3 church street, suite 100
toronto, ontario, M5E 1M2
tel: (416) 364-4414
fax: (416) 364-2099
www.nblc.com

n. barry lyon consultants limited

DRAFT - Memorandum

To:	**City of Greater Sudbury**		
From:	N. Barry Lyon Consultants Limited		
Phone:	(416) 364-4414	**Date:**	November 2018
Re:	Social Housing Revitalization Plan: Portfolio Rationalization Analysis		

N. Barry Lyon Consultants Limited (NBLC) has been retained by the City of Greater Sudbury to develop a Social Housing Revitalization Plan, which aims to develop a range of strategies designed to revitalize and optimize the aging social housing stock. As part of this Revitalization Plan, NBLC has evaluated each of the real estate assets managed by the Greater Sudbury Housing Corporation to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each building/project. Factors such as operating and capital costs, alignment with current and projected social housing demand, wait list indicators, end of debentures, required grant repayments, locational strengths/weakness, unit turnover rate, long term vacancy occurrences, redevelopment potential, and other similar items have all been evaluated.

This foundational piece of analysis will be used to develop recommendations to be undertaken through the revitalization plan. The summary information and recommendations found herein are based on the following background work completed in support of the Revitalization Plan:

- Affordable Housing Supply and Demand Analysis: NBLC assessed current and projected demand for affordable housing in the City of Greater Sudbury relative to the existing social housing supply. This work directly influenced some of the findings within the GSHC Real Estate Portfolio Analysis.

- GSHC Real Estate Portfolio Analysis: NBLC assessed each asset in the GSHC housing portfolio. This analysis determined the qualitative and quantitative strengths/weaknesses of each asset. A profile of each GSHC asset is provided in this report, which summarizes the data and other factors evaluated.

- Stakeholder Consultation: Utilizing the Real Estate Portfolio Analysis, NBLC facilitated a discussion of the GSHC real estate portfolio to identify the properties that require targeted revitalization strategies and/or other interventions. Attendees at this session included key members of the GSHC, members of the GSHC Board of Directors, and staff from the City's Housing Services department.

- Social Housing Revitalization Best Practices: This report informs the larger Revitalization Plan with respect to social housing revitalization approaches that have proven effective in other jurisdictions.

Based on the analysis undertaken by NBLC, in addition to the consultation session with the GSHC and City of Greater Sudbury, the GSHC assets have been sorted into one or more of the following categories.

- **Retain:** Assets are generally in good shape, perform well, and meet the needs of current and future tenants. These buildings will be retained and all required capital repairs will be made. Renovations and other investments (e.g. energy retrofits, design interventions, green space implementation, etc.) could also be considered on a site by site basis.

    - These assets will require base capital repairs to ensure they can remain operational and can be safely occupied. Some assets may require more significant capital investments, but remain useful components of the GSHC portfolio and should therefore be retained.

- **Revitalize and Retain:** Assets are generally challenged due to one or more prevailing issues. These buildings may not be strategically located from a redevelopment perspective, would command a modest value if sold, or other contributing factor that would make the asset less desirable for redevelopment or disposition. Revitalization actions are required at these assets to improve the living conditions, desirability and attractiveness of the asset/community, reduce the high operating costs and/or capital liability, and other actions to ensure the asset is restored as a useful component of the GSHC portfolio. Investments such as interior renovations, exterior façade improvements, site design interventions (e.g. public parks, art, community programming, community hub/space, etc.) could all be considered. Other factors such as converting some units to AMR or market housing to promote income-mixing could also be considered.

- **(Re)development:** Could include total or partial redevelopment of large sites, demolition and new development on existing sites, new development on underutilized or vacant lands, as well as significant alterations to existing assets (e.g. converting a large home into two smaller apartments, expanding an existing apartment building, etc.).

- **Dispose:** These assets typically do not meet the future projected demand and have high operating costs. These assets should be sold to generate capital for investment efforts elsewhere. This could include a market sale or selling a home to existing RGI tenants or other qualifying purchaser through an affordable ownership program.

The recommendations in this report have been developed through a short to mid-range planning horizon. Appreciating that there are not enough financial resources or organizational capacity to fully revitalize every asset within the portfolio, some assets may be sorted into more than one category (e.g. retain until funding becomes available for redevelopment, both redevelopment and disposal should be considered, etc.).

1.0 Asset Classification Analysis

The tables on the following pages illustrate the classification results based on the analysis and consultation completed. Some observations are noted:

- Nearly 70% of the portfolio falls within the **Retain** category, including 100% of the one-bedroom units in the portfolio.

- The assets recommended for retention have modest average operating costs (annual) on a per unit basis ($3,620) relative to the assets classified as **Revitalize and Retain** ($4,869), **Redevelopment** ($5,308), and **Dispose** ($4,967).

- Similarly, the forecasted average capital need on a per unit basis to 2036 is lower for the assets recommended for retention ($66,268) when compared to the assets classified as **Revitalize and Retain** ($112,554) and **Redevelopment** ($124,273). Of note, the assets recommended for disposal have capital needs very similar to the retention category.

- The assets classified as **Retain** have a forecasted capital need of just over $82 million by 2036, representing approximately 60% of the total capital need of the entire portfolio. This capital need is estimated through Ameresco Asset Planner software, which uses component life duration, estimated costs, and date of last replacement to generate a comprehensive model of necessary capital work.

- While the Asset Planner software is an efficient tool to estimate the capital needs of a portfolio for reporting and forecasting purposes, a more detailed analysis is necessary when making capital investment decisions. More detailed analyses will consist of building component inspections and full building condition assessments.

- It is important to note that the service manager will remain responsible for the segment classified as **Retain**, which includes this forecasted capital need and the ongoing operating subsidy.

Asset Classification: RETAIN										
Property	Typology	Units						Capital Need to 2036	Capital Need to 2036 (per unit)	Operating Cost Per Unit (2017)
		1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	5 BR	Total			
720 Bruce	High-Rise Apartment	250	1				251	$11,737,328	$46,762	$3,065
166 Louis	High-Rise Apartment	50					50	$2,903,361	$58,067	$3,830
1920 Paris	High-Rise Apartment	100	1				101	$8,055,031	$79,753	$2,849
1960 A Paris	High-Rise Apartment	100		1			101	$7,417,611	$73,442	$3,724
1960 B Paris	High-Rise Apartment		150	12			162	$14,288,726	$88,202	$3,817
1052 Belfry	High-Rise Apartment	100	1				101	$5,118,135	$50,675	$2,626
715 Burton	Low-Rise Apartment	20					20	$2,009,274	$100,464	$3,764
1528 Kennedy	Low-Rise Apartment	20					20	$1,025,395	$51,270	$3,643
3553 Montpellier	Low-Rise Apartment	41					41	$2,401,322	$58,569	$3,135
240 B Street	Low-Rise Apartment	26					26	$1,797,309	$69,127	$4,155
155 Lapointe	Low-Rise Apartment	27					27	$2,019,438	$74,794	$3,634
27 Hanna	Low-Rise Apartment	20					20	$1,668,575	$83,429	$4,173
35 Spruce	Low-Rise Apartment	24					24	$1,907,638	$79,485	$3,929
1200 Attlee	Townhouse		24	16	29	7	76	$5,717,634	$75,232	$4,348
1950 LaSalle	Townhouse		20	74	12		106	$7,400,510	$69,816	$4,601
241 Second	Townhouse			36	26	8	70	$3,732,799	$53,326	$4,701
491 Camelot	Townhouse		20	22			42	$2,840,194	$67,624	$3,948
Sub-Total/Average		**778**	**217**	**161**	**67**	**15**	**1,238**	**$82,040,281**	**$66,268**	**$3,620**
Percentage of Total		**100%**	**62%**	**32%**	**42%**	**33%**	**67%**	**59%**	**-**	**-**

Asset Classification: REVITALIZE AND RETAIN										
Property	Typology	Units						Capital Need to 2036	Capital Need to 2036 (per unit)	Operating Cost Per Unit (2017)
		1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	5 BR	Total			
159 Louis	Low-Rise Apartment and Townhouse		66	39	15	7	127	$21,035,571	$165,634	$5,412
Rumball Terrace	Townhouse			26	12	4	42	$2,754,826	$65,591	$4,286
744 Bruce	Townhouse		45	93	12		150	$13,117,315	$87,449	$4,529
1778 LaSalle	Townhouse			16	11	3	30	$2,373,550	$79,118	$5,084
Sub-Total/Average		**0**	**111**	**174**	**50**	**14**	**349**	**$39,281,261**	**$112,554**	**$4,869**
Percentage of Total		**0%**	**32%**	**34%**	**31%**	**30%**	**19%**	**28%**	**-**	**-**

Asset Classification: (RE)DEVELOPMENT										
Property	Typology	Units						Capital Need to 2036	Capital Need to 2036 (per unit)	Operating Cost Per Unit (2017)
		1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	5 BR	Total			
Cabot Park	Low-Rise Apartment and Townhouse		20	44	24		88	$5,683,150	$64,581	$5,158
159 Louis	Low-Rise Apartment and Townhouse		66	39	15	7	127	$21,035,571	$165,634	$5,412
1778 LaSalle	Townhouse			16	11	3	30	$2,373,550	$79,118	$5,084
Bruce Avenue Property	Vacant Land						0	-	-	-
Other Available Lands	Vacant Land						0	-	-	-
Sub-Total/Average		**0**	**86**	**99**	**50**	**10**	**245**	**$29,092,271**	**$118,744**	**$5,280.73**
Percentage of Total		**0%**	**24%**	**19%**	**31%**	**22%**	**13%**	**21%**		**-**

Asset Classification: DISPOSE										
Property	**Typology**	**Units**						**Capital Need to 2036**	**Capital Need to 2036 (per unit)**	**Operating Cost Per Unit (2017)**
		1 BR	**2 BR**	**3 BR**	**4 BR**	**5 BR**	**Total**			
Cabot Park	Low-Rise Apartment and Townhouse		20	44	24		88	$5,683,150	$64,581	$5,158
Scattered Units	Single-Family Home		4	132	20	17	173	$11,240,962	$64,977	$5,035
Rumball Terrace	Townhouse			26	12	4	42	$2,754,826	$65,591	$4,286
Sub-Total/Average		**0**	**24**	**202**	**56**	**21**	**303**	**$19,678,938**	**$64,947**	**$4,967**
Percentage of Total		**0%**	**7%**	**40%**	**35%**	**46%**	**16%**	**14%**		**-**

- Approximately 30% of the units in the portfolio are recommended to receive attention beyond base capital repairs and appropriate improvements/renovations. The majority of these units include two and three bedroom suites, which have experienced declining waitlist numbers since 2011. Aside from the scattered homes, these units are made up of townhomes and low-rise apartments.

2.0 Priority of Revitalization Efforts

Six GSHC projects have been classified as **Revitalize and Retain**, **(Re)Development**, and/or **Disposal**. The following briefly describes each of these assets, the classification(s) recommended, and the overall priority of revitalization efforts.

2.1 High Priority

2.1.1 Sale of Scattered Units

- These units are relatively popular amongst tenants (higher wait list than 2-4 bedroom apartments and townhomes) and have lower capital needs relative to other assets in the portfolio, which is partially due to significant SHRRP investments over the past decade. These homes also represent a mixed-income approach to social housing, as they are scattered throughout market residential neighbourhoods.

- However, these units are also very expensive to operate on an annual basis and do not match the core demand characteristics of current and forecasted social housing tenants and the need for accessible one-bedroom units.

- The scattered homes are the most marketable assets owned by the GSHC from a sale perspective and typically have sale values ranging from $185,000 to $200,000[1]. Unlike some of the larger townhome projects managed by the GSHC, the scattered units do not contain the same site disposition challenges (e.g. require a plan of subdivision or part-lot control), although some semi-detached homes may require severances if they are sold.

- A forecast of $32.0 million is estimated if all 173 scattered homes could be sold for the $185,000 benchmark appraisal value.

- The sale of scattered homes is a common practice across the Province. Despite the positive features that the scattered units provide, the sale of these homes can provide a quick injection of capital for other revitalization efforts and will also be an important first step in realigning the affordable housing supply with demand. It is also likely that if these units are sold,

[1] Per benchmark appraisals completed by Appraisals North Realty Inc. for the GSHC.

households on the wait list will redistribute to the townhome projects in the GSHC portfolio, which experience weaker demand from tenants but offer similar accommodation.

- In addition to sale values, the disposal of the 173 scattered units would result in a capital cost avoidance of $11.2 million to 2036 (i.e. the $11.2 million capital investment that is required for these units between 2018 and 2036 would not have to be made if they were sold).

- Some of the scattered homes could be sold to existing tenants or other qualifying households through an affordable ownership program. There are several models to consider, the most basic being that the City offer down payment assistance (in the form of a secured second mortgage) to qualifying purchasers. When the home is eventually sold by the home owner, the City is reimbursed through a repayment of the original loan plus a share of the gain in equity. This model allows existing tenants or other qualifying low-income household the opportunity to enter the home ownership market. It allows the City to provide assistance to these households, share in the long-term gain in equity of the real estate, and generate capital for revitalizing the social housing stock.

- Homes could be sold over the long-term at tenant turnover, with the equity put aside in a fund designated solely for the purpose of building new housing. The disposition program could be accelerated through offering a relocation incentive program to existing tenants.

- These RGI units would have to be replaced through some combination of new housing development, rent supplements, and/or portable housing benefits to maintain the RGI service level standard.

- While the majority of the scattered homes, including the New Sudbury Scattered homes (A15C and A16C) have reached EOD, others have not. Selling an asset prior to EOD will require debenture payout and could also result in other financial penalties. The scattered homes that have not reached EOD include Chelmsford St. Onge (2026), Garson Catherine/Maplewood (2022), New Sudbury Colonial Court (2024), and New Sudbury Havenbrook/Springbrook (2026).

- Many of the scattered homes also have SHRRP grants tied to them, which generally range from as little as $700 to around $12,000. These grants were largely for renovation and retrofit capital programs that covered basement repairs and new windows and roofing. The funds were advanced at various points in 2010 and have a ten-year affordability requirement. Therefore, if any of these homes are sold prior to 2020, a pro-rated portion of the grant must be repaid. The City could therefore wait until 2020 to dispose of these assets, however the repayment amount would be insignificant (e.g. $12,000 grant issued in 2010, if sale occurred in 2019 a pro-rated repayment of only $1,200 would be required).

- Notwithstanding the above, three of the scattered homes (2065 and 2110 Madison Avenue and 1157 Paquette Street) have significant grants attached to them in excess of $85,000. These should not be sold until the repayment window has expired.

2.1.2 159 Louis Street

- This project is located adjacent to Greater Sudbury's downtown and contains 31 townhomes as well as 96 units in a series of walk-up apartments. The majority of units are two and three bedrooms.

- Overall, demand is very low for these units as there are currently only 10 households waiting for 31 townhomes and 3 households waiting for 96 walk-up apartments. The turnover rate is also very high for the walk-up apartments, which indicates a general undesirability of the units and results in lost revenue through move-out costs and vacancy loss.

- These units are not popular for seniors due to accessibility issues associated with walk-up apartments and multi-storey townhomes. The adjacent GSHC high-rise building (166 Louis) offers 50 one-bedroom units and performs well from virtually every perspective (e.g. operating cost, capital needs, turnover rate, waitlist demand).

- The cost of operating these units is very high relative to other assets in the portfolio and the project also has high capital needs, exceeding $21 million by 2036.

- Revitalization actions are necessary at this site given the high costs, high capital needs, weak demand as per the wait list, and the overall inability of the property to adequately meet the needs of current and future tenants. Due to the fact that the units at 159 Louis are likely to experience modest demand and value from a disposition perspective, as well as the site's strategic location near Sudbury's downtown, the site has been classified as either **Retain and Revitalize** or **Redevelopment**.

- The large property is strategically located next to the downtown and has excellent development potential. The site could therefore be redeveloped with a strong mix of building typologies and affordability levels. This mixed-income approach would revitalize the existing property, create a more financially sustainable model in the delivery of social housing, and increase the population (with a broad mix of socioeconomic characteristics) in the downtown, the latter of which is a council objective.

- Building on the above, the site is large and centrally located and could accommodate social service providers, community amenity space, and/or a community hub opportunity. The GSHC has already investigated the potential of converting one of the walk-up apartments to a space dedicated for social service delivery.

- The site could accommodate full or partial redevelopment, and could be undertaken incrementally in phases. Notwithstanding the benefits of redevelopment, the current lack of capital dollars is a major barrier to moving forward with a large scale redevelopment such as this.

- Other strategies could be investigated to revitalize the site, which could lead to the long-term retention of the property. Actions such as major renovations to the townhomes and walk-up apartments, converting units to one-bedroom suites, improving existing accessibility issues, integrating park space into the property, integrating social services or other community space into the site, and other similar strategies that improve the project's attractiveness and ability to meet the needs of those requiring social housing.

- The project has reached EOD, however it has received significant SHRRP grants totally $1.168 million. While the repayment window does not expire until 2020, it is highly unlikely that the City will be able to move forward with a large-scale redevelopment of this property within the next two years. There are therefore few obstacles for revitalization aside from maintaining RGI service level standards.

2.1.3 Cabot Park

- The townhomes and low-rise apartments at Cabot Park experience low levels of demand from social housing tenants, with only 3 households waiting for the 20 apartment units and 2 households waiting for the 68 townhomes. At the same time, these units are very expensive to operate and experience high turnover rates relative to other assets in the portfolio. The property also requires nearly $5.7 million in capital repairs by 2036.

- The property is located in the Donovan neighbourhood, which is an area of the City that accommodates a significant concentration of social housing. As a result, the surrounding real estate market and socio-economic indicators for the community are weak.

- For the above reasons, the asset is not suitable for revitalization nor does it meet the current or projected demand profile of tenants. It is therefore recommended that the property be either **Redeveloped** or **Disposed.**

- Disposal of the site could include selling the units as individual lots, similar to the approach of selling the scattered units. However, these homes are not currently located on separate, transferable lots. As a result, a plan of subdivision will be required to create a lot for each home. This will add costs, time, and complexity/uncertainty to disposing of the units.

- Alternatively, it could be possible to sell the units to College Boreal for student housing, or to another investor/rental operator interested in the current homes. This would avoid the need for a plan of subdivision.

- The appraised value of the townhome/semi-detached units is approximately $150,000 (per home) as per a 2017 appraisal prepared for the GSHC. This compares with an appraised value of between $185,000 and $200,000 for the New Sudbury scattered single-family homes. Selling these units could therefore result in approximately $10.2 million as well as $5.7 million in capital cost avoidance. The capital gained through this process can be used for revitalization and development efforts elsewhere.

- A comprehensive redevelopment of the property could also be undertaken, which could be implemented in phases. The large property could easily replace the existing 88 units in a much more compact and mixed-income development, and could possibly result in residual lands that could be sold or converted to public space (e.g. park).

- The GSHC could also retain the property and repurpose the homes to student rentals at market rates. While this would improve the revenues collected by the GSHC, it would negate any capital that would have been gained through the sale of these assets. The City would then have to fund the development of 88 RGI units (or rent supplements) at another location.

- Whichever direction is selected through the revitalization plan, the long-term operation of the property in its current form is not a desirable outcome. The property should be retained until a redevelopment plan is prepared and capital is secured, or the property should be sold or retained by the GSHC and repurposed to market rates.

- The project has reached EOD and also does not owe any SHRRP grants, therefore presenting few obstacles for revitalization aside from maintaining RGI service level standards.

2.1.4 Rumball Terrace

- These townhomes are sandwiched between three high-rise social housing towers owned by the GSHC. This context makes them unpopular amongst families in need of social housing, which is the primary reason noted for the low demand experienced at these units.

- Currently there are only 3 households waiting for 42 townhomes. Unlike other projects in the GSHC portfolio offering 3-5 bedroom units, demand has been consistently low at this location since 2011.

- Notwithstanding these issues, the townhomes experience relatively low operating costs. In addition, the capital needs of the property are currently lower than the portfolio average and will continue to be modest to 2036. The property also does not reach EOD until 2021.

- Redeveloping the townhomes with apartments is not believed to be viable due to underground parking and other site challenges as noted by GSHC staff. The site has therefore **not** been classified for **Redevelopment**.

- Action is required at this property to address the low demand experienced. The site has therefore been classified as **Revitalize and Retain** or **Dispose.**

- It is possible to undertake significant renovations at these units to improve building conditions and the attractiveness of the project. The GSHC could also consider converting the townhomes to market rates to increase the social mix on the large property – however these RGI units would have to be replaced elsewhere.

- The sale value of these units is likely to be low due to the presence of a significant density of high-rise social housing buildings as well as the imposing built-form impacts that these buildings create. The sale of these homes may therefore result in a negligible equity gain.

- Notwithstanding the above, some of the townhomes could be demolished to create more park and amenity space on the site. This would provide an improved living environment for the families who live in the townhomes and apartment building at 1960(B) Paris. The open space could integrate with the multi-use centre already on the site, which could significantly improve the use and functionality of the space.

- A combination of these strategies could also be considered where some townhomes are demolished to integrate greater park and community space, units are renovated/improved, and some units are converted to market to allow greater income-mixing.

- Of note, the above strategies will result in the loss of RGI units, which will require replacement without any offsetting gain in equity. Notwithstanding this, this option could still be rationalized if the capital cost avoidance of the units as well as improved operating considerations (e.g. lower turnover/move out costs and vacancy loss) are accounted for.

- While there have been significant capital grants allocated to this property over the past ten years, they have all been specific to the high-rise towers.

2.1.5 Development on Surplus City and GSHC Lands

In addition to the vacant property owned by the GSHC on Bruce Avenue, as well as redevelopment opportunities on GSHC owned properties, the identification of surplus City-owned properties that are appropriate for modest social housing buildings should be initiated. The development of new and modestly sized mixed-income buildings to replace the sold scattered units will be a vital component of the City and GSHC's ability to renew and revitalize the housing portfolio.

2.2 Moderate Priority

2.2.1 1778 LaSalle

- This townhome project is well located in New Sudbury and has frontage on LaSalle Boulevard. Its surrounding context likely will be supportive of a denser and more compact development consisting of mid-rise apartments, stacked townhomes, and compact traditional townhomes.

- Unlike other GSHC housing in New Sudbury, the wait list for this property is much lower, with only 12 households currently waiting for the 30 townhomes. This property is of poorer quality than the other GSHC townhomes in New Sudbury, which is contributing to low demand and a high level of unit turnover and resulting move-out costs and vacancy loss.

- The operating costs and capital needs at this development are also very high relative to other assets in the portfolio.

- Notwithstanding the site's challenges, it is located in a "strong" market area that presents an opportunity to implement a mixed-income project. This asset has therefore been classified as **Revitalize and Retain** and **(Re)Development**. Given the strategic location, disposal should not be considered.

- Strategic improvements at the site could increase the attractiveness and desirability of the project, such as interior renovations and improvements to unit functionality, base capital repairs, energy retrofit improvements to reduce utilities and operating costs, and other similar actions. These actions would likely improve many of the negative features observed at this project and result in the asset becoming a useful component of the GSHC housing portfolio over the long-term.

- On the other hand, this is a very well-located site that could likely be developed with a higher intensity of development. Redeveloping this property with one-bedroom units would in all likelihood make the site one of the most popular offerings in the GSHC portfolio. This would also introduce much needed one-bedroom units into the New Sudbury community.

- While the site is a strong redevelopment opportunity, it is of a lower priority relative to the scattered units, Cabot Park, Rumball Terrace, and Louis Street in terms of immediate actions being needed.

2.2.2 744 Bruce

- The largest townhome project in the GSHC portfolio experiences high tenant turnover and weak demand, with only 12 households waiting for 150 townhomes. The costs of operating these units is expensive relative to other assets in the portfolio and there are considerable capital expenses required looking forward to 2036.

- The units at this site could be sold, however similar to Cabot Park, a plan of subdivision would be necessary and the sale values would likely be modest. New development on the site could also be contemplated, however there are several considerations that limit the attractiveness of this option:
    - The area is already dense with social housing.
    - The property is very large and would require significant financial and other resources to undertake a comprehensive redevelopment.
    - There is a vacant GSHC property just west of this site that could accommodate a new social housing building.
    - The large townhome project could become a more useful component of the GSHC portfolio if strategic improvements were implemented, which would be a more cost effective option relative to redeveloping the site.
- The property has therefore been classified as **Revitalize and Retain**. While the site is well utilized with a relatively efficient and compact development pattern, actions are required to improve demand on the property and reduce operating expenses.
- The sale of scattered units is likely to redirect demand for larger units to the GSHC townhomes. If improvements to the site (e.g. incorporating new and better integrated green space, community amenity space/community facilities) and renovations to the units were also implemented, the attractiveness of the property would likely improve.
- Some units could be sold at market rates or converted to market rents to improve the social mix at this very large and concentrated social housing project. Social mixing is often viewed as a positive step in improving behavioural issues at social housing developments. A mixed-income approach is also observed to improve overall living conditions, perceptions of safety, sense of community, decreasing operating expenses, and improved revenues. Improvements to the site, such as better integrated open space and community facilities, could be necessary to enhance the opportunities of income mixing.
- Similar to 1778 LaSalle, while revitalization actions are required at this property, it is a lower priority than the other GSHC sites identified in the previous sub-section.

3.0 Next Steps

The results of this analysis will be used to develop the Social Housing Revitalization Plan. This analysis, along with the other background research and analyses completed, will result in the selection of specific actions to be implemented that will have the greatest impact in revitalizing the social housing stock. This Plan will also include an implementing business plan, which will contain all of the quantitative and qualitative aspects of each of the selected strategies.