Creating Great Near Campus Neighbourhoods
Challenges Past, Present and Future

Jennifer A. Smout[1]

The City of London is home to two post-secondary institutions, Western University and Fanshawe College. Consistent with the experience in other cities with post-secondary institutions, the City of London has encountered a number of challenges associated with addressing issues in near campus neighbourhoods. Over the years, the City of London has undertaken several initiatives, some of which have been more successful than others. This paper provides an overview of some of the initiatives that the City of London has used and briefly examines some deficiencies in the provincial legislation that may have limited their success.

London's Great Near Campus Neighbourhood Strategy

The most recent initiative undertaken by London City Council to address near campus land use planning issues was the "*Great Near Campus Neighbourhood Strategy*" (GNCN)[2]. Adopted by City Council in November 2008, the GNCN Strategy was an initiative that arose from a study completed in February 2007 entitled "*Closing the Gap: New Partnerships for Great Neighbourhoods Surrounding our University and College*" that identified gaps between the vision for the near campus neighbourhoods and the state of affairs at that time.

The GNCN Strategy included ten strategies designed to cumulatively create great near campus neighbourhoods. The strategies were developed from feedback received from an extensive series of information sessions and discussion forums with various stakeholders including the University and College student governments, the University and College administrations, neighbourhood associations, area residents, London Police and the London Fire Department. Participants were presented with a number of strategies and then invited to make comments, ask questions and provide feedback on them. At the end of each session, participants were asked to rank each strategy in priority order. The ten strategies recommended in the GNCN strategy represent those that encompassed a majority of the concerns identified in the consultation process.

The ten strategies were:

---

[1] I express my views in this paper and not those of The Corporation of the City of London. This paper was presented to the International Municipal Lawyers Association (IMLA) Conference, Niagara Falls, Canada, October 2017.

[2] See the City of London Great Near-Campus Neighbourhoods Strategy at the following web page: https://www.london.ca/business/Planning-Development/current-topics/Pages/GreatNearCampus.aspx The page includes links to the GNCN strategy and various other documents including the reports to the City's standing committees and a summary of the planning amendments undertaken in support of the strategy. Unless stated in a separate footnote, the reports referenced in this paper may be found at this link. To ensure accuracy, much of the text from the various GNCN reports has been included verbatim in this paper but for ease of reading has not been marked and footnoted.

1. Welcome students as a vital part of our community;
2. Provide for safe housing;
3. Offer a higher level of public service to the community;
4. Align expectations;
5. Protect residential amenity;
6. Provide alternatives to balance the mix;
7. Create great places and spaces in our neighbourhoods;
8. Invest in our infrastructure;
9. Level the playing field for landlords; and
10. Provide affordable housing for students, renters and homeowners.

The full text of the ten strategies is set out in Appendix 1. Each strategy included a series of initiatives recommended to achieve the objectives of the strategy.

The GNCN strategy also included a detailed implementation plan which set out time lines for work completed in the previous 3 years, work underway and work to be undertaken in the next 6 months, year and 3 years. The implementation plan required action by all of the stakeholders and charged completion of the initiatives to various groups including the City's Planning department, By-law Enforcement department and Building Division, the London Police, London Fire, the University and College administrations and Student councils and the London Transit Commission.

A review of the GNCN strategy was directed by City Council in May 2015. The purposes of the review included examining the changing planning and neighbourhood contexts and the effectiveness of the strategy and other initiatives associated with it. Reports related to the review were presented to City Council in December 2015 and July 2016[3]. The December 2015 report included an overview of the implementation of the GNCN strategy, including each component of the strategy, whether it was implemented and comments related to the same. (Appendix 1)

The review concluded that the strategy has positively affected trends in improving the near campus neighbourhoods and that, based on the findings in the review, the main components in the strategy should remain in place. While near campus neighbourhoods remain as sensitive planning areas, not enough time has passed since the adoption of the land use planning policies to have seen their full effect and as such, continued review and monitoring is required.

The key initiatives identified in the review that have contributed to improvements in the near campus neighbourhoods include land use planning actions in the form of Official Plan and zoning by-law amendments for the GNCN area, by-law enforcement initiatives and education and communication strategies.

[3] Report to the City's Planning and Environment Committee July 18, 2016 "Great Near-Campus Neighbourhoods Strategy Review". Link to the Committee agenda with the report shown as Agenda Item 21: http://sire.london.ca/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=1256&doctype=AGENDA

In terms of land use planning actions, in 2012 the City adopted Official Plan Policies and enacted zoning by-law amendments for the near campus neighbourhoods. Further refinements were made in 2016.

Key Official Plan policies include infill policies for intensification and development that support and encourage intensification proposals that are in appropriate areas and are constructed in purpose built, higher density forms designed to accommodate the anticipated level of intensity and managed to mitigate operational concerns. The policies include specific criteria for evaluating proposals for intensification to prohibit inappropriate developments which may include intensification in areas that have already absorbed high levels, development that is too intense for the proposed structure types or development that is not at an appropriate scale given the existing neighbourhood character. Policies were also implemented to require site plan approval for some intensification proposals. In 2016, the policies were updated to refine and clarify the vision statement and reduce the boundary area to which the policies apply. The policies were also restructured and rewritten and incorporated into the City's new Official Plan known as the "London Plan". The intent and planning approach of the policies remain unchanged.

Key zoning by-law amendments include a reduction in the maximum number of bedrooms per dwelling unit from five to three, height reductions in lower density residential zones, floor area ratios, parking regulations and increased landscaped open space requirements for lots.

In the December 2015 review, City planners noted that near campus neighbourhood intensification declined in 2009 and remained low until 2013 with the construction of a 300 unit apartment building. City planners also noted that following the 2012 planning amendments, the location of large-scale developments was consistent with the policies that direct them to arterial roads and that small-scale developments interior to most neighbourhoods had "come to a halt".

By-law enforcement initiatives were also identified as contributing to improvements in the near campus neighbourhoods. The City moved to consolidate and streamline parking and by-law enforcement services. A one contact enforcement line was established and in 2012, was reported to have been handling 60,000 calls per year. Proactive by-law enforcement efforts in place since the 1990s for some near campus areas were expanded to the entire GNCN area. Additional funds were budgeted to provide enforcement to the expanded area and to provide after hours enforcement.

Under the GNCN, the City expanded its existing by-laws to address nuisance issues. In 2012, the City amended its Public Nuisance By-law[4] to provide enforcement mechanisms related to large scale parties or gatherings defined in the by-law as "nuisance parties".

[4] Public Nuisance By-law PH-18: http://www.london.ca/city-hall/by-laws/Documents/public-nuisancePH18.pdf

In summary, the amendments to the Public Nuisance By-law create an offence for any person who sponsors, conducts, continues, hosts, creates, attends, allows, causes or permits a nuisance party as defined in the by-law. The Public Nuisance By-law also includes the power for the Chief of Police or the City's Manager of Enforcement to order that a nuisance party be discontinued; that persons leave the premises and to close public highways where a nuisance party is occurring. A further amendment to the Public Nuisance By-law was made in March, 2017 to expand the definition of nuisance party to include the use of a roof not intended for such occupancy. The purpose of the amendments is to address safety concerns related to parties where persons use roof tops for parties, an activity dubbed with the term "brewfing".

The full text of the nuisance party regulations in the City's Public Nuisance By-law is as follows:

> *"Nuisance Party" means a social gathering on Premises within the Municipality and which, by reason of the conduct of the persons in attendance, results in any one or more of the following activities occurring so as to constitute a public nuisance whether occurring on neighbouring public or private property:*
> *(a) disorderly conduct;*
> *(b) public drunkenness or public intoxication;*
> *(c) the unlawful sale, furnishing, or distribution of alcoholic beverages or controlled substances;*
> *(d) the deposit of refuse on public or private property;*
> *(e) damage to or destruction of public or private property;*
> *(f) pedestrian traffic, vehicular traffic, or illegal parking that obstructs the free flow of traffic or could interfere with the ability to provide emergency services;*
> *(g) unreasonable noise, including loud music or shouting;*
> *(h) unlawful open burning or fireworks;*
> *(i) public disturbances, including public brawls or public fights;*
> *(j) outdoor public urination or defecation;*
> *(k) use of or entry upon a roof not intended for such occupancy;*
>
> *4. NUISANCE PARTIES*
> *4(1) No person shall sponsor, conduct, continue, host, create, attend, allow, cause or permit a Nuisance Party.*
> *4(2) No person who, individually or jointly with others, is an owner, occupant, tenant, or who otherwise has rightful possession of or possessory control of any Premises, shall allow, cause or permit a Nuisance Party on said Premises under their possession or control.*
>
> *5. ORDER TO DISCONTINUE ACTIVITY*
> *5(1) Upon the order of the Chief of Police or his or her designate or the City's Manager of Licensing and Municipal Law Enforcement Services or his or her designate, a Nuisance Party shall cease and all persons not residing on the Premises shall leave the Premises where it is occurring.*
> *5(2) An order under this section shall identify: (a) the location of the land on which the contravention occurred; (b) the reasonable particulars of the contravention of the By-law; and (c) the date and time by which there must be compliance with the order.*

5(3) An order under this section may be given verbally or may be served personally on the person to whom it is directed. If the order is given by regular mail to the last known address of that person, and if given by registered mail, it shall be deemed to have been given on the third day after it is mailed. Service on a corporation can be effected by registered mail to the corporate mailing address.
5(4) No person shall fail to leave the Premises after having been directed to leave the Premises by an order to discontinue activity under this By-law.

6. CLOSE PUBLIC HIGHWAY
6(1) The Chief of Police, a London Police Service police officer, or a municipal law enforcement officer may temporarily close any Highway or portion thereof to public travel under this By-law where a Nuisance Party is occurring on or adjacent to the Highway by placing a notice on the Highway to be closed in accordance with the Municipal Act, 2001.
6(2) Where a Highway or portion of a Highway has been closed under this By-law, the common law right of passage by the public over the Highway and the common law right of access to the Highway by an owner of land abutting the Highway are restricted, as directed by the Chief of Police, a London Police Service police officer, or a municipal law enforcement officer.
6(3) No person shall use a Highway, or portion of a Highway that has been closed under this By-law except with lawful authority or in accordance with the direction of the Chief of Police or other officer pursuant to this section.
6(4) No person shall, without lawful authority, remove or deface any barricade, device, detour sign or notice placed on a Highway pursuant to this By-law.

Also in the area of by-law enforcement, in 2010, the City introduced a new Residential Rental Units By-law [5] (RRUL). While the RRUL By-law was discussed during the development of the GNCN Strategy and is attributed to some of its success, City Council began studying the regulation of residential rental units before the GNCN was even contemplated.

In March 2007, City Council directed its administration to investigate the potential for licensing residential rental units in keeping with the then recent changes *to Municipal Act, 2001* which came into force on January 1, 2007. Prior to that, municipalities were not authorized to licence residential rental units. Following extensive public consultation which included 11 public reports to City Council, 2 public open houses and 2 public participation meetings, the by-law was passed in September 2009 and came into force and effect on March 2010. It is important to note that the by-law was passed to address concerns related to safe housing citywide, and not just for the near campus neighbourhoods[6].

[5] Residential Rental Units Licensing By-law CP-19 http://www.london.ca/city-hall/by-laws/Documents/rentalunitsCP19.pdf

[6] The City of London's By-law was challenged and successfully defended. See: London Property Management Association v. City of London 2011 ONSC 4710
London's by-law applied citywide and not just to the near campus neighbourhoods. The stated purposes of the by-law are listed in the recitals as follows: "…*the City of London considers it necessary and desirable for the public to regulate the renting of residential premises for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the persons residing in residential rental premises by ensuring that the certain regulations are met, that the required essentials such as plumbing, heating and water are provided, for*

The 2012 report to City Council discussed the results of the By-law enforcement initiatives in the GNCN Strategy. The initiation of the heightened proactive enforcement combined with the introduction of the RRUL By-law and the amendments to the Public Nuisance By-law resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of violations in the near campus neighbourhoods. However, since 2012 there has been a steady decrease in the number of violations. As a result of further public consultation in 2016, City administration agreed to expand the proactive enforcement areas in the vicinity of the University and College.

Much of the GNCN Strategy's success has been attributed to enhanced education and communication between all of the participants. The Housing and Mediation Service is an important component of the education and communication strategy.

The Housing Mediation Service was established following a 1988 task force on student housing and the impact of student housing on low density near campus residential neighbourhoods.[7] One of the key services offered is free mediation to assist in the speedy resolution of problems that may arise between students, landlords and residents.

Related to the GNCN Strategy, the Housing Mediation Service is credited with developing new methods for engaging students as important members of the community. Examples include electronic newsletters, social media, videos and presentations. In addition to the work by the Housing Mediation Service, the City, London Police and Fire, the College and University administrations and Student councils have implemented additional student engagement campaigns.

The Town and Gown Committee has also contributed to the GNCN Strategy's success. The Town and Gown Committee was established by City Council in 2007[8] (prior to the GNCN Strategy). The mandate of the Town and Gown Committee is:

a) to develop and enhance relationships and communication among the City of London, Fanshawe College, London Police and Fire Services, Western University, residents, students and landlords;
b) to provide a forum for individuals and groups in which solutions can be built for challenges related to near-campus neighbourhoods and the community's relationship with students in London; and
c) to work collaboratively and help to solicit feedback in order to improve near campus neighbourhoods and relationships between members of the committee.

---

ensuring that the residential rental premises do not create a nuisance to the surrounding properties and neighbourhood and to protect the residential amenity, character and stability of residential areas".

[7] Housing mediation service link for UWO: http://offcampus.uwo.ca/mediation.cfm
Link for Fanshawe College: https://www.fanshawec.ca/student-life/campus-services/housing/campus-housing/housing-mediation

[8] Terms of Reference for the Town and Gown Committee may be found at the following link: http://www.london.ca/city-hall/committees/task-forces/Documents/Terms%20of%20Reference%20-%20Town%20and%20Gown%20Committee.pdf

The membership in the Town and Gown Committee is comprised of stakeholders who live, work or otherwise seek to improve the quality of life in near campus neighbourhoods. There are 15 voting members on the Committee:

- 1 Deputy Mayor appointed by Council (ex-officio)
- 4 City of London Councillors; Wards 3, 6, 13 and one additional Ward Councillor
- 1 Fanshawe College, Administrative representative
- 1 Fanshawe Student Union representative
- 1 Fanshawe Student Union administrative representative, as appointed by the President of the Fanshawe Student Union
- 3 Neighbourhood representatives residing in Wards 3, 6 & 13
- 1 Western University, Administrative representative
- 1 Western University's Affiliated Colleges (Brescia, Huron and King's University College) Representative
- 1 Western University, Society of Graduate Students Representative
- 1 Western University Students' Council Representative

Non-voting resource members include representatives from the Housing Mediation Office, London Housing Advisory Committee, London Property Management Association, London St. Thomas Association of Realtors, Urban League of London, London Police Services and representatives from various departments from the City including Planning, By-law Enforcement, Housing Division, Fire Services and Intergovernmental and Community Relations.

The Town and Gown Committee meets 4 times each year. Meetings are held during the academic year from September 1 to April 30.

The Committee uses a collaborative and cooperative approach to fulfill its role which is defined as follows:

- To report to the Community and Protective Services Committee (a standing committee of City Council);

- Provide a multidisciplinary forum for open discussion on issues related to near-campus neighbourhoods;

- Facilitate communication among stakeholders;

- Identify, prioritize and address specific issues and concerns;

- Monitor and evaluate activities of its sub-committees, studies or projects;

- Provide a forum for individuals and groups in which solutions and strategies can be built for challenges related to near-campus neighbourhoods in London;

- Work in collaboration to conduct education programs, designed for students, community groups, individual residents and landlords that will address issues related to near-campus neighbourhoods and the community's relationship with students;

- On behalf of the City of London, Fanshawe College and Western University act as the contact point for the Housing Mediation Officer; the Officer will submit reports to the Committee and the Committee will assist the Officer with advice, take appropriate action and/or pass information, concerns or recommendations to the Community and Protective Services Committee;

- Monitor the London Housing market with specific reference to factors affecting student housing and consult with affected stakeholders in order to provide recommendations where appropriate, to the City of London relating to urban planning matters in near-campus neighbourhoods and to review city-initiated studies, initiatives, process reviews or other matters that would benefit from the Town & Gown Committee review;

- Build an action plan to achieve agreed upon goals at the beginning of each academic year; and,

- Make recommendations to achieve the vision and mandate.

The City's Town and Gown Committee, has played an important role in implementing the GNCN Strategy. All of the work related to the Strategy was vetted through this Committee. The Committee has also played an important role in terms of enhancing communication and cooperation for all stakeholders in the near campus neighbourhoods.

Despite the positive results of the GNCN Strategy, shortcomings that persist include balancing the long term and short term resident base and the availability of affordable housing in the near campus neighbourhoods.

The GNCN Strategy recognized the need for a balance between long term and short term residents as important to its overall success. It was noted that in some parts of the near campus neighbourhoods, the balance had tipped too far towards a majority of short term residents resulting in a lack of stability in the neighbourhood. In the 2012 report, City planners noted that the rental population in the near campus neighbourhoods was 46%, above the City average of 37%. However, their findings identified no overall increase in rental units relative to all dwelling in the near campus areas as compared to citywide trends and that planning districts often identified as having high short term rental populations did not show upward trends in rental housing.

Housing affordability was discussed in the 2012 report. One perspective raised was the "over inflation" of housing prices due to the student rental population and the "fear" that property values in the near campus neighbourhoods are derived on potential cash flow as opposed to what a potential owner-occupier would pay. In the 2012 report it was noted

that a review of the housing costs in the near campus neighbourhoods illustrates that house prices, while above the city-wide average, have appreciated at a lower rate and have not kept pace with the rest of the city. From a review of assessment values, no clear trends had been identified that associate parts of the near campus neighbourhoods with higher student rental populations with significantly greater or lower property value appreciation than other comparable neighbourhoods.

In evaluating the GNCN Strategy, some may suggest that it represents a culmination of decades of planning studies and attempts at community cooperative efforts to address the problem of striking a balance between short and long term rentals and housing affordability in the near campus neighbourhoods.

The City of London has devoted a considerable amount of attention to studying and addressing land use planning issues in its near campus neighbourhoods. A summary of some of these initiatives is set out in the 2012 report as follows:

> St. George/Grosvenor Neighbourhood Study & Official Plan Amendment (1985)
> Special policies in the City's Official Plan were adopted for this residential neighbourhood which evolved from the 1985 St. George/Grosvenor Area Study. The polices were later updated in 2004.
>
> Task Force on Student Housing (1988)
> The Task Force issued a report and 18 recommendations to address issues of student housing and impacts on low density residential neighbourhoods. Recommendations included improved municipal by-law enforcement; promotional activities to educate students on parking, noise, and property standards by-laws; undertake regular surveys on adequacy and availability of student housing; and establish a Student Housing Advisory Committee. One of the most successful outcomes of this task force was the establishment of a cost shared Housing Mediation Service office for Western and Fanshawe which remains in place today.
>
> Residential Intensification in the Essex Street Area Planning Study (1995)
> This study of intensification activity, mostly in the form of dwelling conversions and development of fourplexes and low rise apartments, near the intersection of Essex Street, Wharncliffe Road North, and Western Road, resulted in special zoning to allow for intensification and infill of an appropriate scale and intensity. Floor area ratios and parking requirements were established. The underlying purpose of the study was to identify areas where redevelopment should be encouraged and where conservation of the existing housing stock should be maintained. Given its proximity to the University of Western Ontario, this is a neighbourhood which experiences great demand for low rent, short term housing accommodation.
>
> Intensification and Bill 120 – Impact on the North London and Broughdale Communities - Planning Study and Official Plan Amendment (1995)
> A special policy in the Official Plan was adopted based on a comprehensive planning study of the impacts of residential intensification in the Broughdale

Neighbourhood of Old North London. In addition to the special policy, zone regulations specific to this area were introduced to control the scale and bulk of intensification and infill projects including: maximum floor area ratios and maximum dwelling size regulations; minimum yard setbacks to preserve private amenity space; and, new parking requirements.

Intensification and Bill 120 – Impact on the North London and Broughdale Communities - Expanded Area (1996)

The special policies and zoning regulations established in 1995 were later expanded to a wider area of the community experiencing similar issues and impacts including The Parkway, Sherwood Avenue, and Victoria Street.

Richmond Street/University Gates Corridor Review - Report and Official Plan Amendment (2001)

As a result of several applications for multi-unit residential development, a report was prepared recommending that a special Official Plan policy be adopted for the Richmond Street frontage across from the University Gates between Broughdale Avenue and Epworth Avenue to permit residential redevelopment up to a fourplex with a specific floor area ratio (FAR), maximum building size, parking regulations, and a requirement for public site plan review of any future redevelopment proposals.

North London Residential Study and Amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law (2004)

This study included a review of the existing Official Plan policies and zoning regulations in the Broughdale neighbourhood in order to determine if the same planning tools should be extended to other North London neighbourhoods. The study considered by-law enforcement and health and safety issues; as well as residential intensification, lodging house regulations, floor area ratios, parking, and number of bedrooms in dwelling units. City Council approved the extension of special zone regulations to a much wider area of North London. Along Richmond Street the zoning was also amended by allowing dwelling conversions up to four units and removing triplexes and fourplexes as permitted uses.

5 Bedroom Limit - By-law No. Z.-1-041300 (2004)

This was a City-wide amendment to the Zoning By-law to change the definition of “Dwelling Unit” to introduce a limit on the number of bedrooms to five (5) maximum. While there were appeals, the Ontario Municipal Board decision upheld the by-law.

Central Avenue/West Woodfield Area Zoning Review (2006)

This study covered part of the Woodfield Neighbourhood in the City’s core area experiencing similar kinds of problems to North London. The Official Plan and Zoning By-law were reviewed and amendments were made to reflect City Council’s intent to protect the residential amenity of this historic neighbourhood and ensure that its scale, intensity, and character are preserved. To implement the policy, area-specific zoning amendments were adopted which did not change the

permitted uses, but which did apply through special zone provisions a number of new regulations including floor area ratios, maximum floor areas, minimum rear yard depth, minimum number of parking spaces, and yards where parking may be permitted.

Beaufort Street, Irwin Street, Gunn Street, and Saunby Street Neighbourhood Planning Options (2011)

As a result of several recent intensification projects in the interior of the BIGS Neighbourhood (Beaufort, Irwin, Gunn and Saunby Streets), whereby single detached dwellings were being demolished and replaced by duplex dwellings, City Council directed Planning Staff to, among other matters, retain a Planning Consultant to prepare a planning study for the BIGS area to consolidate the recommendations of the Essex Street Study prepared in March 1995, where appropriate, include a master plan and policies to direct future development within the context of the Great Near Campus Neighbourhoods Strategy.

Over the years London, like other communities with post-secondary institutions have used a variety of approaches to address the issue that some authors refer to as "studentification" defined as:

> "*..a process of urban change resulting from the repackaging of existing (generally single family or semi-detached dwellings) housing by small scale entrepreneurs to supply housing in multiple occupancy dwelling for university and college students in neighbourhoods in close proximity to institutions of higher education*".[9]

Common regulatory measures used by municipalities to address "studentification" include land use planning instruments, licensing by-laws, and property standards by-laws, noise control by-laws, parking by-laws and requirements for owner occupancy.[10]

Curious, perhaps about all of this is that the primary and related causes of "studentification" have been identified as *"..the encouragement by senior governments of post-secondary school education and the tendency of universities and colleges to leave the accommodation of a growing number of their students to the private, off campus market*". [11]

This raises the issue as to whether near campus neighbourhoods in Ontario might look and function differently today and whether neighbourhoods and students might be better

---

[9] See Doumani, Robert G. "The Regulation of Private Sector Student Accommodation: a Multi-Jurisdictional Survey of Issues and Responses" (2011) 5 D.M.P.L (2d) citing D.P. Smith "Studentification: The Gentrification Factory? In Gentrification in a Global Context: the New Urban Colonialism, Ed. R. Atkinson, G. Bridge (London Routledge, 2005) at pp. 72-89; Soheil Sabri and Ahmad Nazri Muhamad Ludin, "Studentification is it a Key Factor Within the Residential Decision-Making Process in Kuala Lumpur"(Johor Bahru, Malaysia: Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, undated) ("Sabri, Ludin") at p. 2.

[10] See Doumani p.3.

[11] See Doumani p 2, Teresa Thomas, "Studentification, Neighbourhoods Change and the Role of Planning in Kingston, Ontario, Summer 2010, Slide 2, Residential Intensification in Kingston's Near-University Neighbourhoods" at pp. 1 and 8.

off than they are today had the provincial government provided municipalities with the proper tools to address the impacts of intensification. Three examples where the government has fallen short in Ontario might include the regulation of unrelated persons in households, residential rental licensing and inclusionary zoning.

Zoning by-laws that regulate the number of unrelated persons in a dwelling are common throughout the United States but are not permitted in Ontario. Subsection 35(2) of the *Planning Act* states that a municipality has no authority to pass a zoning by-law that:

> "*…has the effect of distinguishing between persons who are related and persons who are unrelated in respect of the occupancy or use of a building or structure or part of a building or structure, including the occupancy or use as a single housekeeping unit."*[12]

Curiously, subsection 35(2) of the *Planning Act* arose from actions taken by the City of London to amend its Zoning by-laws in part to address intensification in the University area.

In the mid-1980s, the City of London passed 9 zoning by-law amendments to replace the definitions of "dwelling unit" and "family". The University Student's Council appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board primarily on the grounds that the definitions were *ultra vires* the City because they were contrary to the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in *R. v. Bell*[13] .

In *R. v. Bell* the Supreme Court of Canada addressed the issue of "people zoning" and held that a by-law that restricted the occupation to family defined by reference to consanguinity, marriage and adoption was *ultra vires* the municipality because it regulated the "user" and not the "use" of the building.

The issue appeared to be settled until *Smith v. Township of Tiny*[14] . In the *Tiny* case, the Supreme Court of Ontario found that a zoning by-law that restricted land use based on an expanded definition of single family did not constitute zoning based on the relationship of the occupants because it incorporated most types of usual arrangements for people living together. The decision was upheld by the Court of Appeal. Leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was dismissed.

Following the decision in *Smith v. Township of Tiny*, the City of London passed nine zoning by-laws with definitions for dwelling units and family. These definitions were consistent with those upheld in *Smith v. Township of Tiny*.

---

[12] Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13
[13] [1979]2. S.C.R. 212.
[14] Smith et al. v. Township of Tiny, (1980), 29 O.R. (2d) 661, (1980), 114 D.L.R. (3d) 192, 27 O.R. (2D) 690, 107 D.L.R. (3d) 483

The Ontario Municipal Board held that the definitions in the London zoning by-laws were not beyond the powers of the City and dismissed the University Student Council's appeal.[15] An application by the University Student Council for leave to appeal was dismissed by the Divisional Court which noted that the issues raised were not of sufficient importance to warrant further consideration.[16]

The City's by-law amendments were short lived. As a direct response, in 1989 the government of Ontario amended the *Planning Act* to introduce what is now subsection 35(2).[17]

In the absence of subsection 35(2), near campus neighbourhoods in Ontario would most likely look much different than they do today. Arguably, most, if not all, of the issues that the City of London has attempted to address since 1989, including its efforts with the GNCN Strategy, were raised in the University Student Council's appeal against the London zoning by-law that gave rise to subsection 35(2) of the *Planning Act*.

Taken directly from the Ontario Municipal Board decision these comments made in 1988 provide insight into the struggles that Ontario municipalities continue to encounter since the enactment of subsection 35(2) of the *Planning Act*:

> "*The City passes these nine by-laws because of a large number of complaints received by them to the effect that many residential buildings in the City had become residences for a number of students from Western University and Fanshawe College. It was alleged these students were noisy, disruptive in their neighbourhoods, creating traffic problems, neglecting to look after their rented properties, etc*."[18]
>
> "*Planning evidence by the City's planner indicated…he believed it was important to preserve neighbourhoods and low-density areas in the city and to do so by an appropriate use and definition of "family*"."[19]
>
> *" The assistant vice-president of student affairs and registrar of Western University….in response to a question put to him by the board…stated that although the by-laws would not do away with the existing problems, that nevertheless 'they would be of some help'*".[20]
>
> "*Are the residents whose complaints the board finds were reasonable entitled to protection to the extent the law allows, by appropriately worded zoning by-laws,*

[15] Re City of London Zoning By-laws C.P.-952-41/18 (1988) 21 O.M.B.R. 10 (OMB)
[16] University Student's Council of the University of Western Ontario v. London (City) (1988) 22 O.M.B.R 255 (Div. Ct). See also Osbaldeston, Mark "The Town/Gown "Conflict and s. 35(2) of the Planning Act" (1995) 3 D.M.P.L. Vol. 3 Issue 2.
[17] Planning Amendment Act, 1989 S.O. 1989 c. 5.
[18] Supra note 14 at p. 15.

[19] Ibid p. 16
[20] Ibid p. 16

> *which would help preserve their neighbourhoods and their homes? The city believes they are and passed these by-laws.*"[21]
>
> "*It was urged that control over student residential buildings and the actions of their occupants could be maintained by appropriate enforcement of municipal by-laws re noise, parking, licensing of rooming houses, etc. In addition, if the actions of occupants of the houses were such as to be a nuisance, or the properties were not reasonably maintained, appropriate enforcement of housing standard legislation could remedy much of the trouble*."[22]
>
> "*The problems that the students are presently encountering in regard to housing accommodation are serious and deserve quick attention from the City Council of London and the Governments of Ontario and Canada. They will not be resolved by removing from the by-laws the definitions which afford some measure of protection to property owners and residents to the neighbourhoods in which the houses are situate.*"[23]

Also common in other jurisdictions, including the United States, is the use of licensing by-laws to regulate residential rental units. In Ontario, however, such by-laws were expressly prohibited. As noted earlier, it was not until January 1, 2007 that the province authorized municipalities to pass licensing by-laws regulating residential units.

Rental licensing by-laws are often used to correct and prevent housing conditions that adversely affect or are likely to affect the safety, general welfare and health of persons occupying dwellings and to enforce minimum standards. They are also widely used to protect the character and stability of residential areas. Licensing by-laws afford municipalities the remedy to suspend or revoke a licence for non-compliance with other by-laws such as property standards by-laws and noise and nuisance by-laws. Suspension or revocation of a licence is effective in terms of securing compliance with by-laws and regulations outside of other enforcement mechanisms.

The effect the late introduction of the authority to regulate residential rental units in Ontario on the quality of rental housing is not known. Neither is the effect on the character and stability of residential areas in near campus neighbourhoods. However, it is difficult to surmise that such effect is negligible. While some municipalities have introduced rental licensing by-laws, it is likely that had they been authorized to do so sooner, some of the existing conditions in near campus neighbourhoods today, in particular the balance between short and long term occupants, might have been avoided.

As with rental licensing, inclusionary zoning has been widely used in the United States for decades.[24] Inclusionary zoning is a land use planning system of by-laws, policies and

---

[21] Ibid p. 17
[22] Ibid p. 15
[23] Ibid p. 17
[24] Smout, Jennifer "Inclusionary Zoning Comes to Canada" October 2016, International Municipal Lawyer's Association San Diego.

programs that require development proponents to provide affordable housing as part of a market rate development. Inclusionary zoning was introduced for the first time in Ontario through the enactment of the *Promoting Affordable Housing Act, 2016* (Bill 7) which received Royal Assent on December 8, 2016.[25]

Noteworthy is that the availability of affordable housing for students was one of the significant issues in the appeal by the University Student Council against the City of London's zoning by-laws in 1988:

> "*The appellants argue ….that there is a great shortage of affordable student housing in London at this time and that the dismissal of these appeals would aggravate the shortage and result in the denial of post-secondary education to many deserving students."*
> ……
> *"One student from Fanshawe College, in particular, impressed the board with his evidence as to the problems of finding affordable student housing in London unless the costs of the accommodation would be shared by at least five students."*[26]

In London, a supply of affordable housing for students has frequently presented as an issue:

> "*The explosive growth of the University of Western Ontario may pose serious student accommodation problems in the future*". [27]
>
> "*The main thing we're struggling for is to get this housing situation in order… it is a constant worry*". [28]
>
> "*The University of Western Ontario needs accommodation for 500 to 1,000 students 'as quickly as we can get it' a UWO official told a public meeting on a planned married-students residence*…". [29]
>
> *"[Susan]Grinrod [UWO director of housing] said sharing a rented house has become a popular option for students in the London market where the supply of apartments has been shrinking because of condominium conversions, rent controls which have made developers reluctant to construct new buildings and other factors. 'Houses are bigger, they usually have three or four bedrooms so you share with three or four people….if you split up the costs it becomes more*

---

[25] [25] Bill 7, Promoting Affordable Housing Act, 2016:
http://www.ontla.on.ca/web/bills/bills_detail.do?locale=en&BillID=4118&detailPage=bills_detail_status
Note that originally this Bill was introduced on May 19, 2016 as Bill 204, Promoting Affordable Housing Act, 2016:
http://www.ontla.on.ca/web/bills/bills_detail.do?locale=en&BillID=4025&detailPage=bills_detail_the_bill

[26] Supra note 14 at pp. 15 and 16.
[27] London Free Press July 9, 1965.
[28] Col. D. B. Weldon chairman of the UWO Board of Governors London Free Press March 22, 1967.
[29] London Free Press January 9, 1976.

> *affordable'…In a growing trend, some parents are buying houses or townhouses for their children to live in while at university, Grinrod said. 'Its not a bad option in a tight rental market*..'" [30]

The effect of the late introduction of inclusionary zoning in Ontario on the quality and quantity of affordable housing is not known. It is plausible to suggest that the earlier introduction of inclusionary zoning powers may have assisted municipalities and post-secondary institutions in securing affordable housing for students and in turn, may have contributed to a better balance of short term and long term occupants in near campus neighbourhoods.

Conclusion

The City of London has spent decades attempting to address issues that arise in near campus neighbourhoods. The City's GNCN Strategy is its most recent initiative. The GNCN Strategy has attempted to address near campus neighbourhood issues in a more comprehensive manner. The GNCN Strategy has positively affected trends in improving near campus neighbourhoods. While near campus neighbourhoods remain as sensitive planning areas, not enough time has passed since the adoption of the land use planning policies to have seen their full effect. It is plausible to suggest that efforts by municipalities in Ontario to address issues in near campus neighbourhoods have been hindered by the prohibition against the regulation of unrelated persons in a zoning by-law and the late introduction of the authority to licence residential rental units and to implement inclusionary zoning by-laws. We are left to wonder whether near campus neighbourhoods would be better off had the province taken a different approach to the issue other than the introduction of subsection 35(2) of the *Planning Act*.

[30] London Free Press August 1987.

Appendix 1
(from the December 14, 2015 report to London's Planning and Environment Committee)

Implementation of the 2008 Great Near Campus Neighbourhood Strategy

The Strategy that was adopted in 2008 included 10 strategies, with specific items listed below that could be implemented to achieve the strategy. This Table lists each component of the 2008 strategy, whether it was implemented, and comments that relate to the method of implementation and/or level of success.

Implementation of 2008 Strategy

Great Near-Campus Neighbourhoods Strategy	Imple-mented?	Comments
1. Welcome Students As a Vital Part of Our Community		
1. Build on the many strengths of Housing Mediation Services and continue to develop new methods for engaging students as important citizens in the community	✓	The Housing Mediation Service has developed successful strategies to engage students via electronic newsletter, social media, videos, and presentations.
2. Continue to develop an accredited list of housing – build on system being instituted by Fanshawe College	✗	With the implementation of a residential rental licensing by-law the need for an accredited housing list has waned. Both Fanshawe and Western have offered to highlight licensed properties.
3. Host a housing fair at UWO/Fanshawe – housing providers, consumer protection information, info on being a Londoner	✗	Review of best practices revealed that other approaches for providing housing information to students are more effective. Decided against implementation of this idea.
4. Explore neighbourhood food co-op – run by students and neighbourhood	-	Western and Fanshawe offer on-campus farmers markets and Western has a grocery store on campus. Both schools also offer a student food bank. Addition of a food co-op is unnecessary.
5. Explore housing co-op – run by students, acquire housing already under rental and operate; brings student into ownership perspective	✗	A best practice review showed low participation rates in places where similar programs are in place. A decision was made to focus on other methods.
6. ENGAGE students in the dialogue and solution building	✓	A variety of student engagement campaigns have been implemented with high levels of success. The student

		unions and school administrations will continue to come up with new and innovative ideas to engage students.
2. Provide for Safe Housing		
1. Potential rental housing licensing by-law (City-wide) is a possible tool to assist with this strategic direction	✓	Implemented via a licensing administration process and associated enforcement. To date over 10,000 applications have been received and 25 landlords have been charged for non-compliance. Program to be continued, with greater promotion of on-line licensing information.
2. Run training sessions for landlords	✓	Meet with landlords on several occasions, had some initial success but less in recent years.
3. Prepare and distribute accredited housing list	✗	Deemed to be redundant given the new rental licensing by-law.
4. Deliver fire prevention messages using new techniques (e.g. fire demonstration video via Youtube)	✓	Various approaches have been implemented and new ideas are continually being tried. Current focus is on social media.
3. Offer a Higher Level of Public Service to the Community		
1. Consolidate by-law enforcement	✓	Consolidated parking and by-law enforcement services, addition of a call centre to streamline service.
a. Consistent direction and coordination	✓	Efforts have been made for a streamlined and consistent approach to public service from the City.
b. One person to write tickets for variety of infractions **i.** E.g. parking on right-of-way OR parking on front yard **ii.** E.g. write parking ticket as well as clearing of land ticket	✓	Process improved so that MLEOs may issue various types of tickets including parking tickets.
2. Targeted, proactive enforcement **a.** Budget resources to allow for proactive enforcement	✓	Proactive enforcement in effect. Have seen an increase in compliance as a result. One time blitzes have been used proactively to address specific issues.

b. Expand beats and be more proactive in addressing infractions **c.** Include new areas (west of University)		
3. Add after-hours enforcement	✓	Most MLEOs work after hours, also partner with London Police Service (LPS) for after-hours concerns.
a. Partner with police to address nuisance issues while police deal with alleged criminal activity (budget for resources)	✓	There are multiple examples of partnerships between By-law Enforcement and LPS – Eg: Project LEARN is a joint effort.
4. One contact enforcement line	✓	A call centre has been implemented which now handles approximately 60,000 calls per year.
5. Establish New Nuisance Gathering By-law **a.** Dealing with nuisance gatherings **b.** Where large gatherings undermine residential amenity **c.** Bowling Green, Ohio provides an example	✓	Nuisance Gathering By-law implemented, has resulted in multiple charges laid by LPS. Future amendment planned to address rooftop parties.
6. Establish New Nuisance By-law **a.** Urination and minor damage to property **b.** Is now in place and now enforcing	✓	Nuisance By-law established.
7. Explore 5 day garbage cycle	✗	Council approved the recommendation of a report (11/25/2013 - Civic Works Committee) that found there to be significant cost savings with a 6-day cycle. No changes are proposed regarding the pick-up schedule.
8. Provide large garbage bins on targeted streets for moving in and moving out periods	✓	Both Western and Fanshawe now offer this service.
4. Align Expectations		
1. Continue to explore new methods for conveying key information on rights and	✓	New approaches for conveying information to students is continually being implemented. Current focus

responsibilities to student citizens		includes social media and video production.
2. Establish 2 new nuisance by-laws as identified above	✓	See 3.5 & 3.6 above
3. Amend Unauthorized Parking By-law – deal with parking in rear of lot and also prohibit access to parking through front yard	✓	Very few charges have been laid, very high level of compliance.
4. Policing		
a. Continue to educate students on significance of criminal charges	✓	Education opportunities at point of incident and through partnerships with Student Unions at UWO/FC
b. Continue to build on Project LEARN	✓	Primarily includes increased police presence at key times and locations where there have been issues
c. Continue Liquor License Act investigations by COR Unit	✓	Risk based inspections during academic year, focus on education of bar and restaurant owners during summer season
d. Continue Liquor Symposium for licensed establishment owners	✓	Was initially organized by LPS, now run by AGCO and outside the purview of LPS
e. Continue presentations to Fanshawe College and expand to UWO	✓	Presentations conducted initially, now messaging has been coordinated with student unions and school administration so not directly presented by Police.
f. Continue proactive letter campaign to targeted addresses advising of noise legislation	✓	See above
g. Continue presentations to residents of targeted addresses	✓	See above
h. Continue patrols of targeted area	✓	Additional patrols available to respond to emerging trends.
i. Ensure that budget allocation is adequate for strong COR Unit program	✓	COR Unit receives adequate resources to fulfill mandate.
5. Review Official Policies to clarify that the existence of illegal units or bedrooms within units does not constitute a basis of support	✓	OPA Adopted in 2012 – no specific policies regarding illegal uses, illegal establishment of a land use is never considered justification for future approvals.

for variance or zoning amendment applications.		
5. Protect Residential Amenity		
1. Establish new policies for infill development	✓	Official Plan Amendment adopted in 2012 includes specific criteria for infill & intensification in GNCN
a. Require that all development (including singles, duplexes, conversations, etc.) go through site plan approval process	✓	Official Plan Amendment includes that residential intensification proposals require Site Plan Approval, subject to exemptions in 3.2.3.5 (some conversions and applications where a separate public process has occurred are exempt)
b. Require character statements and design briefs for all infill projects	✓	Neighbourhood character statements are required for residential intensification projects per Official Plan Section 3.2.3.5.i.
2. Modify zoning by-law	✓	Zoning By-law Amendment adopted in 2012 for GNCN.
a. Regulate number of bedrooms by structure type **i.** Possibly 5-single detached; 4-duplex; 3-triplex and above	✓	Zoning By-law Amendment adopted in 2012 for GNCN. 5 bedrooms are permitted in single detached dwellings, 3 bedrooms permitted in other dwelling types such as apartment, semi-detached, townhouse, etc.
b. Establish regulations to ensure that parking is not accessed via front yard & parking on narrow driveways must be tandem	✓	Use of Landscaped Open Space for Parking is not permitted per Section 4.12.2.
c. Require rear-yard amenity area – cannot use for parking	✓	Rear yard parking is permitted per Section 4.19.4. Additional regulations added such as a 3.0m buffer from any rear or int. side lot line.
d. Include driveway in the parking area maximum calculation	✓	“parking area” includes all “access driveways, aisles, driveways, and parking spaces”
e. Reduce maximum height in all R1 through R3 zones	✓	Maximum heights reduced in 2012 ZBA.
f. Apply FAR to all zones and include OP policies that provide clearer guidance for the evaluation of variances	-	FAR included as tool in Official Plan, not included in general R1-R3 zones but is a requirement in some site specific zones, including areas adjacent to Western.

g. Review culmination of regulations to establish appropriate combination	✓	Zoning By-law Amendment adopted in 2012
h. Review where R2 and R3 zones are applied and assess whether changes are required	✓	Zoning By-law Amendment process included a mapping review, no map changes were recommended.
i. Revise Noise By-law **i.** Higher fines **ii.** Escalating fines **iii.** Explore opportunity for By-law Enforcement to enforce this by-law when it is safe and appropriate	✓	New noise by-law implemented
6. Provide Alternatives to Balance the Mix		
1. Continue to research and better understand student demand for housing	✓	Ongoing reviews of Near-Campus Neighbourhoods, including this review
2. Identify opportunities for medium and high density development at strategic locations	✓	2012 Official Plan Amendment includes preferred locations for intensification, primarily along arterial roads with access to transit.
a. May be close to UWO/Colleges or at locations which are well connected to campus	✓	Locations along arterial roads near campuses may accommodate intensification. (Eg – 2013 development at 1235 Richmond Street)
b. Master-plan and establish policy to allow for design-oriented bonus zoning in these areas to encourage high quality design, mix of unit types and costs (including affordability), residential amenities, etc.	✓	Bonus zoning is permitted in NCN per policy 3.4.3.iv).
3. Facilitate collaboration and joint-venture partnerships between academic institutions, the development community and the City	✓	Private developments and on-campus residences have been proposed and developed to provide additional student housing in appropriate locations.
a. Possibly academic institution operates facility, or portion thereof	✓	Activities are ongoing
b. Academic institution may contribute to cost or simply market the development	✓	Activities are ongoing

through recruitment initiatives		
c. City may provide for density bonusing if certain criteria are met and may offer residential amenities as required	✓	Specific bonusing criteria have not been established for GNCN, but the general bonusing requirements apply.
d. Explore opportunities for developing in strategic areas to revitalize/regenerate areas	✓	Secondary Plans or special studies are completed or underway for some areas – Eg: BIGS Secondary Plan.
4. Seek out opportunities for more on-campus housing – either built and operated by academic institution, or built and/or operated by a private sector partner	✓	Since 2008, Western has opened 1000 beds and Fanshawe has opened 800 beds. Private developments have also added new student housing opportunities.
5. Explore opportunities for campus relocation (strategic locations in need of revitalization, such as Downtown, should be considered)	✓	Fanshawe has opened some downtown facilities, which will be expanded to include the old Kingsmill building. Western has moved its Continuing Education campus downtown and is exploring other opportunities.
7. Create Great Places and Spaces in Our Neighbourhoods		
1. Undertake a review of our near-campus neighbourhoods and determine whether a master plan would be appropriate and useful as a framework for change over time.	✓	A review was conducted, resulted in area-specific Official Plan policies. Secondary Plans/Area Plans for specific areas have been completed.
a. Should there be over-all guidance for the development of infill projects in the neighbourhood?	✓	Official Plan Amendment added criteria for the review of applications for infill projects.
b. Are there public amenities that should be introduced into the neighbourhood?	✓	The 2012 Official Plan Amendment identifies a need for public spaces near to the university and colleges, and includes that the City will encourage public projects in the Near-Campus Neighbourhoods, such as park development.

c. Are there commercial and/or recreational spaces that should be improved, enhanced, expanded, etc. to benefit the neighbourhood	✓	The 2012 Official Plan Amendment encourages public realm improvements such as tree planting, street lighting, road improvements, etc.
d. What is missing from the neighbourhood that could be added create a truly great neighbourhood?	✓	Policies are reviewed with input from community stakeholders, to ensure that their vision is considered.
2. Explore opportunities for "blurring the line" between campus and the community.	✓	Design considerations in the Official Plan include that campus lands adjacent to the community should provide opportunities to interact and gathering areas. Commercial uses are encouraged in these locations.
a. Create special spaces on campus that are for the joint use of the neighbourhood and students	✓	Various programs are available to the community on campus.
b. Introduce programming on campus for neighbourhood patrons	✓	Various programs are available to the community, has been successful and new opportunities are continuously being explored.
c. Establish strong pedestrian connectivity between campus and the neighbourhood	✓	Official Plan policies encourage connectivity between campus and the community.
d. Explore commercial, cultural and entertainment uses that fit well within the fringe of the campus and neighbourhood and might bring students and long term residents together using a public space	✓	Ongoing investigations.
3. Explore innovative green design options for development within the neighbourhood and on the campus	✓	Many of the new buildings on campus are LEED certified.
4. Explore development projects which can enhance the Creative Cities initiative – creating vibrant, dynamic	✗	The "Creative Cities" initiative was not implemented in name, however many of its principles are included in other policies and initiatives.

spaces that attract long term residents and students alike		
5. Explore the introduction of a heritage conservation district in Old North, recognizing the importance of this area and its streetscapes to the identity and character of the City	✓	HDC's implemented for West Woodfield, East Woodfield, and Bishop Hellmuth
6. Establish new policies in the Official Plan which describe the vision for each near campus neighbourhood, providing a context for infill development, conversions, site plan applications, variances, etc.	✓	Near-Campus Neighbourhoods policies apply to all neighbourhoods within the boundary. Some special policy areas exist and Secondary Plans may be completed for portions of the NCN.
8. Investing in Our Infrastructure		
1. Establish improved transit linkages between target areas and campuses.	✓	Transit system is continually monitored and updated to meet demand. Eg: Route 6A added to provide a direct linkage from downtown to Western campus.
2. Review hours and regularity of transit service on key student utilized corridors. **a.** Example – Brock Bullet	✓	Transit system is continually monitored and updated to meet demand.
3. Explore potential improvements to the amenities offered by transit on these routes.	✓	Amenity improvements are reviewed by request. Regular facility reviews are conducted to ensure adequacy.
4. Explore the possibility of remote parking opportunities, linked to transit to campus	-	Information pending from LTC
5. Explore the possibility of providing bus service after bar closings in Downtown London.	✓	Mustang Express provides after hours service – operated by Western USC. Future consideration by LTC to extend hours of operation by 1 hour.
6. Consider allowing University staff and faculty to purchase bus passes at student rates	-	Information pending from LTC
9. Leveling the Playing Field		

1. Conduct housing fair at various campuses each year	✘	A campus housing fair was explored and found to be ineffective. Other initiatives are in place such as online housing listings.
2. Continue to develop an accredited housing provider list	✘	Found to be redundant with the City's rental licensing by-law.
3. Develop a model lease	✘	This has not been implemented, in accordance with legal advice given to university/college administration.
4. Deliver landlord training sessions – lease writing, insurance, risk management, licensing	✓	Has been implemented on an as-needed basis, particularly effective when specific issues arise.
10. <u>Providing Affordable Housing for Students, Renters and Homeowners</u>		
1. Establish a Targeted Home Ownership Program **a.** Long term loans in return for deed restriction for home ownership only; also enter into a maintenance agreement **b.** Loans help with inflated cost of housing in targeted area **c.** Loans repayable over long term, or upon sale of property, or upon breach of maintenance agreement	✘	A Targeted Home Ownership Program has not been Implemented to date.
2. Another option is to establish a Community Improvement Plan to provide interest free loans to convert housing back from rental to home ownership	✘	A CIP has not been implemented to date.
3. Student Housing Co-op (as described above)	✘	A Student Housing Co-op has not been implemented to date, as a best practices review showed this to be less effective than other approaches.
4. Walk to Work Program – UWO and Fanshawe **a.** Financial assistance to staff for purchasing property	-	A walk to work program is in place at Western, not yet at Fanshawe. Financial assistance is not available, as a best practices review showed this to be less effective than other approaches.

close to UWO (within targeted area) **b.** Will reduce air emissions, energy consumption and help regain balance in neighbourhood **c.** Deed restriction requiring how owner occupancy		