

**LYNWOOD HALL CHILD & FAMILY CENTRE  
CHARLTON HALL CHILD & FAMILY CENTRE**

---

**Presentation to Planning Committee  
January 17, 2012**

---

1. We need to care for the vulnerable in our community.
2. We must protect our neighbourhoods.
3. The 300 metre distance separation regulation is helpful but imperfect.
4. We must have a fair, open, accountable process.
5. Assessing community benefit/impact - balancing public interest

\* \* \* \*

**1. *We need to care for the vulnerable.***

- we have done a good job as a community in protecting, serving vulnerable, disadvantaged
- we can do better
- we are best community in Canada to raise a child
- that is partly because of our response to client group served by Lynwood/Charlton
- they are among the best in Ontario at doing what they do best
  - both are accredited organizations (meeting over 400 standards)
  - looking after youth
- over 100 years experience
- we are indeed fortunate as a community to have the skills, compassion these community caretakers provide
- they do this job well; they are the best of the best
- their success rate is encouraging - testimonials

**2. *We must protect our neighbourhoods.***

- neighbours in the downtown core have been working hard to survive and thrive in the midst of challenges
- recognized by Lynwood/Charlton
  - they are part of community
  - actively involved as a contributing member
- 100 years experience of compatibility in downtown and mountain neighbourhoods
- no reason why this 100-year-old record of co-existence with neighbours is expected to change
- co-existed in Durand for 50 years - can co-exist in Corktown for 50 years
- letters suggest connection between this proponent and prostitution and drugs
  - inaccurate, unfair and not helpful

**3. *The 300 metre distance separation regulation is helpful but imperfect.***

- concern about concentration of social services
  - not here to debate principles
  - accept for now
- this is a blunt instrument to deal with a very complex issue
- it is all we have
  - need to work with it
  - like all regulations, subject to review, amendment
    - amendment only after a careful review
- limitations of distance separation formula
  - 300 m is arbitrary
  - no distinction between
    - size of facility
    - type of facility
- **the blind application of seemingly reasonable regulations can lead to unreasonable and unintended results**

Examples:

- A) 1) this works: 2-25 unit corrections residences or 2-20 unit residential care facilities which are 300 m. apart
- 2) does not comply: 2-6 unit residential care facilities 299 m. apart
- is impact of (2) greater than (1)?
  - of course not
  - by-law says first one is OK while second one is not

- B) Proposal - 8 teens (at Augusta)
- within 300 m. of Augusta street - 4 youth with development challenges (Forest Ave.)
    - 6 developmentally delayed (Catherine St.)
    - 18 residents totally
  - E zoning allows all 3 uses in 1 building up to 20 residents
  - if integrity of by-law at stake, we can say we meet by-law by consolidating all 3 facilities in 1 building
  - proposal is for 3 uses in 3 buildings
    - no different impact
    - consistent with dispersion principle of by-law at a smaller scale (internal inconsistency of by-law)

C) Larger, community perspective

- current facility is in Durand
  - larger concentration of facilities there
  - this community has fewer
  - relocation from a more intense concentration to a neighbourhood of lower concentration
- summary of considerations of regulation:
  - broad strategy for very precise issue
  - do we throw it out - no
  - we must assess it carefully
- this has been assessed before and modifications to the by-law have been made
- this is not precedent setting

- careful assessment done by Lynwood
- use is permitted
- what is not permitted is more than 1
- issue is not presence of use in community, but presence in light of another use
  - what difference does it make?
- review by Alex
  - not included in package from staff
    - based on extensive experience
  - staff position unsupported
    - no technical review
    - no hint at area of disagreement

**4. We must have a fair, open, accountable process.**

- (i) we went to community prior to application
    - initial Open House
      - 3 neighbours appeared with concerns
        - girls getting out of jail (not the case)
      - met with representatives of Lynwood/Charlton Hall
        - satisfied
        - one lady offered to volunteer
  - (ii) subsequent meeting of ratepayers
    - we were not there
  - (iii) review of letters - in staff report
  - (iv) our response - not in staff report
  - (v) numerous attempts to meet through requests by
    - myself
    - Deirdre Finlay/Alex Thomson
- no response

(vi) staff report - an engaged citizenry - page 14

- not a good example
- have not been engaged
- letters included in staff report
- responses have been omitted

**5. *Assessing community benefit/impact - Balancing public interest.***

(i) there is a need to be met

- need has been met over last 50+ years
- we have the best in the business and the results to prove it
- the need is ongoing

(ii) there is a cost to this service

- social service costs are a very real concern in this community
- discussion at every budget by City Council
- here is a proponent who is pro-active, forward-thinking, and showing leadership by bringing forward a proposal which will increase efficiencies and maximize service effectiveness
- cost is not the only criterion, however, it is a factor
- particularly when lack of action carries with it a \$1.2 million bill for the City
- this is real estate and capital improvement costs, above and beyond cost of providing social services
- staff report notes report is coming later - too late

**Summary:**

1. Our community has done an excellent job in caring for vulnerable members within our midst and must continually strive to maintain its position as the best place in Canada to raise a child. We have the benefit of being home to the best care providers in the Province and need to continue to support their efforts.
2. We must continue to protect our residential neighbourhoods and carefully examine change to ensure compatibility. This analysis is based not only on the strength of the neighbourhood, but also the history of those proposing the change.
3. The by-law that is being amended is well-intentioned but broadly defined. The matter before Committee is a complex matter that warrants careful consideration of a broad array of public interests.
4. We must continue to have a fair, open, and accountable process which includes dialogue and consideration of all interests.
5. In assessing overall community benefits of any proposal, the final decision of Committee and Council must consider all elements of balancing public interests.