

--	--

D. Menard:

TO:	CHAIR AND MEMBERS PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
FROM:	JOHN M. FLEMING MANAGING DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER
SUBJECT:	FUGITIVE SLAVE CHAPEL UPDATE MEETING ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2013

RECOMMENDATION

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the heritage planner, the following report **BE RECEIVED**.

PREVIOUS REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER
--

2013, November 7: Planning and Environment Committee –Added agenda Item re **275 Thames Street**

2013, September 24: Report to PEC – **Notice of Intent to Designate 275 Thames Street**

2013, June 18: Report to PEC - **275, 277 & 281 Thames Street Status Update**

2013, April 23: Report to PEC - **Demolition Requests-275, 277 & 281 Thames Street**

BACKGROUND

Previous reports have identified the cultural heritage significance of the former slave chapel which once occupied the building at 275 Thames Street. This recognition was given added importance following the request for a demolition permit for the building and its neighbours to the north. With the owner’s consent in April, 2013 the request for demolition has been deferred pending the successful removal of the building to a new location at 432 Grey Street, adjacent to the Beth Emanuel Church, on property owned by the Beth Emanuel Church.

Since April, with Council’s financial assistance in addition to volunteer efforts, much of the archaeological site work has been carried out although more remains to be done once buildings have been removed. As well, Council has authorized the rezoning of 432 Grey Street to allow for future re-use of the chapel with respect to the program activities of Beth Emanuel. Council had also provided direction to identify a source of funding for the interpretation of the site at 275 Thames and the area around it with respect to its cultural heritage significance.

Fundraising initiatives were launched by the Fugitive Slave Chapel Coordinating Committee to raise monies to pay for the removal of the building and its establishment on a new site. Although some funds have been raised, the total was not sufficient to allow for the removal of the building to 432 Grey Street. In September, 2013, a report from the staff noted concerns about the status of the building and recommended its designation on its existing site as a means of clearly expressing the City’s view that the building remains a significant heritage asset. That designation came into force following the completion of the 30 day period for objections, November 18, 2013. Subsequently, the situation of the building and its removal was brought before the Planning and Environment committee at its meeting on November 7, 2013 by Councillor Usher. PEC made several recommendations for consideration by Council at its meeting on November 19.

Agenda Item #	Page #

D. Menard:

Update with respect to the PEC November 7 recommendations to Council

1. With the building now designated under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, its removal to Grey Street will necessitate securing the approval to move by gaining Council approval of a heritage alteration application to relocate the building. The LACH has discussed this at its November 13 meeting but, as no application was yet before the LACH, no specific recommendation was made at that meeting with the understanding that the matter would likely come before its meeting in December, 2013.

In the discussion at the LACH meeting in November, 2013, some arguments were expressed that, notwithstanding the previous Council recommendation to relocate the building, it would be more fitting to retain the building at its present location on Thames Street for both historical and contextual reasons.

2. Council directed staff to work with the community and with the municipal Facilities Services staff to establish an accurate cost for the Fugitive Slave Chapel Preservation Project to transfer the Chapel to 432 Grey Street, to place the building on a full basement foundation, to secure the building with an adequate roof, doors and windows, to equip it with basement stairs, heating, plumbing and electrical service, so that the building is adaptable for any future additions, as may be planned at some future date by the Church.

The Fugitive Slave Chapel Preservation Project has raised, as of November 21, approximately \$43,500 from information provided by co-Chair George McNeish.

Facilities Services has provided the following estimates for the various costs identified above based in part on architectural drawings prepared for the FSCCC (note these drawings were under revision at the time of preparation of this report)

Estimated costs of moving the main building

Designated Substance Survey	
Selected Demolition	\$2,000.
Site Services	\$5,000.
<u>Grey Street</u>	
Site Services –including excavation, footings, foundation walls -	\$49,700.
Foundation& Basement -jack posts, wood stairs, beams	
ceiling and floor insulation,	\$13,250
Door and window units, door operator, ramp,	\$12,500.
Drywall, ceilings, walls	\$7,000.
Paint Interior walls and ceilings	\$3,750.
Paint, Exterior Siding, door and window units	\$1,850.
Refinish Wood floor	\$4,000.
Replace Roof	\$4,500.
Exterior Siding Repairs	\$1,500.
HVAC	\$10,000.
Lighting and electrical	\$5,000.
Site restoration	\$3,000.
Sub-Total	\$123,050.
Miscellaneous (3% of \$123,050)	\$3,690.
Contingency (10% of \$123,050 + \$3,690)	\$12,675.
General Conditions (12% of 123050 +3690 +\$12,675)	\$16,730.
Total	\$156,145.

Agenda Item #	Page #

D. Menard:

Notes:

1. In some cases amounts are estimated as allowances.
2. Costs to relocate the building were not identified by Facilities Services.
3. Plumbing requirements are not included as they had not been included in the first set of drawings provided. Site Service allowance will include a water supply to the basement.
4. Budget assumes soil conditions are adequate for the work.

The project manager for the Fugitive Slave Chapel Project Committee has commented on the estimates above saying that they are in-line with his estimate where he had advised his committee members that including the move, he thought that the relocation would cost about \$160,000. However, he cautioned that this was a preliminary estimate that would require a full set of drawings for greater accuracy.

At the time of the preparation of this report, the drawings for the new foundation are near completion and will be used for building permit application when ready.

Council further directed that staff should explore opportunities for in-kind contributions from the development, home building and construction industries that might assist the Church with excavating and constructing the basement foundation, relocating the Chapel and improving the building as described in #2 above.

At this time, there may be in-kind contributions with respect to donations of concrete and formwork which, with in-house labour, might reduce the estimated foundation costs by a substantial amount, possibly in the range of 80%.

3. Council Request

At its meeting of November 12, 2013, Council resolved that:

Council requested a report back prior to the end of December, 2013 to identify the funding gap, if any, between what has been raised by the community by way of financial and in-kind contributions and the identified costs for constructing the basement foundation, relocating the Chapel and improving the building so that if there is a funding grant, the Municipal Council can give consideration to:

- i) Providing a grant to Beth Emanuel Church to address the funding shortfall in order to protect this important heritage asset;*
- ii) Receiving civic Administration's advice as to what conditions should be tied to the grant including, but not limited to, the requirement that further improvements to the interior and exterior would have to be in keeping with good heritage stewardship; and*
- iii) Identifying a potential source of financing for the grant.*

Moving costs have not been finalized but an earlier projection was in the range of \$11,000-\$12,000.

The Fugitive Slave Chapel Committee is continuing its fundraising efforts and is working toward a major fundraising event in February, 2014.

The potential "funding gap" with respect to the relocation of the building from Thames Street to Grey Street would seem to be roughly \$115,000 - \$125,000 in the absence of any further in-kind donations of materials or labour or reductions in anticipated expenses related to permits fees, etc. However, it is hoped that there will be more in-kind contributions.

Given that Staff have only recently been able to determine the potential costs associated with relocating the Chapel, there has not been discussion with Finance staff regarding potential

Agenda Item #	Page #

D. Menard:

municipal contributions to address the projected funding gap, and the following recommendations will require further consultation with Finance.

- i) Council may choose to provide a grant towards this amount, in part or in total. It should be noted that the Council grant would be aimed only toward the relocation and stabilization of the Chapel on its new site. There will still be extensive additional costs to be dealt with as the congregation moves forward with respect to its vision.
- ii) A heritage alteration application should be submitted for consideration now that the building is designated under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. The LACH would need to be consulted with respect to any application. This would also be true in the future if and when the congregation is able to move forward towards its larger goal.
- iii) A potential source of funding for the grant would need to be identified, in consultation with Finance.

It should be noted that there may be opportunities to provide onetime funding for this specific project, however, any funding that would require an on-going commitment would require consideration through the budget approval process. Such an on-going commitment is not currently identified in the 2014 budget deliberations.

CONCLUSION

While the actual funding gap may be reduced by continued community contributions, it is possible that there will not be sufficient funds raised to cover the full costs of relating to the relocation of the Chapel. While there is a very strong community desire that the Chapel be relocated, it has been designated *in situ*, and while there would be costs associated with ensuring that the structure was rehabilitated to minimize further deterioration, these costs could be significantly lower than the costs associated with relocation. The structure is currently privately owned, and, if left *in situ*, there may not be as many opportunities for community use and/or ownership of the building.

PREPARED BY:	SUBMITTED BY:
D. MENARD HERITAGE PLANNER POLICY PLANNING AND PROGRAMS	GREGG BARRETT, AICP MANAGER, POLICY PLANNING AND PROGRAMS
RECOMMENDED BY:	
JOHN M. FLEMING, MCIP, RPP MANAGING DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER	

December 9, 2013

DM/GB/

Y:\Shared\policy\HERITAGE\Heritage Alteration Reports\275 Thames Street\Update Report to PEC December 10 2013.docx