield illustration concept, soft costs amount to about 50%.

The feasibility study will provide guidance to Council regarding the most cost effective manner in which to proceed after a thorough review.

f) Funding Sources

Funding available to assist affordable housing developments, either through the provincial Affordable Housing Program or the City’s DOOR funding program to date has been up to $130,000/unit in an effort to ensure the proponents have small manageable mortgages at the time of initial occupancy and can operate a financially sustainable project for 25-35 years. The Barriefield proposal would require a considerably higher level of initial capital subsidization (at $70,000 per unit above the $130,000 level, or upwards of $1.3 million on a 20 unit project) if no other sources of equity are found. It is important to note that it is typical for non-profit providers or the private sector to contribute significant equity or to carry a sizable mortgage in order to make their projects financially viable. This option needs to be further investigated in order to assess short term and long term financial viability.

Similarly, preliminary financial analysis being done on the noted downtown projects indicates that additional subsidies will be required if we are intent on gearing such new housing to be truly affordable to those most in need through additional operating rent subsidies (or rent supplements). This raises a number of public policy issues that warrant consideration. For example, what level of subsidy is considered appropriate and supportable to ensure that truly affordable housing is built in higher cost locations such as the downtown or on brownfield sites or within heritage conservation districts? Wherever the location, it is safe to conclude that federal-provincial subsidies are not sufficient to cover capital and operating costs; and the level of municipal subsidy top-up will vary depending on a number of factors, including the intended target group. Obviously, the highest level of subsidy will be needed for those most in need of rent subsidy and support services. This subsidy level would decline as the intended target group shifts along the continuum of housing need.

The feasibility analysis will have to analyze the best model for providing funding sources which may include support and affordable housing development on the property.

g) Affordable Housing in Heritage Districts – Some Examples

Barriefield Village throughout most of its history provided modest housing to residents of modest income. New models may be developed on the subject lands in a manner that is respectful of and sympathetic to the 19th century village fabric the City is intent on conserving within the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District. To provide some context to this question, staff has assembled some examples of affordable housing projects within or in conjunction with heritage properties in cities across the world (see Exhibit E). While historic conservation projects in these examples most often involve the incorporation of affordable housing within historic buildings as a means of saving the heritage value of properties, the accommodation of new home developments within historic areas is not new as some
examples will show. The exhibit shows examples from other cities and is not meant to be an exhaustive or representative sampling. It is fully appreciated that each situation is unique and must be assessed on its merits. Infusing new development within a heritage district is a sensitive and complex matter.

It is important to note that these examples or any other development for municipal uses will require review and approval with respect specifically to the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan. If housing is determined to be the preferred municipal use for the property, any proposal will be subject to the public heritage approval process.

h) Planning and Development Public Policy Considerations

The Planning and Development Department, which encompasses land use and development planning as well as heritage planning, has been involved in the consideration of this matter and has been consulted as to what planning and heritage approvals will be required to develop the subject lands for residential purposes. Information regarding approval processes and anticipated time lines together with requirements for supporting studies has been included in this report. The federal property is currently not subject to provincial jurisdiction and the Barriefield Heritage District Conservation policies do not apply to federal use on the lands.

In 2005, there were substantial changes made to the Ontario Heritage Act that provide additional protection for properties designated under Parts IV (individual properties) or Part V (districts.) The Planning and Development staff identified an update to the existing Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan in the capital planning budget for 2010. A recent OMB decision in Port Dalhousie has permitted the approval of a 17-storey tower in the middle of a small scale heritage conservation district that predated the 2005 changes to the Ontario Heritage Act. Other decisions by the OMB have indicated that the heritage conservation districts do provide protections even if they were created prior to the legislation changes in 2005. While detailed analysis has not been completed on the similarities of the Barriefield Heritage District and the district in Port Dalhousie, given the number of potential changes in the Barriefield Conservation District, it is advisable that a review of the current Heritage Conservation District Plan be undertaken prior to significant development occurring by private land developers or the City on the properties declared surplus.

The federal lands as well as the lands owned by the school board could undergo transformation as they are declared surplus or converted to other uses. Given the opportunity afforded the municipality through the federal divestiture of the subject lands, it is considered now to be a priority to move up the schedule for this review and initiate a Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan update in 2010. Staff could undertake the review starting immediately if the updating of the Market Square Heritage Conservation District Plan was delayed until after the Barriefield Heritage District review was complete. Timelines and milestone dates for the completion of the Heritage Conservation District update are currently being reviewed and would be made available for Council by the time the feasibility study is complete.

Should consideration of this housing development concept proceed and be refined, additional supporting studies or peer reviews will be required as part of the planning review. It should be noted that these decisions need to be made within an existing legislative and policy framework, the details of which are outlined in Exhibit F. The discussion of policy in Exhibit F does not represent a comprehensive policy analysis; it is only a statement of existing provincial and municipal policies that may impact the development of the subject lands.

The lands in question are identified as being within what is called Landscape Unit 4 of the Heritage Conservation District plan – Grassed Open Space (see boundary map in Exhibit G). The relevant policies can be found on page 5-7 of the plan and are as follows:

- The open space surrounding the district should be conserved as much as possible in order to protect significant views into and from the village. Of particular sensitivity is the gradual slope on the south-east, at the approach from Kingston, and the area north of the church. These areas in particular accent through
contrast the cohesive visual character of the settlement area. Use of these areas for parking, such as along the south side of James Street should be moderated with the installation of plant material screening.

- Within this landscape unit it may be possible to allow low profile development to the south of the church, adjacent to Highway 15 and still retain major views.

Some sections of the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan that may have a bearing on decisions affecting the subject lands are outlined in more detail in Exhibit F.

i) Development Approvals Studies and Background Research

In addition to the applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law, application for site plan control approval and possibly draft plan of subdivision would be required for a housing development. According to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), cultural heritage issues must be addressed as part of the planning approvals process. Any development or construction works on the subject lands will require approvals from council via the city’s Heritage Committee under the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act. In support of any planning and development applications involving the subject lands, the following studies and background information would require external consultants support with costing shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Costing Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical staff pre-consultation</td>
<td>no direct cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing brief/storm water management plan</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View plane analysis</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and Traffic impact analysis</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Rationale/ Demonstration Report</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for Alteration under the Ontario Heritage Act for each parcel and other applications</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological assessments (minimum Stage 2 Assessment, Stage 3 &amp; 4 included in estimate)</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Impact Statement</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Plan analysis, including cultural heritage landscape and visual impact analysis integrating a heritage planning analysis</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Landscape Plan</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Landscape Analysis</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review &amp; Contingency</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Control/ Support</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimate for all 3 parcels</td>
<td>$382,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the main studies and supporting background research are pertinent to heritage preservation and are summarized below. The duration of time it takes to adequately complete each of these studies and complete related public consultations can extend into six or more months. An estimated timeline for development of the lands is provided at the end of this section.

A Cultural Heritage Impact Statement’s (CHIS) purpose is to ascertain if a proposed development (i.e. an intervention into a Heritage Conservation District or HCD) will have an impact on the heritage value of the place (i.e. District) and
if so, how it will impact it (i.e. if the intervention is consistent with the objectives and guidelines of the Heritage Conservation District Plan). This report is focused on the proposed intervention with respect to the HCD Plan.

A Conservation Plan (CP) provides an integrated approach to determining the appropriate balance between the conservation of heritage value and ongoing use. It discusses the significance of a historic place in a broad context, presents a vision of its future that focuses on heritage and makes practical recommendations for its short and long term conservation. It examines the current condition of the buildings and landscape, and embraces the site’s particular local significance and heritage value. Normally, the Conservation Plan also presents a ‘Demonstration Plan’ that illustrates conceptual potential for future site evolution based on these values. Conservation Plans can run from 50 to over 200 pages. It is estimated a mid-range scope would be appropriate here, based on extensive previous documentation available. The likely range of topics covered would include: Benchmark Data; Historical Background Summary; Current Physical, Social and Economic Condition Summary; Statement of Heritage Value; Policy and Legislation Summary; Vision Statement; Recommendations; Incremental Development Planning; Implementation, Opportunity and Costs.

The Cultural Heritage Landscape Analysis (CHLA) is a component part of the Conservation Plan. This is the part of the overall analysis that focuses on the cultural landscape aspects and the relationship of that landscape within its broader context. The original Barriefield Heritage District was one of the earliest in Ontario and as time has progressed, many of the original ideas and comments provide insufficient direction on the issue of appropriate infill development and changes that are occurring in the village and its surroundings. It is not surprising that there is a need to again revisit the Heritage District documents to determine what impact they would have on the planning of infill development on lands in and around the district.

A full review of the Heritage Conservation District documents is recommended, including from the point of view of a Cultural Landscape Assessment to confirm the heritage attributes and values that have been identified in the other studies in this suite. It is necessary to look particularly in the guideline section which lays out parameters for infill development that respect the historic views, land patterns and circulation, in order to identify the key issues to be considered in planning for any new development.

The servicing brief would detail the existing sanitary infrastructure, water infrastructure, storm sewer, electric service and natural gas service. It will provide a plan and recommendations for access and servicing the site.

A stormwater management plan would detail the existing drainage conditions of the site and provide recommendations to address stormwater quality and quantity issues and minimize the impacts on the natural drainage and environment.

A noise control feasibility study would identify major noise sources (current and future) impacting the development and define the minimum noise attenuation requirements for the control of outdoor and indoor environmental sound levels.

A transportation impact study would review the existing traffic volumes, to quantify the transportation impact of the proposed development on both existing and proposed road configurations and to recommend any improvements to mitigate the impact.

A view plane analysis represents a protected view (views out and particularly in this case, views to) of a key feature(s) (i.e. structure or landscape) within an area which is critical to understanding its value, and/or heritage value. In many cases view planes involve creating specific zoning measures including setbacks and height restrictions. A view plane study for Barriefield would be a recommended set of guidelines that would protect heritage value, based upon the qualified consultant’s studies and analysis. A view plane study for the project would assess
the impact of any proposed development on the village as well as view planes from Highway 15 and the Rideau Canal.

A planning rationale will be required in accordance with City of Kingston guidelines and requirements. The rationale will provide a clear description and understanding of the development proposal, summarize and review pertinent supporting study findings, analyze and prepare recommendations. It is expected that a Planning Rationale for a project of this nature will be 30 – 50 pages in length and contain extensive graphics.

It should also be noted that in some instances, peer reviews of supporting documentation may also be required. In order to have these studies completed at a detailed enough level to support a development application, work would have to begin soon after Council approval of a concept. The timeline associated with the federal land transfer, if applying for the affordable housing grant, must take place in the same period as the fiscal year. It is considered realistic to assume zoning and approvals in place during the Federal fiscal period April 2011 to March 2012. Due to the high public profile of this project, it is also recommended if Council wishes to proceed that steps be taken to hire staff resources that can assist to move the project along and keep the public and Council informed at the necessary milestones. The next stage feasibility analysis will further refine the resources, requirements, and timelines. Below is a high level estimate:

**Timetable Estimates Assuming Development on Barriefield Federal Surplus Lands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Complete, Decision to Proceed, Modify or Discontinue</td>
<td>September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Project Management Office</td>
<td>October November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Professional Services and Supporting Studies for OPA and ZBL</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish contract agreements for supporting studies/ equity contributions</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of supporting studies – servicing, planning, heritage</td>
<td>December 2010 start to March 2011 completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews with city staff, heritage committee, approvals as required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Decision Point to Proceed, Modify or Discontinue</td>
<td>2nd week March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to Federal Grant program based on approved concept</td>
<td>3rd week March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of applications for Official plan and Zoning Amendments – includes statutory notice, public hearing and reporting out to Planning Committee and KMHC</td>
<td>April to October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive report and staff recommendations regarding Official Plan and Zoning Amendment applications</td>
<td>November December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Land Transfer Agreement with Federal Government</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan and other approvals leading to construction start</td>
<td>January to March 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **The Opportunity to Acquire the Lands - Other Public Uses**

Council’s direction to staff to undertake research and analysis of options, opportunities and constraints has included consideration of acquiring all or a portion of the subject lands for uses other than residential. In the absence of alternative funding arrangements the federal government, by policy, must divest itself of its surplus lands at fair market value. In this case the value was appraised in 2007 at just over $1 million.

City staff has been in contact with a variety of upper level government officials and non-governmental organizations in an effort to identify any available programming partnerships or grant opportunities that could be used to reduce or
eliminate the need to purchase the subject lands at full market value in the event Council decides on a non-housing public purpose for the lands. The Ontario Heritage Trust, Ontario Ministry of Culture, Heritage Canada Foundation and Parks Canada have been approached to obtain advice on partnerships and funding availability. To date, staff has not learned of any available programs that would provide funding for the acquisition of the subject lands for open space, memorial, cultural or recreational uses, or other non-housing public purposes.

4. Community Consultations – Next Steps

Consulting the public is important to this and any other public policy deliberations that Council undertakes. The consultation process will offer meaningful opportunities for interested parties to become informed. As part of the feasibility study, it is recommended that focused consultation take place with respect to specific uses for the property and there may be an opportunity to provide some clarity on issues related to the properties.

Members of staff have had initial conversations with a number of parties in developing an appropriately inclusive and meaningful community engagement process. We have had discussions with some representatives of the Community Round Table on Poverty Reduction, the Barriefield Village Residents Association and other individuals in this regard.

Council has directed staff to hold at least one public meeting with a suitable panel of expertise to provide briefings and then to hear public comment and discussion. As part of the feasibility study, a public consultation similar to the world café format will be held that allows participants to provide comments on a variety of different issues. Staff has been researching individuals willing and able to come forward to serve as part of the expert panel including heritage experts who will assist in providing input on the public policy reasons for purchasing the property.

If Council decides to proceed beyond the feasibility study for this project, there may be other phases to the concept development for these lands that have separate but complementary public consultation processes: (1) Planning Act related public meetings based on the proposed use, and; (2) Heritage Act related public meetings based on the proposed use as well as the Heritage Conservation District Plan update. As such, there will be a number of opportunities afforded to the public to express opinion and provide input into the municipal decision-making process on this matter.

5. Conclusions

The information and conclusions in this report provide some key insights for Council’s consideration. The Risk/Opportunity summary on the accompanying page provides some key points and a high level “first pass” evaluation of the opportunities and the risks before Council. More detailed information needs to be gathered before Council can make firm commitments.

This risk-opportunity comparison indicates that a further feasibility analysis is needed to create a comprehensive project viability and options review. This would ensure that all elements of risk and opportunity are managed to make an informed decision that will increase the odds for success and minimize the risks of failure.

Staff recommend proceeding with the next stage of feasibility review for further refinement and analysis along with public consultation. A staff steering committee would guide the process going forward.

High Level Risk/Opportunity Assessment for the Development of Affordable Housing

As part of the feasibility analysis a risk assessment will be required for Council to make a final decision on the acquisition of the property. Staff has done an initial review of opportunities and risks associated with the provision of an affordable housing component and have provided a summary below.
Opportunities:

- There is a need for affordable housing in Kingston. One of Kingston’s key public policy objectives is to encourage the creation of more housing supply of all types, but particularly housing for those in need.
- Affordable housing and heritage designated neighbourhoods can and do co-exist. Several international examples are highlighted in this report (Exhibit E) and a prime local example is the juxtaposition of the central branch of the Kingston Frontenac Public Library and the creative design for public housing fronting on Bagot Street at Johnson Street.
- The subject lands are designated as residential in the City’s new Official Plan; a public, non-profit, or private developer would be on solid ground in putting forward several options for residential development on the lands, as long as they join the inter-related aspects of Official Plan policies and the Heritage Conservation District Plan requirements.
- A development concept was created demonstrating how a small scale affordable housing project could be built while maintaining the heritage fabric of the village.
- Developing affordable housing is expensive and so every opportunity must be explored to lessen development costs. We may have the opportunity to acquire some lands from the federal government at nominal cost, provided that we develop the lands for affordable housing. Such an opportunity warrants serious consideration.
- In order to reduce the City’s costs in a potential development, equity partners could be sought in order to limit the City’s exposure and allow a better understanding of the full range of options available.
- In order to mitigate the risk of escalating sunk costs, the City could seek to negotiate an agreement with the Federal government whereby expenditures that are required for determining development feasibility be deducted from the appraised market value in the event that is necessary.
- Federal representatives have confirmed that they will not accept applications which extend local and provincial land use approvals beyond the fiscal year. Application for transfer in the April 2011 to March 2012 fiscal year, or a purchase option at fair market value may be an acceptable contingency.

Risks:

- There are sets of inter-related policies in the Official Plan and in the Barriefield Conservation District Plan (excerpts in Exhibit F & G) which are intended to protect the heritage aspects of the village, guide the type of residential uses permitted, protect view planes, and incorporate buffering open areas. These may severely hinder the economical creation of affordable housing.
- The development concept for Part 3 Parcel 3 has not had widespread support among village residents and the unknown prospects for development of the remaining parcels are a cause for great concern to the surrounding land owners.
- Development on the subject lands is made more expensive, time consuming, and risk prone than a typical housing development because of: a) the requirements for meeting a high threshold of analysis and investigation under the Ontario Heritage Act and other land use policies and statutory regulations; b) the potential for archaeological discoveries of high importance.
- The federal land grant program requirements cannot be met for the upcoming fiscal year, in that the federal fiscal budget year deadline of March 31, 2011 will pass before the City is able to conclude an acceptable funding application that is based on a Council-endorsed development proposal and conclude successfully all of the planning and heritage approvals needed for the land transfer. A grant application for the federal land grants for the April 2011 to March 2012 period assumes new federal funding will be allotted under the program.
- Should the grant monies not become available, or if the outcome of various studies, consultations or investigations determines that development for residential use is not feasible, Council after expending time and resources may then feel it necessary to purchase the lands at market value.
• Even with land costs factored out, the unit cost to develop 20 homes in this location is high at an estimated $200,000 per home.

EXISTING POLICY/BY LAW:

Information has been provided throughout the report regarding the existing policies and bylaws related to this analysis.

NOTICE PROVISIONS:

There are no notice provisions at this time.

ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS:

This report is available in alternative formats and in French upon request.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

The costs associated with the housing option are outlined in this report in some detail. No project budget has been requested or authorized at this point. In 2007 Council earmarked funding for affordable housing, awaiting specific opportunity and proposals to determine and approve a budget. The recommendation in this report will require expenditure estimated at $250,000. As this cost is considered one-time, by policy the appropriate funding source is the Working Fund Reserve. Should Council determine to proceed following the feasibility study, specific budget and funding sources will be required. The costs associated with acquiring and programming the lands for public open space or parkland purposes have not been set out in any detail apart from the approximate value of $1,000,000 for the subject lands in their entirety. Passive open space entails certain ongoing operating costs. Currently no City department budgets include specific monies to purchase and develop the subject lands for such purposes.

Typically when dealing with affordable housing projects, the City partners with other organizations and equity partners so that the City's share of the costs is reduced. It would be within the terms of reference for the feasibility review to assess housing or other equity/provider options as a partner in any concept for development on the subject lands.

In addition to staff time, to date approximately $20,000 has been expended on consulting fees to develop, assess the merits of, and cost out the current affordable housing proposal.

CONTACTS:

Jim de Hoop, Director, Community and Family Services 546-2695, ext. 4957
Marnie Venditti, Manager of Development Planning 546-4291, ext. 3256
Cynthia Beach, Commissioner, Sustainability & Growth 546-4291, ext. 1150

OTHER CITY OF KINGSTON STAFF CONSULTED:

A group of city staff from a number of departments has been consulted on this issue to date:
Marcus Letourneau, Heritage Planner
Cheryl Hitchen, Manager, Community Programs
Mary McIntyre, Housing Administrator
Therese Greenwood, Manager, Communications
Alan McLeod, Senior Legal Counsel
Speros Kanellos, Director of Real Estate and Construction
Jim Miller, Director of Technical Services, Utilities Kingston
Stephen Dickey, Manager, Accounting Services
Kim Brown, Infrastructure Engineer
Carolyn Downs, City Clerk
John Bolognone, Deputy City Clerk

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:

Exhibit A  The Subject Lands
Exhibit B  City’s Affordable Housing Strategy 2005
Exhibit C  Community Plan on Housing and Homelessness in Kingston - Executive Summary
Exhibit D  Hughes Downey Affordable Housing Development Concept Report
Exhibit E  Affordable Housing Projects in Heritage Districts – Some Examples
Exhibit F  Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan – Landscape Improvements
Exhibit G  Pertinent Provincial and Local Land Use Policies
MAP OF BARRIEFIELD SHOWING THE 3 SITES
Overview
The Kingston Model was developed to provide a practical action-oriented approach through which the City of Kingston and its community partners can take positive steps to meet the range of affordable housing needs facing the City today and in the future. A particular emphasis is being placed on expanding the supply of various forms of housing to address the full continuum of housing needs in the area. Taking a pro-active role in meeting community housing needs requires integrating the Kingston Model into the municipal housing business.

This Kingston Model report demonstrates that sufficient financial resources are available to enable the City of Kingston to operate the Kingston Model in a cost-effective manner.

The report also demonstrates that, by investing in affordable housing projects and programs, the City and the community as a whole stand to gain a wide range of financial, economic and social benefits above and beyond providing an affordable place to live for the many local households in need.

The Model
The elements crucial to the success of the Kingston Model are set in place to equip the City of Kingston and its community partners to move ahead with an effective Affordable Housing development program.

The Elements:

a. Continuum of Housing Need - The Kingston Model has been designed to address the full range of housing needs such as: emergency shelters, supportive/transitional housing, social housing, affordable rental housing and affordable homeownership

b. Tools to Stimulate Affordable Housing Supply – The City needs to takes advantage of as many sources of funds as possible to support an active affordable housing development program and to monitor federal, provincial and other funding sources to identify emerging opportunities through:
   ● support an active affordable housing development program is legislative and regulatory provisions that impact on such developments.
   ● financial support and incentives. To be fully effective, the Kingston Model needs to incorporate as many sources of financial assistance as possible to reduce financial barriers.

c. Building Community Capacity - Building community capacity involves such functions as familiarizing all segments of the community with the range of local housing needs; gaining support and acceptance for the Kingston Model initiative; overcoming neighbourhood resistance to affordable housing (often known as NIMBY – “Not in My Backyard”); training support agencies about how to work more closely with housing providers in the delivery of supportive and transitional housing projects; familiarizing City Council with the tools and resources available for affordable housing and with the types of innovative approaches needed to succeed; familiarizing staff of relevant City departments with such instruments as Affordable Housing Agreements, CMHC mortgage insurance requirements and the operations of land banks and land trusts; expanding the information available to City planners on alternative
development standards, second suites and other innovative planning measures that can help contribute to affordable housing; educating tenants about the requirements to become homeowners; and so on.

d. Partnerships - Partnerships are a necessity in order to bring together the resources and expertise needed to pull together affordable housing developments in the current environment. The range of potential partnerships and roles and responsibilities of each is virtually endless, depending on the nature and requirements of each project; yet the principle remains the same. That is, by combining the unique skills and resources of several contributors, the opportunities to successfully develop affordable housing increase dramatically.

e. Municipal Leadership - In order to ensure that every effort is made to obtain the greatest possible level of resources for affordable housing, the City and its community partners must continually make their voices heard on matters related to affordable housing development. This can be done through ongoing advocacy, primarily through City Council to senior levels of government.

f. Public Consultation - While it is important that an aggressive approach be taken to the development of affordable housing in Kingston, it is equally important that the public be fully informed of affordable housing initiatives and that stakeholders be consulted in the design and implementation of such initiatives. Such consultation should go hand-in-hand with training and education programs aimed at breaking down barriers to community acceptance and developing a greater understanding of local housing needs.

g. Monitoring - When an initiative of the magnitude and importance of the Kingston Model is undertaken, it is crucial to evaluate its success in achieving its objectives. This can be achieved through ongoing monitoring of the activities undertaken as a result of the Kingston Model and by regular reporting of the results.

h. Financing the Kingston Model
Moving ahead with the range of activities suggested for the Kingston Model will require two types of funding – funds to cover day-to-day operations and funds to contribute to individual affordable housing projects and programs.

i. Implementation
A practical approach to Implementation of the Kingston Model is critical to its success. The report recommends appointing various existing staff to fulfill key roles in the implementation of the Kingston Model. It then suggests an active development program through the following recommendations.

j. Demonstration Projects
The report identifies four feasible demonstration projects serving different components of the continuum of housing needs that could represent the affordable housing development program.

Recommendations
These recommendations are organized in accordance with the elements of the Kingston Model outlined above. The following original 44 recommendations of the 2005 Kingston Model Report were approved in their entirety by City Council at its regular meeting held on May 26, 2005.

1) It is recommended that the City of Kingston adopt the following Housing Vision and Mission Statement:
KINGSTON MODEL FOR ACTION - AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLY

- **Strategic Vision for Affordable Housing**
  The City of Kingston commits to building capacity for adequate, affordable and accessible housing through progressive professional services, leadership, and developing lasting partnerships to enhance quality of life for all citizens.

- **Housing Mission**
  To provide adequate, affordable and accessible housing that responds to the diverse needs of all residents.

- **Underlying Principles**
  - **Adequate Housing**: housing in suitable locations offering adequate space, amenities and quality to meet the needs of all residents of the City of Kingston
  - **Affordable Housing**: housing affordable within 30% of household income of all residents of the City of Kingston
  - **Accessible Housing**: housing that is physically and economically accessible to all residents of the City of Kingston

2) It is recommended that all decisions on municipal policy, programs, incentives, and other matters related to the delivery of the Kingston Model should be made by City Council and that all such matters should be brought before the Community Services Committee for discussion and recommendation to Council.

3) It is recommended that the City of Kingston appoint an Affordable Housing Development Committee to provide advice to the Community Services Committee and Council on affordable housing matters. The composition of the Committee should include one Council member, the Housing Manager, two community champions, a private developer, a non-profit housing provider, a tenant, a landlord, a representative of a community-based service agency and a financial expert. The Committee should report through the Community Services Committee of Council. The Committee should maintain close linkages with other City committees to ensure full coordination of all initiatives.

4) It is recommended that an ongoing multi-disciplinary Affordable Housing staff team be established comprised of staff from the Housing Division, CAO's Office, Finance, Department of Planning and Development Services, Public Works, GIS, Legal, Social Services, the Kingston Economic Development Corporation (KEDCO) and representatives of CMHC and the Provincial Ministry of Infrastructure and Renewal. This team would be familiarized with the mandate of the Kingston Model and contribute in a variety of ways to the success of proposed initiatives. The staff team would report to the Affordable Housing Development Committee.

5) It is recommended that the function of Affordable Housing Co-ordinator be incorporated into the City of Kingston Housing Division. The efforts of this individual should be overseen by the Housing Manager and supported by the Housing Secretary.

6) It is recommended that the City establish the Kingston Affordable Housing Centre to facilitate affordable housing development and to act as a visible demonstration of the City's commitment to affordable housing. The Centre should be located within the Housing Division offices at City Hall. Secondary centres such as the offices of KEDCO should also be established to help distribute information.

7) It is recommended that all participants in the Kingston Model be prepared to take a flexible approach in order to enhance the opportunity for success. The Affordable Housing Co-ordinator, the Affordable Housing Team, the Affordable Housing Development Committee and City Council itself should be prepared to consider a variety of new challenges with every potential opportunity and to maintain the flexibility to arrive at unique solutions on a case-by-case basis; providing, of course, that the solution supports the Housing Vision, represents value for the community and is consistent with the overall Strategic Plan.

8) It is recommended that the City continue to make active use of the provisions of the Capital Facilities Bylaw to provide incentives for the development of affordable housing.

9) It is recommended that Planning Staff investigate the potential for incorporating density bonusing and transfer of development rights as policies in the new Official Plan to support the development of affordable housing. Given the urgent need for affordable housing across the City, it is important that Council move forward with reviewing planning provisions related to affordable housing in the short-term to accompany the adoption of the Kingston Model.
10) It is recommended that the City continue to provide financial incentives by altering or reducing municipal fees and charges or give grants in lieu of development charges of municipal fees and charges/grants in lieu of development charges an important part of the Kingston Model. It is recommended that the City investigate the feasibility and impact of allocating part of the revenues collected through Development Charges Bylaw to the proposed Affordable Housing Revolving Fund. In addition, the next time a new Development Charges By-law is developed, the City should document the level of service required to meet affordable housing needs and make sure the By-law incorporates a strong rationale for an appropriate charge.

11) It is recommended that the Kingston Model consider brownfield redevelopment as a source of sites for affordable housing.

12) It is recommended that the City support the recommendations of the Provincial Housing Supply Working Group as set out in Sections 7.6 and 7.7 of this report and further outlined on the website of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

13) It is recommended that the City work with private and non-profit housing developers to ensure a supply of designated lands close to services continues to be available for affordable housing development.

14) It is recommended that the City ensure that new affordable housing development supports the policies contained in the City’s Urban Growth Strategy.

15) It is recommended that the City ensure that the Kingston Model incorporates the policies set out in the Provincial Policy Statement on Housing when it is finalized and adopted by the Province of Ontario.

16) It is recommended that the City work with the federal and provincial governments to prepare an inventory of federal and provincial lands and investigate the availability of any surplus parcels for affordable housing.

17) It is recommended that the City prepare an inventory of municipally-owned lands with potential for affordable housing and also adopt a Housing First policy where any surplus municipal lands are considered for affordable housing first before being placed for sale.

18) It is recommended that Council confirm its support for a Land Banking program as part of the Kingston Model initiative, to be established and operated through a Land Trust. Council should request staff to recommend the organizational, financial and policy elements comprising the program in its upcoming Land Banking Report. This program would go hand-in-hand with the recommended Housing First policy.

19) It is recommended that the City ensure that the new Official Plan under preparation for the amalgamated City reflects a comprehensive program in support of affordable housing in a similar fashion to the Official Plan policies currently contained in the Official Plan of the former City of Kingston, updated to reflect current practices and strategic visions and consistent with the new Provincial Policy Statement on Housing. These policies should apply throughout the entire area as appropriate.

20) It is recommended that the City ensure that the new consolidated Zoning Bylaw under preparation for the amalgamated City harmonizes regulations regarding residential development in a manner that reduces barriers to the development of affordable housing. The bylaw should attempt to reduce potential barriers caused by minimum separation distances for some forms of housing in some areas, the lack of various permitted residential uses in some areas (especially for special needs housing), and large minimum floor areas in some areas. The new Bylaw should provide the opportunity to support reduced parking standards in some cases, in accordance with demonstrated evidence of reduced parking requirements for uses such as senior citizen housing, housing for physically disabled individuals, and so on.

21) It is recommended that the City review its policy on second suites in consultation with the broader community with a view to expanding the areas where they are permitted as of right, providing they comply with identified planning criteria, building codes and health and safety regulations.

22) It is recommended that the City review its development standards with a view to identifying standards which could potentially be relaxed in support of affordable housing developments. It should adopt a policy of identifying criteria which would have to be met in order to qualify for such relaxed standards.

* Full report can be found on the City of Kingston website: www.cityofkingston.ca/residents/social/housing/kmahd/reports.asp
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23) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Team place a particular priority on encouraging affordable housing developments that support downtown revitalization and related City of Kingston intensification policies and initiatives.

24) It is recommended that the City monitor the Province’s consultation process on controlling conversion and demolition of existing affordable rental housing and adopt a harmonized local policy in this regard across the amalgamated City following finalization and approval of the Provincial policy.

25) It is recommended that Planning Staff undertake further study of an inclusionary zoning policy to require a portion of all new housing to be affordable. The study should determine the impacts and feasibility of its implementation and include further investigation into the legal authority under current legislation to adopt an inclusionary zoning policy. Should positive results be identified, the City should consider incorporation of such policies in its new Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw in order to further support the Kingston Model. The City might consider waiting until the draft Provincial Policy Statement on Housing is finalized to determine whether it will include this type of requirement.

26) It is recommended that the Kingston Model promote and support the initiatives set out in the Kingston Transportation Master Plan by encouraging affordable housing development in close proximity to public transportation and promoting affordable housing development in inner city locations and underutilized areas.

27) It is recommended that the Kingston Model promote and support the initiatives set out in the Kingston Cycling and Pathways Study by encouraging affordable housing development in inner city and redevelopment areas that would facilitate pedestrian, bicycle and other forms of non-vehicular transportation.

28) It is recommended that the City approach CMHC with a view to taking over administration of the RRAP Program. The City should review the most appropriate internal organizational structure to deliver the program and the financial impacts of undertaking program administration.

29) It is recommended that the City approach CMHC with a view to taking over administration of the Emergency Repair Program. The City should review the most appropriate internal organizational structure to deliver the program and the financial impacts of undertaking program administration.

30) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Team ensure that the City takes advantage of as many of sources of federal and provincial funds as possible to support an active affordable housing development program and regularly monitors federal, provincial and other funding sources to identify emerging opportunities. The City should continue to advocate strongly for increased levels of ongoing federal and provincial financial support to assist in the provision of all forms of housing and support along the housing continuum.

31) It is recommended that the City try and tie new rent supplement units to new affordable development projects wherever possible in order to contribute to the financial feasibility of these developments and continue to request expanded funding for additional units under this Provincial Program.

32) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Team explore partnership opportunities with local organizations pursuing innovative forms of affordable housing, such as affordable home ownership initiatives being undertaken by the Kingston Chapter of Habitat for Humanity, to expand the range of housing alternatives available at all ends of the housing continuum.

33) It is recommended that the City commence a pilot Portable Rent Subsidy program that would start with 25 units in the first year and add a further 25 units per year for the following three years. At that time, an evaluation should be undertaken to determine whether the program is meeting its goals and objectives and should be continued, expanded or terminated.

The Portable Subsidy Program should also be used to provide support for the development of new affordable housing projects by incorporating tenants receiving these subsidies into such developments. The City should also monitor Provincial announcements regarding Provincial Rent Supplement Program funding for Service Managers and adjust the scale of its municipally-financed program accordingly.

34) It is recommended that the City establish and maintain a Municipal Affordable Housing Revolving Fund by means of an annual contribution of $100,000. These funds should be allocated by the Affordable Housing Team to support a variety of activities related to affordable housing developments.

* Full report can be found on the City of Kingston website: www.cityofkingston.ca/residents/social/housing/kmahd/reports.asp
in the City. Funds should be provided on a loan basis at 1% below prime with repayment commencing upon the development of the project.

35) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Co-ordinator develop and conduct training programs for local affordable housing stakeholders to assist in building local capacity for affordable housing development. The Co-ordinator should seek the assistance of organizations currently making available appropriate training packages, such as CMHC, the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association, the Canadian Homebuilders Association, the Canadian Real Estate Association, the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association, the Co-operative Housing Federation of Canada and the Ontario Professional Planners Institute.

36) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Co-ordinator conduct a survey among housing stakeholders to identify the topics of greatest interest and importance with which to initiate capacity building training and education in affordable housing.

37) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Co-ordinator commence gathering materials and resources for the Kingston Affordable Housing Resource Centre and should commence the establishment of the Kingston Model website. This website should be linked to the City of Kingston website and to other relevant websites. A network of stakeholders should be established for the circulation of new materials, RFP’s, applications forms, newsletters and other key information on affordable housing.

38) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Co-ordinator place a strong emphasis on bringing together potential partners to enhance capacity for affordable housing developments. Typical examples could include private and non-profit housing providers; non-profit housing providers and service agencies; government departments at different levels; volunteer agencies and self-help housing groups; and so on.

39) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Team monitor policies and programs of senior levels of government and recommend to Council areas where they might advocate for change and improvement to more effectively meet affordable housing needs. The Affordable Housing Co-ordinator should participate actively in associations such as the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association, the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association and the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association in order to facilitate exchanges of information and to help develop support for advocating change in senior government policies and programs.

40) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Team ensure that members of Council and local ratepayers in areas where new affordable housing developments are being considered are consulted and involved from the earliest stages of such developments. Further, when new affordable housing initiatives are being considered, stakeholders should be widely consulted for input regarding the design and delivery of such initiatives. A particular effort should be made to involve potential occupants of such developments in the consultation process.

41) It is recommended that the Affordable Housing Co-ordinator monitor the success of the Kingston Model in achieving its objectives, update the analysis of housing needs on a regular basis and prepare an annual report card documenting activities and achievements of the Kingston Model each year and identifying needs, goals and objectives for the following year.

42) It is recommended that the City of Kingston place responsibility for day-to-day operations of the Kingston Model with the Housing Division. Day-to-day operations should be carried out by existing staff of the Housing Division with the following time allocation:

- 10% of the time of the Housing Manager
- 25% of the time of the Housing Policy Co-ordinator
- 10% of the time of the Housing Secretary

A maximum of $30,000 should be set aside annually for equipment, supplies, communications and space rental for activities related to the Kingston Model.

Should the Portable Rent Subsidy, Land Banking/Land Trust and Affordable Housing Revolving Fund Programs be established, 25% of the time of one existing program administrator should be allocated to operations of these programs.

* Full report can be found on the City of Kingston website: www.cityofkingston.ca/residents/social/housing/kmahd/reports.asp
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Should the City be successful in obtaining agreement from CMHC to act as its agent in the delivery of the RRAP Program, it should ensure that program administration costs do not exceed the amount of funds received from CMHC for administration of the Program.

The City should actively pursue administrative funds available through RRAP, the Federal-Provincial Affordable Housing Program and any other affordable housing programs to help cover the costs of operating the Kingston Model.

43) It is recommended that the City of Kingston financially support the following affordable housing development/subsidy program:

- 100 units per year developed primarily under the Federal-Provincial Affordable Housing Program. These units would be financially assisted locally through providing municipal incentives (reducing or altering municipal fees and charges), equalization of property taxes to the residential rate and the donation of surplus municipal lands where possible.
- 25 RGI units per year over four years funded through a municipal Portable Rent Subsidy program at an estimated cost of $150,000 in year one, $300,000 in year two, $450,000 in year three and $600,000 in year four.
- An active land banking program (costs to be reported on later in 2005 by staff)
- An annual municipal contribution of $100,000 to an Affordable Housing Revolving Fund, to be loaned out at 1% below prime to assist proponents in the start-up stages of affordable housing developments, with repayment commencing when projects are developed.

44) It is recommended that the proposed Affordable Housing Team work together with local housing providers to bring the suggested demonstration projects to reality.
Executive Summary: Community Plan on Housing and Homelessness in Kingston

Produced by United Way serving Kingston, Frontenac, Lennox & Addington
The 2009 Community Plan on Homelessness and Housing is a collaborative community effort, coordinated and developed by the United Way serving KFL&A. Volunteers and staff analyzed data, consulted extensively with community members, researched other homelessness plans and developed recommendations about ways to tackle the issue of homelessness in Kingston.

FACTORS LEADING TO HOMELESSNESS

The factors leading to homelessness are numerous and complex. The following were identified as factors that may lead to homelessness in Kingston:

1. Poverty
2. Vacancy Rates
3. High Rents
4. Affordable Housing, Social Housing Registry Waitlist
5. Health Issues
6. Mental Illness and Addictions
7. Government Policies
8. Personal
9. Emergency Shelter Usage

KEY DATA FINDINGS

Kingston is a city divided. With a highly educated work force and relatively stable jobs, it is an attractive place to live. However, many in the city have a hard time making ends meet.

There is a wide income gap

Kingston’s median family income is $67,908, lower than the provincial median income ($69,156) but higher than the national median income ($63,866).

There are large discrepancies in family income within Kingston. The highest median family income is $131,948 in one neighbourhood and the lowest is $35,247 in another.

Ontario’s minimum wage has increased but individuals and families struggle

Minimum wage rates have increased from $6.85 in 2004 to $9.50 in 2009, an increase of 38.68%. In spite of these increases, a person making minimum wage, working steadily through the year, will find it challenging to pay rent as well as eat healthy food.
Low Income Cutoff (LICO)

LICO for Kingston (urban area with a population range between 100,000 and 499,999) is between $18,260 for a single person and $34,671 for a family of four. In Kingston, 13.4% of the population (19,820) people live below the Low Income Cutoff level.

Affordability

With high rents, many individuals and families struggle to pay rent and afford healthy food and utilities. Families and individuals who pay more than 30% of their income on rent do not have enough money left for necessities. By definition, a household spending 50% or more of its income on shelter would fall below the affordability standard.

One in two households in Kingston spend more than 30% of their income on housing. Even worse, one in five spend half their income or more on housing, leaving very little for other basic needs.

Many struggle to pay for utilities. Gas has increased by 62% and heating fuel has increased by 89% since 2003. More and more people are accessing the utility banks in Kingston.

Kingston’s average rents have increased

Vacancy rates in Kingston are low. Wait list and wait times for social housing are high. With low vacancy rates and long social housing registry waitlists, there are not enough affordable housing units in Kingston.

New affordable housing is being built but is not always affordable. The amounts identified as ‘affordable’ in fact are unaffordable for many. The average rents in Kingston are high.

Over the last 5 years, average rents have increased between 14.6% and 55.9%. Kingston has the highest rent for a three-bedroom apartment in the province of Ontario.

A “healthy” vacancy rate is considered to be 3 to 5%. Kingston’s vacancy rate is a low 1.3%.

The number of households on the centralized waiting list for social housing has increased from 979 in 2005 to 1,073 in 2008, a 10.6% increase. Just 321 households from this list were housed in 2008.

The approximate wait time for families is 6–24 months, for seniors 2 years and for singles it is 4 years or more.

The demand for services is increasing

More residents are accessing meal programs, food bank usage, addiction services and counselling. Since 2006, there has been a 6% increase in the number of bed nights in the emergency hostels. Kingston Hostels and Shelters all report longer stays and an increase in the number of people turned away.

Meal providers in Kingston have seen a 4% increase in the number of meals served in 2008. Partners in Mission Food Bank has seen a 12% increase in demand for their services. 7,454 children accessed their services in 2008. The Food Sharing Project served 9,092 students in 2008, up from 5,218 students the previous year.

Addiction Services report an increase in the need for services and have added additional programs over the past couple of years. The Kingston Detoxification Centre reported that the length of stay has increased by approximately 25%.

Cost of poverty and homelessness

Poverty has a significant cost for governments. The federal and provincial governments are losing at least $10.4 billion to $13.1 billion a year due to poverty.

It is estimated that the cost of a homeless person is about $134,000 per person per year. People who are homeless are more likely to access health care services, many of them are also more likely to spend time in correctional facilities. All studies indicate that it costs less to spend directly on supported social housing.

"Homeless people want housing. Continuums are neither linear nor continuous, and blind referrals don’t work"

Iain De Jong, Manager of Toronto’s Streets to Homes Program
HOUSING FIRST: AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

There are essentially two approaches to homelessness. One approach is to provide a continuum of housing services, with shelters, transitional housing and affordable housing, along with related support services to move individuals and families through this continuum. The other is securing housing as a first step and then addressing other specific needs after the housing is in place.

In recent years, several cities across North America have adopted the Housing First model, which eschews the continuum approach in favour of addressing the most pressing need: stable, sustainable permanent housing.

Established in New York City in 1992, the Housing First model places homeless people directly into permanent housing first and then addresses other specific needs after the housing is in place. This model is successful when paired with intensive supports and services for the individuals and families.

The Housing First model has since been adopted in Canadian cities including Toronto, Halifax, Calgary and Vancouver. Evidence compiled in those cities suggests that the approach has resulted in reduced hospitalization rates and lengths of stay, fewer court appearances and arrests and, most importantly, clients reported higher self-esteem with an improvement in health and safety. Moving homeless people directly into stable, permanent housing has proven to increase their ability to learn vital life skills and allow them to become self-sufficient.

Additional evidence suggests that Housing First reduces costs borne by the community and taxpayers. It costs less to place people in permanent supportive housing than to accommodate them in emergency shelters.

There are some successful examples of the Housing First model in Kingston. Kingston Home Base Housing provides permanent housing for homeless people in units on Joseph Street. Early reports show that this initiative has had a positive impact on shelter use. Frontenac Community Mental Health Services and Providence Care Mental Health Services have also taken this approach with some of their clients.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Shelters/Hostels**

   There will always be a need for shelters and hostels for those who face crises and emergencies. Our community needs to ensure that we continue to provide support services, beds and meal programs for those who are homeless as well as those who are at risk of losing their homes.

   We recommend sustaining and maintaining shelter beds to meet the community emergency needs. We need to identify ways to reduce the number of chronically homeless people in emergency shelters and reduce the average stay in emergency shelters to less than seven days.

2. **Housing First**

   Building on the success of Housing First models across North America and local initiatives, working with community partner agencies, we recommend that a local Housing First approach be developed that recognizes housing as a first priority with the required supports to help maintain tenancy.

   We recommend that a Community Leadership Group work with all stakeholders to develop a plan to oversee the implementation of this model. A comprehensive plan for coordinated case management will be critical to the success of this approach.

   All levels of government, funding agencies, shelter providers, developers and the private sector need to work together to find new, innovative ways to increase the housing supply to eliminate homelessness.

3. **Keep People Housed**

   One of the best ways to reduce homelessness is to prevent people from losing their homes. We recommend that place-based services and eviction prevention support need to be in place to help people stay housed, with fewer evictions and more rent subsidies in place across the city, including support for low-income seniors and families.

A copy of the full report is available at [www.unitedwaykfla.ca](http://www.unitedwaykfla.ca) or by calling (613) 542-2674.
BARRIEFIELD HOUSING
CONCEPT DESIGNS

1 OVERVIEW

The Department of National Defense is considering releasing specific properties it owns along Highway 15. Three properties are within the Village of Barriefield. These will be offered first to the City at a nominal cost, provided they are used for the development of affordable housing.

Hughes Downey Architects was engaged to investigate the site layout feasibility of the development of these sites for affordable housing in a manner consistent with the intent of the Barriefield District Study and the character of the Village.

Building affordable housing in Kingston’s only Residential Heritage District offers unique challenges because of unique design parameters and the sensitive historic atmosphere of the Village. Requirements for low-cost construction, smaller units and denser development may have fit in with the socio-economic situation when the Village was created but may compete with current approaches to the preservation of the Village’s ambiance.

It must be understood that this current offer of properties in Barriefield presents a great opportunity for the City of Kingston to have control over the development of these properties and, in the process, to address concerns of the Village residents regarding the future of any vacant land.

Apart from underground services and their associated access structures, the sites are vacant, with a variety of grassed fields, thickets of dense brush, trees and open areas. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessments have been completed for all three sites and no indication of contamination has been identified.

The approach taken for the housing model was to develop a simple housing unit, using the architectural character of the village as a basis and designed to respond to the variety in village housing stock. It is one and a half storey on one side and two on the other, thereby offering different wall heights while employing the same structural components. This repetition of the building system is meant to address the economy of this proposed project, while its combination with other units and additional components were intended to provide visual variety and improve energy efficiency.
MAP OF BARRIEFIELD SHOWING THE 3 SITES
2 PROCESS

2.1 GATHERING BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Staff from Hughes Downey Architects visited the sites and conducted meetings with City Staff to gather background information. The following publications, maps and studies were reviewed by Hughes Downey Architects in reference to this project:


4. **Township of Pittsburgh Zoning By-law Number 32-74** – Specifically Section 9 (2) Special R2 Zones (a) Barriefield (R2-1).

5. **Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing** – Recommended unit sizes for affordable housing development and the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program (AHP) 2009 Extension.


7. **Aerial Photographs of Barriefield** and surrounding area.

8. **Digital Mapping of Barriefield** – including site grades, streets, trees, buildings and landscaping.

9. **Site Services Mapping** – including water, sanitary, gas and steam lines.

10. **Barriefield Building Review** – a study conducted by this Firm in 1988 to better understand the relationship of the buildings to their lots as well as the proportional qualities of the width of the structures to their height.

2.2 STUDY OF R2-1 ZONING

All three sites are currently zoned Institutional (I) and any residential development would require a Zoning Amendment. The Barriefield R2-1 Zone is a specific zone intended to guide development in keeping with the character of the Village of Barriefield.

As an exercise only, Hughes Downey explored how many units could be built if the site were developed under the R2-1 Zoning. Development would have to be individual single family homes on separate lots. This type of development did not appear to be beneficial to the character of the village or conducive to Affordability, Environmental Sustainability or Energy Efficiency. In order to meet the Zoning requirements, building size would be greater than the maximum allowed for under the affordable housing model and would not meet the model’s required balance of one-bedroom units to larger units.
Although the approach of single family homes on individual lots may not lead to Affordable, Environmentally Sustainable and Energy Efficient housing, it is the most likely approach for private development of the sites and was explored as a comparison.

Allowing for the required landscape buffer along Highway 15, it appears that approximately 42 house lots could be created if the whole site were divided into minimum sized lots. In contrast, if this number of units were provided in multi-unit buildings, they could take up a fraction of the area and leave significant landscape buffering and open area space.
3 BACKGROUND

3.1 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

This project is part of a larger initiative by the City of Kingston to build housing across the community that is affordable, accessible, and sustainable. There is an opportunity to acquire these three sites from the Department of National Defense as Federal Surplus Lands at minimal cost for affordable housing.

Based on the current waiting list for Rent-Geared-to-Income (RGI) housing in Kingston, the greatest demand is for one bedroom rental units. However, over the past few years, there has also been a demand for larger (3-4 bedroom) accessible units as these are not available within the social housing portfolio or in the private sector rental market. The preferred proportions of unit sizes is 60% one bedroom, 20% two bedroom, 10% three bedroom and 10% four bedroom. There should be two or three larger (three to four bedroom) accessible units.

The New Rental Housing Component of the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program (AHP) is an initiative to provide funding for new self-contained rental housing for households on, or eligible to be on, social housing lists, with emphasis on low-income seniors and persons with disabilities. Other target groups include Aboriginal persons, recent immigrants, victims of domestic violence and the working poor.

The average combined federal and provincial AHP contribution is $120,000 per unit. A maximum of $150,000 is available to projects which incorporate enhanced energy efficiency and provide units for low-income seniors and persons with disabilities.

Buildings must meet the energy efficiency requirements of the proposed 2012 Ontario Building Code. Buildings under Part 9 of the Building Code must meet the performance requirements of Energuide 80 or the equivalent. Accessible and barrier-free design is encouraged.

3.2 BARRIEFIELD

The Village of Barriefield was reviewed as a Heritage District in 1978. It was one of the Province’s first designated Heritage Districts, and has therefore had any development monitored by the Municipality through design review by the Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee (now the Kingston Heritage Committee). The design review was originally based on the 1978 study and is now based on an updated District Plan Study, completed in 1992. The intent of the guidance provided in the Studies is to endeavour to have alterations to the district carried out in a manner consistent with the historic ambiance. That ambiance is one derived from the historic, hand-built, unadorned structures using local materials and a basic knowledge of the carpenter/boat builder’s craft. It was a village of the working class.

It is intended that original components of historic structures are retained in order that evidence of the techniques and tools of the time are preserved and held distinct from the machined quality of today’s building components.
The Municipal Bylaws and District Plan offer specific requirements for any new development in an attempt to retain the quality of the village. Any new building must first address these requirements and be reviewed by the Heritage Committee for consideration of the design and how it responds to the architectural character and setting in the Village.

3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Achieving Environmental Sustainability and Energy Efficiency in construction is most successful when an Integrated Design Process is followed. This process requires a commitment to more involvement in the process by the client, consultants such as energy simulators, engineers and landscape architects at earlier stages of the process to encourage interdisciplinary solutions to specific issues. More direct communication between disciplines throughout the design process helps with appropriate decision making and balancing of factors relating to the design. Cost consultants should be closely involved in the choices of means and methods from early in the process to allow decisions to be made before design development goes too far to allow corrections. Since these sites are in a sensitive heritage area, communications with the City’s Heritage Committee and local residents early on are also a part of this process.

It is likely that an Integrated Design Process would offer alternatives not explored in these initial concept designs included in this report. For the purposes of this exercise, it is necessary to address some fundamental design issues regarding environmental sustainability in design because they relate to the layout of the site. Choices of materials and systems are finalized at more detailed design stages, but planning choices with respect to physical form and site layouts certainly relate to the energy efficiency of buildings. Heating and cooling loads over time account for the greatest consumption of energy in construction and using the physical form of the buildings to reduce these loads reduces the dependence on mechanical means to achieve comfort, and therefore improves energy efficiency.

Reduction of heat loss in the winter and heat gains in the summer is directly related to the form of buildings. Compact shapes with reduced surface to volume ratios reduce heat losses. Apartments are more efficient than detached homes because of reduced exterior walls and roofs. However, the heritage building forms in the village are predominantly single detached homes. It was felt that developing designs that would be similar in size and shape to the existing buildings, but housing several units rather than a single unit in one building would be an appropriate compromise.

Orientation of the buildings and openings also affect energy efficiency and relate to the site layouts. Increasing passive solar heat gains in the winter means ensuring predominantly southern orientation for windows and avoiding overshadowing on that side. Reducing heat gains in the summer means a combination of shading windows and reducing windows, particularly west-facing ones.
3.4 OFFICIAL PLAN

Kingston’s Draft Official Plan identifies specific planning directions relating to Barriefield as a Heritage Conservation District. These include:

1. **Land uses** to be limited to detached dwellings and limited numbers of semi-detached dwellings (being 10% or less of the total). Churches, publicly-funded schools, other community facilities, senior citizens homes and small scale commercial uses are also permitted.

2. **New lots** must have full street frontage and be similar to the lot pattern and grid road structure of the heritage area.

3. **New residential and institutional units** must be low profile and compatible with adjacent properties.

4. A **landscaped buffer along Highway 15** must be maintained and no new structure will be permitted to impede the view of St. Mark’s Church from either Main St. or Highway 15.

An Official Plan Amendment would be necessary to allow for a denser residential development than detached dwellings.

3.5 ZONING

All three sites are currently zoned Institutional (I). Part 1, on Main Street next to the church, is adjacent to properties zoned as Residential (R1). Part 2 is adjacent to the school, which is zoned Institutional (I-8). Part 3 is adjacent to the hwy #2 / Hwy #15 intersection and heritage properties zoned Residential (R2-1).

The R2-1 zoning is a special zone for Barriefield recognizing the heritage nature of the village and allowing for smaller lot areas and setbacks in keeping with the existing urban patterns. It is assumed that future residential developments on the sites would need to respond to the requirements of the R2-1 zone.

The approved buildings allowed in the R2-1 zone are existing dwelling houses, single family dwelling houses, converted dwelling houses or boarding houses. Zoning amendments would be required to allow for duplexes, triplexes and apartments. In addition, an 18m setback is required from Highway 15.

R2-1 zoning provisions include:

1. **Lot Area** (min.): 464.5 m²
2. **Lot Frontage** (min.): 15.24m
3. **Front Yard Depth** (min.): 1.2m
4. **Exterior Side Yard Width** (min.): 1.2m
5. **Interior Side Yard Width** (min.):
   1. If 1 yard: 3.04m
   2. If more than 1 yard and 3.04m on any other side: 1.2m
6. **Dwelling Unit Area** (min.):
   1. Boarding house: 18.58 m²/person
   2. Other permitted dwelling house: 92.9 m²/unit

7. **Yards for Accessory Buildings** (min.): 1.2 m and not allowed in front yard

8. **Setback** (min.): 7.3 m

### 3.6 ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENTS

The Department of National Defense has owned Parts 1 and 2 since 1909 and Part 3 since 1840, but they have not been used by the base for any military purposes.

Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessments of all the sites were completed in March, 2007. Apart from services and their associated structures, the sites are vacant, with a variety of grassed fields, treed areas and thickets of dense brush. There is no evidence that buildings have ever been constructed on any of the sites.

**Potential for Contamination:** According to the assessments, there have been no activities on the sites contributing to actual or potential contamination, although the service route through Part 1 has been identified as a potential migratory route for contaminants, though nothing specific was identified.

**Archaeological Significance:** The Environmental Site Assessments indicate that Parts 1 and 3 have high to moderate archaeological significance due to documented historic period land use as 19th century civilian farmsteads and a grave location, although nothing specific was identified. Part 2 is not identified as an area of specific archaeological significance.

**Part 1** - a triangular lot bordered by Main Street, Highway 15 and St. Mark’s church - is an approximately 0.86 acre manicured grass field with limited trees, sloping to the north-west. There is a water metering station in the south-east portion. Water and sanitary service lines cross the property along the east and south edges, and a sanitary service line runs along the north-east side. The soil is shallow clay and loam.

**Part 2** - next to the school - is an approximately 1.85 acre grassy open area with several thickets of dense brush, gently sloping to the south. There are indications that the site may have been used as a staging area for a nearby quarry at one time. A parking lot associated with the adjacent school is located in the south west corner and there is an electrical control box next to the road along the south edge. Water and sanitary service lines run north-south across the property along the west side. Bedrock is very close to the surface, and exposed in places. The site is, in the words of the Environmental Site Assessment, “heavily used by deer”.

**Part 3** - between George St and Highway 15 - is an approximately 1.38 acre property with a grassed field to the north and forested land with several thickets of dense brush to the south. Sanitary and water lines run north-south along the west side. A gas line runs east-west along the north edge of the site and then north-south along the west side. A steam line from the Base Central Heating Plant, located on the east side of highway 15, runs east-west across the centre of the site and then to the south along the west side of the site. There are also several service vaults and ventilation pipes associated with the steam line. Several trails cross the site,
including one which is “heavily used by deer”. There are indications that the site has been used for recreational purposes by local residents.

4 BARRIEFIELD VILLAGE HOUSING DESIGN

4.1 THE SITES

The three sites suggest different approaches for development.

1. **Part 1** is a small triangular site with frontage on Main St., backing on to Highway 15 and St. Mark’s Church. This suggests a limited number of lots on Main Street, leaving an easement for the sanitary and water service lines on the south side, open space at the corner, and a landscaped buffer along Highway 15 and at the rear of the site. This would maintain the sight lines for the church from the Highway.

2. **Part 2** is a narrow, deep property running along the east side of the JE Horton Public School property. This school is presently under-enrolled and is slated to close. If this happens, it is likely that the property will be developed, whether as another community facility, residential units or a combination of building types. If possible, it would be best if development of Part 2 is integrated into whatever happens to the school site.

   **Common facility for use of village** - The building contains space and services that may be modified at a modest cost to support public gatherings, events and programming to serve residents of Barriefield and the Base. It would certainly be beneficial if some of the grounds, like the playing field and hard surface spaces next to the building were retained to support these activities.

   **Part 2** on its own is deep and narrow with access only along the south end. The lot is only wide enough for a somewhat inefficient use of the site having a street running north-south with lots on one side. Incorporating it with the school property could allow for alternate and more efficient street layouts.

3. **Part 3** is adjacent to the existing heritage residential area. It is accessible from two sides and wide enough to allow for a street with houses on both sides as well as a possible continuation of regent Street. It was important to consider that a right-of-way will likely be required to ensure no development occurs over the existing service lines.

4.2 HOUSING MODULE

The combined requirements for affordability, environmental sustainability and energy efficiency all suggest a compact form. A simple 24’x24’ housing unit was developed, with a one bedroom unit on each floor level, including kitchen, dining, living, bedroom, bathroom and utility space.

The architectural character of the village was used as a basis. The lots and houses in the village vary in size and shape. The main housing component was designed to respond to the variety in village housing stock. It is one and a half storey on one side and two on the other, thereby offering different wall heights while employing the same structural components.
This repetition of the building system is meant to address the economy of this proposed project.

Two housing units would be put together to make up a building with four one-bedroom units and a building footprint of 1150 ft² (107m²). Additional components, such as bedroom units, porches, dormers, stair units and pergolas can be added to make up larger units, to provide visual variety and improve energy efficiency.

This housing model offers the consistency and economies of a modular system while allowing for flexibility to respond to the general character of the village and solar access.

### 4.3 SITE PLAN

A site plan was developed for Part 3 using the housing module system for the buildings. It was felt that development for Part 2 would be best accommodated as part of a larger plan incorporating the school property and that Part 1 was only large enough for two or three house lots and the required open area space.

Lot sizes were increased to provide additional amenity space and parking for the larger number of units per lot. 32 units were accommodated on eight lots in the south portion of the property, leaving room for community gardens to the north and landscaped buffers along George St. and Highway 15.

The rationale for development of the site plan include:

1. Using the housing modules in different combinations for visual variety.
2. Using combined forms which are longer in the east-west direction to increase passive solar gains in the winter and decrease westerly heat gains in the summer.
3. Providing a road directly from Wellington St. to avoid increasing traffic through the village.
4. Maintaining the service route along the west side of the property. This would form laneway access for parking. A landscaped buffer area would remain between the service route and George St.
5. Maintaining open area space for landscape buffering.
6. Keeping existing vegetation where possible.
Introduction:
The following projects represent the joining of two goals often thought to be antithetical – affordable housing and historic preservation. While historic preservation projects in these examples most often involve the incorporation of affordable housing within historic buildings as a means of saving the heritage value of properties, the accommodation of new home developments within historic areas is not new as these examples will show. As with each of these examples, the Barriefield development remains unique.

1. Woollen Mill Project, Peterborough, Ontario

The Woollen Mill affordable housing community offers many low-income families in Peterborough a place to call home while preserving one of the city’s architectural landmarks.

Originally constructed in 1911, the Woollen Mill was a factory that produced knitted goods for Canadian soldiers fighting overseas during World War I. In 1954, it was purchased by Sir Sandford Fleming College. Used for classrooms and offices until 1997, the building sat idle for several years before the college approached the Peterborough Housing Corporation in 2001 to donate the building and land for low-rent apartments.

Through a partnership with the federal, provincial and municipal governments, Peterborough Housing Corporation gave the Woollen Mill a $7.7 million makeover, which included $1.45 million in funding through the Canada-Ontario Affordable Housing Program.
2. **Shelly School Apartments, West York Pennsylvania**
   The Shelly School Apartments, West York, Pennsylvania, consist of two former public school buildings built in 1897 and 1905. Completed in 2002, the two buildings were rehabilitated into 17 apartments: 4 units in the 1897 building and 13 units in the 1905 building, 5 of which are accessible.

3. **Mary Andrews Clark Memorial Home, Los Angeles, California**
   Mary Andrews Clark Memorial Home, a 1912 building that The Los Angeles Times has called "architecturally one of the most imposing structures in this city." The building also happens to serve as a 153-unit single-room occupancy (SRO) affordable housing development.
4. **Notre Dame Academy, Cleveland, Ohio**

In Cleveland, the Notre Dame Academy, a five-story Gothic Revival structure built in 1914 as a school for girls, is the largest building in the area, with its front in the neighborhood and its three back wings towering over the west slope of Rockefeller Park. Despite its impressive architecture, the building stood vacant for 20 years and fell into such disrepair that neighbors demanded its demolition. Today, the outside of this historic landmark has been restored to its original condition and it offers 73 independent-living apartments for low-income seniors, along with commercial space and a community center.

5. **Infill Housing, Charleston, South Carolina**

In Charleston, South Carolina, the local housing authority in the 1980s created infill housing with "piazzas" (high-ceilinged porches historically designed to capture sea breezes) and other features to fit the character of neighborhoods that are part of the oldest designated historic district in the country.
6. **Homeless Safe Haven, Buffalo, New York**

Construction on Lakeshore Behavior Health's sixteen-bed homeless housing facility includes an historic brick structure that is being rehabbed and expanded with an addition at the corner of Sycamore Street and Michigan Avenue in Buffalo New York.

7. **Dalhousie Church Lofts, Brantford Ontario**

River of Life Baptist Church was converted into 17 affordable apartments. The historic church, a brick building with the original stained glass windows, was vacant. Meanwhile, the city had a shortage of affordable housing in the downtown to meet the needs of moderate- and lower-income citizens.

8. **The Wiseman Centre, St. John’s Newfoundland**
The Salvation Army and community, federal and provincial government groups worked together to renovate a heritage building as a new, expanded centre, offering housing (30 rental homes) and support services to homeless men.

Several groups contributed to the $3-million Wiseman Centre renovation: CMHC and the province of Newfoundland and Labrador: $750,000; through the Affordable Housing Initiative and $240,000 in Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP) funding. The federal government, through the National Homelessness Initiative: $1,397,500. The province conveyed the Wiseman Centre property, valued at $396,000, to the Salvation Army. The Salvation Army raised $1,225,436. The corporate community provided in-kind support of $119,570. The centre receives roughly $600,000 a year for operating costs from the provincial Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment.
9. **Bishop’s Landing, Halifax NS.**
Cranberry Commons is a 22-unit co-housing development in Burnaby, B.C. It is in an established
neighbourhood that supported the project. Residents enjoy the many innovative features,
many of which posed challenges, including some regulatory issues like parking requirements.

![Bishop’s Landing, Halifax NS.](image)

10. **Atira Women’s Residence, New Westminster B.C.**
The economic downturn has resulted in a short-term shot in the arm for affordable housing
in New Westminster. The building, which was vacant when the Salient Group acquired it in
2005, is to be managed by the non-profit Atira Women’s Resource Society and will provide
23 units for women and children who are homeless or at risk of being homeless. Provincial
agency B.C. Housing has provided some financial assistance to renovate the building.

![Atira Women’s Residence, New Westminster B.C.](image)
11. **Guardian Angels, Hastings, MN**  
Guardian Angels is a newly developed rental community located in historic area of Hastings, Minnesota, providing new townhomes to needy families.

![Image of Guardian Angels]

12. **Historic Faubourg Tremé, New Orleans, Louisiana**  
Local artist and urban planner Robert Tannen of Creative Industry has collaborated with world-renowned architect Frank Gehry and green building advocacy group Global Green USA to create a house design that is affordable, sustainable, and compatible with most neighborhoods in New Orleans, including historic districts.

The innovative modular design was geared toward incorporating sustainability, affordability, and preservation of traditional local architectural styles to yield a model that would best facilitate the return of New Orleans residents displaced by Hurricane Katrina. Particularly suited for historic neighborhoods, the shotgun-influenced design is a compatible and appropriate fit among existing architecturally significant buildings.

![Image of historic Faubourg Tremé]

13. The Historic Green New Orleans Initiative
14. **Brewery building in La Crosse, Wisconsin**

An historic former brewery building in La Crosse, WI (pop. 50,000) has been converted into mixed-income apartments in a cooperative venture with the city and a major local employer, a regional medical center.

The project, the Historic Gund Brewery Lofts, was developed by Gorman & Company, Inc., a Madison, WI area firm that specializes in historic preservation, affordable housing, and niche projects that typically solve an identified problem or meet a specific need of the local community.

Opened in late summer 2007, Gund Brewery Lofts exhibits multiple different development traits, including historic preservation, adaptive re-use, infill, and workforce and employer-assisted housing.
15. **Accordia Housing Development, Cambridge, UK**

The modern housing development of Accordia has been designed to complement the character of the conservation area that surrounds it. The spatial variety of the surrounding neighbourhood - characterized by individual villas and denser Victorian housing, along with the spacious Botanic Garden nearby - has been convincingly adopted into Accordia, which delivers generous open space for walking and for play. The development, as yet incomplete, is set in a strong and protected green structure of magnificent mature trees, and its legible road layout displays an openness unusual in modern housing.

Accordia became the first housing scheme to win the Stirling Prize in 2008. Close to the centre of Cambridge, the scheme has been fitted densely into a site which formerly housed government offices and prefabricated WWII buildings.
16. New Lanark Homes, North Lanarkshire, Scotland

New Lanark is a World Heritage Site, and it has been restored as a living, working community. New Lanark Homes is a subsidiary company of New Lanark Trust. It is the operating company, a private landlord, which rents the 45 domestic residential tenancies that the Trust owns in the historic village of New Lanark. These are mostly tenemental, upper level flats, which were the original mill workers' housing. While the external building is historic the interiors are fully modernised, with either 2 or 3 bedrooms, plus a kitchen, bathroom, and sitting room. Most of the flats share a communal central heating system and an additional charge is paid as part of the rent.

The resident population is around 185. In addition to the 45 rented properties, there are 20 houses which are privately owned, and which come on the open market from time to time. New Lanark Homes has an 'open' tenancy application system, and applications will be accepted from anyone. In an average year there are only a couple of new tenancy lettings. Once people are resident they tend to stay, so turnover is low. New Lanark Homes is a recognized Scottish charity.
17. **Granville New Homes, London Borough of Brent**

Granville New Homes was the first housing developed by the London Borough of Brent in over 20 years. It was designed as a showcase development for the wider South Kilburn regeneration area and provides a range of housing units, a new building for a local children’s and community centre and a pocket park for the wider community.

The scheme’s distinctly patterned facades offer a contemporary twist to traditional brickwork, yet careful attention to detail has ensured that it integrates seamlessly with the surrounding conservation area & historical homes.
18. **79 unit residential development, Hegianwandweg, Zurich**

Developed by a co-operative housing association, Hegianwandweg has a strong community character and the layout of the flats can be adapted to suit tenants' needs. It is located 11 minutes away from Zurich city centre by tram, yet the site has a distinctively suburban flavour. It is situated between an area of 1930s blocks of flats, arranged in parallel, and a 1970s high rise home for elderly people. The homes have not been built as social housing, although they still offer very good value for money compared to what is available on the Zurich housing market.
19. **Queen Elizabeth Park, Guildford, UK - Forster Road, Guildford, Surrey**

   Parkland and green areas are a key feature of the Queen Elizabeth Park housing development. Previously an army barracks and depot, 525 houses and flats are being constructed on this 23 hectare (57 acre) site. The layout takes into account the preservation of over 1000 trees. Calming measures to the roads, and their detailing, help vehicular access blend into the environment.

   The elevational treatment of the initial stages is based on the arts and crafts movement, with later stages having more a contemporary aesthetic - including 'Surrey vernacular'. A total of 35% affordable housing is included which is either owner-occupier, shared ownership, or rental.
20. **Abode, Newhall, Harlow UK**

Located on the outskirts of Harlow, the Abode housing development combines exceptional design and planning with an environmentally sustainable approach. Described by John Prescott as 'a model of the communities we have to build', Abode combines the sense of occasion afforded by one-off houses with the economies of volume house building. Eighty-two dwellings range from single bedroom apartments at 57sq.m (614sq.ft), to five bedroom houses at 101sq.m (1087sq.ft).
21. **The Piggeries, Frome UK**

The sensitive design of the Piggeries development of affordable homes fits effortlessly with the surrounding historic terraces. The Piggeries is on the edge of the historic Trinity area, close to the centre of the historic market town of Frome and within its Conservation Area, which contains some of the oldest surviving industrial housing in England. The development comprises 71 houses and flats built in small blocks of between two and four storeys and differing in design, details, materials and colour, but forming a coherent whole that includes public and shared spaces. Parking is arranged in courtyards between the housing units.
22. **Beaufort Court, London UK**

The affordable housing development at Beaufort Court is thoroughly modern yet fits well with the surrounding Victorian red brick buildings. Beaufort Court consists of 65 dwellings, which have been constructed adjacent to an existing Peabody Estate. The houses and flats range in size and are arranged in three blocks round a communal area. There are 19 shared ownership flats, which sell at £115,230 (2003). The remaining houses and flats are social housing, key worker housing and part of a rough sleeper initiative.
23. **Grow Homes** in the Bois Franc development near Montreal, Quebec (above), Avi Friedman’s Grow Home and Next Home designs have been adopted across North America and Europe. Home ownership usually requires a big income and a move to the suburbs but two McGill architecture professors came up with an alternative. They came up with the design for the affordable and adaptable Grow Home. Since then, 10,000 models have been built across Canada, while versions of it have been exported around the world.

There are typically seven features that would characterize the Grow Home: it has (1) a narrow-front rowhouse, (2) small and with (3) unpartitioned space and (4) do-it-yourself components, built so as to have (5) a traditional appearance but (6) using cost-effective materials that (7) could be prefabricated. The Grow Home caught the imagination of buyers, especially young couples, either with a child or planning on having children soon, looking for a first home. However, the demographic appeal reached beyond that set of people. "Society is experiencing an amazing transition, a revolution," Friedman points out. "Demography is changing. We have many more single people, as well as couples without kids. The nuclear family is really becoming a minority." The change has tremendous implications for housing. The Grow Home, with its philosophy as a flexible living space, accommodated the different needs of a growing range of citizens. Not including land costs Grow Homes typically sell for between $15,000 to $45,000 less than other homes of comparable size.
The Grow Home also appeals to a more environmentally conscious era, having been identified by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation as a model of sustainable living. A smaller home exploits fewer natural resources to build and maintain, can be built more densely and the homes consume much less energy.
24. **Earthen Homes In The Town Of Guadix, Andalusia Spain**

White washed earth homes (some very small, some very large) dot the hillside in this town of Spain. Within this ancient town are many buildings and homes of architectural and historical significance.
Provincial and Local Policies, Legislation, and Regulations Pertinent to the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District

There are two provincial pieces of legislation that apply to any development proposal within the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District, the Provincial Policy Statement and the Ontario Heritage Act. Applicable sections of these policies that may have bearing on decisions affecting the subject lands are discussed below.

(i) The Ontario Heritage Act
The Ontario Heritage Act serves as one of the main pieces of legislation for cultural heritage conservation in Ontario. It is enabling legislation, meaning that government bodies have the authority to choose whether or not to exercise authority under the Act. Once a municipality chooses to do so, however, the specific requirements of the Act must

Heritage Conservation Districts - Section 41(1) of Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act enables the council of a municipality to designate the entire municipality or any part thereof as a Heritage Conservation District (HCD). A Heritage Conservation District designation allows a council to manage and guide change through the adoption of a district plan containing policies and guidelines for the conservation, protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources within the district. A Heritage Conservation District is intended to be more than a collection of heritage buildings; it protects viewscapes, green spaces, parks, watercourses, and a defined district’s distinctive sense of place and identity, focusing on the area as a comprehensive whole.

Under revisions to the Act in 2005, requirements concerning the content of a Heritage Conservation District Plan were clarified and guidelines were created to better manage change and development within a Heritage Conservation District. Any new heritage conservation plan or updated plan must comply with Subsection 41.1(5) of the Ontario Heritage Act, and should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- A statement of the objectives to be achieved in designating the area as a Heritage Conservation District;
- A statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the Heritage Conservation District;
- A description of the heritage attributes of the Heritage Conservation District and of properties in the district;
- Policy statements, guidelines and procedures for achieving the stated objectives and managing change in the Heritage Conservation District; and
- A description of the alterations or classes of alterations that are minor in nature and that the owner of property in the Heritage Conservation District may carry out or permit to be carried out on any part of the property, other than the interior of any structure or building on the property, without obtaining a permit under section 42. 2005, c. 6, s. 31.

The process of updating or creating a Heritage Conservation District Plan includes recommendations on implementing the plan including any necessary amendments to land use planning documents such as the city’s Official Plan, zoning by-laws, site plan control requirements, and other related policies. An update to an existing heritage plan is appealable to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).

Consistency with Heritage Conservation District Plan - The Act has specific clauses concerning consistency and conflict with heritage conservation district plans:

41.2(1) Despite any other general or special Act, if a heritage conservation district plan is in effect in a municipality, the council of the municipality shall not:

(a) Carry out any public work in the district that is contrary to the objectives set out in the plan; or
(b) Pass a by-law for any purpose that is contrary to the objectives set out in the plan.
41.2(2) In the event of a conflict between a heritage conservation district plan and a municipal by-law that affects the designated district, the plan prevails to the extent of the conflict, but in all other respects the by-law remains in full force.

**Erection and Demolition of Structures** - There are also provisions concerning the erection and demolition of structures:

42(1) No owner of property situated in a heritage conservation district that has been designated by a municipality under this Part shall do any of the following, unless the owner obtains a permit from the municipality to do so:

1. Alter, or permit the alteration of, any part of the property, other than the interior of any structure or building on the property.
2. Erect, demolish or remove any building or structure on the property or permit the erection, demolition or removal of such a building or structure.

(ii) **The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)**

The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. The PPS is the policy basis for the development and use of land and supports the provincial goal to enhance the quality of life for residents of Ontario. The preamble of the PPS states that it “provides for appropriate development while protecting resources of provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of the natural environment”.

The PPS contains three broad sections of policy that need to be analyzed together with all of the policies within the policy statement and the overall vision for Ontario’s land use planning system. These broad policies address a number of land development initiatives including managing and directing land use to achieve efficient development and land use patterns.

**Section 1.0 Building Strong Communities** - Section 1.4 contains specific policies that speak to providing an appropriate range of housing types and densities and promoting and establishing efficient use of land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities. These provisions would have to be considered in assessing any housing proposals on the subject lands, keeping in mind the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

**Section 2.0 Wise Use and Management of Resources** - Section 2.6 of the PPS contains policies regarding *Cultural Heritage and Archaeology*, and the following principles concerning heritage and archaeology are articulated:

- **2.6.1** Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

- **2.6.2** Development and site alteration shall only be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential if the significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal and documentation, or by preservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration which maintain the heritage integrity of the site may be permitted.
• 2.6.3 Development and site alteration may be permitted on adjacent lands to protected heritage property where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved. Measures to mitigate impacts and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property affected by the adjacent development or site alteration.

(iii) City’s newly Adopted Official Plan
The PPS recognizes that the most important tool for implementing provincial public policy direction is the city’s Official Plan.

**Strategic Direction** - Section 2 of the city’s newly adopted Official Plan recognizes that the city is subject to economic, social and environmental forces that may change over time and may have competing or opposing demands. The Strategic Policy Direction of the Plan is contained in Section 2 and states the Goal as;

“To protect, conserve and strategically deploy the natural cultural and built resources of the city in a manner that promotes compatibility between different functions; that reduces energy, land or resource consumption in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions with the objective that all new buildings are carbon neutral by 2020; that encourages sustainable forms of energy production and the use of cultural heritage resources to benefit the public good; that limits the need for undue extension of infrastructure or reliance on the private automobile; that fosters local sources of food which are sustainable; and promotes programs and practices that will produce increasingly sustainable development in the City.”

**Land Use Designation** - The lands subject to this review are designated as Residential within the new Adopted Official Plan for the City of Kingston. Under the previous Plan for the former Pittsburgh Township the lands were designated as Heritage Residential/Institutional and Heritage Residential (discussed in section of report pertaining to the Official Plan for former Pittsburgh Township).

**General** - In addition to the strategic policy direction of the Plan there are a number of different policy sets within the Plan that would need to be reviewed in detail and assessed with respect to any development proposal for these lands:

- Section 3.3 Residential Uses, which includes Section 3.3.10 regarding Affordable Housing
- Section 4 Infrastructure and Transportation, with respect to ability to service development, traffic impacts and requirements of any development and waste management;

**Cultural Heritage** – Within Section 7 the city has stated it will undertake the following actions:

7.1.6 - The city will protect and conserve cultural heritage resources in accordance with the best available cultural resource management protocols and charters including, but not limited to, the following:

a. UNESCO and International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) Conventions and Charters
b. Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada and
c. Ontario Ministry of Culture’s eight guiding principles in the conservation of built heritage properties.

Section 7.1.11 - The city will conserve and protect cultural heritage resources and implement and enforce the policies of this Section by undertaking the following:
a. designing and constructing, in conformity with policies of this Section, any public, capital and maintenance works involving or adjacent to designated and other cultural heritage resources;

Section 7.2.1 - The city must lead the community in the management of its cultural heritage resources by providing good examples of proper heritage stewardship in the care and management of the municipally owned heritage properties.

Section 7.2.5 - The city may permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to a protected heritage property where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated, and it has been demonstrated through the preparation of a heritage impact statement that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

Section 7.3.C.4 - Any private or public work or development that is proposed within or adjacent to a designated heritage conservation district must demonstrate that it respects and complements the identified heritage character of the district or area.

Section 7.3.C.5 - A heritage impact statement may be required where construction, alteration, or addition to a property located within a heritage conservation district or heritage area is proposed.

Section 7.3.C.7 - Barriefield is a designated Heritage Conservation District containing historic buildings, laneways and landscapes that have preserved a 19th century village setting. New development or any alteration must follow the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan and must maintain the heritage buildings, features and landscapes, the topography, and archaeological sites and resources. The following specific matters must be addressed:

a. land uses must be limited to detached dwellings and limited numbers of semi-detached dwellings (being 10% or less of the total);

b. a church, publicly-funded school, or other community facility, and a senior citizens home may be permitted subject to a rezoning;

c. permitted commercial uses must be small in scale, convenience oriented, supportive of the heritage setting, will not increase traffic volumes, and may have a maximum of three residential units as an accessory use above the main floor use;

d. new lots must have full street frontage and be similar to the lot pattern and grid road structure of the heritage area;

e. new residential and institutional units must be low profile and compatible with adjacent properties;

f. a landscaped buffer along Highway 15 must be maintained and no new structure will be permitted to impede the view of St. Mark’s Church from either Main Street or Highway 15; and,

g. no new lots will be severed from the Barriefield House property except one with frontage on Regent Street with a depth of 30 metres.

Archaeology - Barriefield has been identified as an archaeologically sensitive area within the draft Archaeological Master Plan and meets the criteria of the council adopted Ministry of Culture Checklist for Determining Archaeological Potential. This relates directly to the policies of Section 7.4 including the following:

Section 7.4.2 - The city will permit development and site alteration on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential if the significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal.
and documentation, or by conservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration that maintains the heritage integrity of the site is permitted.

Section 7.4.9 - Upon receiving information that lands proposed for development may include archaeological resources or constitute an area of archaeological potential, council will not take any action to approve the development, and the owner of such land will be requested to have studies carried out at the owner’s expense by qualified persons to:

a. survey and assess the property;
b. assess the impact of the proposed development;
c. indicate methods to mitigate any adverse impact of the proposed development on any archaeological resources, including methods of recovery and preservation;
d. comply with current Ministry of Culture standards and guidelines for consulting archaeologists; and,
e. provide a compliance letter issued by the Province for any completed archaeological study.

Further, works on City of Kingston property are bound by By-law No. 2006-134 “A By-law to Regulate the Discovery of Items of Archaeological or Historical Interest on City of Kingston Property”.

It is our understanding that an archaeological assessment of the subject lands has been undertaken by the federal government. To date staff has been unable to secure a copy of that report. We understand there to be artefacts on and under the surface of the lands, but are not privy at this time to the details. A visual inspection of the lands shows foundations of former buildings on the site. Historic research illustrates the range of former military and civilian uses of these lands. Clearly, before proceeding with any development of the lands, the proponent would need to satisfy all archaeological assessment requirements and any necessary mitigation methods.

(iv) The Official Plan for the former Township of Pittsburgh
The Official Plan for the former Township of Pittsburgh, which remains in effect until the province approves the new Official Plan adopted recently by council, also has specific policies concerning Barriefield, reproduced below.

3D Barriefield Planning Area

Barriefield is a designated Heritage Conservation District (HCD) under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

Council recognizes that the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District comprises a unique ensemble of heritage buildings and landscapes that have resulted from a century and a half of many social, economic, natural and physical changes.

Council will conserve and protect this unique heritage character in the process of change.

Council and the Committee of Adjustment, in making decisions on Planning Act applications (i.e. Official Plan amendments, Zoning By-law amendments, subdivisions, consents, minor variances, site plans, etc.) shall be consistent with the policies and guidelines in the Barriefield HCD Plan which has been adopted by Council, and shall consider any other relevant matters.
Council, in making decisions on permit applications under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act for new development, additions, alterations, repairs and demolition, shall be consistent with the policies and guidelines in the Barriefield HCD Plan which has been adopted by Council, and shall consider any other relevant matters.

3D.1 Land Use Designations

3D.1.1 The land use designations and policies relevant only to the Barriefield Planning Area are set out in this Section (3D). Where a land use designation is shown on Map 2 but not defined in this Section, the policies for such land use designation contained elsewhere in this Plan shall apply.

3D.2 Heritage Residential

3D.2.1 Permitted uses shall be limited to: single detached and semi-detached dwellings, provided the number of semi-detached units does not exceed 10% of the total number of dwelling units in the Barriefield Planning Area.

3D.3 Heritage Residential/Institutional

3D.3.1 Permitted uses shall be limited to: single detached and semi-detached dwellings, provided the number of semi-detached units does not exceed 10% of the total number of dwelling units in the Barriefield Planning Area; churches; publicly funded schools; and seniors homes.

3D.3.2 A site specific rezoning shall be required for a church, publicly funded school, or seniors home.

3D.4 Heritage Institutional

3D.4.1 Permitted uses shall be limited to: churches; and publicly funded schools.

3D.4.2 The view of St. Mark’s Church looking south from County Road No. 15 shall be preserved.

3D.5 Heritage Commercial

Permitted uses shall be limited to: a convenience store; small scale commercial uses compatible with a residential area and not likely to create a nuisance or increase traffic volumes significantly; and a maximum of three dwelling units.

3D.6 Creation of New Lots

3D.6.1 New lots may be created in the Barriefield Planning Area, provided the following criteria are met:

- new lots shall be rectangular and shall have full street frontage. No “driveway access only” lots shall be created nor shall any interior lots be created;
- new lots created shall be similar in lot area and frontage to other lots in that area of Barriefield, except for institutional uses which may be established on larger lots;
- new streets shall maintain the existing grid pattern in Barriefield;
- new lots created on Main Street north of Wellington Street, shall have at least 90 feet of frontage;
Pertinent Provincial and Local Land Use Policies

- no new structures shall interfere with the view of St. Mark’s Church looking south from County Road No. 15; and

- a landscaped buffer is provided along County Road No. 15.

- except that:

- no new lots shall be severed from the Barriefield House property, except for one lot with frontage on Regent Street and a depth of approximately 30 metres.

- on the Marks House property, if the existing house is retained, two new lots may be permitted with “driveway access only” provided the integrity of the heritage landscape is maintained. If the house is not retained, full street frontage for all lots will be required.

**3D.6.2** When considering the creation of new lots, regard shall be given to:

- protecting the shoreline of the Great Cataraqui River and its vegetated slopes;

- protecting existing heritage features including buildings, structures, streetscapes, archaeological sites and vegetation;

- maintaining existing mature trees;

- maintaining existing topographical features, grades and contours; and

- protecting archaeological resources.

**3D.7** New Houses and Additions to Existing Houses

**3D.7.1** New houses shall maintain the existing low density and low profile character of existing residential development.

**3D.7.2** New housing shall be similar in size, height and setback to neighbouring houses.

**3D.7.3** New additions to existing houses shall generally be no higher than the existing building and be placed to the rear of the building or set back substantially from the principal facade. Where building, site or lot characteristics do not allow such placement, upper storey additions may be permitted in accordance with the Barriefield HCD Plan.

**3D.8** New Institutional Buildings

**3D.8.1** New institutional buildings shall be low profile and compatible with adjacent residential development.

**3D.9** Landscape and Public Works

**3D.9.1** The vegetated slopes of the Great Cataraqui River, existing trees, tree lines, hedgerows, and other heritage landscape features and vegetation will be preserved where possible.
3D.9.2 Public works undertaken in Barriefield shall minimize adverse impacts on the heritage streetscape and landscape.

3D.10 Zoning By-Law

3D.10.1 The Zoning By-law will control the type, location, size, height, massing, and density of new development to ensure compatibility with existing development in Barriefield.

(v) Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan

Barriefield Heritage Conservation District was officially created through Township of Pittsburgh By-law 17-80. This By-law established the limits of the district and implemented the Heritage Conservation District Plan. (OMB approved January 27, 1981). The District Plan was itself adopted by Township of Pittsburgh By-law 37-79. The current Barriefield Heritage Conservation Plan was created in 1992 and was adopted by Council resolution. The map below reflects this geographical boundary of the district.
The plan contains a statement of intent, recognition of the differing interests in the area, a statement of the heritage character of the HCD, a statement of municipal authority, and a statement concerning the management of change (p. i-iii). Section 2 of the plan provides the Conservation Goals, Objectives, and Principles and Section 4 provides the guidelines for Alterations, Additions, and New Construction. Section 5 provides statements on landscape conservation and enhancement.
The HCD plan is intended to provide the basis for the careful management and protection of the area's heritage resources including: buildings, landscape features and archaeological sites. Additionally the plan provides guidance on relevant planning and development matters that may affect the unique character of this historic settlement area. The plan is premised on the basis that change in Barriefield’s unique built heritage and natural environments is to be expected. The plan emphasises that such changes in the heritage environment of the village must be managed in a manner that recognizes and respects that special character derived from its heritage building stock. The section below provides a summary of the heritage value of the village drawn from the Canadian Registry of Historic Places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriefield HCD contains a diverse ensemble of buildings, mostly residences, and landscape features of 19th century character, while reflecting two centuries of physical, social, economic and natural change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriefield has a long association with European settlement and military activity in the Kingston area, beginning in 1814, with a detailed town site plan. The streets were named after military figures from the War of 1812. The village itself was named, in 1820, after Commodore Robert Barrie, Commissioner of the nearby Kingston Naval Dockyard. Barrie's secretary, John Bennet Marks, an early village resident, was elected MPP, in 1836, and first Reeve of Pittsburgh Township, in 1850.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early growth of the village was associated with the increased activity at the nearby Kingston Naval Dockyard, during the War of 1812, and the construction of Fort Henry, from 1832 to 1837. By the 1840s growth had stabilized, but Barriefield saw further commercial and industrial development in the 19th century, mainly associated with taverns, hotels, boat building and sawmills. Slowly changing from the 1840s to the early 20th century, Barriefield was a reflection of the stable population and economy. In 1886 the Pittsburgh Township Hall, designed by William Newlands, was added to the Village. There was little new construction after 1900. Post 1945, the buildings in the village began to suffer; as the population declined so too did the property values. Since 1977, however, Barriefield has been under increasing development pressure, which led, in part, to the creation of the Heritage Conservation District by Pittsburgh Township, in 1980. While new residences have been built and some existing heritage properties altered, the overall 19th century village character has been retained. Barriefield also has notable archaeological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The distinctive design value of the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District is found in the scale, mass, decorative detailing and siting of its buildings. Most are detached single family residences of frame or stone construction with a few semi-detached houses. There are also a few two-storey buildings, but the overall built environment is typified by low profile, one-and-a-half storey houses. Brick buildings are uncommon with only four 19th century examples. Additions and alterations to properties in the village have reflected continuing use and changing needs and tastes of their owners and occupants over time. Most changes have been sympathetic to the historic character of the buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views from the approaches along Highway 15 to the north, Highway 2 to the east and downtown Kingston to the west, all afford uninterrupted panoramic views of Barriefield, as it sits prominently upon the hill. As well Barriefield's position provides clear views of the Cataraqui and St. Lawrence rivers, Fort Henry and downtown Kingston. Large grassy open spaces on the north, east and south sides preserve these vistas. The northern entrance to Barriefield is through a stone gate and bordered by a walnut grove. On the northern edge, the prominent landmark of St. Mark's Church is highly visible from a distance. The steeply sloping river bank with its screen of deciduous trees and the mature black willows surrounded by tall wetland grasses along the river edge further define the District and contribute to the rich variety of its natural features. The District's landscape reveals a mix of natural and built features that further contribute to the distinctive overall historic character. These include; the original street grid, dividing the properties into rectangular lots, lilac hedgerows, dry stone walls and other surviving landscape elements that define property boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canadian Registry of Historic Places

The plan goes on to state that a key principle for heritage conservation district planning is the presumption in favour of retaining the distinguishing characteristics of a heritage property and that the destruction, alteration or removal of historic fabric or distinguishing architectural features and landscaping is the least durable course of action.