



# Council Agenda Including Addeds

16th Special Meeting of City Council

October 5, 2023

1:00 PM

Council Chambers - Please check the City website for additional meeting detail information. Meetings can be viewed via live-streaming on YouTube and the City Website.

The City of London is situated on the traditional lands of the Anishinaabek (AUh-nish-in-ah-bek), Haudenosaunee (Ho-den-no-show-nee), Lūnaapéewak (Len-ah-pay-wuk) and Attawandaron (Add-a-won-da-run).

We honour and respect the history, languages and culture of the diverse Indigenous people who call this territory home. The City of London is currently home to many First Nations, Métis and Inuit today.

As representatives of the people of the City of London, we are grateful to have the opportunity to work and live in this territory.

The City of London is committed to making every effort to provide alternate formats and communication supports for meetings upon request. To make a request specific to this meeting, please contact [councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca) or 519-661-2489 ext. 2425.

Pages

<b>1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest</b>	
<b>2. Recognitions</b>	
<b>3. Review of Confidential Matters to be Considered in Public</b>	
<b>4. Council, In Closed Session</b>	
4.1 Solicitor-Client Privileged Advice	
A matter pertaining to advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose, related to a legislative interpretation and for advice about legal liability related to criteria for outcomes of an RFP. (6.1/23/SPPC)	
<b>5. Confirmation and Signing of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting(s)</b>	
<b>6. Communications and Petitions</b>	
6.1 Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response RFP 2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan Results	
(Refer to the Special Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee Stage for Consideration with Item #3 (4.2) of the 23rd Report of the Special Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee)	
1. J. and R. Lubell	7
2. (ADDED) T. George	9
3. (ADDED) C. Forster	10
4. (ADDED) E. Hunt	12

5.	<i>(ADDED) B. Varkey</i>	13
6.	<i>(ADDED) M. Vicovac, Fox Hollow Residents</i>	14
7.	<i>(ADDED) L. Hawi</i>	15
8.	<i>(ADDED) M. Jose</i>	16
9.	<i>(ADDED) Leidy V. and Fernando R.</i>	17
10.	<i>(ADDED) M. Bebee</i>	18
11.	<i>(ADDED) B. Bebee</i>	22
12.	<i>(ADDED) J. A. Medeiros</i>	25
13.	<i>(ADDED) N. Birch</i>	26
14.	<i>(ADDED) kk kk</i>	31
15.	<i>(ADDED) S. O'Connell</i>	32
16.	<i>(ADDED) Hemand S P</i>	34
17.	<i>(ADDED) S. Brown</i>	35
18.	<i>(ADDED) A. Escudero</i>	37
19.	<i>(ADDED) B. Negrijn</i>	42
20.	<i>(ADDED) J. Gill</i>	44
21.	<i>(ADDED) J. Neely</i>	46
22.	<i>(ADDED) S. and G. Whiting</i>	49
23.	<i>(ADDED) P. Gosain</i>	51
24.	<i>(ADDED) V. Brown</i>	54
25.	<i>(ADDED) G. Kaur</i>	56
26.	<i>(ADDED) J. Majstorovic</i>	58
27.	<i>(ADDED) M. and K. Higgins</i>	60
28.	<i>(ADDED) S. Bartoch</i>	62
29.	<i>(ADDED) P. Sabados</i>	65
30.	<i>(ADDED) L. Velez</i>	68
31.	<i>(ADDED) S. Bonnavista</i>	70
32.	<i>(ADDED) CO</i>	73
33.	<i>(ADDED) D. Paez</i>	76
34.	<i>(ADDED) B. Rogala</i>	78

35.	(ADDED) J. Abraham	80
36.	(ADDED) Y. Zhang	81
37.	(ADDED) Ash	84
38.	(ADDED) M. Stinson	87
39.	(ADDED) J. Pizarro	90
40.	(ADDED) M. Nasser	92
41.	(ADDED) Jojo M	95
42.	(ADDED) Z. Fadel	97
43.	(ADDED) Y. Patel	99
44.	(ADDED) K. Jongepier	100
45.	(ADDED) P. Block	103
46.	(ADDED) S. Escudero	104
47.	(ADDED) A. Antony	107
48.	(ADDED) M. Lockwood	108
49.	(ADDED) P. Wexler	109
50.	(ADDED) D. Zapata	111
51.	(ADDED) C. Deninson	112
52.	(ADDED) R. Buma	113
53.	(ADDED) A. and S. Dzwonczyk	115
54.	(ADDED) M. Rowlinson	117
55.	(ADDED) D. Bedford	118
56.	(ADDED) U. Maheswari Mariappan	119
57.	(ADDED) L. McKenzie	120
58.	(ADDED) C. Jorge-Paul	121
59.	(ADDED) C. Dyck	123
60.	(ADDED) G. Kongkham-Fernandez	125
61.	(ADDED) E. Finnemore	126
62.	(ADDED) B. Zacharia	127
63.	(ADDED) J. Thomas	128
64.	(ADDED) R. O'Hagan	129

65.	(ADDED) J. McCullagh	130
66.	(ADDED) B. Wallace	131
67.	(ADDED) P. Kaur	132
68.	(ADDED) K. Olsen	134
69.	(ADDED) R. Shroyer	135
70.	(ADDED) B. Reilly	136
71.	(ADDED) S. Ketley	137
72.	(ADDED) R. Odegaard	138
73.	(ADDED) S. Booth	139
74.	(ADDED) M. O'Connor	140
75.	(ADDED) P. Kemp	141
76.	(ADDED) L. Mauffette-Leenders	142
77.	(ADDED) C. Corcoran	143
78.	(ADDED) A. D. V.	144
79.	(ADDED) A. Greenhill	146
80.	(ADDED) M. A. Hodge	147
81.	(ADDED) B. Vojnovic	149
82.	(ADDED) C. Richards	151
83.	(ADDED) D. Van Dinther	152
84.	(ADDED) V. Van Linden	153
85.	(ADDED) G. Shawyer	154
86.	(ADDED) D. Heap and S. Kelly	155
87.	(ADDED) N. Rosales	156
88.	(ADDED) C. Roxx	157
89.	(ADDED) A. Hawi	158
90.	(ADDED) R. Stewart	160
91.	(ADDED) K. Pennesi	162
92.	(ADDED) K. Misic	163
93.	(ADDED) O. Bispo	164
94.	(ADDED) S. Kaplun	165

95.	(ADDED) <i>W. Goldsmith</i>	166
96.	(ADDED) <i>A. MacPhail</i>	167
97.	(ADDED) <i>A. Simpson</i>	168
98.	(ADDED) <i>M. Subramaniyan</i>	169
99.	(ADDED) <i>A. Shapiro</i>	170
100.	(ADDED) <i>R. Santos</i>	171
101.	(ADDED) <i>M. Norman</i>	172
102.	(ADDED) <i>V. Sharma</i>	173
103.	(ADDED) <i>H. Elmslie</i>	174
104.	(ADDED) <i>D. Clark</i>	175
105.	(ADDED) <i>M. Penney</i>	176
106.	(ADDED) <i>S. Vernon-Scott</i>	177
107.	(ADDED) <i>M. Sheehan</i>	178
108.	(ADDED) <i>L. Stark</i>	183
109.	(ADDED) <i>M. Adler</i>	184
110.	(ADDED) <i>I. Omelchenko</i>	185
111.	(ADDED) <i>L. Blumer</i>	186
112.	(ADDED) <i>L. Williscraft</i>	187
113.	(ADDED) <i>P. Brady</i>	189
114.	(ADDED) <i>J. Neilans</i>	190
115.	(ADDED) <i>A. Grzyb</i>	191
116.	(ADDED) <i>J. Boswell</i>	192
117.	(ADDED) <i>J. Tennant</i>	193
118.	(ADDED) <i>C. Wituik</i>	194
119.	(ADDED) <i>A. Jaikaran</i>	196
120.	(ADDED) <i>M. Cassidy, CEO, Pillar Nonprofit Network</i>	197
121.	(ADDED) <i>A. Schneider</i>	199
122.	(ADDED) <i>A. Morrow</i>	200
123.	(ADDED) <i>D. Prout</i>	201
124.	(ADDED) <i>J. Williams</i>	203

125.	<i>(ADDED) C. Ward</i>	204
126.	<i>(ADDED) S. Adamsson</i>	205
127.	<i>(ADDED) C. Murray</i>	206
128.	<i>(ADDED) D. Pachaiyappan</i>	207
<b>7.</b>	<b>Motions of Which Notice is Given</b>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Reports</b>	
8.1	23rd Special Report of the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee	208
	1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest	
	2. (4.1) September Progress Update - Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response	
	3. (4.2) Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response RFP 2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan Results (Relates to Bill No. 367)	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Added Reports</b>	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Deferred Matters</b>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>Enquiries</b>	
<b>12.</b>	<b>Emergent Motions</b>	
12.1	<i>(ADDED) Councillors S. Stevenson and J. Pribil</i>	224
<b>13.</b>	<b>By-laws</b>	
	By-laws to be read a first, second and third time:	
13.1	Bill No. 366 By-law No. A.- _____ - _____	225
	A by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council Meeting held on the 5th day of October, 2023. (City Clerk)	
13.2	Bill No. 367 By-law No. A.- _____ - _____	226
	A by-law to authorize the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development to approve a Municipal Purchase of Service Agreement with each hub provider for the operation of three hubs. (4.2j/23/SPPC)	
<b>14.</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>	

**From:** Jan Lubell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 27, 2023 8:54 AM  
**To:** [Council@london.ca](mailto:Council@london.ca)  
**Cc:** Barb Gmail [REDACTED]; Jan Lubell [REDACTED]; Jen Bibbings [REDACTED]; Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>; Richard Lubell [REDACTED]; Sebastian Russo [REDACTED]; Sophie Lordon [REDACTED]; Sterling Karamar London Office [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] October 6 meeting..comments and letter

Richard lubell would like to be placed on the agenda to make comments about the Fanshawe park road HUB selection.

The points will be made regarding three areas:

1. Process..as a directly neighbouring business our plaza at 655-685 Fanshawe park road did not receive any notice about the decision to be made until the Wednesday afternoon prior to the Monday meeting. Further, the meeting was scheduled for Yom Kippur, the holiest day in the Jewish calendar precluding our attendance.

Furthermore, There is a lack of transparency to the entire input process. Holding a community meeting during the summer does not constitute receiving sufficient feedback from affected community members.

In its initial deliberations Council stipulated that any new Hub :

A. Would not be located near schools or child centred establishments...IT IS ( Thames valley children's centre, potential day care centre in new apartment under construction, directly abutting busy toy and children's activity shoppe)

B would not require re zoning IT DOES. Further, other businesses are waiting for many months, even years for rezoning and building permits. In the normal process in the City, this site would not be available so quickly in the times frames stated.

2. Location choice.

It is on a transit route but is relatively isolated from activities of daily living such as grocery stores, general stores like wal-mart, libraries, community recreation centres, coffee shoppes, etc

The women who would use this site have special and complex needs. But..Does this site provide best access for regular solutions/activities to meet their needs..seemingly not.

Clustering a larger number of special needs clients together, even with trained and caring staff, does create a vulnerability to undesirable community behaviours even as simple as proper needle disposal, garbage and food disposal, etc. we have seen too much of this with just the motel operating and don't want more of it with a complex population.

Costs: granted there would be rooms available and a common kitchen but the total costs for running this for a relatively short period for the number of clients served seem high.

In our professional lives my wife and I spent many years in the community services and primary health sectors. We are well aware of the critical need for the City to act quickly and wisely for the benefit of a vulnerable population . We know this is a complicated process and requires complex solutions. However, the Fanshawe solution does not seem the best choice to meet the needs of this population. This is not NIMBY but suggests real concerns that we must start with the actual needs of the clients not political ones.

Op0Requirements of our business: If this is a done deal, we will insist on the City's assistance with putting up a barrier fence ( not chain link!) between the property in question and the toy shoppe on our plaza, extra lighting in the rear part of our property for safety and security concerns, regular cleanups of needles, garbage etc to the rear of the property and enforcement of NO Parking on the plaza lots, particularly at the rear, for visitors to the HUB site.

Thank you. PLEASE ADD THIS AS AN ATTACHMENT TO THE AGENDA..



**From:** Tomy George  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 11:13 AM  
**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed homeless hub in North London

Dear Sir/ Madam,

The city's proposed plan to bring a homeless hub in N. London raises some issues in our peaceful neighbourhood. We are concerned about the proposal! So, we kindly request you to reconsider the proposal.

Thank you

Tomy George

## Foxwood Community Notes

### Letter to Council

With regards to the upcoming vote on October 5<sup>th</sup>. Specifically, the Fanshawe Park Road location. Let's all be very clear, no one in this community is happy with what is taking place with unhoused individuals in our city. We would all like to see people obtain the shelter and help they need. This is not a "NIMBY" issue and frankly presenting concerned neighbours and businesses with this brush stroke is unfair and a way to easily disregard our concerns. If you can label us, we no longer have thoughts that should be valued and heard. All of us have the right to dignity and safety in our communities. Frankly, it is unjust that our community was not consulted or asked for feedback on this location. Is this the type of city we are, where decisions are made without democracy, without a fair and balanced look at both points of view? We would like the following considerations to be taken under advisement:

- This location does not meet terms that this hub would inhabit a location that would not require rezoning.
  - There are no emergency medical services across the street – this is a walk-in clinic.
- Feedback that we would be able to discuss this as a community during the rezoning process is inaccurate – residents will not have a voice other than on whether this should be zoned for an emergency location. We will not be able to give open feedback or have concerns addressed at this time.
- The cost per bed does not meet the terms of the previous stipulations.
- The number of beds is contrary to what was stipulated in the previous reports.
- The hub is two doors down from a treatment facility for vulnerable autistic children (TVCC).
- Mastermind Toys, which is directly beside the Lighthouse Inn, hosts workshops for children and families.
- Long and McQuaid conduct children's music lessons next door as well.
- There are residential backyards that back onto this location.
- There are current residents at the Lighthouse Inn that it is questioned will be displaced from their housing.
- Black Pearl as a business is going to be severely affected, lose business and possibly will close because customers will not feel safe frequenting this restaurant.
- There is no assurance on safety for the community other than a security guard and advice we learn how to call 911 when we see concerns.
  - When models in other cities are investigated safety is an ongoing issue.
  - Disruption and safety concerns shut down a makeshift center in the Oakridge area in a matter of two months.
- There is confusion on the criteria of clients being served at this location, i.e., how many severely acute individuals vs. transitional clients.

- It has been stated that clients served at the hub will be transitioned to affordable/assisted housing creating a “flow” of clients that will go on to be successful in the community.
  - Where are these supports as it seems the city is currently out of resources with extreme waitlists for housing.
  - A “flow” of clients is unable to take place if acute cases disrupt or take over the spaces for less acute individuals.
  - A “flow” of clients is impossible if there are no resources in the community thereby rendering this a facility that can only take care of 21 individuals.
  - Affordable housing on Hyde Park was voted down, how is this consistent with the plan.

If the goal is to help the most people, this isn't the solution.

If the goal is to do something, as opposed to doing nothing, this is plain desperation without good sense.

If the goal is just to get 20 people off the street this winter, this is unjustified, as this winter will come and go before this hub is opened. Furthermore the 10 CMHA cold weather beds that are attached to this plan – there need to be 10 extra beds allocated to the cold weather plan if this is the issue stopping community members from having their voices heard.

We need a strong location that everyone can get behind. Let's return to the drawing board and find a more suitable option. It must exist.

It is highly concerning that none of us, businesses and residents, knew about this location until Wednesday yet we are not being allowed the platform to discuss our concerns and questions. We are 70K+ strong in this community. If our voices are not important to be heard how is this setting an example for the rest of the city?

At the end of the day, our ward 7 councillor Corrine Rahman has voiced that the results included in the latest report are not what was supported or what the public was originally consulted on. For these reasons above and from our Ward Councillors, which 6/9 have also voiced concerns, we kindly ask that you reconsider this specific location. There are many other locations, which are still located in the North End, that could be considered. For instance, has something attached to University Hospital been considered? As the other two hubs are associated with hospital/care, would this not be something to investigate further? Greater security would perhaps also be available with regards to women who are trying to gain distance from people in their past with allocation in a safe locked facility such as a hospital site.

We thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely, Fox Hollow Residents

Christeen Forster

September 28, 2023

Mayor Morgan and Members of Council  
City of London, Ontario

Re: Proposed Homeless Hub - Canadian Mental Health Association Thames Valley  
Addiction and Mental Health - 705 Fanshawe Park Road West, London, Ontario  
-Opposition to the rezoning of existing Lamplighter Inn for this purpose

Mayor and Members of Council,

I am writing this letter to further express my concern and objection to the recent decision to move forward with the implementation of the "Homeless Hub" proposal located at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West in the city of London.

The required rezoning of the existing Lamplighter Inn property for the purpose of a Homeless Hub is inconsistent and not transparent in its aggressive placement in the existing communities that will be impacted by this project. This location is not ideal nor best suited for the people that are truly in need of this type of assistance and far from areas that are currently experiencing the influx and overflow of the homeless population.

To allow for a successful and positive experience for the homeless to integrate and transition into the community - the location of the Homeless Hubs will be key. Proximity to services and the existing needs for the homeless should to be a priority - not further displacing them.

Consideration for the impact of this project on existing stakeholders, residents and neighbourhoods in the area of the proposed Homeless Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West has not been done. Rushing the implementation of such projects that will have longterm and lasting impacts in areas that are not equipped or suited for this type of project is not acceptable.

All Londoners want to help with a solution to the systemic mental health, addiction and homeless situation that is facing so many cities at the time - but doing so must be a collaborative partnership that is accountable to all.

Please feel free to contact me or share this letter.

Kind regards,

Elisabeth Hunt  
Sunningdale West Resident

From: Bibin Varkey  
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 9:36 AM  
To: [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)  
Cc: Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Homeless Hub in N London

Hello,

Here I am expressing my great concern regarding the proposed Homeless Hub, which will significantly affect the safety and peaceful nature of the neighbourhood. There are lot of vulnerable groups near by the proposed site. So I am kindly requesting to cancel the plan.

Thank you  
Bibin Varkey

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Marija Vicovac  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 1:20 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <[councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca)>  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homeless Hubs

Hello,

With regards to the upcoming vote on October 5 th . Specifically, the Fanshawe Park Road location. Let's all be very clear, no one in this community is happy with what is taking place with unhoused individuals in our city. We would all like to see people obtain the shelter and help they need. This is not a "NIMBY" issue and frankly presenting concerned neighbours and businesses with this brush stroke is unfair and a way to easily disregard our concerns. If you can label us, we no longer have thoughts that should be valued and heard. All of us have the right to dignity and safety in our communities. Frankly, it is unjust that our community was not consulted or asked for feedback on this location. Is this the type of city we are, where decisions are made without democracy, without a fair and balanced look at both points of view? We would like the following considerations to be taken under advisement:

- This location does not meet terms that this hub would placed in a location that would not require rezoning.
  - o There are no emergency medical services across the street – this is a walk-in clinic.
- The cost per bed does not meet the terms of the previous stipulations.
- The number of beds is contrary to what was stipulated in the previous reports.
- The hub is two doors down from a treatment facility for vulnerable autistic children (TVCC).
- Mastermind Toys, which is directly beside the Lighthouse Inn, hosts workshops for children and families.
- There is no assurance on safety for the community other than a security guard and advice we learn how to call 911 when we see concerns.
  - o When models in other cities are investigated safety is an ongoing issue.
  - o Disruption and safety concerns shut down a makeshift center in the Westmount area in a matter of two months.
- There is confusion on the criteria of clients being served at this location, i.e., how many severely acute individuals vs. transitional clients.
- It has been stated that clients served at the hub will be transitioned to affordable/assisted housing creating a "flow" of clients that will go on to be successful in the community.
  - o Where are these supports as it seems the city is currently out of resources with extreme waitlists for housing.
  - o A "flow" of clients is unable to take place if acute cases disrupt or take over the spaces for less acute individuals.
  - o A "flow" of clients is impossible if there are no resources in the community thereby rendering this a facility that can only take care of 21 individuals.

If the goal is to help the most people, this isn't the solution. If the goal is to do something, as opposed to doing nothing, this is plain desperation without good sense. If the goal is just to get 20 people off the street this winter, this is unjustified, as this winter will come and go before this hub is opened. We need a strong location that everyone can get behind. Let's return to the drawing board and find a more suitable option. It has to exist.

At the end of the day, our ward 7 councillor Corrine Rahman has voiced that the results included in the latest report are not what was supported or what the public was originally consulted on. For these reasons above and from our Ward Councillors, which 6/9 have also voiced concerns, we kindly ask that you reconsider this specific location. There are many other locations, which are still located in the North End, that could be considered. For instance, has something attached to University Hospital been considered? As the other two hubs are associated with hospital/care, would this not be something to investigate further? Greater security would perhaps also be available with regards to women who are trying to gain distance from people in their past with allocation in a safe locked facility such as a hospital site.

We thank you for your consideration in this matter  
Sincerely,

Fox Hollow Residents

Dear council members,

Hope this email finds you well

I am a resident in Fox Hollow neighbourhood and I am writing to you to share our concerns as a family regarding the new homeless hub intended to operate at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West

I am writing to you from a resident's perspective as well as an expert perspective

As an expert in the developmental sector and a behaviour analyst, I do understand the need to support the homeless people and I consider that they are victims of unforeseen circumstances, and that we are all responsible to provide support in different ways.

From my experience working with this vulnerable population, and from the true stories that I personally heard from women living in these shelters, I know very well that residents of these shelters continue to be victimized and abused from their perpetrators who use coercion and threats to keep them under their control. To be more explicit, drug dealers and human trafficking networks continue their business as usual using the vulnerable people as their agents. Most of the time, this means that perpetrators frequent the areas of these shelters to visit their agents or to observe their activities. Moreover, substance use continues to happen inside those hubs, and as a result, persons under the effect of these drugs going in and out of these hubs engage in behaviours that pose a safety risk to the people around them such as vandalism, theft, crime, assault and so on. Let alone the used needles and substances that will be left in the neighborhood. The hub is a short walking distance from the walking trails and parks in the FoxHollow area, where we send our children to play.

As a resident and a mother of 3 children, I am extremely concerned about the safety of my family if this hub is operating in our neighborhood, I am honestly very surprised about the choice of this location, and can't find a justification for this choice.

Did the council members take into consideration that there is a center for special needs (TVCC), a music school (Long and Mcquade), a toy store (Mastermind toys) and other medical and family businesses adjacent to the hub location?

As a resident who frequents most of the businesses in this block, I would definitely refrain from doing any business around that hub.

How such a decision could pass without consulting with the residents and businesses in the neighborhood? The speed in which this project is happening poses too many question marks to us and we feel that our safety and wellbeing have been dismissed.

We always used to get letters from the city of London whenever there was a neighborhood improvement project in the area (park, walking trail, infra-structure....) asking for our input and special requests, which we have always admired. How come we were never consulted regarding such a sensitive issue? Did the council members think about the impact of this hub on the surrounding businesses? on the safety of residents?

Like many of the families around us, we sought this neighborhood specifically because it was considered one of the safest for families, we invested all our savings to buy our dream house here, and now chances are that our property will be devalued with this project being implemented. Moreover, when we first came to Canada 10 years ago, we chose London because we heard that it is safe and family oriented. We strongly oppose this project and we hope that the city councilors reconsider this decision.

We anticipate a reply and further explanations about what is going on

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

--

**Lina Hawi**, MPEd, BCBA, RSW  
Board Certified Behaviour Analyst

**From:** midhu githin  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 9:30 AM  
**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Concern about homeless hub

Dear Sir/Madam

I am mother of 2 small kids living near that area. I am really concerned about the proposal. Kindly request you to reconsider the proposal

Thank you

Midhu jose



**From:** LEIDY VEGA  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 12:44 PM  
**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca); Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
**Cc:** Fernando Ramirez Moreno  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Propose Homeless Hub- Fanshawe Park Rd and Wonderland Rd

Good afternoon,

I am Leidy Vega. My family and I have been residents of the Fox Hollow area since 2017. We live at 1061 Eagletrace Dr. We are writing to you regarding the proposed homeless hub at Fanshawe Rd Park. We want to let you know that we are **totally against this proposal**. I have two children 14 and 7 years old. We are very concern about our safety and the problems this will bring to the community in the near future. My daughter takes the city bus every day at Fanshawe Park R and Wonderland Rd and very often she picks up his brother from the school bus at the same intersection and they walk home alone. On top of that, I do not want my kids to see the bad behaviours these vulnerable people bring. I believe everyone deserves support, but we do not think this is the right location for them. Our community will be greatly affected in many ways, personally and financially, if this is approved.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

Thank you

Leidy V.

Fernando R.

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very

uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of

the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,

Melissa Bebee

London, ON N6G 0R6

Please include my letter as part of the October 5th agenda.  
thank you.  
Dr. Ben Bebee

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

**1. Re-zoning** - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

**2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it

that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) to the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,

--

Dr. Ben Bebee  
Chiropractic Life Centre  
London, ON N6J 1G9

**From:** Chiropractic Life Centre

**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 1:52 PM

**To:** McAlister, Hadleigh <[hmcAlister@london.ca](mailto:hmcAlister@london.ca)>; Lewis, Shawn <[slewis@london.ca](mailto:slewis@london.ca)>; Trosow, Sam <[strosow@london.ca](mailto:strosow@london.ca)>; Hopkins, Anna <[ahopkins@london.ca](mailto:ahopkins@london.ca)>; Franke, Skylar <[sfranke@london.ca](mailto:sfranke@london.ca)>; Pelozo, Elizabeth <[epeloz@london.ca](mailto:epeloz@london.ca)>; Ferreira, David <[dferreira@london.ca](mailto:dferreira@london.ca)>; Cuddy, Peter <[pcuddy@london.ca](mailto:pcuddy@london.ca)>; Stevenson, Susan <[sstevenson@london.ca](mailto:sstevenson@london.ca)>; Pribil, Jerry <[jpribil@london.ca](mailto:jpribil@london.ca)>; Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <[pvanmeerbergen@london.ca](mailto:pvanmeerbergen@london.ca)>; Hillier, Steven <[shillier@london.ca](mailto:shillier@london.ca)>; City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>; Lehman, Steve <[slehman@london.ca](mailto:slehman@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] NO HUB AT [705 FANSHAWE PARK ROAD](#)

Dear Councilor,

I am opposed to the proposed hub location at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#). While there are a number of reasons this particular hub does not meet the guidelines for hub locations set out in *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, today I am writing you with concern over the forced closing of The Black Pearl Pub, a long-term, locally-owned business and the forced re-housing of the residents of the Light House Inn.

The Black Pearl Pub faces the road at the proposed location. Behind the pub is a motel. The following information has been verified to be factual after consultation with the business owners at this location.

The facts are as follows:

- The placement of a hub at this location will force the closure of The Black Pearl Pub and The Lighthouse Inn.
- The Black Pearl Pub rents the space and, therefore, will receive zero compensation for their forced closure. They will be forced to leave behind a business they dedicated their lives to building.
- The Black Pearl Pub will not be able to reopen in a different location as it would not be financially feasible for them to do so.
- 11 employees (including 6 families and their children) will be unemployed and without an income should the pub close. This includes children of these employees.
- At least half a dozen people will lose their home. These are long-term residents of the motel that cannot find affordable housing for their particular situations. This includes residents who have lived at this location from years to a decade.

Councilor, I trust that you can see that a hub at this location will cost others both financially, physically, and emotionally. These are people, too. People with a need for income, people with a need for affordable housing, parents who are working hard to put food on the table for their children. I ask that you protect the business owners, families and residents that are blameless casualties of this situation.

I ask that you please share this letter with council.

Thank you,

Dr. Ben Bebee

Chiropractic Life Centre

[London, ON N6J 1G9](#)



From: julie ann medeiros  
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 6:26 PM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fanshawe hub agenda

I'm writing for reconsideration of the Fanshawe hub. The plan isn't a plan. There is no plan. The community was unaware of this location and most still do not know. There was zero communication and involvement for the community. Not following location as it was not zoned for this for a reason!  
Please reconsider costs and location.  
Please attach this email to the public agenda Sincerely fox hollow and north west london

Sent from my iPhone

From: Corey and Nikki Birch  
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 6:23 PM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: Re: Automatic reply: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W - homeless hub location

I, Nicole Birch, give consent for the abovementioned email to be on the public agenda and become part of the public record.

Kind regards,  
Nicole Birch

Letter to Council:

With regards to the upcoming vote on October 5<sup>th</sup>. Specifically, the Fanshawe Park Road location. Let's all be very clear, no one in this community is happy with what is taking place with unhoused individuals in our city. We would all like to see people obtain the shelter and help they need. This is not a "NIMBY" issue and frankly presenting concerned neighbours and businesses with this brush stroke is unfair and a way to easily disregard our concerns. If you can label us, we no longer have thoughts that should be valued and heard. All of us have the right to dignity and safety in our communities. Frankly, it is unjust that our community was not consulted or asked for feedback on this location. Is this the type of city we are, where decisions are made without democracy, without a fair and balanced look at both points of view? We would like the following considerations to be taken under advisement:

- This location does not meet terms that this hub would inhabit a location that would not require rezoning.
- There are no emergency medical services across the street – this is a walk-in clinic.
- Feedback that we would be able to discuss this as a community during the rezoning process is inaccurate – residents will not have a voice other than on whether this should be zoned for an emergency location. We will not be able to give open feedback or have concerns addressed at this time.
- The cost per bed does not meet the terms of the previous stipulations.
- The number of beds is contrary to what was stipulated in the previous reports.
- The hub is two doors down from a treatment facility for vulnerable autistic children (TVCC).
- Mastermind Toys, which is directly beside the Lighthouse Inn, hosts workshops for children and families.
- Long and McQuaid conduct children's music lessons next door as well.
- There are residential backyards that back onto this location.
- There are current residents at the Lighthouse Inn that it is questioned will be displaced from their housing.
- Black Pearl as a business is going to be severely affected, lose business and possibly will close because customers will not feel safe frequenting this restaurant.
- There is no assurance on safety for the community other than a security guard and advice we learn how to call 911 when we see concerns.
- When models in other cities are investigated safety is an ongoing issue.

- Disruption and safety concerns shut down a makeshift center in the Oakridge area in a matter of two months.
- There is confusion on the criteria of clients being served at this location, i.e., how many severely acute individuals vs. transitional clients.
- It has been stated that clients served at the hub will be transitioned to affordable/assisted housing creating a “flow” of clients that will go on to be successful in the community.
- Where are these supports as it seems the city is currently out of resources with extreme waitlists for housing.
- A “flow” of clients is unable to take place if acute cases disrupt or take over the spaces for less acute individuals.
- A “flow” of clients is impossible if there are no resources in the community thereby rendering this a facility that can only take care of 21 individuals.
- Affordable housing on Hyde Park was voted down, how is this consistent with the plan.

If the goal is to help the most people, this isn't the solution.

If the goal is to do something, as opposed to doing nothing, this is plain desperation without good sense.

If the goal is just to get 20 people off the street this winter, this is unjustified, as this winter will come and go before this hub is opened. Furthermore the 10 CMHA cold weather beds that are attached to this plan – there need to be 10 extra beds allocated to the cold weather plan if this is the issue stopping community members from having their voices heard.

We need a strong location that everyone can get behind. Let's return to the drawing board and find a more suitable option. It must exist.

It is highly concerning that none of us, businesses and residents, knew about this location until Wednesday yet we are not being allowed the platform to discuss our concerns and questions. We are 70K+ strong in this community. If our voices are not important to be heard how is this setting an example for the rest of the city?

At the end of the day, our ward 7 councillor Corrine Rahman has voiced that the results included in the latest report are not what was supported or what the public was originally consulted on. For these reasons above and from our Ward Councillors, which 6/9 have also voiced concerns, we kindly ask that you reconsider this specific location. There are many other locations, which are still located in the North End, that could be considered. For instance, has something attached to University Hospital been considered? As the other two hubs are associated with hospital/care, would this not be something to investigate further? Greater security would perhaps also be available with regards to women who are trying to gain distance from people in their past with allocation in a safe locked facility such as a hospital site.

We thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Nicole Birch

Fox Hollow Resident

**From:** Nicole Birch  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:01 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Diverted Homeless Members

Good morning,

My name is Nicole Birch and I thank you for considering my email and my concern. Deputy Mayor Lewis alleged that many people living on the street are being transported to London from surrounding communities and this is often against their will. It is fair to say that London is one of the largest cities in the region and London does offer a number of resources for the homeless members of our city. However, as word gets out about these resources, other cities feel that they can relocate their homeless to London, putting a strain on the resources of London. Deputy Mayor Lewis condemned this move by other cities and the organization associated with cruel relocation. In fact, Deputy Mayor Lewis wanted to send these homeless members back to their home communities. The concern that I have is that the proposed hubs will encourage surrounding communities to continue to relocate their homeless members. Since there does not seem to be a protocol in place to prevent the relocation of homeless members, how is the City of London going to prevent this? How will the City of London track both the homeless members and the organizations that relocate them? Deputy Mayor Lewis made it quite clear that these organizations should be held accountable. The fact that these hubs have been in the news recently, the City of London has inadvertently advertising an influx of homeless resources and that London is going to be resource heavy regarding the homeless community. In turn, it would appear that the City of London is financially capable of addressing our homeless crisis as we are spending large amounts of money despite the fact that so few will be helped with the current proposal. The current budget for this proposal does not suggest that the City of London can sustain this proposed program, much less adding another ten hubs. Please consider these concerns of mine as they were also raised by Deputy Mayor Lewis. I consent to have this posted in the agenda.

Regards,  
Nicole Birch

**From:** Nicole Birch  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:03 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] An ignored voice

Good evening,

My name is Nicole Birch and I have recently shared a lot of my concerns with the homeless hub proposal, especially with the location at 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W. I agree that a sustainable project needs to be put in place for the homeless community of London. However, this particular project seems rushed at best and leaves a lot of questions unanswered. More so, some promises that were clearly outlined have been broken at worst, compromised at best. I am not a 'not in my backyard' person, I am not. I have been labeled as such because I am looking for answers and have a great number of concerns especially for the 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W. I do not know the answer to this systemic crisis and I do not feel that this is the solution that will be sustainable. And I feel that the community as a whole needs more. Everyone needs more support; everyone needs more communication; everyone needs more community. But as of today, this is all lacking for everyone.

Once the locations were announced and I raised concerns, if I received a reply, almost every time I got one from a council member, they directed me to podcasts including the mayor and the deputy mayor. At no point were the concerns I raised were addressed by either the emailed councillor and certainly not by the suggested podcasts. The lack of community involvement is greatly disappointing. The lack of communication is disturbing and treading into a totalitarian-like leadership. We are asking as a community to be educated about the hub and have our genuine concerns addressed. The flow of discussion and debate has been stymied by referring to a podcast and the democratic and diplomatic process is crumbling. I am very disappointed and will definitely explore my options in future municipal elections. True democracy requires open lines of communication and I encourage the council to proceed as such as we are supposed to be in a democratic society.

Thank you for reviewing my concerns and my emails. Please reflect on these and reconsider your previous vote favouring the hubs, especially at 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W. I give consent for this to be included in the agenda.

Kind regards,  
Nicole Birch

**From:** Nicole Birch  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:10 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] How are we saving?

Good evening,

My name is Nicole Birch and I am grateful that you considered my email and my concern. I am trying to understand Deputy Mayor Lewis's argument that tries to justify the cost of the homeless hub beds. He stated that an emergency bed costs \$500 000 to run for a full year while the hub beds will be approximately \$111 000. Does this mean that the plan is to remove the emergency beds for this would be the only way to recoup the savings that are suggested. Otherwise, I feel that now, as a taxpayer, I am expected to pay for a portion of the emergency hospital bed as well as the homeless hub bed. I do not see how the homeless hub bed is removing the cost of the emergency hospital bed. From where I am standing, regardless if I am a Fox Hollow resident or not, I am concerned that there is a potential that emergency beds will be taken away to recoup the \$500 000 that Deputy Mayor Lewis is claiming to save or at least not spend. Unfortunately, my son has been in and out of Victoria hospital for several years and, I admit, that there are a great number of homeless people in the emergency. However, a good number of them do not qualify for any of the currently suggested hubs (ie. white adult men). More so, a great number of people who are using the emergency services at Victoria hospital were not homeless. Granted I did not check their identification but it was safe to assume that there were people with homes having a medical crisis. It would appear that regardless of the many people that enter the hub program, the emergency beds will continue to be used. So, based on the math that suggested, we will save \$500 000 by establishing these hubs since the hub residence will no longer be using these emergency beds, approximately 5 beds will have to close to justify the spending \$2.5million (approximately) for 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W at the very least. Now, please correct me if I am wrong, I find it hard to believe that despite having a place in the hub, a hub resident would still use an emergency bed if they encountered a medical crisis. If for example the hub resident had a rupturing appendix, they would have to go to the emergency room and use an emergency room bed. I do not think that the yet to be established walk-in clinic opposite to 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W could handle such a crisis.

Additionally, what data is there to support that those going into the hubs were in fact the ones occupying the emergency beds? I am at a bit of a loss to understand the flow of finances and the proposed savings.

Overall, the point is that the Deputy Mayor Lewis is trying to justify spending \$111 000 per bed in a homeless hub while saying that "An emergency room bed is half-a-million dollars a year, so in comparison, this is about a fifth of the cost." But I do not understand where the savings are that he is claiming. The emergency beds will stay open regardless if the homeless hub is opened or not, thus still costing \$500 000/year. This seems arbitrarily linked and is not linked directly to each other. So, when the surface is scratched on this argument, the connection is spurious or causally connected at best. Thus, it is a poor argument to lend to this proposal.

Please consider this concern as you reflect on the proposed homeless hubs. I give my consent to have this included in the agenda.

Regards,  
Nicole Birch

<https://london.ctvnews.ca/deputy-mayor-defends-111-000-average-annual-cost-to-operate-each-bed-in-london-s-homeless-hubs-1.6572787>

**From:** Nicole Birch  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:12 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Children at 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W.

Good evening,

My name is Nicole Birch and I am happy that you consider my email and my concern. I am reaching out as I am concerned about the location of 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W. It has been

discussed that children may be moving into the proposed location. As a parent of the Fox Hollow community, I am genuinely concerned about the safety of the children that may move into that location. The current hotel is mostly asphalt and does not provide a suitable space for children to play. The location does not have a playground or grass yard to play in. The closest playground is Vista Woods Park, nearly a kilometre away. Furthermore, the proposed location is set on a busy street where most cars and trucks are travelling well over 60 kilometres per hour. Also, there is a great deal of traffic turning in and out of the strip malls and stores surrounding this location. Drivers are not always aware and tend to drive quickly in and out of the driveways. I personally avoid walking in this area due to the rushed drivers, trucks, and buses. Riding bikes in that area could be very dangerous and walking to the park is loud and intimidating for little children.

Additionally, the elementary schools in this area are reluctant to take on new students even from within their boundaries. So, where are the children supposed to go to school? And if this location is transient as it is suggested, how fair would it be for children to get shuffled around schools throughout the school year?

Please reflect on this concern of mine and reconsider another more appropriate location for this homeless hub. I give permission to have this added to the agenda.

Regards,  
Nicole Birch

**From:** kk kk  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 6:27 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homeless Hub - NW London

I consent to having this letter shared at council.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my deep concern and frustration regarding the proposal to open a homeless hub in North West London, specifically in the vicinity of Whitehills, Fox-Hollow, and Hyde Park. I strongly believe that this idea is not only ill-conceived but also poses a significant potential threat to the safety and well-being of our community.

While I wholeheartedly support initiatives aimed at addressing homelessness and providing support to those in need, the choice of location for this homeless hub raises serious questions. The other proposed homeless hubs are strategically placed within the downtown core or near Victoria Hospital, which makes logical sense due to the availability of resources, transportation options, and proximity to services. Placing one in North West London seems arbitrary and disconnected from the needs of the homeless population it aims to serve.

Moreover, the fact that there is a children's store adjacent to the proposed location is deeply concerning. It is essential to prioritize the safety and well-being of our children and families. The coexistence of a homeless hub and a children's store in such close proximity could potentially expose young and vulnerable individuals to unsafe situations, which is entirely unacceptable.

Our community in North West London has always strived to be a safe and welcoming place for all residents. We have a strong sense of community and a commitment to maintaining our neighborhood's security and harmony. Introducing a homeless hub without the consent or support of the community not only disregards our concerns but also undermines the trust between local authorities and the residents they represent.

I urge you to reconsider this proposal and engage in a transparent and inclusive dialogue with the community to explore alternative solutions that meet the needs of the homeless population while safeguarding the well-being of our residents. The residents of North West London deserve a say in decisions that directly impact our community's character and safety.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns, and I hope we can all work together to find a more suitable and responsible solution to address homelessness in our city

**From:** Stephanie O'Connell  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 6:26 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homeless Hub on Fanshawe Park Road

Please see the below, which I have consented to be shared at the council meeting.

The people who live in this area demand more information be shared and that it be accurate information to boot on the proposal and we need time for us to attend the meeting to voice our concerns.

This city is notorious for dragging their feet on everything. Look at Dundas street, king street, bus rapid transit. But this is moving so fast it makes it seem like we have not been shown the full picture, the city is to caught up in being the first to do this and be a leader among the country.

I served on the board of directors for Neighborhood Watch London for 4 years and looked at the LexisNexis crime map. There is an increase in crime currently around my sisters place, you can see all the theft that has taken place.

I am concerned about the rise in petty crime for our area that will go hand in hand with a homeless hub that allows drugs use and short term housing.

---

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses- In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are



closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

4. Child and Youth Safety and Security - As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

5. Lack of Previous Data - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone. I consent to having this letter shared at council.

Thank you,

Stephanie O'Connell

**From:** Hemand S P

**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 10:53 AM

**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca); Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed north London homeless hub location

Hello,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed location for the North London homeless hub. While I understand the importance of addressing homelessness in our community, I believe that the chosen location raises significant concerns that must be thoroughly considered before moving forward with this project.

Firstly, the proposed location's proximity to residential neighborhoods is a cause for concern. Placing a homeless hub in such close proximity to family homes could have a negative impact on property values and create discomfort for the residents. It is essential to ensure that the hub's presence will not disrupt the lives of those living nearby.

Additionally, the safety of both homeless individuals and the surrounding community should be a top priority. There are concerns about potential increases in crime or disturbances in the area. Adequate security measures and community engagement plans should be put in place to address these concerns and ensure the safety and well-being of everyone involved.

Furthermore, the accessibility and availability of essential services for homeless individuals should be thoroughly evaluated. It's crucial to assess whether the proposed location provides easy access to healthcare, employment opportunities, and public transportation to help individuals reintegrate into society effectively.

Lastly, community input and engagement are vital in the decision-making process. I urge you to involve the local residents in discussions and decisions related to this project. Their perspectives and concerns should be taken into account to create a solution that benefits both the homeless population and the community at large.

In conclusion, while I support efforts to address homelessness in our area, I believe that the proposed location for the North London homeless hub requires careful consideration and addressing the concerns mentioned above. I encourage you to engage in open dialogue with the community and thoroughly evaluate the potential impacts before proceeding with this project.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I look forward to hearing more about the steps taken to address these concerns.

Thanks & Regards,  
Hemand S P

**From:** Sagan Brown  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 6:43 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to hun at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good afternoon,

As a born and raised Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. My reasons are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate an Emergency Care Establishment. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner. I do not feel safe parking my car and walking to work (I work downtown), or leaving work and walking to my car. Let alone my lunch breaks. My safe space is supposed to be my home, where my children will grow up and my city staff is taking MINE AND MY CHILDREN'S rights to feel safe away.

3. In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short term housing. Furthermore, the opening timeframe for this hub was intended to be May, 2024 however the timeline has changed to rush a possible opening before the end of 2023. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and this, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

4. The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on

business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

5. During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Mr. Mayor, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent your constituents in a proportionate and equitable manner.

This is not a matter of not in my backyard situation for me, this is a that location does not meet the guidelines that we're put in place.

Thank you,

Sagan Brown  
Sagan Brown

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows: First and for most residents and local businesses in this area were not given community participation in this plan in any meaningful way. Prior to announcement of the location there was little information given and little exposure for how to participate. How can a community participate if they aren't informed of the details, most importantly the Hub's location. It has only been days since some of us know of this, and many others are still in the dark. How will we voice our concerns in the zoning process. Our voice is being attempted to be taken away from us. We have valid concerns and questions about safety that we would like heard and responded to.

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.
2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, "a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and

short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. **The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.
4. **Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health and Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be

near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

5. **Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

I ask that my concerns are taken into account as well as the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I hope and trust that all the residents of this fine city be represented in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email.

Thank you,

Adriana Escudero

**From:** Adriana Mallo Escudero

**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 4:19 PM

**To:** City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>; Lehman, Steve <[slehman@london.ca](mailto:slehman@london.ca)>; McAlister, Hadleigh <[hmcAlister@london.ca](mailto:hmcAlister@london.ca)>; Lewis, Shawn <[slewis@london.ca](mailto:slewis@london.ca)>; Trosow, Sam <[strosow@london.ca](mailto:strosow@london.ca)>; Hopkins, Anna <[ahopkins@london.ca](mailto:ahopkins@london.ca)>; Franke, Skylar <[sfranke@london.ca](mailto:sfranke@london.ca)>; Pelozo, Elizabeth <[epelozalondon.ca](mailto:epelozalondon.ca)>; Ferreira, David <[dferreira@london.ca](mailto:dferreira@london.ca)>; Pelozo, Elizabeth <[epelozalondon.ca](mailto:epelozalondon.ca)>; Cuddy, Peter <[pcuddy@london.ca](mailto:pcuddy@london.ca)>; Stevenson, Susan <[sstevenson@london.ca](mailto:sstevenson@london.ca)>; Pribil, Jerry <[jpribil@london.ca](mailto:jpribil@london.ca)>; Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <[pvanmeerbergen@london.ca](mailto:pvanmeerbergen@london.ca)>; Hillier, Steven <[shillier@london.ca](mailto:shillier@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed Homeless Hub @ 705 Fanshawe Park Rd.

Dear Mayor and Councils for the City of London.

I am writing to you today to express my concerns on the topic of a Homeless Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Rd. and Wonderland.

I am deeply worried about this situation. Although I understand we must take care of the homeless, I truly believe that bringing them into residential neighborhoods (any neighbourhood) is not a good idea. It seems to me that like a wildfire, we should try to contain it and not spread.

We all know that attached to these facilities come drugs, violence, vandalism, theft, tents, mental illness, etc. As politicians you know better than I, that these have proven to be exactly what I have just mentioned, troubled areas, and many have had to close for these exact reasons.

Has anyone considered that the Lighthouse Inn is occupied and those tenants, whom have affordable housing, are being thrown out to the street?

The Black Pearl? A well-established local business of many years. They will have to force close. They will not be opening at another location since this is not financially feasible, this implies 11 workers and families without a job, that is if only Black Pearl closes.

Mastermind Toys? Do you know that they hold events for children? What will happen to them?

What about the autistic centre for Children? Will they have to close down? Parks and schools in the area?

What about the other many businesses that are in close proximity? Did you know that many will not provide statements because they are scared and fear revenge, criticism and boycott?

This site doesn't even meet the guidelines set out for Londons Health and Homeless. Shouldn't it be by an emergency facility?



Now, the cost!! The cost of \$2,500,000 per year to hold 20 beds. That is about \$125,000 per bed! An astonishing amount considering others cost approximately \$13,000 - \$16,000 a bed. Will the general public have access to see statements? This is no longer a neighborhood issue but City wide. Many households combined income isn't 125,000/year and the City wants to spend it per bed. Even with this kind of ridiculous spending, the problem will not be fixed. This is only a band aid fix.

We must dedicate our hard-earned tax dollars to rehabilitation, not facilities where they are welcome to bring in and do drugs. Not a facility where they are welcome to bring in there guests and have it turned into a prostitution centre.

I ask those that have voted for this Hub, to please reconsider. Don't spread the fire. Let our teens walk to the store, our elders wander the streets without us having to fear the worst.

Sincerely grateful that you are taking the time to read this.

Adriana Escudero

P.S. I grant permission to add this email on the agenda.

**From:** Bryan Negrijn  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 6:51 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

I CONSENT TO HAVING THIS LETTER SHARED AT UPCOMING COUNCIL MEETINGS.

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses**- In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. **The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

4. **Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close

proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone. I consent to having this letter shared at council.

Thank you,  
Bryan Negrijn  
Ward 7 Resident

**From:** Jaspreet Gill

**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 6:57 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

I CONSENT TO HAVING THIS LETTER SHARED AT UPCOMING COUNCIL MEETINGS.

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses**- In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. **The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing

yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone. I consent to having this letter shared at council.

Thank you,

Jaspreet Gill  
(Ward 7 resident)

Please include this in the October 5<sup>th</sup> agenda. This is my consent.

Jamie Neely

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) to the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,  
Dr. Jamie Neely  
Pure Health Wellness  
Oxford St. E.  
London, ON



**From:** Susan Whiting  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 7:05 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] re: Proposed Location of Homeless Hub on Fanshawe Park Road West

**Please note: I am sending this letter with consent to having it shared at public council**

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening Councillors,

While we may not have penned this letter, we are choosing to forward it to you for consideration as we fully agree with each and every point made by Melissa and want you to know that as members of this community, we are very concerned about the location of the proposed homeless hub. Please consider Melissa's position on this and know that many neighbours and members of the community, including us, fully agree with each and every statement. Furthermore, our position with the proposed location of this hub is punctuated by the fact that our extended family owns and operates the Black Pearl Pub. This is a locally owned and operated place of community within itself and our society that is just now recovering from the impact that Covid had on so many businesses, many of them being forced to close. The Black Pearl did not close - it survived. As did its owners, employees and clientele and they are all now finally thriving again. To propose the likely closure of a community gathering place is, quite frankly, absurd, especially given the number of empty and abandoned buildings within the city. Please reconsider this. Please know that we do not disagree with change needing to happen to help those needing it and we recognize the efforts that are being made to address this situation. We have listened to the Craig Needles podcast in response to a previous email that we sent to the Mayor's office to ensure we are educated on the changes that are being proposed. Again, we support the work being done, we just cannot condone or support the proposed location of this specific location. It was mentioned specifically in this podcast that our Mayor, Josh Morgan felt our community was reacting in fear and misinformation. We personally take offense to his statements as residents of this area. We are not asking that you reconsider this location due to fear or misinformation on our part, we are asking that you consider an alternate location in any area of the city, including ours, to ensure that a local, thriving business is not shut down at the city's hands. How can this possibly be justified???

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, we are writing today to put forth our opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, we ask that you consider our concerns and those of our neighbours and community. Our reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.
2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses- In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location

until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that the city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to us directly via email.

Thank you,

Concerned Residents,

Susan and George Whiting

**From:** Paryant Gosain  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 7:02 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe  
Park Road

Good evening Councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see,

decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit

exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Thank you,  
Paryant Gosain

**From:** Vincy

**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 7:13 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. **The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly

responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Thank you,  
Vincy Brown

I consent to my letter being shared at council.

**From:** Gurpreet Kaur  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 7:16 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening Councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. **The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation*



Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Thank you,  
Gurpreet Kaur

**From:** Jovana Majstorovic  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 8:12 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fw: Homeless Hub on 705 Fanshawe

Please include in agenda for October 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.  
Thank you.

---

**From:** Jovana Majstorovic  
**Sent:** September 28, 2023 11:33 PM  
**To:** City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** Homeless Hub on 705 Fanshawe

Dear Mayor Josh Morgan,

Thank you for your support of the London Community and all that you are trying to do to help the unhoused in our community. No one likes what they are seeing become of our city and some of those who are in the greatest need here.

No one disagrees that there needs to be a plan for the unhoused in our community. What we disagree with though are the many factors which were outlined in the city's original plan that are now being disregarded. Zoning, budget, proximity, community involvement. All of these are outlined in my attached council letter below.

The residents in this area, and the local businesses, were not given community participation in this plan in any meaningful way. Prior to announcement of the location, there was little information given and little exposure for how to participate. Corrine hosted one meeting and ¾ were people from OEV. How can a community fully participate if they aren't aware of the details, most importantly the Hub's location? We are finding out this location on Wednesday only. It simply isn't true that the community will have a chance to voice concerns in the zoning process. We will not have a voice on the center, only on whether the building zoning should be changed to emergency. For some reason our voice is being attempted to be taken away from us. We have valid concerns and questions about safety that we would like heard and responded to. I can't understand why this isn't valid.

Our house was broken into in broad daylight on September 20, 2018. The level of trauma this brought on for our children and ourselves was severe and it took a long time for us to feel safe in our home again. I trust you understand that safety is a major issue for our family and that it is not something we look at lightly. I beg you to please take all information and concerns when casting your vote, and consider the concerns of ALL parties involved.

Please remember that we need to be represented too. No one consulted us, no one made us aware, we are simply being asked to take this under the pretense of civic duty. Who will be our voice, and represent our concerns. Our whole neighbourhood rallied behind you when you ran for mayor, many are now questioning their vote and simply feel let down and betrayed. Many, including myself will be re thinking our votes in the next election.

Finally, we know the 10 CMHA beds that are a part of this are vital. Council should explore including these beds under cold weather planning instead of this RFP which is tied to Fanshawe. It makes no sense that our concerns are being tied in together with allocation for cold weather beds to be made available for the end of the year when there is plenty of time to discuss the Fanshawe center slated for a May opening.

Thank you for your time and your consideration in the next step of voting.  
Sincerely,  
Jovana Majstorovic

**From:** Marilyn Higgins  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 8:25 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Plead

I am giving consent to having this letter shared at city council

Attention: All City Councillors Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road  
Good evening councillors, As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

- 1. Re-zoning** - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.
- 2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses**- In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.
- 3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.
- 4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed campus hub. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.
- 5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move

on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back? Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner. Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email . Thank you,  
Marilyn and Keith Higgins

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can

imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable

segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,



City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can

imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable

segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,

**From:** LUIS E. VELEZ

**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 10:01 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road.

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses- In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub.

Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

4. Child and Youth Safety and Security - As per the location criteria of London's Health And

Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

5. Lack of Previous Data - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

I consent to having this letter shared at council.

Thank you,  
Luis Velez

Sent from my Bell Samsung device over Canada's largest network.

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can

imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable

segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,



City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can

imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable

segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,

**From:** diana paez

**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 11:27 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to proposed homelessness hub at 705 Fanshawe park road

I consent to have my letter shared at council

---

City of London

300 Dufferin Avenue,

London, ON,

N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses- In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a

business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

4. Child and Youth Safety and Security - As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

5. Lack of Previous Data - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone. I consent to having this letter shared at council.

Thank you,

Diana Paez

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

**From:** Ben Rogala  
**Sent:** Friday, September 29, 2023 12:20 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fw: London homeless hub concerns

---

**From:** Ben Rogala  
**Sent:** September 28, 2023 9:45 PM  
**To:** [slehman@london.ca](mailto:slehman@london.ca) <[slehman@london.ca](mailto:slehman@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** London homeless hub concerns

I am a concerned citizen and a medical professional who is pleading that you reconsider your support for the homeless hubs, specifically those that will be placed in residential neighborhoods. I have a number of concerns that warrant consideration.

1) I would ask that you reconsider the open drug policies at these hubs. Ongoing addiction without abstinence/ drug free rehabilitation will continue to propagate the addiction problems we are facing. You cannot manage patients concomitant mental illness if they continue to use substances that alter their brain neurobiology. I would request that you read the national institute for mental health bulletin on substance use disorder and treatment. (<https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/substance-use-and-mental-health>). I have also attached an article from Nature, one of the most reputable scientific/medical journals that summaries addiction and best practices for managing substance use disorder. I can assure you best practice is not to enable self damaging behavior.

One of the principles used in counseling patients with addictions is the stages of change model. The stages of change are:

- Precontemplation (Not yet acknowledging that there is a problem behavior that needs to be changed)
- Contemplation (Acknowledging that there is a problem but not yet ready, sure of wanting, or lacks confidence to make a change)
- Preparation/Determination (Getting ready to change)
- Action/Willpower (Changing behavior)
- Maintenance (Maintaining the behavior change)

Patients who are actively using psychoactive substances are not able to advance to higher stages of change and continue to revert to earlier stages of change because the drugs continue to act as a reward to manage negative feelings/cravings.

if the centers were rehabilitation/drug free facilities I would consider supporting the initiative. You will have better success in housing individuals who are ready for change. The focus should be on prevention and housing those on the cusp of slipping into a more vulnerable population not those who are already there. The model as is will fail and hurt the community in the process.

if you are unaware the safe supply/drug policies of some of the community partners are resulting in massive quantities of prescription opiates being funneled/diverted throughout the city for profit. The supplied/prescribed opiates, mostly dilaudid/hydromorphone or morphine are of lower potency than the drug of choice fentanyl so they are sold to less initiated/ newer drug users so the more experienced users can purchase the higher potency drugs typically fentanyl. Making opiates and drugs more available in the city is not a good idea. The escalating doses for the newly initiated then results in them seeking drugs of higher potency. We do not need to spread the sale of moderate potency opiates around the city. They are already easy enough to get.

2) the costs are out of control. If servicing 100 people will cost 8 million dollars then 2000 individuals in the current model will cost over 160 million annually, and as I am sure you are aware the estimated costs are likely on the low side. I am sure there is better use of tax payer and the donated money. Once the generous donation has been burned through by the corporations who profit from homelessness that are currently failing to make any progress with housing individuals using the same models they are expanding on it will be gone and the opportunity will be lost. If you want to see continued donations you need to have tangible change. The notion that you are not

showing gratitude or will scare away donors by not acting with thoughtless expediency is outrageous. what makes you think this time it will be any better.

3) the need for housing to transition people too. My preference/ idea would be to use the donated money and other revenue sources to first build community housing taking a downstream approach rather than an upstream approach. I think a good analogy is buying groceries. If you go to the store without your reusable bags you only have two hands to hold items and you will likely drop some of them along the way. If you bring several bags you can fill them with more items with less risk of damaging your goods. If you build community housing (the grocery bag in my analogy) the agencies who are currently looking to house individuals could then have somewhere to place individuals who are homeless and ready to be homed. The current plan will fail because there is nowhere to transition people to. The council also needs to rapidly approve any and all developments as there will be trickle down effects of lowering prices in less modern units as supply begins to match the demand.

4) rezoning. It is unfathomable that there is consideration for rezoning when the initial proposal stated that rezoning would not be a part of the initial hubs. It would be more reasonable to prove the concept in contained hubs such as the ones on parkwood and Victoria hospital properties before expanding. This project does not warrant the special consideration it is receiving, and should be approached as one would any other public works project as outlined during the city council meeting. There have been countless proposals for rezoning that this council has rejected for reasons much less than neighborhood safety. In fact there have been several affordable high density projects that have been recently denied as they did not fit neighborhood criteria. Even today city councilors are opposing what would be record setting twin towers in London that would have a massive impact on the number of housing units available.

I request your reply to confirm you received this message and look forward to engaging with you further on this topic.

Dr. Benjamin Rogala

This email can be part of the public record.

**From:** Jinu Aneesh

**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 11:56 AM

**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca); Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Against the proposed homeless hub in North London

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Please reconsider the proposed plan for the peaceful living of the community.

Thanking you in advance,

Jinu Abraham



**From:** yuyuezhang  
**Sent:** Friday, September 29, 2023 1:25 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Letter to Council pertaining hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West

Dear Council,

My name is Yuyue Zhang, resident of Foxhollow neighbourhood in Northwest London. I am writing to voice my concerns on the hub location at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West.

Many of the residents in this community were shocked to learn about the hub location last Wednesday (September 20, 2023) from news, like me. As of this evening, as I checked around with neighbours along my street, many of them were still unaware of this. They shared the confusion that they have never been informed in any way from the City on this matter, and wondered why the decision making process on this matter cannot be made transparent to the public, and why the lack of public engagement and communications prior to the announcement.

To be clear, our community members are actively engaged in many public affairs, and are caring for those who are in need - heartwarming actions, fundraising initiatives, etc. Mayor Morgan is from this ward and he should know this very well. So, please don't label any of the opposition to the hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. We oppose not because of not-in-my-back-yard, not because we don't care for the unhoused, not because we fear. We oppose the plan just because the whole decision making process lacks transparency, ignores public engagement, violates the principle of justice and democracy.

All of us have the right to dignity and safety in our communities. It is unjust that our community was not consulted or asked for feedback on this location. Is this the type of city we are, where decisions are made without democracy, without a fair and balanced look at both points of views?

Dear Council, please do reconsider this plan for the hub location at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. The plan is not aligned to City's own location criteria. Implementing the plan will cause more issues with heavy cost, and disappoint your constituents on Council's accountability and ability in decision making for public good.

And below are the concerns that need to be addressed:

1. Could Council clarify on the location selection criteria? This location is not "directly adjacent to licensed childcares or city parks", however, it is just two doors down from a treatment facility for vulnerable autistic children (TVCC), and right beside Mastermind Toys, where workshops for children and families are hosted regularly. It is not in the interior of residential community, but it just backs into the residential neighbourhood, by wood fence. This doesn't assure the safety.
2. Other than the hub location selection criteria City has made, what kind of risk assessments have been made regarding the 705 Fanshawe Park Road West? If any, who made the assessments by what methods?
3. Have the City and Council been aware of the emergency medical services nearby if the hub is established? All other four locations are current agencies that already provide such assistance, hospitals and institutions that have the capacities to provide such services, why Fanshawe location is the only one that doesn't possess any of these capacities? Are any locations in the North End of the city being considered, for example, somewhere close to University Hospital?
- 4.. Could the Council explain on the cost per bed as it does not meet the terms of the previous stipulations?
5. Could Council explain why the number of beds is contrary to what was stipulated in the previous report?
- 6.. Has the Council been aware that the current residents at the Lighthouse Inn would be displaced from their housing? Is this going to create more housing issues?
7. What is the safety assurance for the community if the hub is established here? The advice of a safety guard and we learn how to call 911 when we see concerns are not going to work because this is not a sustainable way. Thinking about disruption and safety concerns shut down a makeshift center in the Oakridge area in a matter of two months. We are not short of such examples.

8. It has been stated that clients served at the hub will be transitioned to affordable/assisted housing creating a "flow" of clients that will go on to be successful in the community. Where are these supports as it seems the city is currently out of resources with extreme waitlists for housing?

If the goal is to help the most people, this isn't the solution.

If the goal is to do something, as opposed to doing nothing, this is plain desperation without good sense.

If the goal is just to get 20 people off the street this winter, this is unjustified, as this winter will come and go before this hub is opened. Furthermore the 10 CMHA cold weather beds that are attached to this plan – there need to be 10 extra beds allocated to the cold weather plan if this is the issue stopping community members from having their voices heard.

We need a strong location that everyone can get behind. Please, dear Council, rethink this plan and find a more suitable option, for your accountability and ability in decision making for public good.

We thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Fox Hollow Resident, Yuyue Zhang

Please add my letter to the public added agenda, with my permission, for the council's October 5th meeting

Dear Council,

My name is Yuyue Zhang, a resident in the Fox Hollow neighbourhood. With respect, I am writing my second letter to the Council to voice my questions and concerns regarding the hub on 705 Fanshawe Park Road West.

After my first letter (sent on Friday September 29, attached) to the Council and the Mayor, I was advised to listen to Mayor Morgan and Councillor Lewis' s informative talk on the Craig Needles podcast. While I listened to the talk, I am not sure if it was as informative as it claimed, it was definitely selective on information and biased on opinions. And it again raised more questions and concerns, not to the hub itself, but also to the accountability and ability of the Council in decision making.

Mayor Morgan and Councilor Lewis, you educated us to separate the Fanshawe hub from other general homeless hubs, as Fanshawe hub is for more acute women who are experiencing housing issues due to their mental health situation. No problem. I get it. But when we asked for more open dialogues, you responded with a rush timeframe (nine-month timeframe) stating this would delay the opening of the hubs for the homeless in winter. I don't understand this rush for the timeframe - Fanshawe hub won't open until May 2024 in your plan, anyway you cannot cover the winter. Also, as you educated us, Fanshawe hub is not the same as other general homeless hubs. Then, why cannot this location be discussed separately from other hubs in your agenda? You want to create a "flow" of these unhoused, where do you plan to flow these more acute women from 705 Fanshawe Park Road West to? Do you really have the full capacity to keep the full cycle running as a flow, rather than just covering one mistake with another?

When we raised concerns over safety, we were given the answer that a security guard will be in place, and this place will be monitored and kept tracking by the staff. How many of you have been to the Parkwood Institute in the other end of the City? Do you know what kind of safety measures are in place over there? It is for sure more than just a security guard and staff monitoring there, multiple gates to swipe in and out, as you can see directly entering into the building, let alone other response mechanisms. Mayor Morgan and Councillor Lewis, if a security guard and regular staff monitoring are all you can say to assure the sense of safety to the community, I am sorry that none of us would take it, because we all know this just cannot enable the work. 705 Fanshawe Park Road doesn't have the capacity to run such a hub, and your plan for such a hub just cannot serve its purpose stated. To be clear, with your current plan for such a hub, it is not going to work at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West, nor to any other neighbourhoods in London - residential neighbourhoods just don't have the capacity to run such hubs this way regardless of the funds you are going to invest in. You will have to find other more suitable plans to spend the funds responsibly.

Mayor Morgan and Councillor Lewis, according to your talks, I understand that you are also taking this project as an experiment. No problem. Social progress needs such experiments. But, such trials of errors cannot just go by people's wills, it needs to consider many factors, including but not limited to the larger social impacts, cost-benefit effectiveness, as the basics. I don't see much of such considerations in your plan or in any of your talks to the public, your plan on this hub location to the public is just throwing money into the river, instead.

Mayor Morgan and Councillor Lewis, you promised that the funds for the hubs are not from property taxes. Thank you for your hard work in gaining external resources for London! However, just because the funds are not from the property taxes doesn't mean you can violate the democratic principles involved in the decision making process. Just because the funds are not from the property taxes, we the residents here cannot have our voices and concerns be heard? Just because the funds are not from the property taxes, any opposition to this hub location shall be labeled as NIMBYs? Just because the funds are not from the property taxes, residents in Fox Hollow community who are not in favour of this hub location shall be portrayed as the million dollars house owners who just turn their back to those who are in need?

In other meetings and talks, Mayor Morgan also commented on some oppositions "misinformed and feared", and out of "misconception". Mr. Mayor, I am one of the opponents to this hub location, and I can correct you that I am not scared of the hub itself, and I am always open to be educated, by good points out of logical thinking though. When we talk about the safety concerns and the location suitability, we are talking about the toy store that regularly provides workshops to children and families, right next to 705 Fanshawe Park Road West; we are talking about a treatment facility for vulnerable autistic children (TVCC) just two doors down; we are talking about Vista Woods park in the neighbourhood in 10 minutes walking distance from 705 Fanshawe Park Road West; and we are talking about the easy access to the adjacent trails that connect multiple schools. Mr. Mayor and the rest of the Council, I can assure you that I am not misinformed, or feared, I just feel I am misrepresented, and most of the opponents from our community feel the same way. And I speak with no entitlement or privilege here. I came to Canada ten years ago, renting a basement, no extra dime for new clothes other than from thrift stores, and paying for a Tim Hortons coffee was a luxury to me by then. As a woman, I do understand these struggles myself. And I appreciate the kindness and support I received here in London along my way from an immigrant to the Canadian Citizen. My husband and I work hard to earn a decent living here and live in a community that we are proud to call it home. Many of the residents in this neighbourhood come from a similar background, and would stand on the point to share the love and care to others whenever needed. I just don't understand why all of a sudden we are labeled unfairly and being publicly shamed just for having different voices over a proposal on Council's agenda. Can we not have our concerns and voices be heard? What are you fearing for, my dear Council?

Mr. Mayor and the rest of the Council, please stop labeling the opponents unfairly. All we want is an open dialogue on the issues and concerns raised over the hub location at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. All we want is to be educated with good knowledge out of logical thinking. All we want is to urge the City Council to hold its accountability and ability in decision making so as to make London a better place to live for everyone!

Dear City Council, please reconsider your view for the hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West, and separate this hub from other hubs from your agenda for further public consultation and discussions.

Please add my letter to the public added agenda, with my permission, for the council's October 5th meeting

Sincerely,

Yuyue Zhang  
Ward 7 resident

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data

collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

You have my consent to having my letter shared at council meeting.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can

imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable



segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,

I consent to have my letter shared at council

---

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses- In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For

Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

4. Child and Youth Safety and Security - As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

5. Lack of Previous Data - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone. I consent to having this letter shared at council.

Thank you,

Juan Pizarro

**From:** Moe Nasser

**Sent:** Friday, September 29, 2023 7:53 AM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

[City of London](#)  
[300 Dufferin Avenue,](#)  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#)

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#). As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a

distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#) houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023,

open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

You have my consent to having my letter shared at council meeting.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,

**From:** JoJo M  
**Sent:** Friday, September 29, 2023 7:58 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

[City of London](#)  
[300 Dufferin Avenue,](#)  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#)

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#). As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. **The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#) houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is

this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

You have my consent to having my letter shared at council meeting.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)



**From:** Zakiya Fadel

**Sent:** Friday, September 29, 2023 8:16 AM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>; City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>; Lehman, Steve <slehman@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homeless Hub on Fanshawe Park Rd. W

\*I consent to having my letter shared at the council meeting" \*

Good Morning,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. My reasons are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate an Emergency Care Establishment. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short term housing. Furthermore, the opening timeframe for this hub was intended to be May, 2024 however the timeline has changed to rush a possible opening before the end of 2023. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and this, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

4. As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

5. During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any

of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Mr. Mayor, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent your constituents in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Thank you,  
Zakiya fadel

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

**From:** patel yogesh  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 1:12 PM  
**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Objection regarding the current proposal for homeless hub Near WONDERLAND AND FANSHAWE INTERSECTION

Hello

I'm a resident of N6G 0M6 And i m against the proposal of Homeless hub at the Lighthouse Inn near fanshawe and wonderland .

While we are not against the proposal for creating a homeless hub in the city when the city is in need of it .

But this is not a suitable location for this project for the number of reasons

1. There is no emergency medical services available near the proposed location .. There is only walkin clinic, not urgent care .
2. Mastermind toys shop where they host workshops for kids throughout the year.
3. There is a TVCC ( Treatment facility for Vulnerable autistic children ) two doors down to this proposed site which also makes this proposal not suitable for this location .
4. There is already safety concerns going on in this community like breaking cars almost everyday.

and the list goes on .

Thank you

--

***Yogesh Patel***

***London, Ontario***

***Canada***

--

***Yogesh Patel***  
***London, Ontario***  
***Canada***

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can

imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable

segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,  
Kristine Jongepier

From: Pamela Block  
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2023 10:26 AM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Homeless hubs

I consent to having my letter shared at the council meeting.

To the city council,

As a social scientist with postdoctoral training in alcohol and addiction studies, I support the evidence-based plans to provide facilities to unhoused people in London. I support the vision and participatory nature of this planning process. I support the creation of housing to support woman and couples with children in Northwest London near Fanshaw and Wonderland near my home. I hope the city will be transparent about planning that involves large injections of money into privately owned buildings for short term facilities. I would like to know there is a plan for short and long term wrap around supports for people needing to use these facilities. I have noticed a great deal of NIMBY panic based in prejudice and misinformation but also some astute questions about use of resources and short and long term consequences of creating these supports. To continue the participatory nature of this process please create advisory boards that include local community members as well as experts in this field. All stakeholders should be represented in a balanced way moving forward. I am very disturbed at the idea that financially and politically privileged people might have the power to bar important services to marginalized people in our community through bullying and fear tactics. At the same time there needs to be transparency and evidence of thoughtful long range planning in these new hubs or the whole city-wide plan is at risk.

Sincerely,  
Pamela Block Ph.D.

Yes please, I'd like this placed on public agenda.

[City of London](#)  
[300 Dufferin Avenue](#),  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#)

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#). As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows: First and for most residents and local businesses in this area were not given community participation in this plan in any meaningful way. Prior to announcement of the location there was little information given and little exposure for how to participate. How can a community participate if they aren't informed of the details, most importantly the Hub's location. It has only been days since some of us know of this, and many others are still in the dark. How will we voice our concerns in the zoning process. Our voice is being attempted to be taken away from us. We have valid concerns and questions about safety that we would like heard and responded to.

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, "a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite



and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

**3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at [705 Fanshawe Park Road](#) houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health and Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a

children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

I ask that my concerns are taken into account as well as the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I hope and trust that all the residents of this fine city be represented in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email.

Thank you,  
Stefanie Escudero

**From:** Aneesh Antony  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 1:49 PM  
**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca); Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homeless Hub

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Please reconsider the proposed plan for the peaceful living of the community.

Thanking you in advance,

Aneesh Antony

Mayor Morgan's statement to Ward 7's concerns "fear and misconceptions" are not mine, rather facts and reality!

As delineated by Councillor Rahman the RFP is already compromised:

-no rezoning for hubs 3-5

-number of beds open for December 2023

-secured funding amounts

My concern and understanding regarding the CMHA's bid for Hub 5 at 705 Fanshawe Road West are:

-CMHA is the agency responsible for Nicole's Choice which was established with the belief that if Nicole could have been housed, she wouldn't have died! However, the **reality** is that many women have overdosed at this facility as well as at least one death from a former resident of this facility. Addiction counsellors have extreme limitations to mitigate addiction and mental health issues. This facility is in a constant flux of drug and sex work problems as well as infestations of bed bugs and cockroaches.

CMHA cannot in good faith ensure that 705 Fanshawe will NOT inherit Nicole's Choice problems. Shelter alone does not address the complex behaviour and needs of these extremely unwell persons with addiction and mental health issues. To purport that this hub will have 24/7 support to resources is naïve given the RFP has already deviated from the initial proposal of implementation. Even if this weren't the case that does not ensure their clientele would focus beyond their need for the next fix to support their addiction. Many of the unhoused individuals have severe behaviour problems that do not allow them to access shelters; not that there are enough shelters either. The individuals accessing hubs have quite often been previously housed and don't have the skills to look after themselves. Specialized staff and security personnel that is allowed to enforce boundaries and restrictions are needed to ensure successful housing. This should not fluctuate due to budget constraints which is often the case. What is proposed has already been sidelined as outlined by Councillor Rahman at the September 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. This doesn't bode well for a successful hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West.

705 Fanshawe Road West is NOT the solution to homelessness the CMHA and Council would want us to believe. **It is imperative that this location is open to more scrutiny and consultation** given the abrupt notice to the public and *"the results included in the report, are not what we (Council) supported and consulted the public on". (Councillor Rahman)*

Margaret Lockwood

Ward 7

From: Patty Wexler  
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2023 8:16 AM  
To: Council Agenda <[councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca)>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses- In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to

close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

4. Child and Youth Safety and Security - As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

5. Lack of Previous Data - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone. I consent to having this letter shared at council.

Thank you,  
Patty Wexler

**From:** Daniela Zapata Taborda

**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 5:56 PM

**To:** [council@cityoflondon.ca](mailto:council@cityoflondon.ca)

**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I AM STRONGLY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL FOR HOMELESS HUB FANSHAWE PARK & WONDERLAND ROAD

To whom it may concern,

I strongly reject the proposal for the homeless hub on Fanshawe Park Rd & Wonderland Road,

Daniela Zapata  
Bob Schram Way

**From:** Cathy Deninson  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 5:33 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <[councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca)>; SPPC <[sppc@london.ca](mailto:sppc@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Hubs

To whom it may concern

With the recent concerns of the hub location on 705 Fanshawe Park road I realize council have a pact to act.

The possibility of dividing the Winter beds from being linked to this location project. With a incredible cost for a few.

I have thought in other scientific fields and disasters the process was to contain. Very rational thought For example. Covid contain rather spread. Chemical spill contain rather than spread. Wildfires to contain rather than spread. The list is endless. Never is it a good theory to polute or contaminate other areas not infected. David Ferreira theory of sharing the issue doesn't seem rational. Just a very unthought through idea.

We have just witnessed a incredible unthought through or researched situation with the speaker of the house. Inviting a wonderful war 'hero' that turns out to have a different effect on our country, and Ukraine.

London Thames River conservation authority Scott Gillingwater just released Turtle species into the natural area's <https://london.ctvnews.ca/the-grand-finale-10-000-endangered-baby-turtles-released-back-into-river-1.6539914> We have three nature trails paths connecting to proposed hub. Medway Valley Heritage, Foxhollow Ravine, Snake creek. Maybe something to consider when encampments encroach on these areas. You invited them in.

I am saying it is better to divide this decision so more information is presented off the possible outfall of a rushed process and having more than just 'egg on your faces' The majority are saying 'no bad idea' for numerous reasons. Be very wise to take a step back and view the devastation and not turn a blind eye in order to complete another task

Kind regards  
Cathy Deninson



**From:** rachael.buma

**Sent:** Friday, September 29, 2023 7:14 AM

**To:** City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>; Council Agenda <[councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca)>

**Cc:** Lehman, Steve <[slehman@london.ca](mailto:slehman@london.ca)>; McAlister, Hadleigh <[hmcaster@london.ca](mailto:hmcaster@london.ca)>; Lewis, Shawn <[slewis@london.ca](mailto:slewis@london.ca)>; Trosow, Sam <[strosow@london.ca](mailto:strosow@london.ca)>; Hopkins, Anna <[ahopkins@london.ca](mailto:ahopkins@london.ca)>; Pelosa, Elizabeth <[epelosa@london.ca](mailto:epelosa@london.ca)>; Franke, Skylar <[sfranke@london.ca](mailto:sfranke@london.ca)>; Ferreira, David <[dferreira@london.ca](mailto:dferreira@london.ca)>; Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed homelessness hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West

**Importance:** High

Attention: Mayor and All City Councillors

Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good Morning Mayor Morgan and Ward Councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. Re-zoning - The original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses- In the Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the Community Engagement Results, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the Hubs Presentation Slide dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

4. Child and Youth Safety and Security - As per the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's

Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

5. Lack of Previous Data - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment?

One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals.

If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large.

I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me directly via email or telephone. I consent to having this letter shared at council.

Thank you,

Rachael Buma  
Gleneagle Trail  
London, ON

Sent from my Bell Samsung device over Canada's largest network.

Hi Heather  
Yes please add.

Thank you  
Anna

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 29, 2023, at 12:05 PM, Council Agenda <[councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca)> wrote:

Good afternoon Councillors,

As a Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. **The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close as a casualty of

this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Fox Hollow Residents  
Anna & Sebastian Dzwonczyk

To London City Councillors.

About: London HUBS plan.

As a City of London resident for over twenty years, I am writing to you in strong support of the whole-of-community approach our city is pioneering to address the housing crisis that has left so many of our neighbours inadequately housed or entirely homeless. As you know, communities throughout North America are struggling with multiple crises that, in a society where wealth is unequally distributed, have made life increasingly hard for our most vulnerable neighbours. These include the flooding of our communities with synthetic opioids, and the critical shortage of affordable housing.

I have been enormously proud of this city's planned response to these interlinked crises. With public funding and with generous support from private donors, we have planned a whole-of-community response to the challenges our community confronts in making sure that every Londoner has access to safe housing and to the supports they need to thrive in it. The hubs program recognizes that the housing crisis affects every part of our city, and needs to be addressed in location across the city. It recognizes that loss of housing is something that could happen to any one of us, no matter here in the city we are, and that every person who is unhoused is an individual who needs their own particular kinds of support to help them get back on their feet.

Recently, though, I have been disheartened by the opposition to the plan I have seen on social media, and have heard from some politicians. Whenever London tries something innovative, there are some members of the community who ask why we need to change, and complain about the cost. The cost in this case is modest, and the seriousness of the crisis is undisputed. But there are some who appear to feel that the aim of a policy to address the housing crisis should not be to help Londoners without housing so much as to make sure that their more privileged fellow-citizens don't ever have to meet or see them. This attitude leads to calls for carceral solutions—at the extreme, to jail folks without housing, or force them into rehab. Or at to confine them to downtown. These supposed solutions pit different parts of the city against each other. They pit those of us with privilege against other members of the community who need our help. They are divisive, where the problems we face call on us to work together and support each other. And, as evidence that you all know better than I do shows, these ways of approaching the crisis simply won't work. They might sweep the problem under the rug for awhile or make it possible for some to ignore it—but so-called solutions like this don't actually help our fellow-citizens in need.

The hubs plan to support Londoners without housing is an innovative and ambitious plan. I know you are hearing from opponents—some of them are afraid, some are misinformed—and some are practicing a politics of division for cynical reasons. Please know that there are many of your voters who support this plan, and who want London to show the rest of the country how by working together we can make life better for everyone in our city. I hope you will affirm the plan, and approve all three of the first hubs, at your meeting on Oct. 5.

Thank you for reading,

Matthew Rowlinson  
Base Line Rd E, Ward 11.

To London City Council:

I wish to give consent for this letter to appear on the public agenda of your Special Meeting on October 5, 2023. My address and phone number below are for verification purposes only and can be removed from the published version. The views expressed here are strictly my own as a resident.

I was born in London and I later returned to study, live, and work for nearly my entire adult life. In that time, London has faced challenges before. However, today's challenges are unprecedented and quite frankly, heartbreaking. These challenges are not solely of London's making. Yet, as a city we must face them together. Assigning "blame" is not particularly helpful exercise, as tempting as it might be to point fingers at other levels of government who have a responsibility towards their citizens.

The sad reality of today's society is a system where just one workplace injury, one disability, one mishap, one ill-advised prescription, one job loss, one toxic relationship, or one relationship breakdown can launch anyone on a path to losing a place to call home. It can happen fast; none of us realize our own family may be just one step away from complete disaster.

We must think about how we can act collectively as Londoners for the welfare of all Londoners. Consider how we would want to be treated should we ever find ourselves in dire need and use that as a guiding philosophy for serving others. What kind of environment and what kind of services would we need, or our children need, to get back on our feet? I'm dismayed at some of the language I've read online: these are not facilities to securely "lock" people away, rather, we need to *connect* people with nearby educational opportunities, potential employers, and other services.

In writing this letter, I wish to express support for London's Health and Homelessness Hubs Implementation Plan. From what I have seen, these first three hubs are a significant, positive step forward. The agencies named in this initial phase have established track records in our community. Led by responsive fellow Londoners who know the neighbourhoods of London well.

I appreciate that the City sought feedback and is holding this special meeting. I appreciate the thought put in so far and the work still to come on this long journey ahead. Like any plan, I'm sure this one isn't "perfect." As much as we must refine plans, we cannot wait for perfection. We do need a plan that is thoughtful and caring; that is what this plan is.

Regards,  
Darryl

--

Darryl Bedford  
London, ON  
N5Z 2C1

**From:** Uma Maheswari Mariappan  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 30, 2023 9:47 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to homeless hub in London

To all council members,

First of all, I do not oppose the helping the homeless population in the city. We all want the city to have clean streets and good neighbourhoods. But **I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plan to open hubs across London** while everyone witnessing what is happening around the shelters in downtown on daily basis. Homeless issue can be addressed only when the homeless person wants to get out of the situation. **Without the cooperation from homeless population any amount of community engagement and inclusion will not solve the problem.**

Instead of opening 15 hub across London for 2000 people, why don't 15 council member set up a individual team to talk directly to the individuals to understand what they are actually looking for?

Here are my concerns with opening the homeless hub across London.

1. **The current shelters are located around police station. But the drug usage and crime couldn't be stopped all the time.** How would you expect the entire London community to deal with drugs and crime on a daily basis. While high value business couldn't thrive in downtown due to homeless issue, how can the council expect the individual home to thrive in the city,. **If an issue couldn't be resolved when it is contained to a location how did the council arrived at a solution to spread across the city will solve it.**
2. As deputy mayor acknowledged in the news article that **homeless people from other cities are sent to London** due to safe injection site and other resources available, In this case if **hubs are opened across the city are we going to get more people ? If more people means we are going to open hubs in every corner of the city?**
3. Once all the hubs are opened, **do the police and emergency services are going to run all over the city to address the emergency calls and issues in and around the hubs.** Will they have resources and time to handle the London residents problem? Are we going to put more pressure on them?

Concerns regarding **705 Fanshawe park road** west location proposal.

1. It would easily take 20 minutes to drive to Victoria hospital in the early morning in own transportation. why would identify a **location far from all the necessary services** the people in the hub would be accessing.

2. The **traffic the Wonderland and Fanshawe road** already creating heavy congestion during peak hours. Along with this presence of emergency vehicles & police vehicle it is going to be chaos for the residents to travel in the city.

3. There are **no emergency services** near this location .

4. Though there could be safe drug policy inside the wall of the hubs, but how the city is going to handle the **drugs usage outside of the hub.**

5. There are **toystore, TVCC for autism kids next door to this location.**

6. There are **parks and trails** near by. Which I am afraid will be used for encampments and usage of needles and drugs.

7. Why would **City do an emergency rezoning** when the site itself not identified as the emergency services zone? Why is the city is rushing to rezoning this location?

8. Why **evicting the current motel residents** to house homeless ?

**Last but not least, while the average house hold income for Londoners with children (family of 4)is less than 50k, Why would city open hubs where operating cost for individual is around 80k to 110K ?**

I consent to include my email in public council agenda.

Regards  
Uma

From: LAWERNCE MCKENZIE  
Sent: Sunday, October 1, 2023 5:53 PM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Hubs Implementation

Item 8.3 on the agenda referring to Item 4.2. Health and Homeless, Whole of Community System Response RFP 2023 - 199

I give you permission to print this in the public agenda.

Happily, I am writing in support of the creation and construction Hubs to service the homeless and vulnerable individuals and families in our community to transition to a healthy and safe environment with dignity!

Larry McKenzie  
London, ON, N6A 3N5

Sent from my iPhone



From: cindy Jorge-Paul  
Date: 2023-09-28 8:59 p.m. (GMT-05:00)  
To: [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)  
Subject: Opposition to homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park road

City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue,  
London, ON,  
N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors  
Re: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Good evening councillors,

As a long time Londoner and Ward 7 constituent, I am writing today to put forth my opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. As representatives of the City of London, residents and key decision-makers on council, I ask that you consider my concerns and those of my neighbours and community. I am a resident whose backyard is behind the proposed area. This is a court where there are always children playing. All the houses but 1 in this court have small children who play in that court. My reasons for opposing the hub are as follows:

1. **Re-zoning** - the original plans for the first 3-5 hubs required that the new locations would not need rezoning. The proposed location is not zoned to accommodate a homelessness hub. Why is council circumventing its own guidelines and making an exception for this particular location? To the public, this may bring the integrity of council and its members into question, which is obviously not ideal when such a contentious issue is at play.

2. **Safety and Security of Area Residents and Businesses** - In the *Report To Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee*, July 24th, 2023, the location criteria was to ensure, ".....a feeling of safety and security within this new system for all Londoners, including individuals being served, business owners and customers, and community members in neighbourhoods". As was made obvious in the meeting that was held on September 25th, residents in the area of the proposed hub feel very uncertain about the details of this hub. Originally it was intended to house women transitioning to more permanent housing. Now it is possibly going to be used for respite and short-term housing. As per the *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, each hub will support a No Wrong Door policy. The hub at this location has been repeatedly touted as, "a transitional hub for 20 women". According to the city's own aforementioned documents, there is a distinct possibility that this location will host other homeless individuals on its property. One example of this concern can be seen at My Sister's Place, located at 566 Dundas Street. This location is often the home of encampments which serve as an unorganized extended hub. As you can see, decisions for this location have changed often and the city has not been completely forthcoming and transparent about the realistic future of this location. This, as you can imagine, leaves area residents uneasy and feeling ironically insecure about the future of their neighbourhood. I request that council table any further decisions regarding this location until area residents have ample time to both understand the updated role of this hub and to allow for public consultation with regard to the changes that have recently been unilaterally made.

3. **The Black Pearl Pub and Area Businesses** - The existing business at 705 Fanshawe Park Road houses The Black Pearl Pub. This is a thriving business that has been at this location for decades. As was mentioned in the *Community Engagement Results*, published July 14th, 2023, Section 3.0, *Criteria For Where Hubs Should Not Be Located*, residents clearly responded, "Hubs should be away from where they may have a negative impact on business operations." As you are aware, the proposed hub at this location will cause the forced and unanticipated closing of this business. It is short-sighted and, quite frankly, unfair of the city to cause a family-owned, local business to close or relocate (at great expense to the business owner). In the *Hubs Presentation Slide* dated August 30th - September 7th, one of the slides posed the question, "Why is this moving so fast?" One of the reasons given was, "businesses are closing". How is it that the city recognizes that businesses are closing but sees fit to force the closing of a business to meet the city's goals? Why is the city allowing yet another business to close

as a casualty of this process? Why is the city putting other businesses along the Fanshawe corridor in jeopardy of closing? London's unemployment rate is 5.6% and it seems council is not concerned with driving that number up as more and more hubs are opened.

**4. Child and Youth Safety and Security** - As per the location criteria of *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan*, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. The proposed location is next door (170 metres) from the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door (within 110 metres) to a children's toy store, notably, Mastermind Toys. Long & McQuade, a business that offers music lessons to children, is also in close proximity (150 metres) to the proposed hub. As was mentioned in the *Health And Homelessness Movement For Change* document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." We can all agree that there is never an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population. Please keep our children safe and allow them the right to access services and businesses in a safe and secure manner. As I mentioned before, the court directly behind is composed of residents with small children who are always outside playing in the court.

**5. Lack of Previous Data** - During the pandemic many of London's homeless were placed in hotels at a considerable cost to taxpayers. Does the city have any analytical data on how this measure alleviated the homelessness crisis? Were those individuals housed in hotels able to move on to more permanent housing? Were any of those individuals who might have been addicted and receiving help while living in, what could be considered transitional, housing successful in overcoming addiction and finding permanent housing and employment? One would think it prudent of the city to have data to follow the success or failure of those measures implemented during the pandemic since public funds were used to house these individuals. If there was no data collected, how can the public be assured that city will be collecting proper and complete empirical data thus measuring the success or failure of this plan so that the plan can be expanded or rolled back?

Councillors, I ask you to take into account my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours and community at large. I trust that you will represent all the residents of this fine city in a proportionate and equitable manner.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,  
Cindy Jorge-Paul

October 1, 2023

To: London City Council

Re: Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response RFP 2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan Results

16th Special Meeting of City Council on October 05, 2023

I consent for my letter to appear on the public agenda.

I am writing in support of the current plan to roll out Hubs throughout London to address Health and Homelessness in our City. I especially wish to write in favour of the proposed Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. I am a resident of Ward 6, but my house borders on Ward 7 and I live only five minutes from the proposed Hub site. I regularly frequent the businesses in the vicinity. For that reason, given current opposition to the proposal, I feel it necessary to voice my approval for this Hub location.

First, I commend the City for approaching Health and Homelessness in this novel manner. We are clearly witnessing a crisis in London, with 2000 unhoused in London, in addition to mental health and addiction issues. Services are stretched to their limits as the problem continues to grow, leaving many slipping through the cracks and vulnerable. Concerns have been raised that these Hubs may not work, but without attempting them we will not know what brings success, and what needs adjusting. Adaptive management is key to any policy; the City and its partners can learn from mistakes and improve. Doing nothing is simply not an option and will not help those in need, especially as we approach winter.

Second, we have a tremendous opportunity with these Hubs to service the most marginalized, in partnership with outstanding organizations, which have demonstrated substantial success in helping those in need. We are lucky to have Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU), Atlohsa Family Healing Services and the Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA) offer their expertise and put forth proposals for their respective Hubs. I fear that if they face too much pushback from citizens and some policymakers, other highly qualified groups will be dissuaded from putting forth similar, much-needed proposals. Moreover, we could lose critical funding from the province and the federal government if we are seen to drag our feet and poorly manage the opportunities before us.

Third, among complaints put forward are those that highlight the high cost of the beds or spots in the programs given the small number they will serve and the scale of our homelessness, addictions, and mental health crisis. However, the opportunity cost of not providing care to the most marginalized and vulnerable is significantly higher, whether it is the cost to London Police Services, our healthcare system, etc. London has received a very generous donation, and many Londoners chipped in on the campaign to raise more funds. The cost might be high, but now is the time for innovation and creativity. Furthermore, the numbers flowing through these Hubs is not static. Many people will pass through, receiving help, which will add up to hundreds served.

Fourth, many of the objections appear based on fear and/or a lack of information. I am personally not afraid of twenty transitional beds at the Lighthouse on Fanshawe for women, female-identifying persons, and children. They are not criminals, as has been suggested, but neighbours who need our support. This motel was already an underutilized space, that is perfect to transform into a Hub. Many of the residents that will come need the opportunity to escape the downtown core where they face increased risk of violence and greater proximity to triggers. They will have a safe place to stay, close to the benefits of nature and relative quiet, allowing them greater possibility of success.

I recognize that many people have not had experience with addictions and homelessness, whether themselves, a friend or a family member. When someone close to you struggles, your perception changes. A close family member of mine experienced all the very darkest trials we

hear about in the news. Hers is not my story to tell but I do want to say that without the support that she received from various organizations, especially after the birth of her first child, she likely would not be alive today and her child would have experienced significant trauma, potentially recreating the cycle of homelessness and addiction. Instead, she is now a very successful medical professional, who volunteers endless hours to better her community and give back. The transformation is miraculous, and I know that other organizations, like YOU, similarly have people they have served, who they believed in, who were able to build fulfilling and purposeful lives.

We must not think of these Hubs as burdens to be borne by certain neighbourhoods. Neither should we look at residents as dangerous criminals, but rather as individuals that just need the tools and support necessary to realize their tremendous potential. With these Hubs, London and its partners can re-write the future of many people. I have had the opportunity to hear Londoners' concerns; the vast majority believe homelessness and addictions are the single greatest challenge to our city. Therefore, we need a whole-city response and that means spreading services throughout London and seizing new opportunities. I urge you to approve the Hubs for the good of our community, and in particular, to approve the zoning change at 705 Fanshawe to allow the CMHA Hub to go forward.

Sincerely,  
Carol Dyck

**From:** Gabriela

**Sent:** Saturday, September 30, 2023 11:56 AM

**To:** Council Agenda <[councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca)>

**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Updated letter in opposition to proposed homeless hub on Fanshawe Park

Good morning Mr Mayor and City Council,

I'm writing with safety concerns on our housing system and the and homeless crisis in our city and specifically to express my **opposition to the proposed homeless hub on 705 Fanshawe Park Rd** for the number of reasons described below.

First of all, the proposed location is not zoned to accommodate an Emergency Care Establishment.

Second, the plans and data regarding the proposed hub are uncertain. The population serviced, services offered and wrap around services of the proposed hub are still unclear and the data on how temporarily housing homeless populations in residential neighbors can reduce drug addiction and the homeless crises is unknown, let alone, data on the impact on the safety of the surrounding communities. This leaves me and our neighbors deeply concerned about the future of our neighborhood.

Third, the hub poses a risk to the surrounding community and the thousands of kids and young adults living in the area.

As a former downtown resident, I have witnessed first hand the safety concerns near the current shelters and homeless areas. Needle drop boxes, miscellaneous homeless things left behind on the street or in front of residential buildings and recurrent acts of theft and vandalism. These safety concerns have been experienced by other neighborhoods with shelters and homeless recently relocated to their communities.

The proposed Fanshawe Park hub will be housed in a residential area, next to the Thames Valley Children's Centre location that services children with autism. This location is also next door to a children's toy store, Mastermind Toys, and within walking distance of the neighborhood park, public schools and hundreds of homes with young children who need a safe place to live, play and develop safe and healthy relationships.

According to the location criteria of London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hub Implementation Plan, hubs should not be in close proximity to elementary schools or daycare centres. In essence, hubs should not be near child-centric centres within the community. As was mentioned in the Health And Homelessness Movement For Change document sent via email on September 21st, 2023, open drug use will not be forbidden at any hub, "A low barrier and harm reduction approach recognizes that some people will use drugs and so practices need to be in place to ensure this happens in the safest possible way." There is NEVER an appropriate situation wherein a child should be exposed to, or witness, illicit drug use. Location criteria were included in the guidelines for a reason - to limit exposure of vulnerable segments of the population.

The hub poses a risk to our community and the thousands of children and families in this area and can become a larger public health and public safety issue for this community and the city in general.

I respectfully ask you to take into account all of these concerns of our neighborhood and community. I ask you to keep front of mind the needs and safety of our kids and allow them the right to enjoy their neighborhood and to access public spaces, services and businesses safely.

I trust that you will represent your constituents reasonably and equitably.

Should you have any questions or concerns please feel to reach out to me directly via email or telephone.

Thank you,  
Gabriela Kongkham-Fernandez

**From:** Emily Rian Finnemore  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 1, 2023 5:42 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Letter in Favour of The Homeless Hubs Plan

To whom it may concern,

My name is Emily Finnemore, and I am writing to you in favour of The Homeless Hubs plan.

This is a project that deeply resonates with my heart and that I feel passionately about. I am a second-year Western University student, a privilege I once thought impossible. I grew up in shelters with my mother, and if it weren't for the efforts of projects much like The Homeless Hubs aims to provide, I would not be where I am today. Words cannot describe how grateful I am that such efforts were made and I was fortunate enough to be given accommodation. Unfortunately, there are still many who must suffer on the streets because they have not been given the same. To deny and deprive shelter when the opportunity is present is inhumane. I beg you not to prioritize the misguided fears of some over the well-being and lives of others. I see this as an opportunity to educate the public and save lives. I urge you to do what is right.

I consent for my name to appear on the public agenda in favour of The Homeless Hubs.

Sincerely,

Emily Finnemore

Grey Street, N6B 1H3

From: Biju Zacharia  
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 9:41 AM  
To: [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)  
Cc: Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Homeless Hub in North London

Hello

The London city's proposed plan to bring homeless hub in N London raises some issues in our neighborhood. We are concerned about the proposal !!! So we kindly request city to reconsider the proposal.

Thank you

Biju Zacharia

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** jinesh thomas  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 9:50 AM  
**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed Homeless Hub in N.London

Hello,

The city's proposed plan to bring a homeless hub at the Lighthouse Inn in N london raises some issues in our peaceful neighbourhood. We are concerned about this proposal.

So, we kindly request you to reconsider the proposal.

Thank you.

Jinesh Thomas



Ryan O'Hagan  
Ward 5

Re: Health and Homelessness in London

To all City Councillors,

I write this letter in support of the first three proposed Homelessness Hubs in the city of London.

I was deeply saddened by the recent onslaught of letters opposing a shelter aimed at supporting unhoused women and children in the city of London. It seems, as is so often the case, that people want to help others right up until those supports enter into their spaces.

I am glad that these sites will be wholistic and staffed in a way that not only ensures the safety of those folks using the site, but also the safety and wellbeing of neighbouring communities.

I saw a number of letters that brought up concerns around a lack of consultation with the public. In all of my time following municipal issues, I have never once seen a program, policy, or piece of legislation be at the center of so many townhalls, information sessions, and advertising. We have billboards across the city outlining the program, an ongoing feedback system through Get Involved, and over a dozen combined information sessions for the public. Respectfully, I would suggest that if people weren't engaged in these opportunities to learn *before* the sites were proposed, then perhaps we need to question the veracity of these concerns.

I recognize that housing and homelessness is a (sadly) deeply contentious issue in the city of London. I also recognize that this plan was put forward by experts from community organizations across the region, including housing organizations, police systems, healthcare workers, emergency support services, and more. As has been questioned time and time again by a number of members of council, I question who else would be trusted to create a plan to address the lack of housing options for our unhoused population.

I urge **all** councillors to vote in support of this plan.

Thank you,  
Ryan O'Hagan (Ward 5)

**From:** John McCullagh  
**Date:** October 1, 2023 at 7:28:17 PM EDT  
**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)  
**Subject:** homeless hub  
**Reply-To:** John McCullagh

I want to express my full support for the proposed homeless hub at the Lighthouse Inn location.

London's councils have been discussing this issue for generations. Every few years there is a new City report on how to alleviate homelessness. It's always lots of talk with no follow through. We need to end that cycle and realize that these problems are only getting worse.

We must not be dissuaded by NIMBY concerns and understand that this is a city-wide problem that requires a city-wide plan.

Unhoused people do not equal criminals. Or drug addicts or those with mental health concerns. These issues go across all demographics and it's sad to see so many of my neighbours fall back on stereotypes. Like it or not, these issues are present throughout the city already, including here in Ward 7.

This is an ideal location and must be pursued.

Let it be the legacy of this current City Council that they have moved beyond mere words and have started to practically address the unhoused situation.

regards

John McCullagh

Rexway Rd

\*This can be added to the agenda

**From:** Brittany Wallace  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 11:46 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for London Hubs

Hi there,

I am reaching out to express my support for the London Hubs. I do not think concentrating the hubs to certain areas of the city will be beneficial to the broad well-being of London residents - the current plan is solid and the hubs should proceed.

Brit Wallace (ward 11)

(I grant permission for this email to be included on the council agenda)

**Subject:** Fostering Hope & Unity: Support for the Homeless HUBS Plan 

Dear Esteemed Council Members,

I extend my respectful greetings to you and wish to express my unwavering support for the innovative Homeless HUBS Plan, set to be deliberated at the Special Council meeting on October 5th.

I am aware that voices of opposition, predominantly from the respected residents of Ward 7, have been echoing loudly. However, I find it crucial to interweave these voices with the significant voices in favor of support, advocacy, and shared responsibility. Upholding the duty of creating a balanced and inclusive dialogue.

The proposed HUBS are not merely structures; they are sanctuaries of hope and pillars of support, designed to uplift and empower the most vulnerable members of our community. They symbolize our collective commitment to fostering an environment where every individual has access to the resources, support, and opportunities needed to lead a dignified and stable life.

#### **Benefits of the HUBS Plan**

1. Enhanced Support: The HUBS will provide essential services and support, acting as a lifeline for those in dire need.
2. Community Integration: By addressing homelessness, we are building a more inclusive, harmonious, and united community, where every member feels valued and has a sense of belonging.
3. Long-term Solutions: The HUBS represent a sustainable approach to mitigating homelessness, focusing on holistic development and long-term well-being of the individuals.

I empathize with the concerns of my fellow citizens and urge everyone to embrace a vision where empathy, compassion, and unity are the guiding lights, leading us to a society that is harmonious, inclusive, and prosperous.

Addressing homelessness is a journey of planting seeds of kindness and watching them blossom into a garden of societal well-being and communal harmony. By endorsing the HUBS plan, we are nurturing these seeds, allowing them to flourish and transform our community into a beacon of hope and unity.

I implore the Council to resonate with the spirit of compassion and to sculpt decisions that reflect our shared values and mutual aspirations. Let's be the architects of positive change and the creators of a future where diversity and inclusivity are our greatest strengths.

With sincere hope and respect, I grant consent for this letter to be included in the public agenda and to contribute to the council's thoughtful deliberations.

Thank you for your consideration and for being the custodians of our shared dreams and collective well-being.

Warm regards, with vision and hope,

**Prabhkirat Kaur**  
**London, ON, N6A 1R2**

**From:** Kelly Olson  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 2:22 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homeless HUBS plan

Hello Council,

I give my strongest possible support to London's homeless hubs plan. We need to do something for these poor individuals and this is an excellent concept. Please don't let a bunch of ultra-conservative Londoners dictate the future of those who most need our protection and support.

(I give consent for this letter to appear on the public agenda)

Sincerely,

Dr Kelly Olson

---

Dr. Kelly Olson

Professor and Chair

Dept. of Classical Studies

Lawson Hall 3227 and 3205B

Univ. of Western Ontario

London, Ontario, CANADA N6A 5B8

**From:** Richard J Shroyer  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 3:05 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] In support of the HUBS

To the Council,

I want to support the concept and the application of the Hub project in London Ontario. Whether the hubs are in my neighborhood or not, I believe that the project is the first of many similar ideas to begin to solve the enormous problems with houseless women, men, children, families that how confront us. I hope you will agree with the hubs projects.

Yours sincerely,  
Richard Shroyer

**From:** Betsy Reilly  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 2:52 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I support the Hubs for the Homeless

Dear Members of London's City Council,

I am deeply concerned about the resistance to the Hub plans to serve and support our community members who are homeless.

The hubs are the most movement we have seen in decades and I hate to see the momentum stalled because of insular views from NIMBYs. To have the private sector and government support we currently have and a coalition of those who serve the homeless community collaborating is the most hopeful plan I have seen. Can we really turn our backs? I strongly support the Hub concept because it does not ghetto-ize or "warehouse" those experiencing homelessness. I love the fact that the initial hubs target specific populations in our community - Indigenous, women, youth, etc -- in order to better serve and support the diversity among them. It is unreasonable to me that only downtown and the east end should be affected by the struggles and that the rest of the community can hide from this important human issue. We need to share responsibility and we need voices of support to be heard.

Sincerely,  
Betsy Reilly  
London, Ontario  
N5Y 4B8



**From:** Stefanie Ketley

**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 3:43 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please place community hubs in neighbourhoods across the city

Dear councillors,

I strongly recommend that community hubs be placed in many of London's neighbourhoods, not just in the east end and downtown.

As a general principle, you might target areas with malls, e.g. Sherwood Forest ( near a mall), areas near Whiteoaks mall, etc. These areas typically include public transportation services and have useable office space and parking.

Disadvantaged people from all backgrounds deserve community support and respect: as a city community, we must take care of our own.

Sincerely,

Stefanie Ketley, Ph.D.

**From:** rick  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 5:24 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] in support of the HUBS plan

Dear Council,

I am a resident of London west, in the Springbank Drive and Wonderland area. I fully support your efforts in implementing the HUBS plan here in London. I welcome a HUB in our area when the time comes.

NIMBYism doesn't work to solve the pressing problem we have in London with the homeless. They need and deserve a place to live that is off the streets. HUBS will be an essential step in getting the homeless properly housed.

Sincerely,

Rick Odegaard,  
London, ON

**From:** Susan Booth <  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 5:24 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homeless Hubs

To all Councillors,

There is much nay saying about the homeless hubs, with many supporting them but not in their neighbourhood.

I believe that the community, councillors, researchers, funders, and government have done their due diligence with choosing the initial 5 sites and for determining the populations they will serve.

I also believe that the wrap around model is excellent and the result of much research, trial and error. They need to be tested and tried in ALL possible neighbourhoods - with these 5 showing the rest of us the way.

Let's make London a community that pulls together, that supports with compassion, empathy, and tangibles those who need a hand-up.

We will be stronger because of it and an example of what can be done for the rest of the country.

Sincerely,  
Susan Booth

**From:** Margie O'Connor  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 5:51 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for the hub

Dear city hall council members,,

I am writing to express my support for the expansion of the Hub community to better support our city's homeless. The current collaborative effort to create positive change is much needed in our city. We cannot afford to not look at the issue of homelessness because some people do not want these hubs in their neighborhood. The coalition that has worked tirelessly to support and serve the homeless deserve Londoner's support. I like the tailored support that is being offered for special needs groups. Homelessness is a community wide issue and needs the support of the various regions in London. If we have a concerted effort we just might be able to offer the support that many Londoners are begging for. We must not turn a blind eye to this growing problem as winter approaches.

Sincerely,  
Margie O'Connor

**From:** Penn Kemp  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 6:25 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Special Council Agenda

This is my letter in support of the HUBS plan on the Added Agenda for the Special Council meeting of Thursday October 5th.

Such a HUBS is essential for our burgeoning homeless population, especially as winter approaches. The conditions otherwise are deplorable.

I give consent for it to appear on the public agenda)

Penn Kemp

From: Leenders  
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 4:13 PM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for the hubs

Dear councillors,

I want to express my strong support for the new hubs and their strategic location. I live in the north west part of the City and am especially delighted that the a hub will be set for women in need of a roof and support services in this part of our City.

I just hope that more hubs will be developed and operating soon as the needs are huge for our homeless population and three hubs will only make a small dent into solving a very serious problem. I am proud to be a citizen of London with an enlightened council not afraid to vouch for the most needy in our community.

Sincerely,

Louise Mauffette-Leenders

London, On, N6G 1S7

**From:** Carolyn corcoran  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 3:41 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Hubs

Dear Counselors,

I have followed the discussions about the homeless in London and the growth of this issue for many years.

I was amazed by the generosity of the anonymous family who kickstarted this work and immediately contributed to that fund.

I watched the unfolding of the plan the leadership of Ms. Livingstone who helped to create communities of connection among our various agencies serving the homeless, and now after much work, the development of the Hub concept and the first three hubs. I think it's important and valuable work. I support the first three hubs and think it's important that they will be for specific populations and directed by agencies that are knowledgeable and experienced, and situated in various areas of the city.

Please continue to vote for and work for this important initiative. All of London needs this work because homelessness is a London-wide issue and one that's important for all of us.

Thank you,  
Carolyn Corcoran  
London

From: **Anna D.V**

Date: Thursday, September 28, 2023

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Homelessness Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

To: [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca), "[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)" <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>, [slehman@london.ca](mailto:slehman@london.ca), [hmcaster@london.ca](mailto:hmcaster@london.ca), [slewis@london.ca](mailto:slewis@london.ca), [strosow@london.ca](mailto:strosow@london.ca), "[ahopkins@london.ca](mailto:ahopkins@london.ca)" <[ahopkins@london.ca](mailto:ahopkins@london.ca)>, [sfranke@london.ca](mailto:sfranke@london.ca), [epeloz@london.ca](mailto:epeloz@london.ca), [dferreira@london.ca](mailto:dferreira@london.ca), [craham@london.ca](mailto:craham@london.ca)

City of London

300 Dufferin Avenue

London, ON N6B 1Z2

Attention: All City Councillors

Good evening Councillors,

I'm writing to you in regards to the proposed homeless hub on 705 Fanshawe Park Rd. W.

After years of deciding whether to live in London or move to Toronto. We decided as a family to plant our roots here. Unlike bigger cities, London was safe. When choosing a neighbourhood to settle in we loved the foxfield area. In 12 years I have owned 2 houses in the same subdivision. My grandchildren attend a great school, have wonderful friends in the neighbourhood and the community of foxfield is a great place to live.

As a family of 5 and the current economic situation it is not easy to just pick up and leave. I have worked my whole life and have been a productive member of society to see everything that I have worked for be ruined by a subdivision I know longer will feel safe in. Lately We don't feel safe driving with the windows down in the area as every other intersection there is someone begging for money impeding traffic and hastling others while driving to work. Surely there will be more of this. Not to mention the recent break ins of vehicles, theft and broad daylight shootings, statistically this is bound to get worse. Police response is lacking, I'm sure there will be more police response when someone chooses to OD from whatever illegal illicit drug they can do there then the average homeowner that has their vehicle or house broken in too.

In some parts of town you can't even use a washroom without asking someone to unlock it because of drug use and vandalism. Do you want this to happen here with all the new businesses opening near the hub? Is this what they will have to resort to? Do you think it's fair to the local businesses owners that weren't told about this prior to signing a lease this is people's livelihood.

I asked you to reconsider this hub placement and listen to the community that it will affect.

I am not going to speak for everyone but it seems like the majority of people in the community want the homeless to be helped and want a roof over their head and a warm place to sleep at night but is a subdivision with small children and families the appropriate place for housing?

I ask you Josh Morgan if you still lived in the neighbourhood would you want this for your family.

Would you want your hard earned money to be spent on a 20 person hub that is going to cost approximately \$5.2 million for the initial two-year term.

Do you know how many lives you can change with 5.2 million dollars?

I ask you and the members of council to explain this cost as contributing members of society. Do I not have a right to know? As tax paying citizens do we not have any rights. The mere fact this was put in the media before it was addressed with the community is disgusting.

Most recently there was a huge community debate on fireworks within the city. You mean to tell me that "fireworks" were a bigger topic of discussion then homeless hubs in a residential area?



To put a skating rink in a neighbourhood, a city park or splash pad everyone has the opportunity to vote or be heard but a decision like this gets swept under the table.

I don't make 100 000 a year and can support a family of 5. How can the city of London justify spending this much money to help 20 people.

I am not a financial advisor but surely I can find a way to support more people in this community than 20 with that amount of money.

Has the city considered other areas of London that have already have structured buildings to house people, maybe buildings that can house more as well?

Can you explain the reasoning behind the location choice? Can you tell me why this is a good choice for people that are homeless, mentally ill or have addiction issues?

Do I teach my grand kids that this is normal? Do I tell them it is ok to become addicted to drugs because the city will just put you up in a nice neighbourhood and let you drugs in a "safe" place? While the rest of society has to suffer all while making less then the room and board you are spending for one person

Or do we teach our kids there are consequences to actions? And choices made in life and the wrong ones could lead to different circumstances.

Do you think it's right? I've worked my whole life and made choices in my life to make it where I am to know that in a year from now I can kiss the value of my house goodbye and my retirement.

Will you be there to assist me?

Do you know what will happen to this community and local businesses that surround it. Those businesses support London. They Will be gone due to a decision made by the "higher ups" so you can say see we helped 20 people.

Listen to the people, listen to the concerns, listen to the community. They have supported and put their trust in you over the years, please don't make us regret the decision we made on choosing you.

If I haven't made it clear in my email I am opposed to this proposal.

I give my consent to have this letter shared at the Council meeting.

Respectfully,

Anna D. V

**From:** Alison Greenhill  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 8:45 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Location of Hubs

Good evening!

I am writing to support the excellent collaborative work that has been done to date to plan, organize and implement the Hubs.

I live in OEV and understand what it is like to live in a neighbourhood where the homeless are present. I am aghast at the unwillingness of some Londoners to be willing to support the ongoing Hub project in their part of the city. The Hub project is a good start to address the homelessness challenge and we all need to assist in any way possible.

Here's to a great success!

Alison Greenhill

**From:** MaryAnn Hodge  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 9:58 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 16th Special Meeting of City Council on October 05, 2023

To: London City Council  
Re: [Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response RFP 2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan Results](#)

As a resident of London, living in the downtown area, I have seen firsthand the growing need for supportive housing in London. I consider these hubs to be high-support housing. The longer people are unhoused, the more severe and multi-faceted become their problems.

As a supporter of Indwell, I am well aware of how a lack of stable housing affects one's mental health. As I am sure you are aware, Indwell is a successful model of supportive housing, taking people who are homeless and creating communities where they can flourish. London has seen a reduction in the total number of 'affordable' housing as existing units affordable for people with low incomes, become re-developed into luxury apartments, but no new low income housing is built. Homeowners can downsize. Where do you go when you are already on the bottom tier of the rental market? How can you recover once you lose your housing?

**Process:** I applaud City Council for taking their time to make this a well-thought out response. The Whole of Community System Response is a great example of getting all the stakeholders involved to work together. I have attended several of the opportunities for residents to attend townhalls where the plan has been explained. I too am surprised at the cost for implementation.

But - as a sewer, one of my favourite expressions is "a stitch in time, saves nine". Unfortunately, as a society we have let homelessness become a crisis, and now the costs have become much greater. Clearly, this plan is expensive. As a member of First-St. Andrew's United Church, who has provided a winter shelter response for the past two years, I can attest that this model is not sustainable. Providing a shelter bed does nothing to integrate people back into society. I have seen, again through my involvement with Indwell, that providing wrap around services and supporting people is a successful model. I would expect that people who enter these transitional rooms may one day transition into an Indwell facility. The costs from other services like hospital emergency rooms and first responders can be much greater!

**Speed:** Homelessness is a crisis, and I applaud your desire to respond accordingly. The provincial government has given London Strong Mayor powers to accelerate zoning changes that would address housing issues. We are hearing lots of talk about repurposing commercial spaces for housing. This is apparently a feasible option for this building. Homeless people are dying at unprecedented rates. This facility can be operational within 6 months! It is time for action!

**Location:** No where in London can you build a hub where all the required services are nearby. That was the whole premise for creating these hubs – to bring services to the people. Hopefully, these locations will also have access to green spaces – which not only help alleviate mental stress but improve health outcomes as well. With a shelter system, people are asked to leave during the day, I don't think this is the case with the transitional rooms – resulting is less people loitering on the streets.

**Compassion:** I have known people, people like you and me, who for one reason or another, end up homeless. They are people. They are Londoners too. There are about 2,000 unhoused people in London. Only 20 will be housed at the Wonderland Road facility. Only those who have been assessed as being good candidates for this facility will be there. There may be children included. They should not be walled off, hidden out of sight, behind solid fencing.

Nobody wants to see people become homeless, yet here we are. Taxpayers who live in the downtown core pay the same tax rates as those at Fanshawe Park and Wonderland Road, yet they disproportionately experience the effects of the surge in homelessness. We have a Whole of Community recommendation. We, as a city, should be prepared for a Whole of Community support for this plan. The city has done a great job to develop a comprehensive plan. Funding is available from provincial programs and our own citizens who have stepped up to donate millions of dollars. We can no longer ignore or delay.

I urge you to vote in favour of the 3 hubs presented for approval, including the rezoning necessary.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Hodge

I consent for my letter to appear on the public agenda

From: Branko Vojnovic  
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 11:04 PM  
To: McAlister, Hadleigh <hmcalister@london.ca>; Lewis, Shawn <slewis@london.ca>; Trosow, Sam <strosow@london.ca>; Hopkins, Anna <ahopkins@london.ca>; Franke, Skylar <sfranke@london.ca>; Pelosa, Elizabeth <epelosa@london.ca>; Ferreira, David <dferreira@london.ca>; Cuddy, Peter <pcuddy@london.ca>; Stevenson, Susan <sstevenson@london.ca>; Pribil, Jerry <jpribil@london.ca>; Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <pvanmeerbergen@london.ca>; Hillier, Steven <shillier@london.ca>; City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>; Lehman, Steve <slehman@london.ca>  
Cc: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Homeless Hub - No Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road

Dear Councilors,

I provide consent that my letter be openly discussed on the Public Agenda. I am opposed to the proposed hub location at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. While there are a number of reasons this particular hub does not meet the guidelines for hub locations set out in London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, today I am writing you with concern over the forced closing of The Black Pearl Pub, a long-term, locally-owned business and the forcing residents out of the residents of the Light House Inn and the response I received from the Mayors office, receiving a podcast with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

1) A number of individuals and their families will lose their homes and many may end up on the streets. The proposed site at the motel is a long term home for people who cannot find affordable housing for their particular situations. This includes residents who have lived at this location from years to a decade. I personally know 4 people living there that are hard working people and are currently scared because they may end up homeless because of the proposed plans. Are the organizations providing the funding aware that your proposed site will leave individuals and families potentially homeless are you as Councilors aware of this, please visit the site and see there are hard working people living there.

2)The Black Pearl Pub faces the road at the proposed location. Behind the pub is a motel. The following information has been verified to be factual after consultation with the business owners at this location.

The facts are as follows:

- The placement of a hub at this location with force the closure of The Black Pearl Pub and The Lighthouse Inn.
- The Black Pearl Pub rents the space and, therefore, will receive zero compensation for their forced closure. They will be forced to leave behind a business they dedicated their lives to building.
- The Black Pearl Pub will not be able to reopen in a different location as it would not be financially feasible for them to do so.
- 11 employees (including 6 families and their children) will be unemployed and without an income should the pub close. This includes children of these employees.

As for the podcast response I received from the Mayors office, I had increased concerns of what the Mayor and Deputy Mayor had to say:

3) The Mayor and Deputy Mayor said this current proposed plan may not work and that we may have to pull this idea but we have no other options to consider. Further, openly stating that a past attempt by building the 200 bed in downtown London has failed, which we clearly see has had a direct impact to the location. This does not provide any comfort for me, the safety of my children and the thousands of children who pass by there everyday to get to 3 schools in the proximity and a toy store meters away.

4) The Mayor and Deputy Mayor's continuous focus on removing individuals off the streets; however, failing to note that this proposed site would leave hard working individuals on the street, refer to point 1 and result in a lose of jobs point 2.

5) The Mayor and Deputy Mayor continuously criticize us the residents who oppose the proposed site calling us "hatemongers" and spreading "dis-information". Further in an article released by LFPRESS.COM on September 30 2023 the Mayor criticizes the people opposed to the site. This is disappointing to have a Mayor criticize people for their views. During the Podcast, the Mayor and Deputy Mayor go to say they know the people in the community and the people will support it. In fact, many residents even today don't know of the proposition and as they find out about it there is a significant opposition to it. The Mayor disregards our views and criticizes us if we don't agree with his opinion. There have been many online petitions going on and while they don't mean much, I would like to show that within a few days more than 450 individuals oppose this and these are only a few individuals who know of the issue and petition.

In conclusion, bidders of the RFP have not met the criteria set by your own administration, the Proposal has gone against its own guidelines (zoning, residential, school proximity), the Proposal has changed many times (again stated by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor on the podcast response). This entire initiative has been plagued with integrity and due process issues and the Mayors response to individuals such as myself is one of criticism and disappointment for my views. If your own guidelines, RFPs and rules have been bent so much, I urge you to remove 705 Fanshawe Park Road from the locations, do an appropriate assessment, which includes involving residents, as its clear that all other parts of this proposal can be change if needs to be.

Councilors, I trust that you can see that a hub at this location will cost others both financially, physically, and emotionally. These are people, too. People with a need for income, people with a need for affordable housing, parents who are working hard to put food on the table for their children. I ask that you protect the business owners, families and residents that are blameless casualties of this situation.

I ask that you please share this letter with council.

Thank you,

Branko Vojnovic, CPA, CA, MA

**From:** Cedric Richards

**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 11:17 PM

**To:** council@london.ca; Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>; Ask City <askcity@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] re: Oct 5, 2023 Council Meeting, Item 6.1

Hello all,

I would like this placed on the agenda for the October 5, 2023 Council meeting, under item 6.1.

Although City Council and SPPC have the same amount of members (the entire city council), I nevertheless urge council to vote yes to implementing the first set of homeless hubs. We need to try something new instead of going with the status quo and wondering why we face the problems we're facing.

The rhetoric coming out of Northwest London has been hurtful and unhelpful. There have been appeals to emotion where residents are invoking "families, children, businesses, residential neighborhoods, people with special needs", and so on. As if we in the east end don't have these things? And we have been thanklessly asked to care for the city's most vulnerable?

The discourse in this city has shown to me that there are two Londons. I live in the one London that, as stated above, is always called on to provide solutions to end homelessness in many material ways. The other London is where I grew up. I went to high school 1.8 kilometers from the proposed hub. It's in that London, in my experience, where they have reaped the "reward" of washing their hands of the effects of poverty.

Based on civic debates over the last several years, it seems as though in the London I live in, municipal services are something that is done *for* the people. In the other London, municipal services are something that is done *to* people.

Our hands get dirty, their hands stay Instagram aesthetic-friendly, and almost nobody cares.

Should we be the Forest City, or a Tale of Two Cities?

Please vote yes to approve the hubs.

Thank you,

Cedric Richards  
London, ON N5Z 4Z6

From: Dave Van Dinther  
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 11:18 PM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Homelessness Hubs

Hello,

I am in support of the proposed homelessness hubs in the City of London. The issue is exceedingly complex and does not have an easy answer, but “not in my backyard” cannot be the cry that sways our city from making real progress on this issue. I also give consent for this e-mail to appear on the council agenda.

Thank you.

David Van Dinther (Ward 8)

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** Vicki Van Linden  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 12:46 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please include on October 5th council agenda regarding Homeless Hubs

Note: I give permission for my letter to be displayed in the public agenda.

**Dear Members of Council:**

I strongly urge you to approve the much needed transitional housing for women at the location of the former Lighthouse Inn on Fanshawe Park Road.

This is a moment of truth for our community. We all know that we have an urgent crisis involving homelessness exacerbated by addiction, mental illness and poverty. There has been more than enough discussion and it's time to move ahead with speed and resolve.

Of course dealing with this long-standing crisis will cost money. Of course more services will need to be provided, and this will mean that some Londoners will have new services located near them. Of course there will be push back. Nimbyism is always an issue. Push back is no surprise. I urge you all to stand firm against the voices of Nimbyism, to show that our fine words about concern for homeless citizens will be backed up with action.

Let's note that the Fanshawe Park Road location will be **transitional housing for a relatively small number of women who will be referred to the program**. They will be established residents of the location, as this hub will not be a drop-in offering respite beds. This is an extremely significant detail.

This location will serve specific women who have been approved for the program and have been assigned housing there. They will have indoor areas available to them at all times of the day, and will not need to roam the streets while they wait for shelter beds to open in the evening as takes place around traditional shelters. The women being assisted will have several layers of support provided at the hub, including mental health support.

There is no reason to believe that unhoused people who have not been assigned to this location will travel to Fanshawe Park Road once it's understood that this is not a respite shelter, and that no drop-in services will be provided there. I understand that business owners on Richmond Row and downtown have encountered problems with the behaviours displayed by some unhoused people who do not have access to 24 hour support. There is nothing in the plan for the transitional housing for women at the former Lighthouse Inn that would suggest that this kind of activity will take place at that hub location.

There has been opposition to this location from some in the surrounding community of the former Lighthouse Inn. Homes in that area do cost more, and residents therefore pay more taxes. This surely does not mean that they should be exempted from participating in the 'Whole of Community' solution to homelessness. It should not need to be stated that all London citizens deserve equal respect and consideration, regardless of how much we pay for housing, or even if some have no housing at all.

Waiting for people who are fortunate to get used to a new idea means that those who are extremely unfortunate will wait even longer for the basic relief of a reliable bed. Let's keep in mind who it is who is truly at risk, and who it is that experiences daily distress and hardship. It's the unhoused.

The belief that 'housing is a human right' must be defended. I urge you to lead our community with courage and compassion and vote to move all five of the proposed hubs forward.

Respectfully yours,  
Vicki Van Linden  
London, ON, N6J 3H2

From: Gary Sawyer  
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 7:51 AM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Homeless Community Hubs

I believe that London should create homes throughout the city for people who are struggling to afford safe places to live. This action will allow people to interact with a diversity of the London population and if children are involved attend schools that will the younger population. So many good lifestyle examples can be learned by watching and interacting with different cultures.

If we put all hubs close together we will not create a beneficial learning environment for adults and their children.

I am very surprised that the above approach is not what has been planned from the outset.

Gary Sawyer  
London ON. N6H 3M3

London, October 3, 2023.

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

We are writing to support the proposed Homelessness Hubs Implementation Plan now before Council. We understand that this Plan has been developed with the active input of community agencies including Atlohsa Family Healing Services, Youth Opportunities Unlimited, and CMHA Thames Valley Addiction and Mental Health Services. These organizations bring many years of professional and lived expertise as well as direct practical experience to the task addressing the complex issues related to homelessness in the most compassionate possible way for unhoused Londoners and for our whole City. They deserve our thanks and our respect for their work.

We live in a part of the London (Ward 13) which certainly sees and feels the effects of the homelessness crisis, and we know that it will take a sustained effort from all parts of the city to address the growing needs of our most vulnerable residents, especially those who are currently unhoused. Part of the plan must include transitional housing for women who are ready to take the next step towards housing stability but still need support and services in order to get there. Since some of these women have dependent children living with them, it makes sense for these services to be located in areas where they will have access to schools, parks and other community facilities that families need to thrive.

Each of the proposed Hubs has been planned to address specific needs in a particular specific context, with the appropriate services needed to succeed for all Londoners, both housed and unhoused. We urge you to adopt the proposed Homelessness Hubs Implementation Plan in its entirety, and we give our consent for this letter to appear on the public agenda.

Sincerely,

David Heap & Stephanie Kelly  
Longtime London residents and concerned citizens

**From:** Nelson Rosales  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 8:52 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] support for ward 7 homeless hub

Hello,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Homeless Hub strategy the city is adopting.

I live in ward 7, and want to communicate my support for the Hub specifically being considered for 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. The transition housing and wrap around services this Hub and others will provide vulnerable people, is precisely the type of approach we need to start finding permanent solutions to the homelessness crisis causing so much suffering in our city.

Some of my neighbours have expressed fear about a potential rise in violence and crime in the area as a result of the Hub at Wonderland and Fanshawe. There is no evidence to support this. On the contrary, this Hub will serve precisely the people most affected by the crime and violence in our city's downtown: unhoused women. To deny them the chance for a safe start this Hub and others provides, is to shirk our responsibility to our most vulnerable neighbours.

Others have balked at the price tag of the Hubs. To them, I say creating more short-term shelter beds downtown fails to address the root causes of homelessness and addiction, while the crisis continues to grow. That is an ineffective and wasteful approach. To those neighbours I say, consider the cost in money and human misery that non-action and more stop-gap solutions already produce.

That is why I urge City Council to approve the Homeless Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. Morally and financially, it's the right thing to do.

I give consent for this letter to appear on the public agenda.

in peace,

Nelson Rosales  
London, ON  
N6G 2Y3

**From:** Roxx, Caroline  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:39 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Cc:** Roxx, Caroline  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] hub at Black Pearl London Ontario

I wanted to voice my concerns with regards to the possibility of a hub going into our neighborhood at the area mentioned above. I understand this location is being considered for beds and living accommodation for women in distress or need. With public schools in close proximity and single-family homes right in the backyard to this location, I am somewhat shocked this is even being considered. I am concerned what this will bring to our neighborhood (lots of elderly) and the safety of our community. As we are all aware, this can bring an array of unexpected circumstances and to be honest, I am quite shocked of this consideration. I understand from our homelessness issue in London that this may be a step to facilitate a change to our streets downtown, but my feeling is that we are just expanding the issue from the core to the remainder of the city. What does the city plan to do in monitoring this "Hub" in making sure that it does not become a spot for prostitution, drugs exchange, theft and destruction in our community?

What can we do as a community to have a "choice" in the matters that affect our lives, and would it be helpful if a petition is created from the residents of the area. I also wanted to add that I give permission in sharing my concerns at your meetings and I appreciate any direction from you as to what I can do in order for my voice to be heard.

Warmly,  
Caroline Roxx

From: Ayman Hawi  
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:55 AM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] opposition to the proposed homeless hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road.

Dear Councilors,

I provide consent that my letter be openly discussed on the Public Agenda. I am opposed to the proposed hub location at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. While there are a number of reasons this particular hub does not meet the guidelines for hub locations set out in London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023, today I am writing you with concern over the forced closing of The Black Pearl Pub, a long-term, locally-owned business and the forcing residents out of the residents of the Light House Inn and the response I received from the Mayors office, receiving a podcast with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

1) A number of individuals and their families will lose their homes and many may end up on the streets. The proposed site at the motel is a long term home for people who cannot find affordable housing for their particular situations. This includes residents who have lived at this location from years to a decade. I personally know people living there that are hard working people and are currently scared because they may end up homeless because of the proposed plans. Are the organizations providing the funding aware that your proposed site will leave individuals and families potentially homeless are you as Councilors aware of this, please visit the site and see there are hard working people living there.

2)The Black Pearl Pub faces the road at the proposed location. Behind the pub is a motel. The following information has been verified to be factual after consultation with the business owners at this location.

The facts are as follows:

- The placement of a hub at this location with force the closure of The Black Pearl Pub and The Lighthouse Inn.
- The Black Pearl Pub rents the space and, therefore, will receive zero compensation for their forced closure. They will be forced to leave behind a business they dedicated their lives to building.
- The Black Pearl Pub will not be able to reopen in a different location as it would not be financially feasible for them to do so.
- 11 employees (including 6 families and their children) will be unemployed and without an income should the pub close. This includes children of these employees.

As for the podcast response I received from the Mayors office, I had increased concerns of what the Mayor and Deputy Mayor had to say:

3) The Mayor and Deputy Mayor said this current proposed plan may not work and that we may have to pull this idea but we have no other options to consider. Further, openly stating that a past attempt by building the 200 bed in downtown London has failed, which we clearly see has had a direct impact to the location. This does not provide any comfort for me, the safety of my children and the thousands of children who pass by there everyday to get to 3 schools in the proximity and a toy store meters away.

4) The Mayor and Deputy Mayor's continuous focus on removing individuals off the streets; however, failing to note that this proposed site would leave hard-working individuals on the street, refer to point 1 and result in a loss of jobs point 2.

5) The Mayor and Deputy Mayor continuously criticize us the residents who oppose the proposed site calling us "hatemongers" and spreading "dis-information". Further in an article released by LFPRESS.COM on September 30 2023 the Mayor criticizes the people opposed to the site. This is disappointing to have a Mayor criticize people for their views. During the Podcast, the Mayor and Deputy Mayor go to say they know the people in the community and the people will support it. In fact, many residents even today don't know of the proposition and as they find out about it there is a significant

opposition to it. The Mayor disregards our views and criticizes us if we don't agree with his opinion. There have been many online petitions going on and while they don't mean much, I would like to show that within a few days, more than 450 individuals oppose this and these are only a few individuals who know of the issue and petition.

In conclusion, bidders of the RFP have not met the criteria set by your own administration, the Proposal has gone against its own guidelines (zoning, residential, school proximity), the Proposal has changed many times (again stated by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor on the podcast response). This entire initiative has been plagued with integrity and due process issues and the Mayors response to individuals such as myself is one of criticism and disappointment for my views. If your own, RFPs and rules have been bent so much, I urge you to remove 705 Fanshawe Park Road from the location and do an appropriate assessment, which includes involving residents, as it's clear that all other parts of this proposal can be changed if needed.

Councillors, I trust that you can see that a hub at this location will cost others both financially, physically, and emotionally. These are people, too. People with a need for income, people with a need for affordable housing, and parents who are working hard to put food on the table for their children. I ask that you protect the business owners, families and residents who are interested in blameless casualties of this situation.

I ask that you please share this letter with the council.

Thank you,  
Ayman Hawi

**From:** R Stewart

**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2023 4:47 PM

**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca)

**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>; Trosow, Sam <[strosow@london.ca](mailto:strosow@london.ca)>; Stevenson, Susan <[sstevenson@london.ca](mailto:sstevenson@london.ca)>; Pribil, Jerry <[jpribil@london.ca](mailto:jpribil@london.ca)>; Hillier, Steven <[shillier@london.ca](mailto:shillier@london.ca)>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <[pvanmeerbergen@london.ca](mailto:pvanmeerbergen@london.ca)>; City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Review prior to October 5 meeting to reduce Hub operating costs

I attended the 4 pm council meeting on September 25.

I have lived in Ward 7 for just over a year now.

I agree with Councillor Rahman that all of the city must participate together to shelter the 2000+ homeless people in our city and I am not opposed to homeless shelters in Ward 7.

What I am opposed to is the inefficient use of funds whether they be taxpayer funds or the hard earned donation monies that have been contributed to reduce homelessness in London.

First, a comment on the process. Yes, there have been public forums on the overall process and plans but limited input on specific locations such as 705 Fanshawe Park Rd. So for councillors to state that the taxpayers have had their chance to participate is unacceptable particularly as it relates to the specific locations where taxpayers were given six days notice and then told by the Mayor on September 25 to sit in the gallery and be quiet.

My first concern about the 705 Fanshawe location is the relative inefficiency, as I understand it. While capital expenses are different for each of the three proposed sites and must be considered when selecting a project, I am focusing on the annual operating expenses where the Atlosa site will operate a new bed for \$75,648 a year; Youth Opportunities Unlimited will operate at \$87,833 per bed annually and 705 Fanshawe proposes that they will need \$131,542 per bed per year. I'd like to know how Atlosa can operate at 42% below 705 Fanshawe and request that City Council review this before approving the 705 Fanshawe location. Given that both Atlosa and YOU operate within 15% of each other, it appears to me that the range of \$76,000 to \$88,000 is the acceptable operating target per bed for this important project.

During the meeting and in support of having no further discussion on the three locations, Councillor Sam Trosow suggested we need to think about our donors and stated that if we can't vote now after all we've been through, we're going to look foolish. I believe he is correct to keep donors in mind through this process and in particular the London family who made a large donation; however, I don't believe any donor would be impressed with an inefficient use of their hard earned donations at the 705 Fanshawe proposed location. In fact, based on the annual bed operating ratios, if you took all of the operating expenses proposed for 705 Fanshawe and gave the money to either Atlosa or YOU, they would be able to provide between 10 to 14 more beds with 10 to 14 more homeless people sleeping in warm beds this winter. I think donors and taxpayers would be more impressed with more beds than Sam's concern that we might look foolish if we don't act now.

The homeless people in London is an urgent situation and you could sense the urgency at the September 25 council meeting. However, the lack of planning on the part of Social and Health Development should not make an emergency on the backs of donors and taxpayers. Kevin Dickins and his team knew one or more years ago that it is likely to snow again in London, Ontario in November. It appears that finding three locations now at any expense is more important than finding 10 to 15 hubs with reasonable operating expenses. I don't know Mr. Dickins but I believe him to be smart enough to understand the difference in the operating expenses and to understand that 705 Fanshawe looks like an expensive outlier. He is after all smart enough to have avoided the high property taxes of London, Ontario by choosing to live in Exeter where his property taxes will not be affected by decisions on homeless hub selections



here in London - whether they be reasonable as in the case of the expenses to operate Atlosa or YOU or unreasonable as in the case of 705 Fanshawe. If this plan/timeline was started 30 days earlier than it was, the Social and Health Development could have and should have built into the plan the extra 30 days requested by Councillor Rahman for public discussion on the specific locations.

I agree with Councillor Rahman that 705 Fanshawe should have been presented as a separate suggestion mainly because of its high expenses. I also feel Council should proceed immediately with the other two locations as they appear to be operating within a comparable and reasonable expense range. Kevin Dickins and team should continue to look for all other hubs that can operate in the \$76K to \$87K range, lower would be better but anything as high as what 705 Fanshawe is proposed to operate at is 1) unacceptable to the taxpayers of London, 2) somewhat of an insult to the donors behind this project and 3) a disservice to the homeless of London where more beds should be the priority and not any beds at any cost to meet the now time-pressured department's rollout plan.

I am new to London and new in trying to understand the Hub plan and its finances. If any reader sees errors or any misunderstandings of the numbers in my email then please correct me or give me updated information.

Sincerely,

Robert Stewart  
Property Taxpayer Ward 7

PS: I could not find Kevin Dickins' email. If anyone wants to send him a copy, please do so as I have mentioned him in this email and please feel free to forward this email to any other council member if you wish.

**From:** Karen Pennesi

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 11:10 AM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>; Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] support for homeless hub in ward 7

Dear Members of City Council,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Homeless Hub strategy the city is adopting. As a Ward 7 resident, I think the Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West is a good idea. It gets the people who need it away from the downtown area, where they are vulnerable to a number of risks. Putting the hubs in neighbourhoods out of the downtown core also acknowledges that the people they will serve come from all over London. It can be any one of us or our family members who may find ourselves in need of housing and the related supports.

Having multiple services in one location where the people live is beneficial because when people are already going through so much in those times of transition in their lives, it can be extra difficult to arrange transportation and appointments. Sometimes just figuring out where to go is too much. It can also facilitate sharing information and a sense of community among the population using the services.

I am not concerned that having a Hub in our neighbourhood will increase crime. We already have break-ins so we can't blame homeless people for that.

Homeless hubs cannot be the only solution. In some cases, transferring cash directly would do more good. But in the cases of the people needing the hubs, they are facing multiple problems and a single cash transfer would not be appropriate. They need a more global approach and the hubs can help if they are organized and run effectively. I especially would like to see spots dedicated for youth because they really need more than just a bed in a shelter.

I urge City Council to approve the Homeless Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West and in the other locations. Morally and financially, it's the right thing to do.

I give consent for this letter to appear on the public agenda.

Sincerely,

Karen Pennesi  
London, ON  
N6G 2Y3

**From:** Kim MISIC

**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 1:57 PM

**To:** McAlister, Hadleigh <[hmcaster@london.ca](mailto:hmcaster@london.ca)>; Lewis, Shawn <[slewis@london.ca](mailto:slewis@london.ca)>; Trosow, Sam <[strosow@london.ca](mailto:strosow@london.ca)>; Hopkins, Anna <[ahopkins@london.ca](mailto:ahopkins@london.ca)>; Franke, Skylar <[sfranke@london.ca](mailto:sfranke@london.ca)>; Pelosa, Elizabeth <[epelosa@london.ca](mailto:epelosa@london.ca)>; Ferreira, David <[dferreira@london.ca](mailto:dferreira@london.ca)>; Cuddy, Peter <[pcuddy@london.ca](mailto:pcuddy@london.ca)>; Stevenson, Susan <[sstevenson@london.ca](mailto:sstevenson@london.ca)>; Pribil, Jerry <[jpribil@london.ca](mailto:jpribil@london.ca)>; Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <[pvanmeerbergen@london.ca](mailto:pvanmeerbergen@london.ca)>; Hillier, Steven <[shillier@london.ca](mailto:shillier@london.ca)>; City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>; Lehman, Steve <[slehman@london.ca](mailto:slehman@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] NO HUB AT 705 FANSHAWE PARK ROAD.

Dear Councilor,

I am opposed to the proposed hub location at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. While there are a number of reasons this particular hub does not meet the guidelines for hub locations set out in *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, today I am writing you with concern over the forced closing of The Black Pearl Pub, a long-term, locally-owned business and the forced re-housing of the residents of the Light House Inn.

The Black Pearl Pub faces the road at the proposed location. Behind the pub is a motel. The following information has been verified to be factual after consultation with the business owners at this location.

The facts are as follows:

- The placement of a hub at this location will force the closure of The Black Pearl Pub and The Lighthouse Inn.
- The Black Pearl Pub rents the space and, therefore, will receive zero compensation for their forced closure. They will be forced to leave behind a business they dedicated their lives to building.
- The Black Pearl Pub will not be able to reopen in a different location as it would not be financially feasible for them to do so.
- 11 employees (including 6 families and their children) will be unemployed and without an income should the pub close. This includes children of these employees.
- At least half a dozen people will lose their home. These are long-term residents of the motel that cannot find affordable housing for their particular situations. This includes residents who have lived at this location from years to a decade.

Councilor, I trust that you can see that a hub at this location will cost others both financially, physically, and emotionally. These are people, too. People with a need for income, people with a need for affordable housing, parents who are working hard to put food on the table for their children. I ask that you protect the business owners, families and residents that are blameless casualties of this situation.

I ask that you please share this letter with council.

Thank you,

Kim Misic

**From:** Ossie Bispo  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2023 2:12 PM  
**To:** [council@london.ca](mailto:council@london.ca); Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homeless hub at Lighthouse inn and black pearl  
**Importance:** High

Hi,

I am writing in response to the proposed homeless hub at Lighthouse inn and black pearl. I live in Sunningdale neighbourhood and have serious concerns with all the schools in direct proximity to this site. I feel that this poses a significant risk to our neighbourhood and respective businesses in the area.

As a tax payer in this subdivision I strongly oppose this location and feel that it puts residents at risk and the location puts the homeless residents at risk due to the amount of vehicle traffic.

Please add my name to the growing list of opposition

Thanks  
Ossie Bispo  
London,  
N6G5J7

**Ossie Bispo, RN, MScN**

**From:** Sam Kaplun <  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 1:04 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: HUBS Implementation Plan

Please interpret my above email as consent for the HUBS plan to be added to the agenda.

On Tue, Oct 3, 2023 at 1:02 PM Sam Kaplun wrote:

Hello,

My name is Sam Kaplun. I am a resident of Ward 6 here in London.

I want to voice my support for the HUBS plan, and would like to see it on the public agenda for Thursday's special council meeting.

As a young person, I see how deeply the housing crisis is impacting my generation and urge London to take as ambitious action as possible to address it. I am glad to see that progress is being made, such as with this plan, and want to let you know that many residents of the city support it.

Thank you very much,

Sam Kaplun

**From:** wendy goldsmith  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 12:57 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: homelessness hub plan

Hello ,

I am writing in full support of the homelessness hub plan, including all the proposed sites. I am a lifetime resident of London and have been a social worker in various roles and positions in London for 35 years. My work always involves working with the most marginalized and oppressed in our communities who reside in every corner of our city. Over the past 10 years I have seen a stark increase in homelessness in London and the opioid crisis is only one reason for this increase in poverty and homelessness.

I feel that it is beyond time for London to address this complex issue with the coordinated service delivery approach that the plan supports. It is important that the hubs serve all areas of our communities including the Northwest.

Homeless is a city problem, not just a problem relegated to certain neighborhoods and frankly the NIMBY arguments and comments I have heard are entitled and egregious. Aren't we all here to support one another? It is an irrational belief that community hubs are not needed across the city. Homeless hubs won't bring drug problems to communities because they are already there. To think otherwise is naive. Homelessness hubs will bring solutions, not problems.

I strongly support the plan in its entirety and hope that the final decision reflects the fact that homelessness and human rights are everyone's business.

Sincerely ,  
Wendy Goldsmith

**From:** Ann MacPhai  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 2:13 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] In Support of Council passing the 3 London Hubs Recommended

Dear London City Councillors

Re: [Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response RFP 2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan Results](#)

Council meeting scheduled for October 05, 2023

I consent for my letter to appear on the public agenda

As a resident of London, living near Gibbons Park, and seeing the growing tent city among the trees along the Thames River in my neighbourhood, I have seen firsthand the growing need for supports, like the suggested 'hubs' for the homeless individuals and also the desperate need for increased supportive housing in London plus rent geared to income housing. These housing options are a continuum . In the 1990's Mike Harris closed psychiatric hospitals, with the intent of integrating these individuals into our communities, but little money, housing, supports followed this. Now these individuals are on our streets. In the 1970's there was a combined federal/provincial housing strategy where rent geared to income was supported and built. However over the past 40+ years, little substantial new, rent geared to income housing has been built. So here we are today....with many homeless individuals, many with mental health and addiction issues and a 10 year waiting list for rent geared to income housing. These problems will not solve themselves. London hubs for the homeless is the first of many steps required to tackle these social issues, that any caring and compassionate society/individuals would encourage London City Council to support. I encourage London City Council to approve the 3 recommended 'Hubs' in the 3 locations suggested, and yo move forward with more Hubs in future. They are so badly needed.

Sincerely  
Ann MacPhail  
London

Sent from my iPhone

I am following up to give my consent for this message to be shared – as I know this is on the agenda for Thursday's meeting.  
Thanks

**From:** Annie Simpson

**Date:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 at 2:22 PM

**To:** [Councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:Councilagenda@london.ca) <[Councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:Councilagenda@london.ca)>

**Subject:** Supporting the Hubs

Dear City Council,

I was born and raised in this city, and I love this city. It's been painful and incredibly frustrating to see what has happened both with the increase of homeless people and the dire situation in the downtown core. I am writing to express my support for hubs as people need to be cared for and supported out of homelessness.

I also feel strongly that the brunt of this work cannot only fall to the downtown and the east end-two areas of the city that have nearly been decimated by this crisis. Other parts of London need to get involved, and our downtown needs to be protected. I support hubs in different parts of the city. I recognize that there are privileged neighbourhoods that like to feel removed and separate from this crisis, but it is not fair for the responsibility to only lie in the hands of the downtown and the old east community. This is a London issue not a downtown issue.

Please protect our downtown, and please support the homeless by locating these hubs in different parts of the city.

Annie Simpson

**Annie Simpson M Ed**

Senior Facilitator/Consultant – Leadership Development

Talent, Learning, and Engagement

Western University | Human Resources

London ON, Canada

Western University is located on the traditional territories of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, Lūnaapéewak and Chonnonton Nations. We value and honour the significant historical and contemporary contributions of, and relationships with, local and regional First Nations and all the original peoples of Turtle Island.



**From:** murugesan subramaniyan  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 30, 2023 9:40 PM  
**To:** SPPC <[sppc@london.ca](mailto:sppc@london.ca)>  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>; City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Concerns Regarding Proposed Homeless Support Facility at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West

Dear Members of the London City Council,

I trust this email finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concerns about the proposed establishment of a homeless support facility at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. This location is in close proximity to my residence and several essential community establishments, prompting me to raise these critical concerns for your consideration.

While I wholeheartedly support initiatives aimed at addressing homelessness and providing assistance to those in need, I believe it is essential to thoroughly evaluate the implications of the chosen site. This is not a matter of opposition but rather a plea to safeguard the safety, well-being, and overall quality of life of our community members, particularly our vulnerable populations.

Here are the specific concerns that I wish to bring to your attention:

**Proximity to Residential Areas:** The proposed homeless support facility is situated perilously close to residential neighborhoods, including my own. The potential impact on the safety and tranquility of our residential areas is a cause for significant concern.

**Security and Safety:** As residents, our primary concern is the safety and security of our families. The presence of a homeless support facility in close proximity to our homes raises legitimate safety concerns. It is paramount that we ensure our families can live without fear and anxiety.

**Community Well-being:** We are concerned about the potential for increased disturbances, such as crime and anti-social behavior, that may arise as a result of this facility's presence. Our community has worked diligently to foster a safe and harmonious environment, and we fear that these efforts may be undermined.

**Accessibility to Essential Services:** While supporting the homeless community is vital, we believe that it is equally important to ensure that these facilities are adequately equipped to provide comprehensive support services to those in need. We hope the proposed facility will provide comprehensive assistance to its residents.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that we fully acknowledge the critical importance of addressing homelessness and mental health challenges within our city. Our intention is not to obstruct these efforts but to advocate for a thorough evaluation of the chosen location and its potential impact on our community.

I respectfully request that you and the esteemed City Council carefully consider the concerns raised by residents in the vicinity of 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. We stand ready and willing to collaborate with you to explore alternative locations for the homeless support facility that can better ensure the safety and well-being of all residents.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I eagerly await your response and look forward to engaging in a constructive dialogue on this significant issue.

Yours sincerely,

Murugesan S

**From:** ALVIN SHAPIRO  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 3:14 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support For London City Hubs

Hello,  
I think that I am in Ward 5, Councillor Jerry Pribil:

I strongly support the Hub concept because it does not ghetto-ize or "warehouse" those experiencing homelessness. I love the fact that the initial hubs target specific populations in our community - Indigenous, women, youth, etc -- in order to better serve and support the diversity among them. It is unreasonable to me that only downtown and the east end should be affected and that the rest of the community can hide from this important human issue. We need to share responsibility and we need voices of support to be heard.

Yours truly  
Alvin Shapiro

From: Rose Santos  
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 3:57 PM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Hubs for homeless

Dear city council of London

I fully support the latest move to house our homeless people in what's being termed as "hubs". I support these hubs in areas of the city where there is access to transportation and other services. Although we all know that this is only a bandaid solution as this issue has gotten out of control especially since the closure of 2 large psychiatric hospitals. I support any effort which addresses the root causes of poverty starting with social determinants such as access to housing, food, employment, education etc.

Let's all Work together to make a better society.

Rose Santos

**WORKING TOGETHER**

Coming together is a Beginning , Working together is Progress, Staying together is Success.

**From:** Marilyn Norman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 12:15 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Hubs Plan

I am writing to voice my support for the latest proposals pertaining to the launch of hubs to provide basic services for those currently living on the streets of London. Having been developed through consultation with those most directly involved, the general plan strikes me as sensible and workable. In particular, I am happy to see that the hubs will be located throughout the city. People do not become homeless only through living in the core of the city. Mental health issues are not unique to the core. Lack of affordable housing is not unique to the core. Services to address the complex problems involved need to be spread across the city. For too long the downtown area and its businesses have been suffering the related negative impact of homelessness. Services need to be more widely available. Individual needs should be better met in smaller settings, where clients and those providing the services may be more easily integrated into the larger community. We need to collectively own the problem and get started sooner rather than later in addressing it.

Thank you for considering my views, which I am happy to have shared.  
Marilyn Norman

**From:** Vineet Sharma

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 4:35 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Concerns over proposed homeless hub at lighthouse Inn -Fanshawe rd west

We are the residents of this neighborhood at coronation drive, London,ON. We are very concerned that the city is considering the above location as a hub for the homeless and this is certainly going to have far reaching adverse impact on the existing residential neighborhood .

We are opposed to this move , and want to participate in transparent public engagement where the city can share the rationale of such a proposal. While we appreciate that vulnerable population need to be supported , band aid solutions are not the answer , especially when it is at the cost of honest tax paying residents of the city . We respectfully request to be part of this process and this can be included in public agenda.

Regards,

Vineet Sharma

**From:** Hazel Elmslie

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 12:11 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <[councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca)>

**Cc:** [bbreilly](mailto:bbreilly)

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fw: Supporting the Hub plan in response to Homelessness

I support the Hun Plan and the comments of Betsy Reilly.

I believe that homelessness and its attendant problems are a direct result of political action by the previous Harris government and the failure of the current Ford government to adequately fund health care. I speak from direct experience with these challenges. We don't need more highways. We need adequately funded health care. We don't need more 2,000 ++ square foot homes, we need adequately funded social housing.

Hazel Elmslie

London, ON, N5W 1P5

From: Donna Clark  
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 6:04 PM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for homeless hubs plan

Hi,

I am writing to voice my support for the homeless hubs plan. Time is of the essence to get this housing ready before winter arrives. I'm sure implementation of the plan can remain flexible so any issues that arise can be dealt with. You may include my letter on the public agenda.

Sincerely

Donna Clark

**Please circulate and attach to agenda**

I am writing to express my unequivocal support for London's hubs plan. The commitment to our city's first three hubs, run by experts at Atlohsa, Youth Opportunities Unlimited, and CMHA, represents a valuable and evidence-based approach to wrap-around and city-wide support for London's most vulnerable citizens. More importantly, they signify a more kind and ethical way of working with and for our homeless neighbours in order to combat stigma while providing life-improving and life-saving essential services, including housing, health care, and other crucial resources.

As a longtime London citizen, I am deeply concerned about the harmful and inflammatory rhetoric leveled against both the organizations providing these much-needed hubs and essential services, as well as the people who require them and have been ignored for too long. There are many on social media and in neighborhoods - including public figures - who are spreading fear about the people who will rely on these hubs as a tactic to prevent these projects from proceeding.<sup>1</sup> Drawing on common myths about homeless people as necessarily violent, drug abusing criminals deprives them of their humanity and does not paint an accurate picture of the people for whom the housing crisis has threatened their quality of life and their survival.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile, the binary representation of this population as being in opposition to the families and businesses in neighborhoods (and on busy city thoroughfares) ignores the reality that our homeless neighbors have families. They are human. And they have needs in an economic and social climate that would write them off. That would corral them into only specific neighborhoods. That would - as some people prefer - force them into violating and ineffective coercive treatment programs and/or criminalize them for living a reality that is borne about by systemic, societal, and policy failures at all levels. I reject this polarization and misinformation and insist that we move forward ethically and with care. All people deserve housing. All people deserve access to robust wrap-around services. All people deserve to be seen as whole people. The hubs are the start of a long-overdue movement to acknowledge the people in our city who have, for far too long, been sleeping on the street. Finally, the hubs plan aligns with Canada's National Housing Strategy, which calls for "advancing the right to housing," "seeking...input from voices who know first-hand what it's like not to have a home," and "creating livable communities."<sup>3</sup>

As @mattixv on Twitter so clearly notes, "there is a difference between not wanting people to be homeless and not wanting to have to see people who are homeless." It is time to ask ourselves which of these very different positions we want to espouse? I am writing today to say that the hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West, which will serve women and children, should be given the green light. To not go ahead with this project will paint a picture of a city and its citizens that is not aligned with the London that I would like us to be - one that leads by compassion, evidence, and community, instead of fear, misinformation, and rhetorical violence.

Thank you for your time.

Best,

Mandy Penney (she/her)

Ward 14

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on the most prevalent myths about people who are homeless, see "Myths about Homelessness." *Calgary Homeless Foundation*.

<https://www.calgaryhomeless.com/discover-learn/learn-about-homelessness/homelessness-in-calgary/myths-about-homelessness/>

<sup>2</sup> For the real and primary causes of homelessness, see "Causes of Homelessness." *Homeless Hub*.  
<https://www.homelesshub.ca/about-homelessness/homelessness-101/causes-homelessness>

<sup>3</sup> For more on Canada's National Housing Strategy, see "What is the Strategy?"  
<https://www.placetocallhome.ca/what-is-the-strategy>



From: Sarah Vernon-Scott  
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 7:56 PM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Ward 7 constituent in favor of hub

Dear Council,

My parents, my husband, children and I all live in Ward 7. We are in support of the planned hub at the corner of Fanshawe and Wonderland. We hope it will go through and be able to support our homeless neighbors in need of help. It is important to us that we take care of all members of our community.

I consent to having this message on the public agenda.

Sincerely,

Sarah Vernon-Scott, Ph.D., C.Psych.  
Clinical Psychologist  
Ward 7 community member

**From:** Mel Sheehan

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 8:40 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>; McAlister, Hadleigh <hmcAlister@london.ca>; Lewis, Shawn <slewis@london.ca>; Pribil, Jerry <jpribil@london.ca>; Stevenson, Susan <sstevenson@london.ca>; Cuddy, Peter <pcuddy@london.ca>; Trosow, Sam <strosow@london.ca>; Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>; Hopkins, Anna <ahopkins@london.ca>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <pvanmeerbergen@london.ca>; Franke, Skylar <sfranke@london.ca>; Pelozo, Elizabeth <epeloz@london.ca>; Ferreira, David <dferreira@london.ca>; Hillier, Steven <shillier@london.ca>; City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>; Morgan, Josh <joshmorgan@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Letter of Support for ALL of the Locations of the Hubs

Hello all,

My name is Melissa Sheehan. I'm a woman with 20 years of living/lived experience with homelessness. I am writing today to share my support for these hubs, & all of the selected locations, & with the reasoning for that support.

First off, I will admit that I have had concerns for these hubs in the past. Especially as it pertains to the drug use being permitted. I had concerns based on the fact that current shelters allow drug use, & that has been problematic for them beyond belief.

However, recently, I have been talking with my fellow unhoused folks, especially women with & without children, who are active in addiction and/or constantly attempting to find an avenue to stabilize in order to continue on their path to recovery. Many have been stuck in addiction due to not having the necessary environments, supports, or services available to them, as well as being forced to be in the core to access any current services, such as shelter, social services, mental health, addictions, etc.

And those conversations have really worked to better educate & inform me, someone who already is quite well informed on the topic, the hubs plan, and the wide spectrum of the unhoused population, but is always striving to learn more and become better informed.

A lot of these conversations were with unhoused people I have known or met within the past 20 years of being street level. Many of these folks do not fit the stigma that the majority of us get painted with, that only a small minority of unhoused people actually "live up to" or match the description that stigma perpetuates.

A lot of these people I spoke with are in encampments, & were forced there due to the unsafe shelter systems that have become entirely toxic & unsafe to anyone, addict or otherwise.

As someone whose lived in the Salvation Army Centre of Hope for the entirety of 2022 up until 2023, I can attest to that feeling of not being safe or offered the proper amount of supports I needed as a low acuity person. But I also can attest to the lack of wraparound and appropriate level of supports & lack of safety and health measures for those who are in the high acuity population, especially women with or without children.

Many of these people have ended up in encampments because they don't have any other avenue to pursue, or any wraparound supports or services that can appropriately help them. And it was through these conversations about this unfortunate reality where I had brought up my concern about drug use being a part of the Hub plan.

Of course, many of the unhoused people I spoke with are able to respect my concerns and the validity of them, even if they disagree. They were able to share with me how these hubs, especially those away from the core, will be the first opportunity they have for proper wraparound supports and services and a safe shelter space in a long time. Some have not had that opportunity for as long as 10+ years. Some longer than that.

These concerns were also addressed and discussed with me by lead agencies & City representatives as well, but hearing the same from the unhoused people I have come to know as well really set those concerns aside, and helped me to better understand the role & reason for allowing drug use. I was also made aware that since some of the hubs will have people with their children, whether the adults are addicts or not, there are measures in place to prevent any kind of unnecessary exposure or access to those who will be using drugs on the premises.

I am glad to have had those opportunities and that trust in people to be able to share their own stories and how the role & reason of allowing drug use will actually be more of a benefit to them than a harm. Many of them recognize that they will still need to use for a short time after entering these hubs, as a means of allowing their bodies to prevent withdrawal symptoms while they pursue & access supports and services that will help them stabilize which many will take as their first step towards recovery or getting clean, for the sake of their children no less. Many women don't have access to their child(ren) due to their addiction & homelessness, so they too will benefit more than be harmed because of the permissible use of drugs on premises.

Many of them have expressed respect for these hubs and the supports and services offered, & many will do their very best to be a contributing, positive member of the community at whichever hub they end up at. They don't like the stigma attached to unhoused addicts, & they have and will continue to try to be the change & fight that stigma in being the opposite of it.

Now, I'm not one to accept "sob stories" & can usually tell when someone's pulling my leg or desperately attempting at a sympathy rant or conversation. I can attest to the fact that I have taken time to trust these individuals just as they have grown to trust me enough to be vulnerable & honest & real with one another.

So yes, while I still have those concerns, I am very much able to understand & see that these hubs will have more than appropriate measures in place that will limit, if not entirely eliminate, any chances of contributing to the issues present in these areas already.

I am happy that there will finally be an opportunity for many of my unhoused friends, who have tried everything to get & stay sober and clean while they've been unhoused, to have a proper environment to foster a more successful path towards a better life, sobriety & getting/staying clean.

The distance from the core for some of these hubs is a great thing, because it provides some distance & separation from the influences & environments that have kept these folks stuck & discouraged from pursuing a better path. You have zero clue how even someone like me, being in a toxic, unsafe, & unsupportive environment, with no appropriate supports or services, has & can really negatively impact someone as strong-willed as I am. And if that's the case for me, I can only imagine what it's like for someone whose been stuck in that environment for longer than I have.

I was already feeling emotionally beaten down and worthless in a year of being in the COH, so I can only imagine how hopeless people who have been in that kind of environment for longer must feel. And that's why when opportunities like the hubs prop up, anyone will be as respectful and responsible as possible to honour the program, the neighbourhood, etc.

And delaying these hubs will only contribute to more of that feeling hopeless. Because there are not any other proper or appropriate or safe alternatives for those who would be accessing them to go while we delay the hubs, which could mean more people will probably fall deeper into addiction and deeper through the cracks.

This is a new model that I hope will be adopted or translated over to the shelter system when it's completed. And we need these hubs to go forward in order to have even a chance of that happening.

So now that that's out of the way, allow me to address some of the pushback I've seen from the neighbourhoods of both CMHA hub locations, including and up to the stigma-perpetuating statements & such of our own city council members. Namely, Ms. Rahman, who I have already opened a conversation with separately but will address some of her actions and words, and how that will only do more harm by delaying these hubs and not allowing them to continue.

Now, I'm one of the first to admit that I have and will continue to criticize decisions made by the City and Council at times when it comes to addressing homelessness. But I'm one of few who can also see it from the side of the City and Council and have a deeper understanding of all sides, and can move forward & still support their decisions even if I disagree with them.

But the levels that some of the opposition to these hubs have really taken the cake on how low they can go & how unnecessarily far with their claims & concerns they can go. Approaching family members of council and the mayor.... really? That's disheartening & disgusting.

Most, fortunately, have maintained themselves & have only shared their concerns on social media, or through letters on the agendas for meetings. But don't get me wrong: these approaches are no better.

Especially when they are brought up based on weak, stigmatizing, dehumanizing, misinformed, uninformed or in some cases, blatantly ignorant, selfish, & the worst form of NIMBYism possible.

Now, these stigma-perpetuating assumptions, based on no hard facts or truth, are constantly being disguised as concerns. And not ONCE do these people seem to bother to read the implementation plan, or speak to the people they're so concerned with/about to get their concerns addressed or questions answered prior. And then they say that they aren't being heard when they do. Well, sorry to burst these people's bubble, but if you're gonna come with "concerns" or questions based on nothing but preconceived notions, a lack of effort to inform yourself prior on the issue you're concerned or have questions about, or are simply concerned based on your own selfish and personal beliefs and opinions about how the hubs should be run, and who should be deserving of accessing them, and how the City has made a mistake, or that the hubs have somehow violated criteria in the plan, without actual valid proof for facts to back that up, of course no one worth their salt in these agencies or places are going to want to even converse or have a conversation with them, nor will they give their concerns or questions any kind of credibility or validation.

None of these concerns that I have seen or heard from people have any merit or have any basis in facts found in any kind of available communication or document. They don't know the people who will be accessing these hubs personally, so they can't say that they know they'll contribute to the problems in the area whatsoever with any facts to back that up. That's simply continuing to perpetuate the stigma unhoused people have faced for decades.

Not every unhoused individual is an addict, nor are they disrespectful or going to be the troublemakers that only a small portion of the overall population is. And to perpetuate that stigma as a guise to be concerned about a hub being located in their neighborhood is dehumanizing & disgusting, & is NIMBYISM at it's finest.

Most of the concerns about transit/daily life activities can be disproved by a simple opening of Google Maps or looking at an LTC system map. The location on Fanshawe Park Road for example, is 5 mins from a grocery store. 5 mins from a pharmacy. A short bus ride from the Y, Walmart, Tim Hortons, or a Library or community centre. These are all, also, on the same 1 bus route (the 19) that will take them both to and from these locations.

And yes, it's close to child care and stores, because some of the women will have children with them or visiting them at times. Do they not deserve that same access to child care or child services or supports?

Honestly people.

And the My Sister's Place being "too close" to Beal. Um, compared to their old location (the white building on King right across from Beal) I would say their current location is nowhere near "too close". That location also, if people would dig deeper into why that location was selected, is already a main support and service hub for many women in the core. So, why not offer a 24 hour respite bed hub for them? It's an extension of supports and services for women who wish to access them.

And again, the women who will be accessing that will not be those who fit the negative stigma that many have perpetuated under the guise of "concerns". Maybe these people should visit My Sister's Place and see for themselves how valuable of a location that is now, and will be with a hub, for many women.

Most of these concerns are based on assumptions of that stigma, and the fact that Councillor Rahman entertains and supports perpetuation of that stigma by giving these people even minor validity is a shame.

This city has a commitment to be a safe place for women and girls. When did public outcry revoke that or trump that commitment? Because it seems councillor Rahman is willing to forgo that commitment for the sake of feeding mostly blatantly misinformed or uninformed people more information and delaying services and supports for women and girls.

And concerns about the businesses and owners around the Fanshawe Park Road location. Honestly, did these people miss when the owner of the business said publicly he will and is relocating willingly?

And those business owners probably did participate in the Business part of the implementation plan & planning table. But no one ever asked them that themselves, just more misleading, misinformed, assumptions.

I mean, my goodness. They could have reached out to these business owners themselves for crying out loud.

These hubs do not need to be delayed for 3 months for the sake of most of these opposition members to be provided with more information. Even after that, most won't be satisfied and will still want the location changed. This is a regular thing with everything the City does. NIMBYism is alive and well.

We can move forward with the hubs while allowing opportunity for more conversations and information to be available. Though this information has been readily available for months, minus the locations, and I'm sure leading agencies have been willing and able to answer any questions for quite a while now.

RFPs are not up for location debate by anyone in the public ever. I don't recall any RFP or development that in the same process released the desired location, and somehow was forced to move locations due to community feedback. So what makes this time around different?

Honestly, this opposition is so unnecessary & foolish & misguided. Anyone I've spoken to that has opposed this (including one's who have shared their concerns publicly) has ever been able to provide me any kind of validity or facts behind their "concerns". They've just perpetuated the stigma around unhoused folks & listed off reasons they feel or believe it shouldn't be located in their neighbourhood.

And the thought that councillor Rahman is even entertaining these folks' stigma, assumption, NIMBY, selfish feelings & opinions horribly disguised as "concerns", instead of standing up for those who are on the receiving end of that perpetuated stigma and NIMBYism, especially women, and telling these people they are incorrect, way off base, & have no valid proof or facts to justify their concerns, as a woman, is disgusting.

Instead, she's wanting to DELAY these hubs until she can get them the information through staff, which takes a lot longer than it would if these people would reach out to these agencies and city representatives themselves. To satisfy a small portion of those in her ward who oppose it, with nothing to warrant or justify it other than because people are insulted that they couldn't dictate or control where this hub goes.

In 3 months, if we delay these hubs, what are the consequences to the women who could be accessing that hub? They're forced to stay on the street, or in toxic unsafe shelters. And in 3 months, after all of the efforts of giving these people information, what's to happen when they still oppose it and want to change the location? We will have punished vulnerable women by forcing them to remain in unsafe environments without the opportunity they have now at stabilization.

You don't need 3 months of a delay to spoon feed information to people who haven't been concerned enough to get themselves better informed. Isn't that their responsibility as a member of the community? To do some work themselves to get better informed in order to share with others?

We can have these hubs be on the go, & have a conversation about concerns simultaneously. This isn't appropriate for an either or scenario.

These people have opposed the location from the get go. They will in 3 months too. Because if none of these weak attempts at concerns isn't NIMBYism, I don't know what is. And 20 years of being on the receiving end of the stigma attached to the NIMBYism shown here.... yeah I'm very confident it's NIMBYism.

Especially when it wasn't such a concern during the campaign or recently until the location was announced as in their neighbourhood. And the weak excuses that have followed have tried to disguise the NIMBYism but anyone with common sense can see right through it for what it is.

So please, don't push back these hubs for the simple reason of trying to satisfy these minorities of the population who oppose it. Because you will never satisfy everyone, and if we wait 3 months to find that out the hard way, we are all doomed and foolish.

I'm all for giving people more information. But I'm not about to support postponing an essential service and supports for the sake of that, when that information is, has and will be available even with the hubs in operation.

Please consider what I've said here, as it's based on facts, and lived experience, in your decision, & please don't delay these hubs any longer. Allow them to go forward. Please. Women's lives are at stake here.

Thank you for your time and consideration to this matter. You have my consent to add this to the public agenda for the October 5th Council meeting.

Sincerely,

Melissa Sheehan

**From:** Luke Stark  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:01 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Letter in Support of Community Hub Plan

Dear members of London City Council,

I am writing in extremely strong support of the community hubs throughout London that will provide essential services including beds, for members of the unhoused community. I appreciate very much the plan to prioritize women and female-identifying people, Indigenous people, people with complex medical needs, and youth, and I am glad that council accepted proposals from Atlohsa Family Healing Services, Youth Opportunities Unlimited and the Canadian Mental Health Association. It is heartening that so many different stakeholders in the city have come together to support the city's overall plan.

Given the scale of the housing crisis facing London, the opposition to these hubs seems highly misguided. It is clear we need a full-city approach, including outside the downtown core, to deal with a city-wide problem. Poverty is not confined to Dundas Street. These hubs take a holistic and humane approach to the problem of homelessness, and I hope that when push comes to shove, people all over London will band together to improve the living conditions of living for as many unhoused people as possible as quickly as we can. Please do not delay or defer this decision: support the plan as proposed.

Please feel free to enter this letter into the public record.

Yours sincerely,

Luke

Luke Stark | he/him/his  
Assistant Professor, University of Western Ontario

October 3, 2023

For inclusion on the October 4 London City Council Meeting Agenda

Dear London City Councillors:

I am writing in strong support of the hubs throughout London that will provide essential needs, including beds, for members of the unhoused community. I especially appreciate the plan to prioritize women and female-identifying people, Indigenous people, people with complex medical needs, and youth. I am so glad that council accepted proposals from Atlohsa Family Healing Services, Youth Opportunities Unlimited and the Canadian Mental Health Association. There has been a great deal of research and community and expert input into what we, as a community, need, and the evidence clearly indicates that we need hubs in various strategic places across the city. I find that the calls to “protect the kids” and to keep them “safe” so disheartening because they draw a line between which kids and families deserve comfort and safety and those who do not, and these lines are based on assumptions and a willful misunderstanding. These hubs can be a path toward permanent housing, toward healing and recovery from the trauma associated with being unhoused, toward getting the essential basic health and safety needs, and toward employment. These hubs take a holistic and humane approach to the problem of homelessness. I just can’t understand why someone wouldn’t want to see these kinds of opportunities for London residents in their neighbourhood. We know that the roots of homelessness are systemic and political. The cost of housing has become impossible for many people, and access to all forms of health care is becoming increasingly fraught. I would like to see a London that will do whatever we can to improve the conditions of living for as many unhoused people as possible, starting as soon as possible. Rather than giving into fear and claims based on misconceptions, I urge City Councillors to make their decisions based on the needs of London. And that is to begin the staged plan to introduce hubs in the locations already selected, with the expansion of hubs to other areas over time.

Sincerely,

Melissa Adler  
London, Ontario N6A 2B8  
Ward 6



**From:** Iryna Omelchenko  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:29 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No hubs near toyshops, parks, residential area that allow drug usage

To whom it may concern,  
I understand that homelessness problem should be solved.

I chose Canada because it is a democratic country. But it feels like democracy is falling in London. Obviously the majority of neighbourhoods around 705 Fanshaw Park Rd.W oppose this hub. So will you listen to your voters? It will have an adverse impact on safety. You are councillors and you are supposed to improve the life of Londoners. So make the life of communities in the East of London, West, South, North and downtown safe. Do not throw these hubs as hot potatoes all around the city adding to the pain. Our neighborhood was not consulted, not warned about this hub. This hub will not solve the problem of homelessness but it will add more pain.

My children want to go to guitar lessons to Long and McQuade (10 meters from the hub), we often visit Mastermind Toys that is 5 meters from this future hub. So now I need to warn them about the needles? What about residential houses that are adjacent to these hubs?

In July you promised no rezoning will be required. And now we have rezoning and drug usage tolerance? It feels like betrayal...

At the meeting (September 25th) the mayor mentioned that it will house women with children. Will you allow children to be at a place where people use drugs? Do you realize how dangerous it is? Do you care about homeless children? Now I doubt it...

Please think about your decision thoroughly. Imagine what happens when the first needle is found, when the first encampment will be made in the Medway Creek....

Please be the enforcement of democracy.

I truly believe that no hubs that allow drug usage should be placed near any residential areas, shops and businesses for children.

You may share this email.

Thank you,  
Iryna Omelchenko

**From:** penforhire  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 10:19 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Cc:** Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Oct. 5 decision on Whole of Community System Response

Councillors,

As a resident of Ward 7, I'm urging you to support the hubs presented for approval, including the rezoning required for the hub proposed for 705 Fanshawe Park Rd West.

I consent to this letter appearing on the public agenda.

The Whole of Community System Response has been a long time coming; it is a more comprehensive and collaborative approach than the previous piecemeal attempts, and critically it seems to involve the input and support of those with experience in the community.

I have not personally experienced homelessness; I do, though, know how grounding it is to have stable housing and how essential it is for mental and physical health and well-being. Every person deserves that opportunity – and every neighbourhood should provide that opportunity.

There is clearly not enough affordable, appropriate housing available across this city, and it has caused or exacerbated personal and community crises for years. This is a good plan. It acknowledges the need for support beyond a bed in a shelter, and the need to provide that support urgently. As elected leaders representing all residents of this city, please approve this proposal that will have a tangible, positive impact.

Thank you.  
Lella Blumer

**From:** Laura  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 10:41 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: HUBS Plan

3 October 2023

Proposed HUBS Plan, London City Council

**Please circulate and attach to agenda**

Mr Mayor and councillors:

i am writing to express to council my support for London's hubs plan.

Finally, after an increasingly serious problem with numbers of those residents experiencing homelessness, we have the rubrics of a system which deals with neighbours in a kind and ethical way, providing shelter, healthcare and other resources whilst fighting stigma which has become seriously hostile of late.

i have lived in London nearly all my life. Two of my grandparents were born here and one lived 104 years in her own home. My family has the privilege which comes from generational wealth and the security of not being threatened with losing shelter.

Another part of my family fled unrest and poverty to reach Canada and has known hunger, lack of shelter and the temporary relief of self-medicating.

The inflammatory rhetoric posed on social media lately by politicians, local, provincial and national is deeply concerning.

It's senseless save to drive fixed agendas. It does absolutely nothing for those living rough and merely stirs up greater enmity against them.

The worst tropes are being trotted out to rouse folks' worst instincts.

Most people living rough are trying to find a roof without having an address. They're trying to find safety and comfort as temperatures drop and politicians complain that police won't simply cart them away. And much of the time, what they fear does happen: tents and blankets which are begged or borrowed are destroyed.

Myths are peddled: homeless people are violent, abuse drugs and are mentally ill. They're immigrants or they're people we used to "lock up."

Nobody mentions the young adult in a lean-to. The mom in a car moving from driveway to driveway one step ahead of a repo man who fears reporting domestic violence for fear she'll lose her kids. Nobody speaks of the trans youth whose parent tossed her out because she's "going to hell."

These individuals are primarily that: individuals.

i have one friend a hair's breadth from homelessness. Her abusive partner was arrested and her rent is approximately 98% of her income after a renovation from another home during shutdowns. Our provincial government cut funding to the law students who helped with tenancy issues so she's all alone right now, living in yet another poorly-maintained place but glad she has any type of roof over her head.

Another friend left social housing because she couldn't deal with the chronically low temperatures in winter and lack of repairs. When she was unable to maintain payments for a market-rate apartment, she couch-surfed and lived rough.

All people deserve housing. All people deserve access to robust wrap-around services. All people deserve to be seen as whole people. Absolutely nobody lives rough because that's all they deserve.

These hubs comprise the start of a long-overdue movement to acknowledge the people in our city who have, for far too long, been sleeping on the increasingly-hostile streets where common amenities like water fountains, public washrooms and resting benches have gone the way of the dodo.

I am writing today to say that the hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West, which will serve women and children, should be given the green light. If we are a compassionate community, we should do that with intention, with professionals who are experts in mental healthcare, addiction, domestic abuse and other comorbidities and who stand ready to help people transition to safety without imposing value systems upon them.

Sincerely,

(Ms) Laura Williscraft (she/her)

Ward 4

Sent from Gmail Mobile

**From:** phyllis brady  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 11:02 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Cc:** Pribil, Jerry <jpribil@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Location of Hubs in London

Greetings

After months of reading about the population of London experiencing homelessness & learning about the cities and countries who have had success addressing homelessness, I firmly believe that the plan for the Hubs with a variety of wrap around services is the solution. Mr Pribil provided me with the HUBs report a few weeks ago.

London's persons experiencing homelessness deserve our support and assistance in ways that meet them where they are, providing what they need.

The Hubs must be spread across the City in locations that are advantageous to them.

Please do not allow the citizens of one neighbourhood derail what seems to provide some of the answers to most serious situation.

Respectfully  
Phyllis Brady  
London, ON N5X 4C6

**From:** Jennifer Neilans  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 11:07 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] NO HUB at 705 Fanshawe Park Rd W

\*\*I give my consent for this to appear on the public agenda\*\*

I am opposed to the proposed hub location at 705 Fanshawe Park Road. While there are a number of reasons this particular hub does not meet the guidelines for hub locations set out in *London's Health And Homelessness Response: Proposed Hubs Implementation Plan, July 2023*, today I am writing you with concern over the forced closing of The Black Pearl Pub, a long-term, local favourite and locally-owned business and the forced re-housing of the residents of the Light House Inn.

The Black Pearl Pub faces the road at the proposed location. Behind the pub is the motel. The following information has been verified to be factual after consultation with the business owners at this location.

The facts are as follows:

- The placement of a hub at this location will force the closure of The Black Pearl Pub and The Lighthouse Inn.
- The Black Pearl Pub rents the space and, therefore, will receive zero compensation for their forced closure. They will be forced to leave behind a business they dedicated their lives to building.
- The Black Pearl Pub will not be able to reopen in a different location as it would not be financially feasible for them to do so.
- 11 employees (including 6 families and their children) will be unemployed and without an income should the pub close. This includes children of these employees.
- At least half a dozen people will lose their home. These are long-term residents of the motel that cannot find affordable housing for their particular situations. This includes residents who have lived at this location from years to a decade.

I trust that you can see that a hub at this location will cost others both financially, physically, and emotionally. These are people, too. People with a need for income, people with a need for affordable housing, parents who are working hard to put food on the table for their children. I ask that you protect the business owners, families and residents that are blameless casualties of this situation.

GO and have a meal at The Black Pearl Pub (I dare you) and see what you are throwing away.

You politicians are always wanting us citizens to "shop and support local businesses" yet here you are shutting them down.

Thank you,

Jen Neilans  
(Whitehills resident and frequent patron of The Black Pearl Pub. Best fish n chips in the city)

**From:** Amanda Grzyb  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 11:36 PM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Letter of support for the HUBS plan

To Whom It May Concern:

I give permission for this letter to be included on the public agenda.

I'm writing to express my strong support for the HUBS plan, which offers an innovative solution to the housing and homelessness crisis in our city. I realize that city councillors are facing some opposition to the plan, particularly by residents of higher income neighbourhoods. I urge council to remain steadfast in their decision to operationalize the HUBS and to continue to listen to the advice of community experts on homelessness.

City Council is entrusted to represent the interests *everyone* in London, including those who are experiencing homelessness. One could argue that councillors have an even greater obligation to the people in our community who are the most vulnerable. The HUBS plan offers an approach to our homelessness crisis centred on dignity, care, respect, and humanity. The whole community approach to homelessness will end the ghettoization and warehousing of people experiencing homelessness. It will integrate people experiencing housing instability into our wider communities and help to create the social safety net they so desperately need.

If we use history as a guide, we can see that the most morally right decisions – for example, abolishing slavery or enabling women to vote – were not always supported by the majority of people at the time. Prejudice, discrimination, and fear can often cloud people's judgement and understanding. This week, city councillors have the opportunity to make the morally right choice on the HUBS plan.

It's also important to recognize that a disproportionate number of people experiencing homelessness in London are Indigenous. Housing precarity is related to the legacy of violence and trauma of the residential schools and other forms of genocide against Indigenous people. The HUBS plan can be one important way for our community to move towards reconciliation.

Thanks for your attention and I look forward to seeing the HUBS plan in action and supporting the city's holistic efforts to end the local homelessness crisis.

Amanda Grzyb

-----  
Amanda Grzyb, Ph.D. (she/her)  
Professor of Information and Media Studies  
University of Western Ontario  
FIMS, FNB 2050, London ON N6A 5B9

Project Director  
Surviving Memory in Postwar El Salvador  
[www.elsalvadormemory.org](http://www.elsalvadormemory.org)

Past Chair, Board of Directors  
Unity Project for Relief of Homelessness in London  
717 Dundas St, London ON N5W 2Z5  
<http://unityproject.ca>

**From:** J Boswell  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 4, 2023 12:11 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for hub in Ward 7

Hello: I live in Ward 7 in London ON. My name is Jennifer Boswell.

I wholeheartedly support the proposed hub at the Lighthouse Motel. I fully intend to help out as I can when it opens.

I completely agree that homelessness and drug addiction is a city of London problem; the whole city and all its citizens. People need our compassion and help. We are a strong community that can and should render aid to those who most need it.

I give consent for this email to appear on the public agenda.

Kind regards, Jennifer Boswell

Get [Outlook for Android](#)



October 4, 2023

Dear City Counsellors,

I am writing to express my strong support for London's Hubs plan to address the crisis of homelessness in our city.

Homelessness in London is a major public health crisis and London's proposed plan for addressing it through Hubs is based on an extremely well-designed compassionate community-driven approach.

The Hubs plan has my full support and I urge London City Council to implement it fully.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jeff Tennant". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent 'J' and 'T'.

Jeff Tennant  
London, ON, N6A 1X7

### **Permission to circulate and attach to agenda**

I am writing to express my support for London's HUBS plan. I am a past member of the London Homeless Coalition, a past Community Advocate at a regional shelter for families fleeing intimate partner violence, and I currently practice as a Registered Social Worker, living in Ward 7, in close proximity to the proposed NW Hub location on Fanshawe Park Road West.

As a lifelong London citizen, I am dismayed by the harmful and inflammatory rhetoric leveled against both the organizations providing these much-needed hubs and essential services, as well as the people who require them. There are members of this community, including some who hold leadership positions within your midst, who continue to use appalling, offensive, stigmatizing tactics to spread fear, to perpetuate harmful myths<sup>1</sup> about those who are most marginalized in our community. These tactics serve only to further dehumanize those who are simply trying to survive within a system that I'm sure we can all agree is not sufficient to meet their needs.

These tactics continue to put the most vulnerable members of our community at greater risk of harm. The prevalent narrative used by those who continue to promote and reinforce stigmatizing attitudes, is one of coercive treatment for addiction, and punitive measures/criminalization for homelessness. It is inhumane to criminalize people for living a reality that is a direct result of systemic, societal, and policy failures at every level of government.<sup>2</sup>

In a recent article published by Invisible People<sup>3</sup>, it was noted that "the surrounding people, not the conditions, make homelessness hard. Hatred against unhoused people rages on..." The article noted that according to experts and advocates within the sector, "criminalizing homelessness is fueling the fires of hatred, and fostering lethal consequences."

*"The political rhetoric that goes along with criminalization, especially right now during our current political climate, contributes to a cultural view of homeless people as less than or other, or both...this contributes to a view that homeless people are dangerous, which is incorrect. It also contributes to a view of homeless people as disposable, which, in turn, increases violence against them."*

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on the most prevalent myths about people who are homeless, see "Myths about Homelessness." *Calgary Homeless Foundation*.  
<https://www.calgaryhomeless.com/discover-learn/learn-about-homelessness/homelessness-in-calgary/myths-about-homelessness/>

<sup>2</sup> For the real and primary causes of homelessness, see "Causes of Homelessness." *Homeless Hub*.  
<https://www.homelesshub.ca/about-homelessness/homelessness-101/causes-homelessness>

<sup>3</sup> Criminalizing Homelessness is Fueling the Fires of Hatred and Fostering Lethal Consequences  
<https://invisiblepeople.tv/how-criminalization-is-contributing-to-homeless-deaths/>

In all the years I have lived in this city, I have never seen an entire sector come together with such determined, passionate vision to create this innovative plan. This has been an arduous process and I trust and value the knowledge and expertise of all those involved. I believe that we must move forward ethically and with care. All people deserve housing. All people deserve access to robust wrap-around services. All people deserve to be seen as whole people. The hubs are the start of a long-overdue movement to acknowledge the people in our city who have, for far too long, been suffering, and sleeping, on our streets. Finally, the hubs plan aligns with Canada's National Housing Strategy<sup>4</sup>, which calls for "advancing the right to housing," "seeking...input from voices who know first-hand what it's like not to have a home," and "creating livable communities."

As @mattixv on Twitter so clearly notes, "there is a difference between not wanting people to be homeless and not wanting to have to see people who are homeless." It is time to ask ourselves which of these very different positions we want to espouse? I am writing today to say that the hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West, which will serve women and children, should be given the green light. To not go ahead with this project will paint a picture of a city and its citizens that is not aligned with the London that I would like us to be - one that leads by compassion, evidence, and community, instead of fear, misinformation, and rhetorical violence.

With respect,

Cheryl Wituik, RSW, BA  
Ward 7 Resident

---

<sup>4</sup> For more on Canada's National Housing Strategy, see "What is the Strategy?" <https://www.placetocallhome.ca/what-is-the-strategy>

From: Anne Jaikaran  
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 7:21 AM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Hubs

I understand you are receiving a lot of letters from “Nimbys” who are against the proposed hubs. I just want to say that I support them. We cannot insulate ourselves from the dire problem of homelessness and we all need to be prepared to play our part in bringing about a lasting solution.

Yours, Anne Jaikaran

Sent from my iPad



October 3, 2023

London City Council  
300 Dufferin Avenue  
London, ON N6B 1Z2

**RE: Item 8.1.3., (4.2) Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response RFP  
2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan Results (Relates to Bill No. 367)**

**For circulation and addition to the agenda** for the Special Meeting London City Council  
Thursday, October 5, 2023 at 1pm

Dear Councillors,

On behalf of Pillar Nonprofit Network, I am writing to encourage you – each of you – to vote in favour of awarding the Request for Proposal 2023-199 to Atlohsa Family Healing Services Inc., Youth Opportunities Unlimited, and CMHA Thames Valley Addiction and Mental Health Services, according to their individual proposals.

Though some of us might wish for more relief or faster relief, and some of us may be unnerved by trying something new, we see a once-in-forever opportunity to implement a coordinated system that can deliver good outcomes for unhoused Londonders and the whole of the community.

What good outcomes for the community? For those who fear a rise in unsafe or criminal activity in their neighbourhoods, we would remind our neighbours of two things.

- First, unhoused people are the least safe among us, the most likely to be victimized by crime, and as deserving of safety as everyone else.
- And second, these hubs support the highest acuity cases among unhoused Londoners. That's specialized language. What it means for them is that they're suffering and they desperately need our help to return to the community. For everyone else, it means we are attending to the people who make the most use of paramedic services, fire services, police services, and emergency health care. And without even transitional homes and services in which to stabilize, they make the greatest demands on shelter workers, social workers,

community connectors, and system navigators across all of London's social agencies. Giving these individuals a place to stabilize and make their journey to permanent housing makes them safer, frees up resources for other Londoners, and makes the City safer for everyone.

For those who wonder whether your investment could do more, we would ask, Do you want to **seem** to be doing something, or do you want positive outcomes? Are you willing to make an investment that meets the scale of our challenge? Since nothing we've done to date has even reduced homelessness, let alone eliminated it, should we really be doing the same old things?

- As [we've written elsewhere](#), we've failed time and time again to get the outcomes we seek in part because we have always started with a level of investment we wish to make and then sprinkled that money piecemeal across organizations. Each of them does their best with the resources available, but none of them can rise alone to the challenge of widespread and growing homelessness. The level of collaboration in this whole of community system response is an appreciable accomplishment. But, in the mix of information, misinformation, and disinformation, it can be difficult to identify the **genuine innovation** in this coordinated system. This time, we really listened to people with lived and living experience and the front-line workers who serve them every day, and then we designed a system that supports them toward the outcomes we **all** desire. Only then did we seek the necessary funding, knowing that we are offering supporters a really solid bet. We recommend investing in this scalable and replicable model to test this system.

Councillors, it's been 25 years since a group of big city mayors in Canada declared homelessness an 'unnatural disaster' in 1998, and you voted unanimously this year that housing and homelessness amounted to an "untenable emergency." Londoners can be proud to implement a new way out of this crisis if you are willing to bet on the knowledge and caring of our community today.

Sincerely,



Maureen Cassidy (she/her)

CEO, Pillar Nonprofit Network

[mcassidy@pillarnonprofit.ca](mailto:mcassidy@pillarnonprofit.ca) | 519-433-7876 ext 212

**From:** Aaron Schneider  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 4, 2023 7:53 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] re: Homeless HUBS

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my unqualified support for the new homeless HUBS.

I'm a longtime resident of London. I live in Ward 4, in the Old East Village at 845 Dufferin Avenue. I regularly walk down Dundas Street and see the homeless people who gather there. I don't see them as frightening. They don't make me feel unsafe. They aren't threats. They are human beings who are suffering. They are people in desperate need of kindness, care and support. We should be doing everything we can to assist them, not condemning them or further marginalizing them by turning them into boogeymen.

The homeless HUBS are an important step towards helping this vulnerable population. As someone who lives in one of the neighbourhoods most affected by this issue and who encounters homeless people every day, I see the HUBS as an essential service. From my perspective, they cannot be implemented soon enough.

I want to live in a community that cares for its citizens, and the homeless HUBS are an initiative that will make me proud to call this city home.

You have my consent for this letter to appear on the public agenda.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Dr. Aaron Schneider

**From:** Andrea Morrow  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 4, 2023 7:12 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Homelessness Hubs plan

To whom it may concern -

I am writing to express my support for the homeless hubs plan in London. The plan acknowledges the varied needs of the homeless population, the importance of not isolating the population in 1 location, and the urgency of the crisis in London.

Homeless people are no more likely to be disruptive than any other new neighbor. I live in one of the most desirable neighborhoods in London and recently had to cope with an aggressive and abusive tenant in the 1.4M detached home next to ours. Just as having money does not render you decent, lacking resources does not render you indecent. The arguments against these hubs rely almost entirely on maligning the character of the populations they serve. Furthermore arguments that addiction recovery should be the primary focus of these funds engage in multiple fallacies - that addiction is the primary cause of homelessness (have you seen rent prices??) and that addiction is itself a character flaw that must be resolved before someone "deserves" help.

I urge you to vote in support of the Hub plan and to assist London in moving along the road to resolution of this emergency.

Thank you  
Andrea Morrow  
London ON



# DIRKA U. PROUT

London, ON

October 4, 2023

Mayor Josh Morgan and other members of council

Via email to [councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:councilagenda@london.ca)

**Re: Hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West  
Council Meeting of October 5, 2023**

Dear Council,

I am writing in support of the hub for women and women-identified persons to be situated at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West. Please vote to maintain this hub.

The hubs are supporting high acuity individuals who are the most marginalized. This particular hub will serve the most underserved subset of this population: women and women-identified persons. The Fanshawe Park hub will not bring homelessness to the neighbouring community. The hub is not a shelter. Properly managed, it will not cause nearby businesses to close or be a danger to children, elders or other residents.

Prior to the start of the pandemic, I read reports of pregnant women on the streets of London. This past winter, while gathering signatures for the London Regional Social Forum's petition to declare the housing crisis an emergency in London, we were told of homeless families with children living in a City park. This means things are dire for women and their families. Any delays in providing service to this highly marginalized group will be a travesty.

Women typically exhaust every option prior to being forced onto the streets. The most common reason women, girls and trans women leave their homes is violence from their intimate partners or other family members. In Canada, women's services and shelters for gender based violence are underfunded. There are far fewer homeless shelters that are dedicated to women and even fewer that specialize in dealing with gender diverse people. This situation became much worse with the onset of the pandemic. I fear that if this hub is deferred, that deliberations could become so protracted that we will lose sight of the urgency for this most vulnerable population. Consider that London's women's and family shelters have long been at capacity and have waitlists. Some of the homeless women may be mothers and a delay past May 2024 may cause further separation from their children and further entrenchment of harms that perpetuate intergenerational poverty.

Detractors may say you are bringing homelessness to our pristine community. Homeless people who are tired of constantly dismantled encampments and violence in the downtown may already be living within the idyllic ravines of Fox Hollow. Studies have shown on average 75% of homeless people remain in their community of origin. Further in the case of women, gender based violence has no class limits.

There is the related concern of hubs in general being a revolving door for participants. While conventional shelters do not have people occupying the space during the day and their homeless population may well be transient, the hubs provide transitional housing. Hub participants will remain there with 24/7 supports while they recover from past trauma, heal, prepare for employment and moving into permanent housing. Hub populations are expected to be stable over time with no adhoc intakes.

Some members of the public have expressed fear of violence being inflicted particularly on seniors or other harms on children. This fear is unfounded. Data shows that homeless people are no more violent than those that are housed. Further crime rates for women across all age groups are 1/3 of that of men. It

is far more likely that homeless women and gender diverse persons have been victims of multiple instances of violence. They are in urgent need of protection. This hub will utilize a gendered and trauma-informed approach.

The onsite restaurant Black Pearl may have to relocate. They have reportedly indicated a willingness to voluntarily do so. As a women owned business, they are likely familiar with how societal ills like gender based violence, sexism and the gender pay gap to name a few harm women and can result in women's poverty and eventual homelessness. They can be a valuable ally and it is hoped that CMHA and the City can facilitate to make their move as seamless as possible.

There are fears of other nearby businesses closing. Studies for shelters show that nuisance problems rarely extend more than 400 metres from a shelter. Again, I note this is transitional housing with a stable population. Since the hubs plan mandates provision of security, the community impact will be far less than the average shelter operation. I would note that CMHA is an experienced provider of both shelter and mental health services. The Hubs Implementation Plan requires all providers to adhere to consistent standard of care, de-escalation training and community engagement. Security and nuisance problems can be warded off with early and regular dialogue with the local business, community reps, CMHA, the Ward Councillors and the City's hubs implementation team. This dialogue should also inform Council's deliberations on this and future hubs without the need for any motion for deferral.

Others claim to be concerned about the potential for on-site drug use as part of the hub's low barrier approach. The requirement for one to be clean before entering the shelter is often a barrier for homeless people. Further the nature of opiate addiction is such that abstinence programs do not work. In order to prevent overdose deaths and transmission of deadly diseases like HIV and hepatitis B, it is important that harm reduction techniques be employed. This is a mandatory feature of each hub apart from hub staff having the required training, representatives from the appropriate supporting agencies will be available to assist. Best practices require measures such as needle sweeps and a community hotline for used needles. I expect these measures will be employed along with needle drop boxes that are already in public parks and facilities.

Some say the costs of the hubs are excessive. Homelessness is very costly. Its cost is measured in lost lives and human potential. Considering that 21% of single mothers in Canada raise their children in poverty, not addressing the root cause and allowing women's homelessness to continue perpetuates intergenerational poverty and hopelessness. A 2017 study reported the average annual cost each homeless person with mental illness in Canada is \$53,000 per person and can rise to \$340,000 per person. This includes shelter, policing, health and justice system costs. Housing first approaches that employ harm reduction can reduce those costs significantly. At the public information sessions, we were told there will be feedback loops built into the Hub Implementation Plan. As more hubs come on line, there will be opportunities to use this feedback to lower costs and improve service.

As these hubs are being rolled out, I expect the City will work quickly and steadfastly along with higher levels of government to address the root causes of homelessness and get more co-op, transition and social housing built in this city. Homelessness is complex and has a long history of policy failures and lack of political will. The hubs by themselves will not solve homelessness; nor were they expected to. They are necessary step to break the hold of the streets and move away from trauma for woefully underserved populations like women.

Under the City's *Safe Cities London Action Plan*, Council is obligated to make London a place where women, girls, nonbinary and trans individuals and GBV survivors can participate safely in public life. This includes those experiencing homelessness. Please vote to keep the hub at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West.

Sincerely,

*Darla U. Prout*

**From:** Janet Williams  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 4, 2023 8:33 AM  
**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fw: Homeless Hubs

This is intended as a message for the agenda item on homeless hubs which is to be voted on tomorrow's meeting of city council.

Janet Williams

---

**From:** Janet Williams  
**Sent:** October 4, 2023 8:25 AM  
**To:** [Councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:Councilagenda@london.ca) <[Councilagenda@london.ca](mailto:Councilagenda@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** Homeless Hubs

Hello

I am writing in support of City Councils' initiatives in creating Hubs for homeless people. I am especially pleased with the decision to create a transitional facility on Fanshawe Park Road. This is an important step in the process of eliminating homelessness. In designating hubs for different populations a safer community is created for these vulnerable people. Thank you to city councillors for working with agencies charged with helping homeless people to help put an end to homelessness in a positive and supportive way.

Yours sincerely,  
Janet Williams

**From:** Charmaine Ward

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 4, 2023 8:34 AM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>; Ferreira, David <dferreira@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for Homeless Hubs Plan

Good Morning:

I am writing to express my complete and strong support for the City of London's homeless hubs plan.

The collaboration between government, private sector and coalition of those who serve the homeless means that London is now poised to make substantial, meaningful, and lasting changes that will in the long run benefit all Londoners.

This evidence-based and well-considered plan restores dignity and respects the unique needs of specific homeless populations.

Each and every Londoner is not only a stake-holder but also bears responsibility for achieving compassionate, effective solutions to homelessness.

Of course there will be vocal opposition to the plan, but I firmly believe that the City is doing the right thing. Therefore I would like the City to stay strong and proceed to implement the present plan.

Sincerely,  
Charmaine Ward

October 4, 2023 | RE: Proposed HUBS Plan, London City Council

**Please circulate and attach to the agenda**

I am writing to express my unequivocal support for London's hubs plan. The commitment to our city's first three hubs, run by experts at Atlohsa, Youth Opportunities Unlimited, and CMHA, represents a valuable and evidence-based approach to wrap-around and city-wide support for London's most vulnerable citizens. More importantly, they signify a more kind and ethical way of working with and for our homeless neighbours to combat stigma while providing life-improving and life-saving essential services, including housing, health care, and other crucial resources.

I am deeply concerned about the harmful and inflammatory rhetoric levelled against the organizations providing these much-needed hubs and essential services and the people who require them and have been ignored for too long. Some outspoken people are spreading fear about those who will rely on these hubs as a tactic to prevent these projects from proceeding. Drawing on common myths about homeless people as necessarily violent, drug-abusing criminals deprives them of their humanity and does not paint an accurate picture of the people for whom the housing crisis has threatened their quality of life and their survival. Meanwhile, the binary representation of this population as opposed to the families and businesses in neighbourhoods (and on busy city thoroughfares) ignores the reality that our homeless neighbours have families.

People experiencing homelessness and addiction are human. They have needs in an economic and social climate that would write them off. That would corral them into only specific neighbourhoods. That would - as some people prefer - force them into violating and ineffective coercive treatment programs and/or criminalize them for living a reality that is borne about by systemic, societal, and policy failures at all levels. I reject this polarization and misinformation and insist that we move forward ethically and with care.

All people deserve housing. All people deserve access to robust wrap-around services. All people deserve to be seen as whole people. The hubs are the start of a long-overdue movement to acknowledge the people in our city who have, for far too long, been sleeping on the street. Finally, the hubs plan aligns with Canada's National Housing Strategy, which calls for "advancing the right to housing," "seeking...input from voices who know first-hand what it's like not to have a home," and "creating livable communities."

I am writing today to support the proposed hub locations around the city. Failing to move forward will paint a picture of a city and its citizens that is not aligned with the London that I would like us to be - one that leads by compassion, evidence, and community instead of fear, misinformation, and rhetorical violence.

Thank you for your time.

Shawn Adamsson  
Ward 11

(Template used with permission of Many Penney - Ward 14 resident)

From: Carolyn Murray  
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 9:04 AM  
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Health and Homelessness whole of Community System  
Response hub implementation results

16th Special Meeting of CityCouncil on Oct.. 5, 2023

I consent for my letter to appear on the public agenda.

As a resident of London, living and volunteering in the downtown area, I have seen firsthand the growing need for supportive housing in London. More and more people seem to have no recourse but to become homeless. Social housing has a decade long waiting list. The longer people are unhoused the more severe and multifaceted become their problems.

Homelessness is a crisis and demands a community wide inclusive process to address it. The hub concept will bring the services to the homeless people wherever they are in the city. We as a city should be prepared for a whole of Community Support for this plan. The city has done a great job to develop a comprehensive plan. Funding is available from provincial programs and our own citizens who have stepped up to donate millions of dollars.

I urge you to vote in favour of the 3 hubs presented for approval, including the reasoning necessary.

Sincerely,  
Carolyn Murray

Sent from my iPad

**From:** Dinesh jp

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 3, 2023 11:23 PM

**To:** Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

**Cc:** City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>; SPPC <sppc@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed homeless hub concern

Hi Mr morgan

Good evening I am a resident of london living in north west london I have concerns about bringing a homeless hub in this area as I have two kids who are schooling in this area itself as a parent we are concerned about their safety and this area is quiet good and safe now for families and kids if you bring a homeless hub it will geobardize the safety of families and kids please reconsider the proposal and move it somewhere away from the city

Thank you

Truly

Dineshkumar pachaiyappan

# Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee Report

23rd Special Meeting of the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee  
September 25, 2023

**PRESENT:** Mayor J. Morgan (Chair), Councillors H. McAlister, S. Lewis, P. Cuddy, S. Stevenson, J. Pribil, S. Trosow, C. Rahman, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Franke, E. Pelozza, D. Ferreira, S. Hillier

**ALSO PRESENT:** L. Livingstone, A. Barbon, C. Cooper, S. Corman, K. Dickins, M. Feldberg, J. Ireland, S. Mathers, H. McNeely, S. Mollon, J. Paradis, M. Schulthess, C. Smith, J. Taylor, B. Westlake-Power

Remote attendance: E. Bennett, B. Card

The meeting is called to order at 4:00 PM; it being noted that Councillors P. Van Meerbergen, E. Pelozza and S. Hillier were in remote attendance.

## 1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

## 2. Consent

None.

## 3. Scheduled Items

None.

## 4. Items for Direction

### 4.1 September Progress Update - Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: D. Ferreira

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, that the September Progress Update – Health & Homelessness Whole of Community System Response Report BE RECEIVED for information; it being noted that the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee received a verbal delegation from R. O'Hagan with respect to this matter.

Yeas: (15): J. Morgan, H. McAlister, S. Lewis, P. Cuddy, S. Stevenson, J. Pribil, S. Trosow, C. Rahman, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Franke, E. Pelozza, D. Ferreira, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (15 to 0)**

Additional votes:

Moved by: S. Trosow

Seconded by: C. Rahman

The delegation of Ryan O'Hagan BE APPROVED to be heard at this time.



Yeas: (15): J. Morgan, H. McAlister, S. Lewis, P. Cuddy, S. Stevenson, J. Pribil, S. Trosow, C. Rahman, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Franke, E. Pelozza, D. Ferreira, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (15 to 0)**

4.2 Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response RFP 2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan Results

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: D. Ferreira

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the award of the contracts for Request for Proposal (RFP) RFP-2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan: Lead Agencies London's Health & Homelessness Whole of Community System Response as an irregular result, as per City of London Procurement Policy Section 12.2 (c) "Committee and City Council must approve an RFP award with an irregular result greater than \$15,000":

a) the Request for Proposal 2023-199 BE AWARDED to each of the following organizations to provide Hubs for an initial two-year commitment at a total estimated operating cost of \$15,650,424; with an option to renew operating contracts for up to four (4) additional one-year terms at the City's sole discretion, based on satisfactory services, performance, and funding/budget availability:

i) Atlohosa Family Healing Services Inc. at 550 Wellington Road, Building J in the estimated amount of \$2,118,146 per year;

ii) Youth Opportunities Unlimited at 800 Commissioners Road, Building 16 and 329 Richmond Street in the estimated amounts of Year 1: \$1,317,500 and Year 2: \$1,983,800;

iii) Canadian Mental Health Association Thames Valley Addiction and Mental Health Services at 556 Dundas St. in the estimated amount \$1,425,562 per year;

the proposals submitted by all proponents meet the City's requirements and are in compliance with the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy, in accordance with Schedule 1 as appended to the staff report dated September 25, 2023: for a total operating and capital investment of up to \$20,616,024. of which:

b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to allocate up to \$10,388,716 for operating for 2024 and 2025 from the Provincial Homeless Prevention Program;

c) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to seek funding from the Fund for Change to fund the capital requests received to support the three hubs in the total estimated amount of up to \$4,965,600 for the provision of the initial hubs implementation;

d) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to seek funding from the Fund for Change to fund the estimated operating costs of the Canadian Mental Health Association Thames Valley Addiction and Mental Health Services transitional beds to be located at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West for the provision of the initial two (2) year contract term for hubs implementation at an approximate cost of \$5,261,708 pending necessary development and *Planning Act* approvals;

e) a one-time funding allocation of up to \$1,500,000 from the Social Services Reserve Fund BE APPROVED, if required, should ineligible costs under existing provincial funding sources be identified while finalizing the agency purchase of service contracts and budgets;

f) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all administrative acts, including review of sites and support for *Planning Act* applications to align current or future hub sites with criteria, and any activities associated with additionally requested funding necessary in relation to this project;

g) the approval given herein BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a Purchase of Service Agreement with Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Canadian Mental Health Association Thames Valley Addiction and Mental Health Services and Atlohsa Family Healing Services Inc;

h) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to continue to work with the community on the hubs implementation to establish additional opportunities for future procurement of additional spaces;

i) the annual funding approval noted in a) above is SUBJECT TO the availability of funding through the City of London, and/or other funding sources;

j) the proposed by-law as appended to the staff report dated September 25, 2023 as Schedule 2 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2023 to:

i) AUTHORIZE the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, or written designate, to approve the Municipal Purchase of Service Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and each hub provider for the purchase of services to provide and operate three hubs; and,

ii) AUTHORIZE the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, or written designate, to execute the Municipal Purchase of Service Agreements with each hub provider;

it being noted that the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee received the attached presentation from K. Dickins, Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development and 136 added communications with respect to this matter.

Yeas: (9): J. Morgan, H. McAlister, S. Lewis, S. Trosow, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Franke, E. Peloza, and D. Ferreira

Nays: (6): P. Cuddy, S. Stevenson, J. Pribil, C. Rahman, P. Van Meerbergen, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (9 to 6)**

Additional votes:

Moved by: S. Trosow

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That pursuant to section 31.6 of the Council Procedure By-law, Councillor D. Ferreira be permitted to speak an additional five minutes with respect to this matter.

**Motion Passed**

Moved by: S. Trosow

Seconded by: C. Rahman

That pursuant to section 31.6 of the Council Procedure By-law, Councillor S. Lewis be permitted to speak an additional two minutes with respect to this matter.

**Motion Passed**

Moved by: C. Rahman  
Seconded by: S. Trosow

That pursuant to section 31.6 of the Council Procedure By-law, Councillor S. Stevenson be permitted to speak an additional two minutes with respect to this matter.

**Motion Passed**

Moved by: S. Lewis

With respect to the Chair's ruling that a Referral of this matter is in order, shall the ruling of the Chair BE SUSTAINED?

Yeas: (8): J. Morgan, S. Stevenson, J. Pribil, C. Rahman, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Franke, and S. Hillier

Nays: (7): H. McAlister, S. Lewis, P. Cuddy, S. Trosow, A. Hopkins, E. Pelozza, and D. Ferreira

**Motion Passed (8 to 7)**

The Chair's ruling is sustained.

Moved by: C. Rahman  
Seconded by: J. Pribil

That consideration of Item 4.2, Health and Homelessness Whole of Community System Response RFP 2023-199 Hubs Implementation Plan Results, BE REFERRED to the October 31st meeting of the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee.

Yeas: (6): P. Cuddy, S. Stevenson, J. Pribil, C. Rahman, P. Van Meerbergen, and S. Hillier

Nays: (9): J. Morgan, H. McAlister, S. Lewis, S. Trosow, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Franke, E. Pelozza, and D. Ferreira

**Motion Failed (6 to 9)**

Moved by: J. Pribil  
Seconded by: P. Cuddy

That pursuant to section 31.6 of the Council Procedure By-law, Councillor C. Rahman be permitted to speak an additional five minutes with respect to this matter.

**Motion Passed**

Moved by: S. Franke  
Seconded by: D. Ferreira

That the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recess at this time, for ten minutes.

**Motion Passed**

The Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recesses at 7:15 PM and reconvenes at 7:33 PM.

## **6. Confidential**

### **6.1 Solicitor-Client Privileged Advice**

Moved by: C. Rahman  
Seconded by: S. Stevenson

That the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee convene, In Closed Session, in order to consider a matter related to advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose, related to a legislative interpretation and for advice about legal liability related to criteria for outcomes of an RFP.

Yeas: (8): J. Morgan, S. Stevenson, J. Pribil, C. Rahman, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, and S. Hillier

Nays: (6): H. McAlister, S. Lewis, S. Trosow, S. Franke, E. Pelozza, and D. Ferreira

Absent: (1): P. Cuddy

**Motion Passed (8 to 6)**

The Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee convenes, In Closed Session from 6:47 PM to 7:06 PM.

**5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business**

None.

**7. Adjournment**

Moved by: P. Van Meerbergen

Seconded by: S. Stevenson

That the meeting BE ADJOURNED.

**Motion Passed**

The meeting adjourned at 8:31 PM.



London  
CANADA

# Hub Lead Agencies & Location Recommendations



**London's Health & Homelessness System Response**

Special SPPC Meeting

213

September 25, 2023

# System Development Overview



*Supported by ongoing government relations & communications*



# Hubs

- Hubs are designed to support the highest acuity individuals in our community, of which there are approximately 600 Londoners with the most complex needs. These folks are often completely unsheltered and predominantly living outside of the shelter system.
- The Hubs will become one system with multiple locations to meet people where they are.
- Hubs aim to bring people indoors to access services from multi-disciplinary teams
- ***Every interaction at a Hub is an active and intentional effort to enable an individual's next steps toward highly supportive housing.***



# Core Functions of a Hub

- 24/7 safe places
- Basic needs (food, shower, laundry, rest)
- Community engagement
- Housing access support
- Income supports
- Integrated care planning
- Justice system services
- Medical stabilization beds
- Quick access and intentional connections to acute and primary care
- Respite beds
- Transitional beds
- Translation and interpretation
- Transportation



# RFP Process Background

- Council approved the Hubs Implementation plan at the end of July and directed staff to move forward with a competitive procurement process for the first 3-5 Hubs
- The RFP, issued on August 4th, was to identify lead agencies and proposed locations for the first Hubs, and closed on September 5<sup>th</sup>
- Proponents were to identify: location & size of hub, priority population served, services provided, partnerships where these existed
- Criteria for Hubs is outlined in the Hubs Implementation Plan, and was developed from Summit insight, sector expertise and significant community input



# RFP Results

- Four submissions were received and significant interest was generated among other future potential agencies
- RFP results reflect the expertise and deep understanding of the uniqueness of each specific Hubs priority populations outlined in the plan
- The proposals and proponents have demonstrated a strong case for community engagement and the proposals align with the Lived Experience feedback
- Three submissions are being recommended to Council for implementation

# The Recommendations

- It is being recommended that:
  - **Atlohsa, Y.O.U., and CMHA** be selected to provide Hubs for an initial two-year commitment.
  - Up to **\$10,388,716** be allocated from the Provincial Homeless Prevention Program for the **operating** of the Hubs over a two-year period
  - The City seek further **\$4,965,600** from the Fund for Change to support the **capital** requests of the first three Hubs.



# Atlohsa Family Healing Services

- This Hub will focus on supporting the Indigenous priority population
- It will reconfigure the existing Wiigiwaaminaan shelter space to rapidly bring online 10 respite beds and 18 transitional rooms
- The proposed Hub location is 550 Wellington Road, located on the St. Joseph's Health Care London Parkwood site
- This Hub will open in December of 2023
- **Capital:**\$1,303,750 **Operating:**\$2,118,146



# Youth Opportunities Unlimited

- This Hub will focus on supporting the Youth priority population
- It will leverage all existing YOU spaces and programming to move an estimated 60 youth per year through the Hubs, focusing on 6 respite beds immediately while renovations begin
- The Hub will scale up by providing an additional 9 transitional rooms in partnership with LHSC and will tap into youth centric spaces and services like Joan's Place, Youth Wellness Hub Ontario, and other clinical and acute care services
- The proposed youth Hub location is Building 16 at 800 Commissioners Road East and will be fully operational May 2024
- **Capital:** \$3,123,550 **Operating:** \$1,317,500 (yr one) \$1,983,800 (yr two)



# CMHA -TVAMH

- This Hub will focus on the women and female-identifying individuals priority population
- As subject matter experts for serving this population, this submission outlined the need for a multi-site response
- The first site at 556 Dundas Street would provide 10 respite beds this year with the second site at 705 Fanshawe Park Road West requiring a zoning change to be able to provide 20 transitional rooms
- The respite beds will open in 2023 and the transitional rooms are anticipated for May 2024.
- The operating cost for the Respite beds will be covered within Housing Stability Services budget, and the Fund For Change will be sought for the Transition Rooms pending a successful re-zoning
- **Capital:** \$538,300 **Operating:** \$1,425,562 (Respite) \$2,630,854 (Transition)

# Next steps

- Pending Council approval, civic administration will take necessary steps to enter into municipal purchase of service agreements and work with Fund for Change for applicable capital costs
- Pending a successful rezoning process, civic administration will work with Fund for Change for applicable capital and operating funds for the CMHA transition rooms



300 Dufferin Avenue  
P.O. Box 5035  
London, ON  
N6A 4L9

October 4, 2023

Dear Colleagues,

Given the severity of the homeless/addiction crisis facing our city, the commitment made in our Strategic Plan to address the safety concerns in our existing emergency shelters and the underfunding of emergency shelters as identified by Jon De Actis (Salvation Army Centre of Hope) in his delegation to the February 2022 CPSC meeting, we have identified an opportunity to provide much needed support to the more than 200 people currently living in our two largest emergency shelters (Mission Services and TSA Centre of Hope).

Although we understand that there were plans to move away from emergency shelter beds and put more funding and resources into prevention, the current reality is that the length of stays in our emergency shelters have increased dramatically from 6 weeks to more than 12 months (even 18 months) over the past 5 or so years. Imagine living in the dorm rooms of an emergency shelter with a staffing ratio of less than 30:1 in a shelter that has not received the funding increases needed to cover the increasing costs of food, maintenance, utilities, wages, etc.

We believe in the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. By providing supports (similar to those outlined in the RFP for the proposed hubs eg. transportation, quick access to acute and primary care, housing access support, income supports, integrated care planning, translation and intentional connections to health and wellness services) to the people staying in these emergency shelters, we could improve their safety and living conditions and possibly prevent them from becoming high acuity. This could save money in the long run, help more people earlier and improve the safety of both residents and staff.

Therefore, we are asking your support for the following:

***That the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to prepare a report exploring arrangements with the city's two largest emergency shelter operators to see if they have the ability and capacity to scale up their level of services to approximate the Whole of Community Systems Response level of service outlined in the hub RFP.***

***That the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to prepare a report exploring the option of funding recovery/treatment services like Recovery Community Centre at TSA Centre of Hope and Quintin Warner House (a branch of Mission Services).***

***That the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to identify the costs, operational start dates and potential municipal sources of funding for the above.***

Sincerely,

Susan Stevenson  
Ward 4 City Councillor

Jerry Pribil  
Ward 5 City Councillor



Bill No. 366  
2023

By-law No. A.-\_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_

A by-law to confirm the proceedings of the  
Council Meeting held on the 5<sup>th</sup> day of October  
2023.

The Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. Every decision of the Council taken at the meeting at which this by-law is passed and every motion and resolution passed at that meeting shall have the same force and effect as if each and every one of them had been the subject matter of a separate by-law duly enacted, except where prior approval of the Ontario Land Tribunal is required and where any legal prerequisite to the enactment of a specific by-law has not been satisfied.
2. The Mayor and the proper civic employees of the City of London are hereby authorized and directed to execute and deliver all documents as are required to give effect to the decisions, motions and resolutions taken at the meeting at which this by-law is passed.
3. This by-law comes into force and effect on the day it is passed subject to the provisions of PART VI.1 of the *Municipal Act*, 2001.

PASSED in Open Council on October 5, 2023 subject to the provisions of PART VI.1 of the *Municipal Act*, 2001.

Josh Morgan  
Mayor

Michael Schulthess  
City Clerk

First Reading – October 5, 2023  
Second Reading – October 5, 2023  
Third Reading – October 5, 2023

Bill No. 367  
2023

By-law No.

A by-law to authorize the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development to approve a Municipal Purchase of Service Agreement with each hub provider for the operation of three hubs.

WHEREAS section 2 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, provides that municipalities are created by the Province of Ontario to be responsible and accountable governments with respect to matters within their jurisdiction and each municipality is given powers and duties under this Act and many other Acts for the purpose of providing good government with respect to those matters;

AND WHEREAS section 10 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* provides that the City may provide any service or thing that the City considers necessary or desirable for the public, and may pass by-laws respecting same, and respecting economic, social and environmental well-being of the City, and the health, safety and well-being of persons;

AND WHEREAS The Corporation of the City of London is a service manager under the *Housing Services Act, 2011*;

AND WHEREAS section 13 of the *Housing Services Act, 2011* provides that service managers may establish, administer and fund housing and homelessness programs and services and may provide housing directly;

AND WHEREAS subsection 5(3) of the *Municipal Act, 2001* provides that a municipal power shall be exercised by by-law;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. The Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, or written designate, is authorized to approve the Municipal Purchase of Service Agreements between The Corporation of the City of London and each hub provider for the purchase of services to provide and operate three hubs.
2. The Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, or written designate, is hereby delegated authority to execute a Municipal Purchase of Service Agreements with each hub provider.
3. This by-law comes into effect on the day it is passed subject to the provisions of PART VI.1 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*.

PASSED in Open Council on October 5, 2023 subject to the provisions of PART VI.1 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*.

Josh Morgan  
Mayor

Michael Schulthess  
City Clerk

First Reading – October 5, 2023  
Second Reading – October 5, 2023  
Third Reading – October 5, 2023