



APPENDIX A:

STAKEHOLDER MEETING SUMMARIES

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #1 – Operators/Owners Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Tuesday, April 27th, 2021
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 9

Project Team:

Carola Perez-Book, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Negin Shamshiri, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jim Faught, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Zoie Browne, LURA Consulting
Sunil Issac, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Jim Faught (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls and facilitated a round of introductions of the project team. Carola Perez-Book provided land acknowledgments. Carola Perez-Book and Emma Bowley then provided an overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #1 – Operators/Owners Summary Report

Question: For those multi-tenant houses that are less served by transit, will there also be permit parking options available especially if there are more than two tenants with vehicles?

Response: The two parking spaces proposed will be off-street parking that the operator/owner would be required to provide on the lot. If there is a need for more off-street parking it is something the operator/owner would have to look at in terms of what other options may be available. For example, if there was on-street permit parking available that can be an option.

Question: What about those areas where the multi-tenant housing is permitted but the on-street permit parking is not? Does that mean the proposed framework is not addressing the off-site parking and permit parking at all?

Response: Two parking spaces on the lot is the proposed minimum standard required for operators/owners. If the operator/owners have space to provide additional parking options they can do that. Zoning only pertains to the property itself.

Question: Does 'city-wide' mean every area of the city?

Response: Yes. Every zone that permits residential uses across the city would allow multi-tenant housing.

Question: Why is the requirement of a sprinkler system in a multi-tenant house not being mentioned, especially at this stage of the discussions?

Response: Part of the requirements for multi-tenant houses licensing would also include an annual inspection by Toronto Fire. An annual inspection is not part of the proposed licensing framework itself as it falls under the legislation that Toronto Fire administers.

Question: What is the timeframe for the implementation of the framework? What would constitute the second phase of the implementation?

Response: If the proposals are approved by Council, the City is estimating a year to a year and a half for implementation. The second phase is focused on providing opportunities for newly established operators to apply for licenses.

Question: What would differentiate a single housekeeping unit from a multi-tenant house?

Response: As per the updated definition of multi-tenant house, it is a building with four or more dwelling rooms that may have shared common facilities for sanitary and cooking that does not function as a single housekeeping unit. If tenants are living as

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #1 – Operators/Owners Summary Report

individuals that are not a single housekeeping unit it would be required to be licensed as a multi-tenant house.

Question: How will the City address issues of tenant displacement that may occur because of the proposed framework?

Response: Displacement is a key issue that we are aware of and are trying to address. City staff are looking at ways to help uphold tenants' rights. Staff are doing work through the Tenant Advisory Committee and subcommittees on protection of affordable rental housing and making available tenant tool kits, handbooks and print material.

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety

Participants discussed what works well and what could be improved about the proposed enhanced licensing requirements. It was noted that participants like that incentives are proposed. It was noted that cost variability is an important consideration. It was suggested that the Habitat Services Model be further investigated for the proposed framework as the landlord incentives for increasing safety, accessibility and other standard features has worked well.

There were questions and concerns raised about the number of units proposed. It was suggested that unit size be considered as opposed to unit numbers as well as common areas provided.

Concerns were also noted about the potential for displacement of tenants as an unintended consequence of the proposed framework. It was noted that operators may not be able to sustain profitability due to new licensing requirements and may decide to sell their properties. City staff confirmed that they are aware of this possibility and are looking at developing initiatives to protect existing rooming houses and maintain affordability (for example: developing an acquisition fund to acquire any houses that are sold and then converting them into an affordable housing option).

2. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Participants indicated that they like that the proposed compliance and enforcement program is intended to be fair and transparent. It was noted that there is a need for uniformity in the way inspections are done. City staff confirmed that under the new multi-tenant housing framework, with the training being universal, every level of enforcement would follow the same process which should help bring property owners, especially those that are newly licensed, up to the expected standards.

3. City-wide Zoning Strategy

Participants noted concerns with the proposed parking rates associated with the City-wide zoning strategy. This included concerns for on-street parking and having or making space on properties for parking. It was specifically noted that the space on properties would be a major concern for properties in Scarborough. It was also noted that properties downtown could have on-street parking but tenants and operators may be using public transportation instead. It was suggested that parking rates could be a negotiated item as it may take away from a properties greenspace and be less of a priority for some operators and/or tenants. City staff referred to relevant bylaws that will be applicable depending on which residential zone one may be in which would disallow removal of landscape.

It was also noted that there could be some confusion around the definition of multi-tenant housing as it applies to areas where they are not currently permitted due to similarities of other forms of housing. An example was provided for the old City of York which does not allow multi-tenant housing but does allow for group homes, which are governed by the Province of Ontario. City staff confirmed that, from the zoning perspective, group homes have to be licensed and funded by the province and / or Government of Canada which is not the case with multi-tenant houses. From zoning by-law perspective, group homes are also considered to be a single housekeeping unit – the idea that everyone, for all intended purposes, is living together not as a family but as a single unit where things are shared (costs, etc.). There are some similarities between personal care multi-tenant houses and group homes in that tenants in group homes require a hard hands-on support on a day-to-day basis and residents in personal care homes as well but then there are legislative differences. The City of Toronto Act also restricts from placing certain conditions on group homes as they are under the provincial regime.

4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

Participants provided suggestions related to supports for operators and tenants including:

- Education for operators to understand what the standards are and what will be involved in meeting them; and
- Education for tenants to know what their rights would be and how they will be supported in their application.

It was noted that incentives can help to keep rents down, provide people with housing stability and protect rooming housing stock as a necessary affordable housing option. Examples were provided such as fee exemptions and tax forgiveness. City staff confirmed their intention to develop and improve appropriate incentives to help both tenants and operators. The benefits of certain programs including Open Door Affordable Housing program, loan or grant programs and other City programs to also help with specific retrofits were shared with the participants.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #1 – Operators/Owners Summary Report

5. Implementation

Overall, all participants were satisfied with the presentation of the implementation plan. It was suggested that the focus should not be to legalize what currently exists as illegal multi-tenant housing, but to make all communities, especially the suburban areas that don't have a path to legalization, function better than before for the benefit of all, as a result of this framework.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #1 – Operators/Owners Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed changes to licensing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
6. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #2 – Tenants Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Thursday, April 29th, 2021
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 10 participants

Project Team

Carola Perez-Book, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto,
Jim Faught, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Leah Snowden, LURA Consulting
Lauren Sooley, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Jim Faught (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls and facilitated a round of introductions of the project team. Carola Perez-Book provided land acknowledgment. Carola Perez-Book and Emma Bowley then provided an overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #2 – Tenants Summary Report

Question: What is your definition of a “review” - a checklist? What does it entail?

Response: The review entails two things: 1) The operator will have to check on the zoning to see if they are allowed to operate according to the new zoning permissions; and 2) The operator will have to ensure building code compliance; proper building permits and renovations conducted safety.

Question: The language of the Enforcement and Compliance program seems like a militaristic approach to a rooming house. Is there any thought being given to reword the language to not make it seem so severe or intimidating?

Response: The City wants to create a framework that protects health and safety of tenants. The enforcement approach is focused on operators that are not complying with the standards to ensure that they keep houses safe for tenants. The City will be doing direct outreach to tenants and raising awareness and education on tenant rights. The City wants to work with the property owners and tenants to ensure that any issues are dealt with.

Question: Does parking allow for extra space for support workers who come in to assist residents?

Response: The proposed parking rate of two parking spaces is the minimum requirement. These spaces can be allocated as the owner sees fit. Operators can also provide additional parking if they have enough space on the property. There are no specific requirements for multi-tenant operators to include visitor parking spaces.

Question: People experiencing trauma often have difficulty working with an authoritative landlord or enforcement staff member. Will free mediation services be arranged through a third-party facilitator to help reduce the trauma?

Response: There are agencies that the City has been working with to bridge the gap between potential enforcement or other such issues. Mediation is free of charge for both the property owner and the tenant. The expectation is that both the tenant and property owner would want to come to the table. In the past, this has been successful.

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #2 – Tenants Summary Report

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety

Participants made various suggestions in relations to property management. It was expressed that there is a need to include pest management as part of the proposed changes. There was also a suggestion to include a capital expenditure plan for larger maintenance projects (e.g., leaks for roofs and garages).

Participants noted that tenant privacy should be considered when incidents are reported to the City (e.g., names not included, no blames placed on anyone, etc.). As well, that reports should document pertinent details including what happened, how the issue was resolved or at least a plan of action on how the issue will be resolved.

Participants expressed concerns about the insurance costs that they might be asked to pay by the operators as part of the rent, and that there is a need for an accessible and affordable third-party insurer to support tenants.

2. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Participants noted concerns with surprise inspections. It was suggested that tenants should receive at least 24 hours notice of any inspection or maintenance work. It was suggested that guidelines similar to RentSafeTO can be used. The need for keeping landlords accountable was discussed with a suggestion to include a penalty should the landlords fail to comply within 30 days of inspection.

It was noted that tenant dignity must be upheld as they are engaged, and that information for tenants should be made available both in digital forms as well as physical handouts. It was suggested that legal clinics and local political offices should be involved in tenant outreach and awareness. It was further noted that wrap-around supports should be included as part of the tenant resource with information including:

- How to access social workers for various needs;
- Mental health supports and services; and
- Supports available for tenants with hoarding issues.

Participants noted that they should not only be provided with digital services such as good quality Wi-Fi connection, but also the option to choose which service they want to pay for.

3. City-wide Zoning Strategy

Participants expressed concerns for overcrowding resulting from condo owners renting out bedrooms, living rooms, and dining room as separate rooms. A suggestion was made that the zoning should be based on square footage and not number of rooms.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Workshop #2 – Tenants Summary Report

A need for street parking came up through the discussions, and the fact that more needs to be done on parking licensing to ensure there is enough street parking available for both tenants and other neighbourhood residents.

Highlighting the need for affordable housing, participants made a suggestion on making a certain percentage of rooms in all multi-tenant houses available at affordable rents (rates compatible with ODSP and OW).

4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

Participants expressed concerns with affordability and eviction issues. Participants expressed that food and cleaning services should be included in the overall cost of the rent. Tenants should be aware that if there is going to be a rent increase that it meets standards. The standards should be for all portions of their rent including additional food and cleaning costs.

Participants expressed that any application for work on a multi-tenant houses should include proper requirements for tenant eviction, if required. It is important to ensure that tenants are not evicted for improper renovation work. It is also important to ensure that the building permit is issued prior to the notice of termination to tenants.

Landlord accountability was discussed, and it was noted that landlords are not currently complying with building permit requirements and that the frequency of inspection visits from by-law personnel should be increased to ensure the requirements are being followed and the safety of tenants is not compromised.

The need to look at various ways to help ensure that rooms remain accessible to vulnerable tenants such as seniors, was highlighted. Suggestions to maintain accessibility included:

- Ramps (as per AODA standards);
- Wide doorways;
- Accessible washrooms and showers; and
- Green building incentives and rebates (for landlords) to help offset the costs of retrofitting.

Tenant education suggestions specifically noted include:

- Information provided in multiple languages;
- Information distributed through pamphlets as well as through one-on-one calling services (with a tracking confirmation associated with each call).

5. Implementation

Participants emphasized that the City should prioritize new operators. It was noted that bringing the existing operators (especially those that are high-risk) to full compliance

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Workshop #2 – Tenants Summary Report

may take a long time, with also the possibility of appeals that may further delay the implementation of the proposed framework.

Participants highlighted the importance of providing funding or other means of support (e.g., incentives, retrofit supports, etc.) to help operators bring existing multi-tenant houses into compliance with the building code and other licensing requirements.

The concern about tenant displacement was also noted as participants expressed that as this project process takes effect, vulnerable tenants should not end up losing their housing.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #2 – Tenants Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed changes to licensing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
5. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #3 – Tenant Service Providers Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Monday, May 3rd, 2021
Time: 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 8 participants

Organizations / Groups (represented):

Dixon Hall, Reena Marketing & Communications, Chai-Tikvah Foundation, Homes First, Legal Aid Ontario, Black Cap, Native Child & Family Services of Toronto

Project Team:

Carola Perez-Book, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jim Faught, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Leah Snowden, LURA Consulting
Lauren Sooley, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the stakeholder meetings is to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Jim Faught (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls and facilitated a round of introductions of the project team. Carola Perez-Book provided land acknowledgment. Carola Perez-Book and Emma Bowley then provided an overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #3 – Tenant Service Providers Summary Report

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: Is there a requirement for a sprinkler or a fire suppression system in the framework?

Response: Each multi-tenant house would be inspected by Municipal Licensing and Standards and Toronto Fire. Toronto Fire will be inspecting requirements in relation to the sprinkler system or fire suppression system. The framework does refer to the requirement for fire safety but does not provide any specifics on the Fire Code requirements.

Question: What would 'submitting floor plans' look like for the landlords? Would there be a requirement for any specific documentation that may have to be provided?

Response: The City is looking for an accurate representation of each floor as it relates to the actual property, not necessarily engineered drawings. Drawings would be accepted with accurate measurements of each room and an accurate reflection of what is on each floor.

Question: What is the rationale for keeping the length of the license to 1 year unless the owner/operator lives there, in which case it becomes 2 years?

Response: The City is considering simplifying the owner-occupied parameters of what is currently in the by-law and is looking to have all licenses required to be renewed on a yearly basis.

Question: Is the license focused on the operator or the house?

Response: If the operator of the multi-tenant house changes there would be a requirement to acquire a new license.

Question: What was the reason for removing any reference to rent in the multi-tenant house definition?

Response: The City is still looking at potentially including rent in the definition, but unlike the old definition, it will not be the primary factor in how a multi-tenant house is defined. It has been a challenge in the past to collect information on rents collected in a multi-tenant house.

Question: What is the rationale for ten or more units for the electrical inspection requirement?

Response: On the advice from Toronto Fire, a higher threshold was recommended for electrical inspections. This is correlated with standards in the fire code. If Toronto Fire

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #3 – Tenant Service Providers Summary Report

sees risks, the City can request inspections from other multi-tenant houses with a smaller number of units.

Question: The licensing requirements seem to be very challenging to attain and there is a lot of bureaucracy. How are landlords going to get approval for these requirements?

Response: The City is looking to introduce financial incentive programs for operators to help them meet the proposed requirements. There have been programs in the past where property taxes or application fees were waived for a period of time in exchange for maintaining affordability of the units.

5. Feedback Summary

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

1. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Participants expressed concerns and confusion with how the by-laws are interpreted and implemented by fire inspectors and building inspectors. It was suggested that the amount of administration should be reduced and efforts should be made to make the process simple. City staff confirmed that while the specifics of the Fire Code and Building Code Act are out of scope for this project they are an inter-divisional effort being made to address such issues.

Participants wanted to better understand the timeframe for operators to meet any maintenance or renovation needs identified during inspections. City staff confirmed 30 days (as an average) but highlighted factors such as severity of the issues, time of the year and other such factors are considered.

Participants emphasized the need for resources for both tenants and operators. Funding options and education resources on compliance were highlighted for the operators while educational resources for tenants including information on accessing affordable, safe housing in case they lose their housing as an indirect consequence of the implementation of the new framework. City staff clarified that while enforcement will be undertaken where necessary, the approach would primarily be collaborative to support landlords to comply. If a situation is presented where a multi-tenant house needs to be shut down, the City would be working with other City departments to help tenants get resources needed to transition to other forms of housing.

Participants expressed concerns with the potential for high costs that the operators may have to incur to meet all the requirements and ask if there were any estimates that the City can provide. City staff confirmed that research was completed by Maytree Foundation to understand the costs involved with compliance, and that the relevant

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #3 – Tenant Service Providers Summary Report

information was included in the preliminary report submitted to the Planning and Housing Committee. Based on the research findings, the City learned that the costs can be significant and can vary depending on the size of the house. The City is looking at financial incentives for landlords to offset the costs. The City is also simultaneously working on the possibility of hiring a consultant to look at ways to simplify compliance and lower the cost impact.

2. City-wide Zoning Strategy

Participants discussed the need to have a better understanding of the extent to which the existing multi-tenant houses will be impacted by the new zoning requirements. Participants noted that multi-tenant houses where students are housed often contain more than 6 rooms and thus there is a potential for implications for students, as well as operators, if the framework includes 6 units as a standard.

Participants emphasized that parking implications be seriously considered under the proposed framework. Participants noted that parking can affect different types of tenants in different ways. As an example, for students in the suburbs, availability of parking spaces is important for many who may drive to school.

3. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

Participants noted tenant displacement as a major concern and emphasized that a plan needs to be put in place to deal with mass displacement of tenants. An example of a tenant emergency relocation plan was provided. Incentives for operators will be necessary but also the availability and accessibility of supports (including housing) for displaced tenants will be needed. City staff confirmed that the Housing Secretariat is looking at opportunities to create new supportive housing across the City to cater to different housing needs.

5. Implementation

Participants expressed both support and opposition for the proposed implementation plan. Some participants expressed some concern toward the implementation plan in how it may result in an increase in homelessness across the city (and may also disproportionately impact minority groups). Some participants expressed optimism that with well-designed strategies in place to develop support systems and by maintaining a collaborative approach, the implementation can be successful.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #3 – Tenant Service Providers Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed changes to licensing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
4. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #4 – Post Secondary Institutions Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Thursday, May 6th, 2021
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 14

Organizations / Groups (represented):

University of Toronto (U of T), York University (YU), Seneca College, Humber College, Ontario College of Arts & Design University (OCAD), George Brown, Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations (FMTA), Sts. Peter and Paul Residence

Project Team:

Carola Perez-Book, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Negin Shamshiri, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Liz McHardy, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Zoie Browne, LURA Consulting
Sunil Issac, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Liz McHardy (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls, facilitated a round of introductions of the project team and provided land acknowledgment. Carola Perez-Book and Emma Bowley then provided an overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #4 – Post Secondary Institutions Summary Report

the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: Would the maximum number of rooms apply to existing legal rooming houses when they re-apply for a license?

Response: From a zoning perspective, an existing legal rooming house would be grandfathered into the proposed new zoning permissions. From a licensing perspective, if the multi-tenant house is licensed with the City, we will continue to license them under the new by-law.

Question: How would private student residences such as Tartu College or CampusOne fit within these definitions and these proposed by-laws? Most of their apartment units have 4 or more dwelling rooms?

Response: Private student residences can contain bed-sitting rooms (dwelling rooms) but since they are developed privately and not in cooperation with a post-secondary institution they are not considered a student residence and thus do not fall under multi-tenant housing. If these are existing private residences they may have gone through some approval process with the City and are under certain zoning conditions that will continue to apply. There are some private student residences being developed by UofT (St. George campus) downtown where some site-specific zoning by-laws have been developed through the planning approval process under which these residences would be considered rooming houses. Thus, in certain situations private student residences may fall under rooming houses category but also possible that they may not.

Question: What incentives are being provided for landlords of existing multi-tenant houses to become legal within the new framework?

Response: The Housing Secretariat is looking at incentives to assist landlords such as waiving property taxes and fees associated with planning, development and permits. Work is also being done with Toronto Building to develop alternative development standards (i.e., fire separation) to enable them to meet the code. We want to work with landlords to help them maintain the affordability of units in exchange for incentives. The intent is not to lose housing but to help operators comply to standards to ensure safety and wellbeing of tenants is maintained.

Question: Students can often be living in unsafe conditions with multiple students packed in one room. How would a student know if the place they are living at is licensed or not? How can they report if it is not licensed or unsafe to live in? Will they be assisted with any alternative housing if needed?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #4 – Post Secondary Institutions Summary Report

Response: We want students to have an open line of communication with the City. We are maintaining a page on our website which lists all the existing licensed multi-tenant houses. As well, we are working on a community engagement strategy whereby we will be working with universities and colleges to disseminate information on student rights as residents. Students can get in touch with us through the various means provided on our recently-updated [website](#). Alternatively, students can also go through 311 to get the necessary assistance.

Question: Two parking spaces are not sufficient in places like Scarborough where on-street parking is not allowed. Will that be factored into regional parking minimums?

Response: We are proposing that operators are required to provide a minimum of two off-street parking spaces. If they have additional space, they can provide more parking. At the same time, we are encouraging alternate modes of transportation especially in areas where transit is available and accessible. This is still a proposal and we are seeking feedback on how we can best address this issue.

Question: What are the problems that are leading you to introduce these enhancements and enforcements?

Response: Multi-tenant houses may only be permitted in limited parts of the city but they actually do exist all across the city. Many of them exist illegally and are outside the regulatory framework. This is compromising the safety and wellbeing of tenants as well as leading to many other problems in the neighbourhoods where they exist. We are trying to create a system whereby these houses can exist legally all across the city and benefit both the tenants as well as the neighbourhoods.

Question: Are you putting too many requirements on operators with regards to enhancements? Can you focus on enforcement instead?

Response: The City needs to modernize and harmonize the old and fragmented rules. We are looking at ways to encourage this form of housing to continue to exist, recognizing this is an important part of the affordable housing options in the city.

Question: What is the rationale for a maximum number of units in a rooming house, regardless of the building square footage? Wouldn't this affect the viability and affordability of rooming houses?

Response: The number of rooms being proposed (6, 12, 25) are based on the former City of Toronto requirements, and have been in place since the 1970's. With that said, we remain open to suggestions as to how issues related to the maximum number of units can best be addressed.

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety

Participants expressed strong support for the changes that have been proposed and discussed the necessity of these changes and the impact they may have on the well-being of students. Many participants noted that the proposed requirements could be beneficial to students as well as post-secondary institutions. However, many concerns were raised about the potential displacement of students that may occur and the need for the City to consider how these issues would be addressed.

Participants reflected upon the need for operators to be able to demonstrate compliance with zoning by-laws and Building Code. They highlighted the unsafe housing conditions under which some students have lived and the pressure they feel to not voice their concerns. It was noted that both the necessity of enforcing the by-laws to ensure operator compliance and ensuring tenants are protected are equally important.

Concerns were also raised regarding the expectation laid upon operators to meet certain requirements which may be greater than other programs such as RentSafeTO. It was noted that the proposed fee per unit under the proposed framework is almost double the fee applied to apartment building units. It was suggested to make the standards the same or as close to traditional apartment buildings as possible.

One participant noted that operators are in a for-profit business and do not need incentives.

2. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Participants emphasized the necessity for student tenants to be educated and informed on their rights and thus the need to get the necessary educational material made as accessible as possible for students. Participants highlighted the critical role that the post-secondary institutions can play in organizing effective outreach through student engagement and coordination on various activities. Suggestions were made to involve student unions as well as create opportunities whereby students can advocate for themselves. Off-campus housing programs for students can be utilized to reach students with information that is simple and most relevant.

It was suggested that the City's website needs to be tenant-friendly with content that is engaging, supportive and available all in one place. Examples such as the Parkdale Neighbourhood Land Trust (PNLT) and Parkdale's People Economy were suggested as good resources to empower other organizations on effective tenant engagement where

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #4 – Post Secondary Institutions Summary Report

tenants can not only be made aware of their rights but also mobilized to advocate on eviction issues and other forms of harassment and discrimination. Participants stated the need to develop tenant education tools using simple language and content that is most relevant to students. Translation considerations were also noted.

Some participants noted that while there should be stricter fines for property standard violations, there is also a need for imposing fines or similar measures for cases where tenants have violated their rights and responsibilities.

Participants also discussed the importance of timing in reaching students and suggested the most appropriate time for reaching out to students could be the months of September to March (excluding reading week and exam periods).

3. City-wide Zoning Strategy

Participants expressed concern about the number of units proposed and suggested the consideration of size of unit. It was noted that the proposed maximum number of rooms may be seen as discriminatory and may work against the intention to create more affordable housing options for the vulnerable populations that they serve most.

4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

Participants strongly supported the need for an educational toolkit with information about housing standards and how tenants can protect themselves. It was noted that an email address and / or a contact number to a City department provided on the information materials and website would be effective and encourage student engagement. Factors such as turnaround time for responses and ability to reach a live person were also noted. A few participants indicated that support staff availability can help operator accountability, ensuring maintenance of tenant rights and the safety and well-being of tenants.

Participants discussed challenges that can arise after an emergency situation, such as a fire, that requires relocation and the importance of insurance. City staff confirmed that various insurance options are being further investigated as part of this project process. This includes ongoing discussions with IDC Insurance and the Insurance Bureau. However, there is currently no insurance product that specifically covers tenant accommodation or provision of emergency social services in the case of emergencies.. City staff further noted that the City does have supports available for tenants that need to evacuate their home via the Office of Emergency Management, the Housing Secretariat and the Shelter, Support and Housing Administration (SSHA).

Participants cited social media tools as a powerful means to get important messages to students and particularly emphasized the use of tools such as: website (with content in plain, engaging language), YouTube (for video messaging and longer run content), Facebook and Instagram (connected platforms however Instagram has been more successful for outreach than Facebook).

5. Implementation

A few participants suggested that the proposed phasing of the implementation plan be reversed. Participants noted that the licensing of new multi-tenant housing should be a priority to help increase the affordable housing stock, and that bringing existing operators into compliance can happen simultaneously, but as a secondary priority.

Participants also noted that there can be negative community feedback related to multi-tenant housing and the City needs to consider and plan for this as it looks to open up multi-tenant housing to more neighbourhoods, particularly surrounding post-secondary institutions.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #4 – Post Secondary Institutions Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed changes to licensing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
6. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #5 – Fraternities & Sororities Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Friday, May 7th, 2021
Time: 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 6 participants

Organizations / Groups (represented):

Sorority and Fraternity Association of Toronto (SoFra)

Project Team:

Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Amanda Sinclair, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jim Faught, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Leah Snowden, LURA Consulting
Sunil Issac, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Jim Faught (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls, facilitated a round of introductions of the project team and participants, and provided land acknowledgment.

Participants expressed that they are well acquainted with the proposed framework, and as such, there wouldn't be a need for an overview presentation. Participants indicated that they are attending to present their position on SoFra's houses and how they are being considered within the proposed framework.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #5 – Fraternities & Sororities Summary Report

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: How will LURA be reporting what they are learning from the community and what will constitute the next steps?

Response: The feedback from the community will be recorded and summarized into a report for City staff. The consultation report will form part of a final Staff Report to the Planning and Housing Committee in mid-2021 including:

- Recommended zoning by-law amendments
- New licensing by-law for multi-tenant houses

Question: What is the driving force to include fraternities and sororities in the proposed framework? There are decades of precedents set by the City and Province that have set them aside as a distinct use.

Response: It is Council's directive to include fraternity and sorority houses as potentially licensed entities. The City wants to be transparent in this process and will be looking at various options. There are carveouts in the by-law for types of housing that are not exactly similar to multi-tenant houses, for example, the Parkdale bachelorettes, that can be included as a multi-tenant house and the same is true with fraternity and sorority houses.

Question: If I own a house, undivided, single housekeeping unit, allow 7 to 8 students to use the property and make them responsible for the care and maintenance of the property during the time that they are residing there, would that property be considered multi-tenant housing?

Response: In this case, it won't be considered a multi-tenant house, however, there are situations where there are types of housing that may still be considered as part of multi-tenant housing even if they don't fully meet the exact multi-tenant housing definition that you are referring to (e.g., Parkdale bachelorettes).

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the summary of the key points that participants wanted to share with the City. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback.

- The SoFra Federation executives represent the not-for-profit alumni / associations that own all nineteen (19) nationally and internationally chartered sororities and fraternities with Chapter Houses in the City of Toronto.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #5 – Fraternities & Sororities Summary Report

- SoFra houses do not fall under multi-tenant housing as they are single housekeeping units existing as private residences. SoFra should not be considered a rooming house/multi-tenant house.
- Each of the fraternity and sorority houses have membership with each member having the choice to live in these houses. Members may live in their house if they so choose.
- SoFra houses are not rental properties and are not governed by the Residential Tenancies Act. They do not operate as a business entity but only exist to serve the membership.
- From a zoning perspective, the houses are well-established. SoFra's should be grandfathered into any new zoning regulations.
- From a licensing perspective, if neighbours have issues with SoFra houses (e.g., noise, waste disposal, weeds, etc.) they can call 311 and if there does exist any evidence Municipal Licensing and Standards can take action to enforce the relevant by-laws.
- If the City is proposing to include SoFra houses under the new framework, SoFra intends to appeal the decision. This change could result in hundreds of SoFra members forced out of their residences and becoming homeless which can exacerbate the homelessness crisis.
- SoFra members confirmed that they are going to share a written statement with the City in the coming days to further confirm their position on this issue.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #6 – Housing Advocacy & Academics Groups Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Monday, May 10th, 2021
Time: 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 16 participants

Project Team:

Carola Perez-Book, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Negin Shamshiri, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Liz McHardy, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Leah Snowden, LURA Consulting
Sunil Issac, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Liz McHardy (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls, facilitated a round of introductions of the project team and provided land acknowledgment. Carola Perez-Book and Emma Bowley then provided an overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #6 – Housing Advocacy & Academics Groups Summary Report

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: Will the proposed 6 room limit only apply to multi-tenant houses in areas that are considered residential?

Response: Multi-tenant houses would be permitted in all zones that permit residential uses, subject to certain conditions. The maximum number of dwelling rooms would be 6 in most residential neighbourhoods.

Question: Why is the City proposing a 6 room maximum when by-laws exist to deal with overcrowding issues and have been used in the past?

Response: The number of rooms being proposed (6, 12, 25) comes from the former City of Toronto permissions that have been in place since the 1970's. It seems that the permissions have worked well and we wanted to keep the number of rooms consistent with what we have seen with those houses.

Question: If a house has more than 12 units, will they be losing these spaces or will they be grandfathered?

Response: If the house existed lawfully then it would be grandfathered, but if not it would be required to comply with the new zoning requirements.

Question: What will become of the tenants in rooming houses that may have more than 6 units? Will there be some exceptions in place for such houses that are willing to work with the City on compliance-related issues?

Response: The City doesn't want to create displacement and homelessness as we look to create the city-wide framework for multi-tenant houses. We will be working on options for shelter, rapid housing and acquisition as well as building partnerships with organizations to best deal with the issue of displacement in case it may occur. Tools and resources will be developed focusing not just on enforcement related matters but also on tenant education and supports. We will continue to work with the community on solutions to best address these issues.

Question: Why would the information on tenants be shared with the City when it should be kept confidential? Why can't there be an effort made to unify multi-tenants under the best practices that have already been established by a number of existing multi-tenant houses instead of looking to re-invent the wheel and focusing on the worst of the worst cases of non-compliance?

Response: We have strong relationships with organizations that have been running multi-tenant houses and our intention remains to continue to learn from and apply the best practices that already exist.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #6 – Housing Advocacy & Academics Groups Summary Report

Question: Would a reward/incentive program be considered for good operators (those that have successfully run multi-tenant houses for many years following good practices and laws) and to give non-compliant and illegal landlords an incentive to operate correctly?

Response: The City is looking to introduce financial incentive programs for operators to help them meet the proposed requirements. There have been programs in the past where property taxes or application fees were waived for a period of time in exchange for maintaining affordability of the units. There are several options that the City can explore to work with operators. The City wants to ensure that tenants are living in safe and adequate housing.

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety

Participants agreed on the need for enforcement components and keeping operators accountable on tenant safety and well-being. Participants emphasized the need to streamline the process on zoning and building permit review to avoid uncertainty that tenants may have to face as well as possible increase in costs for the operators. Keeping the costs low would be necessary in order for the fees not to be passed on to tenants. It was also noted that operators of illegal multi-tenant houses should not be penalized for any renovations they may have done on their properties.

Participants inquired if there was a possibility to apply different levels of licensing, especially in the cases where certain multi-tenant houses may be existing under an already well-established system such as the Habitat Services. Concerns were noted with requirements like insurance, cost recovery fees, etc. It was suggested that existing multi-tenant houses that are already meeting the key requirements under the new framework be transitioned without causing any confusion or disruption to service.

2. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Participants encouraged the need for engaging students, and particularly paying attention to the way the engagement process is carried out. Participants noted the need to consider the timing of outreach activities to ensure that the maximum number of students can be reached. It was suggested that the content should be made as relevant as possible, in plain language, and where possible, in multiple languages to ensure broad outreach. It was encouraged to consider working with and through student unions and institutions and involving students, wherever possible, in designing and disseminating information tools. Participants suggested including information such as:

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #6 – Housing Advocacy & Academics Groups Summary Report

- Hotline;
- Information on legal services;
- Information on mental health supports;
- Information on eviction supports.

3. City-wide Zoning Strategy

Participants strongly supported the need for zoning changes but also raised concerns with the existing multi-tenant houses that have been in existence for years, but may fail on meeting the requirements that the City is proposing (e.g., 6 rooms limit, occupant numbers, etc.). City staff highlighted that multi-tenant houses that have been in existence legally will be supported, and where needed, could be permitted through the minor variance process.

4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

Participants noted their concerns with displacement and highlighted the need to look carefully at how the proposed requirements could affect operators and eventually tenants. Displacement and tenant well-being should be paramount as the new changes are introduced. Participants suggested the need to provide opportunities for tenants, who are made to leave their housing, with affordable housing options with considerations of cultural sensitivity and proximity to essential services. It was suggested that a plan for displacement include components such as tenant transportation, education, and housing options.

Participants also emphasized the need for creating educational resources for tenants, and in particular, students, with contact details available for City staff that can be contacted in the case of operators not meeting the compliance requirements or where evictions occur.

5. Implementation

Overall, all participants seemed satisfied with the implementation plan and didn't expressed any concerns.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #6 – Housing Advocacy & Academics Groups Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed changes to licensing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
6. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #7 – Resident Associations Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Monday, May 10th, 2021
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 32 participants

Organizations / Groups (represented):

Long Branch Neighbourhood Association, South Armour Heights Residents Association, Upper Avenue Community Association, Regal Heights Resident Association, President Heathwood Ratepayers Association, Highland Creek Community Association, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association, Avenue-Bay Cottingham (ABC) Ratepayers' Association, Grange Community Association, Federation of South Toronto Residents Associations (FoSTRA), Kensington Residents Association, Grange Community Association, Bayview Cummer Neighborhood Association, West Rouge Community Association, Centennial Community and Recreation Association Scarborough, Guildwood Village Community Association, Highland Creek Community Association, Scarborough Rosewood Community Association, Golden Mile and Neighbourhoods Association, Annex Residents Association

Project Team:

Carola Perez-Book, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Negin Shamshiri, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Amanda Sinclair, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Michael Hain, City of Toronto, City Planning (Transportation Policy & Analysis Unit)
Jim Faught, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Zoie Browne, LURA Consulting
Sunil Issac, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #7 – Resident Associations Summary Report

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Jim Faught (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls, facilitated a round of introductions of the project team and provided land acknowledgment. Carola Perez-Book and Emma Bowley then provided an overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: Will you share the slide deck of this presentation?

Response: The slide deck for the overview presentation can be accessed through our website: <http://toronto.ca/MTHreview>.

Question: How will you find out if a certain operator is compliant or not?

Response: We can know based on the complaints that we may receive from tenants and neighbours and information shared through inter-divisional coordination. We work closely with Toronto Fire when conducting annual inspections and do have regular communication on compliance-related matters. Our own enforcement efforts can also lead to becoming aware of issues with non-compliance. Once the information is received, we carry out the necessary investigations and engage the operators on any requirements that are not being met.

Question: How do you define 'affordable rental housing'?

Response: The City is currently reviewing its definition of Affordable Rental Housing. The review of this definition will help ensure that rent prices set by the City are appropriate and affordable for low- and moderate-income households. The proposed definition is housing that is intended to cost less than 30% of a households' before-tax income.

Question: Is there a minimum square footage requirement on the size of the multi-tenant housing units?

Response: Yes, and we will be enforcing that through the Ontario Building Code and Property Standards by-law.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #7 – Resident Associations Summary Report

Question: What is the timeframe for the implementation of the framework?

Response: The City is proposing a phased approach which can be spread over multiple years. We will start with bringing existing houses into compliance and then provide an opportunity for new operators to apply for licences.

Question: How will you ensure enforcement of the proposed by-laws when the City is failing on existing by-laws enforcement?

Response: The City conducts annual inspections which is a requirement for the multi-tenant housing licensing process. We intend to continue enforcing Fire Code, Ontario Building Code, and Property Standards by-laws through a coordinated effort involving Toronto Fire, Toronto Building and other relevant departments to avoid any gaps in our enforcement strategy. We are also looking to expand the enforcement resources (e.g., dedicated enforcement team) and tools (e.g., Remedial Action Plan) to better tackle any issues moving forward.

Question: How are you going to address illegal parking issues? Will there be a requirement on the number and sizes of rooms, washrooms, kitchen, etc.? Are there considerations being made on how these proposed changes can impact different communities?

Response: If people are parking illegally, it should be reported. That is an enforcement issue. With respect to washrooms, the City is proposing the requirement for a minimum of 1 washroom per 4 dwelling rooms. City staff want to work with neighbours, tenants and operators on maintaining the character of the neighbourhoods.

Question: Will there be opportunities for tenants to build social connections and have access to all the specific services they may require?

Response: The City is committed to building 'complete communities' where people can live, work, shop and access services in close proximity to where they live. Our intention will remain to work with neighbourhoods and communities on ensuring all relevant services are available in the area.

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety

Participants are uncertain if the City would have the resources to be able to keep operators and tenants accountable for the proposed licensing requirements. Concerns

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #7 – Resident Associations Summary Report

were discussed pertaining to property management issues, illegal parking, health and safety concerns.

2. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Concerns were raised that the City may not be able to enforce all the relevant by-laws and licensing requirements which may lead to an increase in the number of illegal multi-tenant houses across the city. City staff confirmed that while they cannot regulate who may end up buying a property in a certain neighbourhood, participants were reassured that operators will have to meet stringent requirements (Fire Code, Ontario Building Code, Property Management Plan, annual inspections, etc.).

Participants considered enforcement measures to be the most critical piece to the proposed changes and maintained that without the proper enforcement this initiative can fail. Participants reminded the City of the need to properly study the implications of these changes before moving forward.

3. City-wide Zoning Strategy

Participants expressed concerns with city-wide expansion of multi-tenant houses without the regard for the character of each neighbourhood. Participants noted that changes will impact neighbourhoods and community members in different ways. Concerns were discussed pertaining to the concentration of multi-tenant houses in certain neighbourhoods and increase in illegal multi-tenant houses as a direct result of city-wide expansion.

4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

A suggestion was presented to the City to think about more incentives and less punishments. Some participants were concerned about tenant well-being, particularly for female tenants, and wanted the City to consider the safety elements.

5. Implementation

Participants wanted reassurance that the City's proposed budget that will be presented to Council matches the realities of what is taking place on ground.

6. Additional Questions

The questions below were raised by participants for follow-up by City staff:

- Is the City certain that Council will agree on the numbers that will be presented?
- Does the City have an idea as to how many multi-tenant houses will be created?
- Does the City know the number of existing illegal multi-tenant houses?
- What is the source of funding for the increased enforcement costs, incentives and other expenses as part of the new framework?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #7 – Resident Associations Summary Report

- How many enforcement officers will be working on enforcement-related matters pertaining to rooming houses, and how many new enforcement officers will be hired?

City staff confirmed that it is not easy to confirm the number of illegal rooming houses in the city. As well, that the budgetary costs are based on the number of complaints that are received on a regular basis. Staff have also looked at other programs like RentSafeTO and other such programs to inform the recommendations that will be presented to Council. The specific details and relevant numbers will be adapted as necessary as the initiative moves forward.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. City staff intend to host a follow-up session with stakeholders from Residents Association to further discuss details pertaining to questions raised during the session. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #7 – Resident Associations Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed changes to licensing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
1. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #8 – Housing Organizations & Providers Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Wednesday, May 12th, 2021
Time: 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 19 participants

Organizations / Groups (represented):

Native Child & Family Services of Toronto, Surrey Place, Houselink, Legal Aid Ontario, Regent Park Community Health Centre, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH), Connelly Consulting Services, Toronto Alliance to End Homelessness, Yee Hong Centre, Youth Without Shelter, Habitat Services, Warden Woods Community Centre, Homes First, Peregrine Cooperative, Ecuhome, East York East Toronto (EYET), Agincourt Community Services

Project Team:

Carola Perez-Book, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Negin Shamshiri, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jim Faught, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Leah Snowden, LURA Consulting
Lauren Sooley, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #8 – Housing Organizations & Providers Summary Report

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Jim Faught (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls, facilitated a round of introductions of the project team and provided land acknowledgment. Carola Perez-Book and Emma Bowley then provided an overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: Is there any room for grandparenting certain houses that are mandated to help the most vulnerable (e.g., homeless) populations such as Urban Native Housing?

Response: For a property to be considered a multi-tenant house it needs to have four or more rooms but must not be operating as a single-house keeping unit where the responsibilities for the care of the house are shared among the tenants. This does not seem to fit with Urban Native Housing but the City will be looking at this further.

Question: What are the back-up plans if the owners decide not to go through the process but end up shutting down the multi-tenant house?

Response: The City is looking at how to ensure these changes are implemented in a manner that protects the existing multi-tenant houses. This includes emergency relocation scenarios and incentive programs to offset the costs of compliance.

Question: If the new zoning by-laws are approved what will happen to the homes with more than 6 rooms providing well-maintained affordable housing?

Response: If and where needed, the operators can request exemptions through the Committee of Adjustment and provide details as to how they can still operate as a multi-tenant house. Unless there is a serious health or safety concern, we do not intend to shut down existing multi-tenant houses.

Question: Can you elaborate on what makes a house a multi-tenant house different from a group home?

Response: Group homes are licensed and funded by Provincial / Federal governments. They provide accommodation for up to 10 people, but they operate as a single house keeping unit (i.e., tenants share meals and house keeping duties). In a multi-tenant house, each tenant signs a lease agreement for their individual room and there is no sharing of duties. The tenants are not living as a single housekeeping unit.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #8 – Housing Organizations & Providers Summary Report

Question: Are there any opportunities for grandfathering houses where the costs to comply would be too high and result in the owners having to sell the property?

Response: If these houses are in the former City of Toronto some of them may already have been grandfathered in when the zoning changed in the 1970s. The City is working with Toronto Building to reduce the costs of retrofitting buildings. The Housing Secretariat is considering developing an incentive program that would help with costs for operators. This could include exemptions to property taxes, development or planning fees in exchange for affordable housing.

Question: Why is the City choosing to have a room cap? Why not use the property standards the City already has in place to deal with issues of overcrowding?

Response: The maximum number of rooms is reflective of existing built form in a lot of the neighbourhoods where licensed multi-tenant houses are currently licenced. The City is working on ways to ensure compliance without having to undergo significant alterations to buildings.

Question: Does the City have resources to provide supports to alternative housing options for tenants if needed?

Response: The City plans to work with organizations to develop tenant information kits so that tenants are made aware of their rights as well as have access to information on housing options and other relevant resources. We want individuals with lived experience to contribute to the development of these kits, help ensure it is easily understood and provided in a variety of languages

Question: What is the plan if tenants are displaced?

Response: The City intends to work with operators to gradually bring them into compliance. If we see a loss of rooms as a direct consequence of the proposed changes we will look at relevant solutions. The City is looking for feedback and ideas from the communities on ways to address issues that may arise from the proposed changes, such as displacement.

Question: What is the purpose of the parking rate?

Response: The intent is to see an overall reduction in parking spaces where it is possible. We will consider all factors, pertaining to different neighbourhoods, as we move forward.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #8 – Housing Organizations & Providers Summary Report

Question: Can the City make it easier to access on-street parking in areas where tenants need cars, especially in the suburbs?

Response: This would involve different divisions and communities and would need Council direction and approval. On-street parking is not regulated by zoning. Transportation Services handles street parking permits.

Question: Can a parking space under the proposed by-law be inside a garage?

Response: Yes. A parking space can be on a driveway or inside of a garage. The space must be included fully within the boundaries of the property.

Question: With the City keen to preserve and expand Toronto's deeply affordable housing and promote the well-being of tenants how will it facilitate licensing approvals and how long do you anticipate Phase 1 to take?

Response: The City is looking at a multi-year, multi-phased approach. The City is looking at incrementally bringing in the existing houses within the framework.

Question: Will Phase 1 and Phase 2 implementation plan be simultaneous?

Response: The City is developing an overall implementation plan and phased approach for the proposed framework. A first phase would be launched to bring existing operators into compliance while the second phase will provide an opportunity for new operators to apply for licenses.

Question: Why has the City decided on this implementation approach?

Response: Implementation is being phased in this way so that resources can focus on priority areas first and then move into work with new operators.

Question: Why will you be focusing on operators that are licensed in the first phase of implementation?

Response: The first phase of implementation will focus on both licensed and unlicensed operators that the City is aware of in order to bring both into compliance with the proposed by-law changes.

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #8 – Housing Organizations & Providers Summary Report

verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety

Participants appreciated the proposed changes to and saw value in bringing consistency in the way regulations and by-laws will be applied as well as the emphasis being laid on tenant safety, dignity and well-being. Participants noted concerns about the potential for increased costs, especially for non-profit operators to meet the requirements. Licensing fees, particularly for non-profit organizations, could be a challenge as some may not have extra funds to sustain these costs. Participants emphasized that the City should allow houses that offer affordable, well-maintained housing, even those with more than 6 rooms, to continue operating.

Participants also emphasized the need for consistency in the way annual inspections are carried out by different inspectors. Participants expressed optimism that with the new licensing process the issue of inspection inconsistency will also be dealt with.

2. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Some concerns were raised with the costs associated with compliance and its implications for both operators and tenants, as well as the way the annual inspections are carried out. Participants encouraged the City to support non-profit operators with incentives, exemptions and other such measures and noted that they are often covering their mortgage and operational costs from the rents they receive from tenants with subsidies not keeping pace with inflation.

3. City-wide Zoning Strategy

Overall, participants were in support of the city-wide expansion of the multi-tenant housing but also did raise some concerns. Participants wanted the City to consider the limits being placed on the number of dwelling rooms. It was noted that 40% of units could be lost if new requirements are fully complied with because a lot of shared housing exists with more than 6 rooms.

Participants further noted that two parking spots can be a barrier for operators. In some cases, off-street parking may not even be necessary as many of the tenants do not drive. However, it was acknowledged that in suburban areas, off-street parking might be very necessary.

Participants also wanted the City to remain cognisant of the contexts of different neighbourhoods when implementing the parking requirement. For example, Scarborough was highlighted as one part of the city with serious parking issues

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Workshop #8 – Housing Organizations & Providers Summary Report

(overcrowding, no on-street parking allowed etc.). Participants noted that more will need to be done in such areas to support multi-tenant housing operators and residents.

3. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

Participants cautioned the City on the fact that tenants, especially those housed in personal care facilities, are very vulnerable and may end up being displaced if the by-law requirements cannot be met and houses are shut down. It was further noted that the supportive housing sector has a limited ability to absorb additional tenants especially those with concurrent disorders and other mental health conditions. If people are de-housed the City would need to come up with a strategy to deal with the situation such that people can attain decent housing quickly.

Participants encouraged the City to remain cognisant of the unintended consequences the changes can bring in the shape of mass displacement of tenants in case the operators sell out or fail to comply with the new requirements. Suggestions to consider include:

- Alternative, reasonable housing options to be considered for tenants. Shelters were pointed out as not an ideal alternative.
- Information on resources should be made available to tenants (including those with mental health issues) in plain, tenant-friendly language and made available in multiple languages. MCIS Language Solutions was noted as a language services agency that can assist with translation in 350 languages.

4. Implementation

Participants recommended that the two phases should take place simultaneously rather than one following the other. They suspect the city may start losing the existing affordable housing and may end up with more homelessness. Thus, the emphasis remained on the need for the creation of more affordable housing and by supporting new operators to become licensed. As well, it was noted that the City should prioritize unlicensed operators first as part of their strategy under Phase 1. Participants agreed that licensed operators will already have some standards in place.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #8 – Housing Organizations & Providers Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed changes to licensing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
5. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #9 – Post-Secondary Students & Tenants Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Wednesday, May 12th, 2021
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 12 participants

Project Team:

Carola Perez-Book, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Negin Shamshiri, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Liz McHardy, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Leah Snowden, LURA Consulting
Lauren Sooley, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Liz McHardy (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls, facilitated a round of introductions of the project team and provided land acknowledgment. Carola Perez-Book and Emma Bowley then provided an overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #9 – Post-Secondary Students and Tenants Summary Report

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: Does the plan for changes to the zoning by-law include Scarborough as well?

Response: Yes. The proposed zoning would apply city-wide in any zone that permits residential uses.

Question: How will the proposed framework for multi-tenant houses respect the restrictions related to COVID-19? How will international students be able to quarantine when they come back to Canada?

Response: The City has consulted Toronto Public Health on provisions that need to be incorporated in the by-law review in recognition of the COVID-19 global pandemic. Toronto Public Health has provided approval with the current proposal's direction. The City does not have jurisdiction over issues of tenants losing their rooms as a result of having to return to their home country due to the pandemic. This may fall under the Residential Tenancies Act under the Provincial Government's mandate. It should come down to the terms of agreement between the landlords and the students.

Question: Are there any protections in place for tenants to ensure that the increased costs resulting from compliance requirements do not get passed on to them?

Response: The City is working on developing incentive programs with landlords to keep units affordable. Incentives could include things like waiving property taxes and development fees for a period of time or offering federal and provincial supports for retrofits in exchange for affordability of units. We are proposing to require landlords to share their rent rolls with the City to ensure that they stay at the agreed-upon rent.

Question: Who is responsible for upkeep of common areas such as kitchens and washrooms in a multi-tenant house?

Response: The operator oversees the property standards and upkeep of the residence.

Question: What are the safety protocols for multi-tenant houses?

Response: When the City licenses a multi-tenant house, part of the licensing requirements includes a thorough annual inspection. The City is proposing a series of enhanced requirements to increase safety in multi-tenant houses. This includes electrical safety inspections for larger multi-tenant houses, property maintenance plans, providing floor plans and a record of the number of tenants living in the house. Annual inspections will be a coordinated effort between different City departments.

Question: Will the fees for licensing remain fixed? What factors will determine any changes to the fees?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #9 – Post-Secondary Students and Tenants Summary Report

Response: The proposed fees for a multi-tenant houses are based on the number of rooms each house may have. It is a fixed dollar amount per room regardless of size, location, etc.

Question: How will on-street parking affect other people who share the road such as cyclists, transit users? How will the City ensure safety of those users?

Response: The proposed framework would require on-site parking space(s). This space will be included within the private property of the multi-tenant house. In most suburban areas of the city, on-street parking is not permitted. Cars that are parked on the street in areas where they should not be parked is a parking enforcement issue. The City has heard that parking is also an issue in residential areas around the post-secondary schools. The City is considering this as part of this process.

Question: Is there an incentive for the residents to take public transportation instead of having a car?

Response: In the downtown area and other areas well-served by transit the proposal is either to have no parking spaces or only one parking space. The City has no jurisdiction over the conditions of rent set up by the landlord. How these spaces are allocated is at the discretion of the operator.

Question: Does the City have a plan to ensure that the cost of providing parking is not passed on to the tenants?

Response: The City does not have the authority to regulate how much the landlord charges for a parking spot or how the landlord allocates the parking spaces. Overall, the City is proposing a reduction in the number of parking spaces.

Question: How can individual tenants exercise their rights to peaceful and safe occupation of their property (dwelling rooms) when there are other tenants doing or selling drugs in the building?

Response: There are legal clinics and other groups in the city who can support tenants. There are also mechanisms under the Residential Tenancies Act where tenants can be evicted for displaying certain negative behaviours. While the option to call the police is always available, the City is looking at mental health intervention alternatives to policing.

Question: What does the consultation process for this project look like and how can we get more involved? How are you going to make sure that all voices are heard?

Response: The City has hosted a variety of stakeholder sessions with various groups including operators, tenants, pos-secondary institutions, housing advocates and more. A Do-it-Yourself (DIY) toolkit was also made available to a variety of organizations. This kit helped reach groups that usually do not get involved in traditional city consultations.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #9 – Post-Secondary Students and Tenants Summary Report

There is also a feedback form available online and by telephone. We encourage you to complete the feedback form as well as share this opportunity with others.

Question: Can the City provide a safety net for students not covered by tenants insurance?

Response: The City has not yet found any insurance product that is an obvious fit in situations where fire and life safety become an issue. Staff are looking at emergency response aspects to assist with safety issues. The Office of Emergency Management can deliver emergency social services in response to incidents that require relocation and ensure that people are safe and have somewhere to go. There are other emergency responses that can be activated depending on the situation in addition to existing services including shelter support.

Question: Were there any consultations done with fraternity and sorority groups?

Response: Yes, the City held a stakeholder consultation session last week with fraternity and sorority groups.

Question: What can relocation look like for tenants?

Response: The Office of Emergency Management is better placed to address the specifics being asked for in this question.

Question: Will all the information become available to the public after the consultations are over?

Response: A report on all the feedback provided during the consultation will be produced by LURA Consulting. This *What We Heard Report* will become a part of the report that goes to the Planning and Housing Committee, along with the proposed amendments to the zoning by-law. This report will be made public.

Question: Have landlords been consulted in this process?

Response: Yes, stakeholder sessions for landlords and operators were held during this process.

Question: Can additional feedback be provided after this meeting?

Response: Yes. Feedback on this project will be collected until May 18th.

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a

verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety

Participants emphasized the need to implement standards, particularly focused on personal care multi-tenant houses, with much care and tact so to not, in any way, negatively affect the many vulnerable tenants of such housing.

2. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Participants supported the annual inspections with enhanced requirements but also expressed concerns with the existing inconsistencies in the way the annual inspections are carried-out by different inspectors. As well, participants highlighted the costs to compliance as a factor that needs important consideration as these costs may be passed on to tenants. In some cases, tenants can end up losing their housing as a direct consequence of them being unable to cover the increased rental costs. Participants particularly wanted the City to consider the impact such evictions can have on low-income tenants during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Participants also noted how the COVID-19 pandemic has negatively affected the ability of operators to sustain their operations. Some of these operators have lost their businesses as they have struggled to comply with certain conditions placed upon them.

3. City-wide Zoning Strategy

Education and awareness raising was highlighted as critical to city-wide zoning approach, especially for student tenants. Key suggestions are provided below:

- Information should be easy to understand and accessible. It should be available in multiple languages to benefit people who are coming from other countries.
- Information should be made available online and through other digital tools. As well, non-digital avenues should be considered including print material (guidebooks, brochures, etc.) made available through various means including post-secondary institutions, legal clinics, housing organizations, cultural organizations, community hubs as well as operators, etc. While information should be made available through digital means there are communities of people who have limited or no access to internet.

4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

Participants emphasized that any resource materials that are developed must be able to address all the possible needs a tenant can have, especially when it comes to living in a multi-tenant house. Tenants must know their rights and who they can turn to in case they experience a violation of such rights.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #9 – Post-Secondary Students and Tenants Summary Report

Participants reiterated their concerns with not being able to deal with emergency situations because many students can't afford tenant insurance. They further confirmed that tenant insurance is not something that they are required to acquire by operators. Students not covered by insurance need a safety net from the City if something happens.

5. Implementation

No specific feedback provided.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #9 – Post-Secondary Students & Tenants Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed changes to licensing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
6. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #10 – Personal Care Operators Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Monday, May 17th, 2021
Time: 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 20 participants

Organizations / Groups (represented):

Habitat Services, Office of Public Guardian & Trustee, COTA, LOFT Community Services, Federation of North Toronto Residents Association, ABC Residents Association

Project Team:

Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Sherri Hanley, City of Toronto, Housing Secretariat
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Negin Shamshiri, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Christine Navarro, City of Toronto, Toronto Public Health
Jim Faught, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Leah Snowden, LURA Consulting
Sunil Issac, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the stakeholder meetings is to provide an opportunity for in-depth conversations with stakeholder groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Jim Faught (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls, facilitated a round of introductions of the project team and provided land acknowledgment. Kyle Knoeck and Emma Bowley then provided an overview

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #10 – Personal Care Operators Summary Report

presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification on the content presented.

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: How many dedicated MLS team members do you have currently, and what would be the new number under the proposed changes?

Response: We currently have 6 enforcement officers, 5 of which are working remotely. We are proposing to expand the team to 28 enforcement officers.

Question: What improvements were made to group homes as a result of the consultations done in 2015, 2017 and 2019?

Response: Group homes are exempt from the current review. They are not included in the definition of a multi-tenant house or a personal care house. They are registered by the province.

Question: Will the cost for electrical evaluation, especially in the case of some of the older and bigger houses, be covered by the package of compliance options?

Response: The City is developing an incentives program for eligible landlords to undertake building retrofits. Toronto Building is developing a package of compliance options for operators to choose from to meet the Ontario Building Code requirements. This does not include the electrical evaluation costs as we are envisioning this cost will be borne by the operators. If the operators are eager that some support be made available for such evaluations we can consider how these costs can be added to the financial incentives we are currently working on.

Question: Since there could be high costs associated with meeting the requirements for compliance in addition to a relatively high per room license fee of \$25 to \$50, especially in the case of larger houses that have more than 6 rooms, will the City be looking to provide any financial packages to support the existing rooming houses with all these costs?

Response: City staff will be considering the feedback on the fees in terms of their impact on larger operators. We are exploring options to provide incentives to bring existing homes into compliance.

Question: Is it possible to have broader partnership involving both provincial and federal authorities to find ways to assist operators with high-cost items like electrical compliance, sprinkler systems, etc.? Incorporating the various regulations into one streamlined package is preferred. Can there be a consideration made to give operators

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #10 – Personal Care Operators Summary Report

an incremental timeline to complete all the requirements being asked of them under the proposed framework?

Response: The City wants to work collaboratively with operators on meeting the licensing and zoning requirements. We will consider advocacy with the federal and provincial authorities on sharing the burden of the costs that operators are asked to bear. As well, the incremental compliance is another area that we can consider.

Question: Of the 350 licensed multi-tenant houses, how many are personal care homes and what is the average number of occupants in personal care homes? What issues were uncovered in any past reviews done on the by-laws pertinent to personal care multi-tenant houses?

Response: There are 55 licensed personal care homes. We don't have the data on the average number of tenants and rooms in each of these houses but we will be happy to follow up with you on this. The licensing by-laws that cover personal care homes have not been updated since amalgamation.

5. Feedback Summary

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the meeting and has been organized by themes. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback. A list of the discussion questions can be found in **Appendix A**.

1. Personal Care Proposed Standards

Participants showed concern with the costs associated with meeting the new requirements being placed on personal care multi-tenant houses. Eight of the organizations participating in the session are contracted by Habitat Services where they are providing funding to run their operations. Often, the experience has been that the funding is not keeping pace with inflation. Habitat Services subsidizes 982 units in partnership with the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care and the City of Toronto. Part of the operations are paid for through subsidies while the remainder is covered by the rents. With the new requirements, participant noted that the already increasing costs of operations would be further exacerbated. Participants expressed a willingness to comply with the new standards but also recommended that the City should be looking to partner with operators to help reduce their costs for meeting the compliance requirements.

In particular, participants raised concerns with the requirements that pertained to the following:

- Changes to the written care agreements;
- Costs associated with hiring a registered dietician to conduct annual reviews;
- Training and qualification for operators and persons-in-charge.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #10 – Personal Care Operators Summary Report

In response to the specific concerns, City staff noted that agreements that are currently being used by operators can be shared with the City to inform their recommendations.

As well, City staff confirmed that while Toronto Public Health dietitians may not have the capacity to carry out the annual reviews to ensure that the food safety requirements are met, they can provide overall guidance to the process. It was noted that Toronto Public Health resources are focused on the pandemic at this time and as such are limited.

On the education requirements, participants sought clarification on the minimum training and qualification for operators and persons-in-charge. It was noted that many personal care homes are managed by new immigrants with nursing experience rather than education obtained in Canada. These homes provide quality services and staff, particularly newcomers, should not be penalized through the new requirements. City staff responded that they do not want to create barriers for staff, particularly newcomers to Canada as their role as frontline workers was mutually acknowledged in the care of the most vulnerable.

2. Compliance and Enforcement Program

Participants wanted to understand what the enforcement operations would look like under the new framework. City staff noted that it would be a coordinated exercise involving various City divisions. Annual inspections will be carried out, as usual, to enforce all the by-laws including the enforcement of any changes being proposed. As well, it was noted that there is not going to be any separation in terms of the number of enforcement officers being assigned to personal care homes as opposed to other multi-tenant houses.

3. City-wide Zoning Strategy

It was noted that Habitat Services funds 42 houses of which a good number have more than 6 rooms. The suggestion was given to have these houses grandparented into the new framework. City staff confirmed that they will be working with City planning to provide grandfathering for existing licensed operators. It was noted that if a rooming house was established and complied with the zoning that was in place at that time then it will be considered as compliant under the new regime (known as legally non-conforming). City staff further noted that only if the operators wanted to expand or start a new operation somewhere on the property then they will have to comply with the zoning standards that Council adopts or they may have to pursue a site-specific minor variance application.

Participants raised concerns about the potential of causing mass displacement if the unlicensed personal care houses are closed down because of their inability to meet certain requirements (e.g., maximum number of rooms, etc.). City staff confirmed that there are parts of the city that will be subject to the 12 room or 25 room maximums. As

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Workshop #10 – Personal Care Operators Summary Report

well, it was noted that there are avenues in the Planning Act to allow landowners and operators to seek site-specific permissions as a minor variance. On de-housing, City staff confirmed that their focus remains on the high-risk operators and that they are looking to work collaboratively with operators to keep houses operational for residents.

Participants wanted to understand the City's proposed parking rates and, in particular, the definition of areas considered well-served by transit. City staff confirmed the use of a City-approved map which clearly defines parts of the city that are well-served (i.e., provides easy access to subways, light rail, dedicated right of way, etc.) when deciding parking rates. In terms of easy access, it was noted this is typically based on walking distance of between 500 to 800 meters.

On the question of any restrictions in the case of property ownership transfer if someone decides to sell their property, City staff noted that a license is attached to the operator while zoning is attached to the property. If the transfer of ownership of the business was to go to another individual that individual would have to notify MLS and the license would need to be applied for in their name. City staff confirmed that from a zoning perspective if the property is sold it would still be in zoning compliance if the use remains the same.

4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability

No specific feedback provided.

5. Implementation

Participants raised concerns with the phased approach where licensing of existing multi-tenant houses is being prioritized over bringing in newly licensed homes. City staff highlighted the fact that the process will be gradual, and somewhat, overlapping. As well, that this gradual approach would allow the City to keep reviewing and improving the implementation areas to best support existing and new multi-tenant operators.

Participants also suggested that instead of hiring 28 new enforcement officers perhaps it would be better to consider hiring 25 officers and 3 registered dieticians that can be dedicated to the support of personal care multi-tenant houses. Participants again reiterated the fact that the operational costs of running personal care multi-tenant houses are high and thus cooperation from the City in this matter would be highly desired.

6. Next Steps

The community engagement and consultation process will continue with other stakeholder meetings, public meetings, online and phone questionnaire and community-led consultations using the DIY Workshop. LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #10 – Personal Care Operators Summary Report

Appendix A

Discussion Questions:

1. Enhanced Licensing Requirements to Promote Health and Safety
<p>Proposed requirements for personal care multi-tenant houses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you like about the proposed changes? • What concerns do you have about the proposed changes?
2. Compliance and Enforcement Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the compliance and enforcement program? • What kind of education tools and resources do you think would be helpful to tenants, owners, operators, and community members to learn about bylaw requirements and the enforcement and complaints process?
3. City-wide Zoning Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed maximum number of dwelling rooms in a multi-tenant house is six for most residential areas of the city. Do you agree with this recommendation? Why or why not? <p>The proposed parking rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any issues/concerns with the City’s proposed parking rates? • Do you have any issues/concerns that the City should consider for the city-wide zoning permissions and standards?
4. Supporting Tenants and Maintaining Housing Affordability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What supports or incentives would help operators/landlords offset costs of retrofits and achieving compliance? • What supports/resources do you think tenants need to better understand their rights and responsibilities in a multi-tenant house? • What supports/resources do tenants need if multi-tenant housing standards are not being met by landlords/operators? • What kind of support do tenants need if there was an immediate fire/life safety concern that required relocation?
5. Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the implementation plan? Why or why not?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing Stakeholder Meeting #11 – Resident Associations (Follow-up) Summary Report

1. Meeting Details

Date: Friday, May 28th, 2021

Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

2. Attendees

of Attendees: 31 participants

Organizations / Groups (represented):

Bloor West Village Residents Association; Agincourt Village Community Association; Beaconfields Village Resident Association; Highland Creek Community Association; Kensington Market Resident Association; Maryvale Community Association; Heathwood Ratepayers Association; St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association; Annex Residents Association; St. Andrew's Ratepayers Association; Harbord Village Residents Association; Avenue-Bay Cottingham (ABC) Ratepayers' Association

Project Team:

Kyle Knoeck, City of Toronto, City Planning (Zoning)
Emma Bowley, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Jean Paul Nadeau, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Aisha Salim, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Amanda Sinclair, City of Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards
Zoie Browne, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)
Sunil Issac, LURA Consulting

3. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to provide a follow-up opportunity for in-depth conversations with resident associations and community groups about the proposed regulatory framework and learn about the unique experiences and insights provided by stakeholders about how the regulation of multi-tenant houses can be improved.

4. Overview Presentation / Questions of Clarification

Zoie Browne (LURA Consulting), welcomed participants, explained Zoom virtual meeting controls and provided land acknowledgment. Kyle Knoeck and Emma Bowley then provided a shortened overview presentation on multi-tenant houses in Toronto and the four components of the proposed regulatory framework. Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask any questions of clarification and provide feedback.

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #11 – Resident Associations (Follow-up) Summary Report

A list of the questions and responses provided by City staff are provided below. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Question: Is the City certain that Council will agree on the numbers that will be presented?

Response: No, we can't be certain until Council reviews the proposal and the numbers presented.

Question: Does the City have an idea as to how many multi-tenant houses will be created?

Response: We do not currently have a number as to how many multi-tenant houses will be created.

Question: Does the City know the number of existing illegal multi-tenant houses?

Response: An estimate can be made, based on complaints that the City has received, that there are hundreds of illegal multi-tenant housing. However, we cannot definitively determine whether these are all multi-tenant houses that are operating illegally. We currently have just under 400 licensed rooming houses which include both personal care rooming houses as well as licensed rooming houses.

Question: Who is paying for the increased enforcement costs, incentives and other expenses as part of the new framework?

Response: This would depend on Council approval. It is proposed that each division will pay for its own enforcement costs and financial incentives would be funded through the Housing Secretariat.

Question: How many enforcement officers will be working on enforcement-related matters pertaining to rooming houses, and how many new enforcement officers will be hired?

Response: We are looking to hire up to 28 officers. These will include officers who will be working on both enforcement and licensing.

Question: Can you please elaborate on the timeline for licensed and unlicensed houses to be properly licensed and give assurance on the number of enforcement officers including assurance that they would be available 24/7?

Response: It is going to be an iterative process to bring unlicensed multi-tenant houses under the licensed regime. In terms of the implementation timeline, we would be looking at:

- year one: prepare internally to launch the licensing process;

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #11 – Resident Associations (Follow-up) Summary Report

- year two: focus on licensing existing operators and those identified as operating illegally; and
- year three: focus on the new operators.

Question: What is going to be done about rooming houses, particularly around UofT, that are operating illegally?

Response: Zoning currently permits multi-tenant housing in the area around UofT and the illegal houses in that area are supposed to be licensed. The 3-year implementation timeline would not apply to those houses. There are a number of properties in that area that are being investigated and we can be contacted by the community about others that they deem as illegal rooming houses.

Question: Were there any changes made to the deck based on the comments that are being received from the community?

Response: The presentation content has not been changed since the public meetings that took place. All comments received are being documented by LURA Consulting and will be included in the summary report that will be provided to City staff to inform their Staff Report as they go to Council.

Question: What is the maximum number of people allowed per house for there are houses that are single-housekeeping units but operating as multi-tenant houses in North York and even after being investigated nothing is being done about them?

Response: There is no cap on the maximum number people allowed in a multi-tenant house through zoning and licensing. The number is determined by the Building Code and Property Standards by-laws. Property standards do consider the size of the room.

Question: How can you come up with a proposal to go city-wide when you can't even enforce the houses that are operating illegally, like in North York, and violating standards consistently with no respect for neighbours?

Response: Illegal multi-tenant houses in North York have no other options but to operate illegally because they are not currently permitted to be licensed. The goal of this proposal is to give illegal multi-tenant houses the opportunity to become licensed. We are also proposing to increase resources so enforcement can be carried out city wide. We have also included proposed financial incentives to assist operators in legalizing their properties under the new proposed framework.

Question: Will existing illegal rooming houses be grandfathered?

Response: Legal multi-tenant houses will continue to be legal within the new proposed zoning conditions.

Question: Are basement units also covered by the same by-laws?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #11 – Resident Associations (Follow-up) Summary Report

Response: The by-law does not distinguish a room in the basement from rooms in other parts of the house so the proposed number of six rooms would apply regardless of whether rooms are in the basement or on another floor. There are houses that have converted the basements into secondary suites and that is considered as a specifically defined use in zoning by-law that is distinct from multi-tenant house.

Question: According to a report issued by the City in 2014 – Rooming Houses Review – one of the findings was that better enforcement of rooming houses is needed for the following reasons: the current system is seen as ineffective; better enforcement requires a change of strategy; better enforcement requires changes to the rules; better enforcement means system changes; better enforcement means tougher penalties. What has been done to improve each of the mentioned areas for this is what is really needed to make this worth the effort?

Response: This is part of an ongoing review, and through the proposed changes in the zoning by-law, licensing conditions this is exactly what we are trying to achieve.

Question: In Ward 22 and all across the city, illegal rooming houses are rampant. How do you reckon that you are going to be able to get them licensed? As well, the garbage disposal is a serious concern. On garbage days the bins are filled to overflowing such that even the containers can't be properly closed with garbage flying everywhere. Do you have any reasonable answers to these issues addressed through this proposed framework?

Response: Under the proposed framework we will require operators to provide us with a Property Standards Plan which would include managing garbage disposal. Once we receive the plan, it will need to be reviewed and approved. The city may also impose fines on operators that remain non-compliant. We have an existing enforcement team, that has been further expanded since last year, and deals with relevant neighbourhood concerns. Complaints can be filed through 311.

Question: Can the City provide us with any update on the previous consultations on multi-tenant houses? Is the summary available on the website?

Response: There were consultations held in 2015, 2017 and 2019. Some reports have been removed from the project webpages, as updates and changes have been made. Reports can be found at the following webpages:

- <https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/planning-studies-initiatives/addressing-the-loss-of-dwelling-rooms/>
- <https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/9726-MTH-Consultation-Report-CoT-FINAL-Nov617.pdf>

Question: How will the feedback provided on the framework be used to improve the framework?

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #11 – Resident Associations (Follow-up) Summary Report

Response: We have received over a thousand responses through the online feedback form in addition to the feedback received via emails and the various engagement events that we have organized. All feedback received is being documented by LURA Consulting and will be included in the summary report that will be provided to City staff to inform the Staff Report to be presented to Planning and Housing Committee and Council.

Question: What exactly is the definition of a multi-tenant house?

Response: We are proposing to include in the definition of multi-tenant housing as a building with four or more dwelling rooms that may have shared washroom and cooking facilities. A multi-tenant house does not function as a single-housekeeping unit.

Question: Can you provide us with details as to what happens when a complaint is filed against an operator?

Response: Once a complaint is received research is conducted on the history of the property. All the relevant information that is acquired through the research is provided to the enforcement team. Based on the information, an enforcement team visits the site and interview tenants, operators and inspects the properties (if needed). If anyone has a complaint you can contact 311 as well as our enforcement team.

Question: How are you going to deal with on-street parking?

Response: The zoning by-law has a current standard for minimum front-yard landscaping. Those standards will remain in place and would affect a multi-tenant house in the same way as any other house. If someone widens their driveways they are violating the by-law and it could be enforced by the City. In the case of multi-tenant houses, the enforcement team manage these issues.

Question: How are you going to restrict multi-tenant houses and backyard suites in Scarborough keeping in view the infrastructure we have in place?

Response: The proposal includes monitoring and communities are encouraged to connect with the city for local studies and planning changes.

5. Summary of Feedback

This section presents the feedback received during the meeting. This summary is not intended to be a verbatim dictation, but instead an overview summary of feedback.

Some participants expressed serious concerns for the health and safety of tenants in illegal multi-tenant housing, including those in North York, Scarborough and students near universities living in cramped living quarters. One participant noted knowing about two deaths that have occurred around a university campus. It was noted that participants greatly appreciated the proposed frameworks efforts of addressing health and safety standards for multi-tenant housing and supporting the vulnerable populations that they usually serve. The proposed by-laws need to ensure that this type of housing

City-Wide Framework for Multi-tenant Housing
Stakeholder Meeting #11 – Resident Associations (Follow-up) Summary Report

is not precarious, and that this type of housing can help people be successful and stable especially vulnerable members of the community.

Concerns were noted about the success of a city-wide approach to the framework and how well it would be received in various areas. It was suggested that the proposed framework have different rules and regulations for areas of the city where multi-tenant houses is legal (i.e. downtown) and areas where multi-tenant houses are not permitted and the framework may be more applicable (i.e. North York, Scarborough, York). A few participants noted that the proposed six dwelling rooms allowed to operate is too high and would a substantial increase in certain areas and may negatively impact neighbourhoods. One participant noted that downtown neighbourhoods may be disproportionately impacted by this framework and the city should consider not approving any new properties in the downtown core.

A suggestion was made that the multi-tenant houses should be the operators principal residence in order to limit one landlord from operating multiple properties. One participant also stated that incentives may not be effective and can lead to an increase in illegal multi-tenant houses.

Waste disposal was discussed, and several participants indicated that it was a major concern in their communities. It was suggested that photographs of buildings be collected when assessing garbage disposal issues. Garbage and recycling bins should also not be permitted in the front yard. It was suggested that waste disposal remain within the property, so neighbourhoods are not filled with an over abundance of waste.

Parking was briefly mentioned and it was suggested that six dwelling room tenants in one property would need access to two parking spaces to support moving, visitors, deliveries and other needs that cannot be met by transit.

As the project progresses, it was suggested that the city research other cities around the world where multi-tenant houses have been successful. It was suggested that a committee be formed to discuss and consider the impact of the framework and whether it can be successful and applied city-wide. One participant also noted that further consultation events should take place to demonstrate how the proposal has been modified to incorporate feedback provided during this engagement process

6. Next Steps

LURA Consulting, will prepare a final engagement summary report for city staff to inform the next steps of the project process.