



Lorne Ave Proposal Update  
Friday, February 17, 2017

It has been over a year now that we have engaged in discussions with the City of London regarding our viable proposal to adaptively re-use the Lorne Ave Public School into an Intergenerational Community Centre. We proposed the best-case scenario for the community based on available information and social, economic and political landscape a year ago. Since that landscape has now changed, a new, revised solution is being proposed, thus any report on our proposal thus far is irrelevant.

We wish to confirm that our proposal is backed financially by an “accredited investor”. We do not require an investor to make this happen, but it should be great assurance to the City of London that one is in place, pending of course a satisfactory agreement between Campus Creative and the City of London with respect to Lorne Ave School.

“accredited investor” as defined under National Instrument 45 – 106, which requirements are:

- An individual who, either alone or with a spouse, beneficially owns, directly or indirectly, financial assets having an aggregate realizable value that before taxes but net of any related liabilities exceeds \$1,000,000;
- An individual whose net income before taxes exceeded \$200,000 in each of the two most recent calendar years or whose net income before taxes combined with that of a spouse exceeded \$300,000 in each of the two most recent calendar years and who, in either case, reasonably expects to exceed that net income level in the current calendar year;
- An individual who, either alone or with a spouse, has net assets of at least \$5,000,000; or
- A person that is recognized or designated by the Ontario Securities Commissions as an accredited investor.

Given that the Staff Report suggests only \$50,000 as the 6-month cost for security and utilities for the vacant building to be secured until demolition can be decided, it should be clear that Campus Creative has demonstrated the means to maintain this property, even if the minimum criteria of an accredited investor are considered. In this case, this particular accredited investor far exceeds the minimum and is verified to be in an extremely sound financial position capable of purchasing the building outright in cash and carrying it empty, if need be. That will not be necessary as we have already lined up anchor tenants and members from the local community.

We will not be assuming that the \$50,000 6-month carrying-cost figure is correct, however, since there are inaccurate numbers in the Staff Report. A claim was made for over \$800K in development charges for our proposed use, however, we have confirmed directly with Zong/Permits that when that number was arrived at, under much frustration to staff tasked to



come up with the number, it was arrived at without being provided with a copy of our proposal, containing the necessary floor plan required to assess development charges (hence the frustration in coming up with the number, not knowing the scenario). We were informed that development charges could be as low as \$0 based on our proposed use, depending on the specific details of how exactly it was structured and the chosen floor plan configuration. Thus the Staff Report grossly inflates the costs associated with our proposal. The report also makes reference to over \$13M in required building improvements, as provided by the School Board. The number is actually under \$10M (\$3M is a big difference) and even then, these costs are related to the school board's plans for schools, not our plans for the facility. Based on our current operations in the re-purposed St. Peter's Choir School building, which we invite any interested party to visit at our weekly Sunday open-house from 1:00pm until 3:00pm to see for themselves, this \$10M number is off-base with any of the costs we would have to incur. The only costs incurred at St. Peter's Choir School were negligible fire-code upgrades, and roof repair. Negligible in terms of the \$10M, as these were just over \$100K in total from our understanding. We rent at St. Peter's Choir School, so we did not bear these costs, however, the staff have been very supportive of our efforts to re-purpose schools into community centres, and have helped us understand the costs involved with such, including utilities carrying costs, which are also negligible compared to the size of the infrastructure, especially heating costs, which are usually very efficient. I would be shocked if we "had to" spend more than \$300K at Lorne Ave to meet the code requirements for our proposed use over the next several years. I will save an exact estimate until such time as we have obtained the requested information on the condition the building would be received in from the City of London, as the building has deteriorated since we first engaged in discussions, due to the delay in reviewing the proposal.

On June 23, 2016, the Corporate Services Committee directed staff to provide an update on the Lorne Ave RFP Process. After this report was provided, the Corporate Services Committee would determine if/when to grant a delegation from Campus Creative.

"I hereby certify that the Municipal Council, at its meeting held on June 23, 2016 resolved: That consideration of the request for delegation status by William Komer, Executive Director, Campus Creative, with respect to use of Lorne Avenue Public School BE DEFERRED until such time as staff provide an update on the Lorne Avenue Public School Request for Proposal process, in order to assist the Corporate Services Committee in determining when/if to grant the delegation request. (5/15/CSC)" - C. Saunders - City Clerk

The information available in the report released February 15, 2017, nearly 8-months later, at least publically, contains little, if any, information that was not already readily available, or easily obtainable, back in June 23, 2016. As we were informed through updates with the City of London staff, we were the only proposal on the table on June 23, 2016, the only new critical piece of information is that a second, in this case behind closed doors, proposal was presented, at some point between our last contact with City Staff and now. We would like to encourage the best use of the property, and welcome competitive options to the community, and wish to encourage the City of London to only accept proposals for review that are subject to community



critique, in keeping with the RFP process, which process was unfortunately flawed due to officially induced error in the direction provided to Campus Creative, resulting in missing the revised deadline by 8-minutes due to misleading/conflicting information provided by city staff on the revised due date.

We wish that a report be provided to the Corporate Services Committee and made publically available as to the exact circumstances that lead to this deadline being moved 1-day early for a holiday rather than a day later, as is the established norm for changing a deadline. This breach of accepted fair procedural custom combined with misleading/conflicting information provided by city staff on the revised due date to Campus Creative resulted in William Komer who arrived on time at City Hall (the wrong place, right time) to submit his proposal 8-minutes “late” at the purchasing and Procurement Office (an off-site, lesser-known location elsewhere downtown).

We ask that Civic Administration be directed to negotiate with Campus Creative on a current proposal for the building as relevant to the current social, political and economic landscape.

Sincerely,  
William Komer  
Executive Director  
Campus Creative  
1-800-272-3002 ext. 700  
[creative@campuscreative.ca](mailto:creative@campuscreative.ca)



February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017

To Whom it May Concern

Re: Campus Creative – Lorne Ave School Project  
London Ontario

This letter is an enthusiastic endorsement of the efforts of Campus Creative to establish Lorne Ave School as an intergenerational community centre.

Over the past 10 years, I have led 3 different research projects in London to identify and study the needs and interests of seniors in our community. My own interest was peaked by economist/demographer David Foot from the University of Toronto when he noted the aging population is a key factor for municipal planning. In fact, he suggested under-utilized provincial and municipal assets should be turned into Seniors Centres. We know our existing Seniors Centres here in London are bursting at the seams. We know the aging population will be a major factor for healthcare, community and social services for the next 30 years.

In 2009, I was the co-chair of the original Age Friendly Working Group that obtained the Age Friendly designation from the World Health Organization for London – the first city in Canada to obtain the designation. I have participated with many Age Friendly Working groups over the past 5 years. In 2015, I received the London Adult Educator Award from the London Council for Adult Education for launching participatory arts programs for older adults. In 2016 I was awarded the Ontario Senior Achievement Award from the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario for my role in promoting lifelong learning and creative aging programs for seniors. This is the highest provincial recognition for seniors in Ontario.

I am the co-producer of a London Rogers TV program called Making the Most of Your Retirement. We are currently producing more segments and the show is

scheduled to run another year. I' m an active advocate/member of CARP Chapter 8 and have served on the Board of Directors.

Our volunteers and trained facilitators have planned and organized innovative Creative Aging Programs through the London Public Library system for the past 4 years. Our courses are popular and growing. They are fully supported by the Library management and staff. The London Public Library has started a designated category for Creative Aging programs because they see the rapid growth in the programs. I should point out that most of our programs, events and activities have taken place without government funding and we are currently pursuing a social enterprise organizational model to continue to financially support new and innovative programs for seniors in our community.

Just recently, we assisted the London Arts Council to obtain funding from the Ontario Seniors Secretariat and Westminster College Foundation to train 10 professional artist-educators to work with older adults in the community. The pilot projects are coming to an end and we developing a plan to identify and sustain sponsorships and fee for service revenues to continue the program.

However, we have many older adults in our network who prefer to participate in intergenerational programs and this is becoming a noted trend. At our 2015 ArtSage Symposium held at Museum London, Dr. Rachel Heydon from Western University presented her initial project objectives for a 5 year study to explore how tech brings younger and older learners together.  
<http://news.westernu.ca/2016/04/professor-explores-how-tech-brings-young-old-together>.

The interest of some of our key volunteer leaders is to explore and promote intergenerational housing, learning and recreation. The London Creative Age Network is a proud community partner and collaborator with Campus Creative. The Executive Director, William Komer has high regard for our senior volunteers and members and treats us with great respect. We would be proud to work with Campus Creative to establish this exciting concept for an intergenerational community centre.

Very best regards  
Kathy Smith, London Creative Age Network.