



Mayor and Members of Council,

Firstly, we would like to thank the many community supporters of our proposal for the Intergenerational Community Centre at Lorne Ave School.



Our video has received over 100K views.

The recent post of the video 2-weeks ago received 365 likes and 291 shares.

The cost to distribute this post on Facebook through London was under \$650.

It was very effective at engaging the community in a discussion on the issue and answer any questions that citizens had.

In keeping with Tanya Park's suggestion at CSC that other avenues for advertising the re-use opportunities for buildings should be considered, we highly recommend Facebook promoted posts over print-based publications, or explore a combination.

The prevalent theme was that the vast majority of community members interacting with the post were in support. There were some very vocal individuals clearly opposed, who claimed, without basis, that our costs were inaccurate. Some opposed claim they would prefer a park. Our proposal does include a neighbourhood park, as a park was always the plan on 40% of the site.

We had very strong support for the saving of \$3M taxpayer dollars and for the provision of the services offered at the proposed Intergenerational Community Centre. We did not see any clear opposition to an Intergenerational Community Centre, only clear support. We did see people assuming we could not pay for this, without any basis for that claim. We did see people supporting very vocally that they wanted a park, and that they wanted an Intergenerational Community Centre. This support for an Intergenerational



Community Centre at Lorne Ave School came from all over the City of London, not just the Old East Village.

Responding to the only clear opposition, which appears to be cost-based, we are very uncertain as to how the cost went from \$800K in 2012 to separate the Lorne Ave School into two self-contained halves, to the suggested \$13M dollar renewal costs figure to use the building as-is. Given that the TVDSB estimated replacement cost of the building is \$10M, we are at a loss where this \$13M comes from, and have not to this date seen any justification as to how that \$13M number was arrived at, however, we have provided justification to our numbers of \$300K-\$500K, over a period of time, based on the actual operation of a similar facility for a similar purpose as we propose.

As provided in the February 21, 2017 Staff Report to Corporate Services Committee:

Life Cycle Renewal Costs

The Lorne Avenue Public School building is a purpose built institutional facility constructed in 1970. It comprises approximately 80,000 square feet of structure in three levels. According to information provided from the Thames Valley District School Board, the estimate costs for life cycle renewal of the building are in the order of \$13 million. Although the renewal items would be prioritized over a period of years, there is an expectation that significant capital will be required to maintain the building and reduce its depreciation in order to preserve the economic life of the asset.

For a period of an 8-month delay in the Staff Report, this is a vague amount of detail, and it does not address how the costs to use as-is are now over 13x higher than the 2012 cost to do extensive separation work into two portions of the building.

We are a for-profit social enterprise, and are prepared to consider the development of a separate, not-for-profit structured organization to operate the proposed Lorne Ave facility, if necessary. As the City of London initially sought business partners, and for-profit organizations to lease the site, then decided to sell the site, the for-profit/not-for-profit status of a prospective buyer should not weigh into the decision making process. This is the sale of an asset declared to be surplus to municipal needs, and it should be treated accordingly, as a sale of an asset.

The use we have proposed is certainly compatible with a neighbourhood park, and the more than \$3M in savings to sell the building rather than to demolish it will go a long way to create a park that the neighbourhood can City of London can be proud of!

Sincerely,
William Komer