

**Council Meeting Number 26-2021  
Addendum Number 2  
Tuesday, November 16, 2021**

**Reports**

**Report Number 100: Received from the Chief Administrative Officer (Recommend)**

**2. 2022 Annual Amendment to Fees and Charges By-Law 2005-10**

The consent of Council is requested to delete page 61 of Schedule "A" to Clause 2 of Report number 21-278 with respect to the 2022 Annual Amendment to Fees and Charges By-Law 2005-10, and insert a new page 61 thereto.

(Revised Page 61 Schedule A to Report Number 21-278 is attached to Addendum Number 2 as schedule page 1)

**Communications**

The consent of Council is requested for the **addition** of Communications Number 26-1007.

26-1007 Correspondence received from Mike Ash with respect to sleeping cabins at Portsmouth Olympic Harbour.

(Distributed to all members of Council on November 16, 2021)

(Attached to Addendum Number 2 as schedule pages 2-3)

<b>Licensing</b>		<b>2022 Fees</b>	
<b>Business Licenses</b> continued		<b>Flat Fee (\$)</b>	<b>HST</b>
Specific Location Sale: Class 3 per year		\$9,840.00	No
Street Performer		\$41.00	No
Theatre (per theatre)		\$315.00	No
Tobacco Sales		\$310.00	No
<b>Plumbing Contractors &amp; Masters</b>		<b>Flat Fee (\$)</b>	<b>HST</b>
Contractor - Resident		\$306.00	No
Contractor - Non Resident		\$377.00	No
Master Plumber - Resident		\$151.00	No
Master Plumber - Non Resident		\$184.00	No
<b>Refreshment Vehicles in Parks</b>		<b>Hourly</b>	<b>HST</b>
Class A/B - Approved Parks (1 month)		\$404.69	Yes
Class A/B - Approved Parks (12 months)		\$3,885.09	Yes
Class C/D - Confederation Park (12 months)		\$3,885.09	Yes
Class C/D - Other Approved Parks (1 month)		\$201.68	Yes
Class C/D - Other Approved Parks (12 months)		\$1,936.06	Yes
Class E - Approved Parks (per day)		\$134.91	Yes
Non vehicle - Self contained food and beverage		\$4,856.33	Yes
<b>Administrative Monetary Penalties</b>		<b>Flat Fee (\$)</b>	<b>HST</b>
Screening officer appeal fee		\$50.00	No
Hearing officer appeal fee		\$200.00	No

Tiny Home Haven or Tin Can Hovel?

Hello,

Apologies for using the book group address to pass this along, but I did want to share my concerns about the Harbour initiative that Council will be discussed tonight. I'm sending this to you as I'm not in Kingston to attend the meeting tonight and I'd like to pass along a little info to support anyone that wants to attend tonight and have their voice heard. I am dismayed to hear the plans for using 'tiny homes' at Olympic Harbour. The plan laid out by *Our Living Solutions* is not research-based, is misleading, and unfounded.

Several claims made by Chrystal Wilson are demonstrably false, including her perspective that the 'Housing First' initiative does not work and that her group is following 'best practices' based on other tiny home placements.

There is an abundance of research showing the long-term success of Housing First, including the Aubrey research in Moncton and the St. Michael's Hospital research in Toronto, as well as research conducted in New York, Vancouver, and Winnipeg. The Housing First approach successfully reduces homelessness on a long-term basis by providing housing and social supports that provide a safe, private living area that is humane and long-term viable. I am troubled as to how Ms. Wilson does not feel that Housing First is a fruitful initiative, but placing individuals in tin cans is a better solution. I would encourage the Kingston City Council to reach out to the experts at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health hospital in Toronto, to get a better understanding of how and why Housing First works and why the current plan for Olympic Harbour is not set up for success.

*Our Living Solutions* is claiming that they are following best practices out of Waterloo, Austin and elsewhere. The reality is best practices have not yet been demonstrated. Both Waterloo and Austin are new sites and there is not enough evidence to identify best practices. Further, both sites are vastly different in their setup and just copying their model is not as simple as *Our Living Solutions* is making it out to be.

The direction the Olympic Harbour initiative is taking is closer to the Waterloo model, which has already received negative media attention due to tensions with community members, and increased incidents of crime, noise, loitering and polluting of the area. The Austin site is a

much larger site with significant supports, such as healthcare services, a market, garden, theatre, woodworking site, transportation and other on-site resources and services. That being said, the Olympic Harbour site is not set up to provide these services, which is especially important for this vulnerable population. The current plan is rushed and ill conceived.

A housing initiative that places homeless people in a 12 x 8 tin can is not appropriate support. Even prison cells have running water and toilets. Placing individuals in tin can hovels in a dark back corner of a windy winter harbour is inhumane and unethical.

Rehousing success requires a multifaceted approach that includes supports to mental and medical health, addiction counselling, life skill assistance and employment pathways. It also requires community buy-in and to date, there has been zero consultation with local community members. The current approach is not research-based and it is not expert-led, it's just a band aid on a bullet hole. The worst part is, rushing into this kind of human social experiment without proper planning and preparation will lead to unnecessary problems and erodes support for future projects of a similar nature.

Regards,

Mike Ash (Portsmouth Village Resident)

**CITY COUNCIL  
MEETING OF:**

November 16, 2021

**COMMUNICATION**

**No: 26-1007**