

## Architectural Conservancy Ontario - London Region

c/o Grosvenor Lodge 1017 Western Road London, ON N6G 1G5

Councillor Elizabeth Peloza Chair, Civic Works Committee City of London 300 Dufferin Ave. London, ON N6B 1Z2 Sent via email October 1, 2021

## RE: Public Delegation Meeting Request on 100 Stanley St.

Dear Councillors Peloza, Cassidy, Turner, Helmer, and Van Meerbergen

The Board of the Architectural Conservancy Ontario, London Branch (ACO-L) would like to request a Public Delegation meeting with the Civic Works Committee for the October 13th meeting. The City Council's sudden reversal of its decision to move 100 Stanley Street in favour of demolition shocked the heritage community. The property's heritage value as a unique example of Queen Anne construction has been detailed and recognized throughout all the Wharncliffe South Improvement planning, and the sudden shift to a demolition requires more public examination and discussion.

Through both the Unterman McPhail study and the project's Environmental Assessment, the property is recognized within the City of London Inventory of Heritage Resources as a Designated Priority 1 under Part IV of the OHA. In Appendix A of the Environmental Assessment its relocation inclusion is a key part of the Wharncliffe Road South Improvement Project. There was never any question that the heritage property would not be retained through any of the planning documents from 2016 until the sudden staff recommendation for demolition in March 2021.

ACO-L and the public would like to better understand how a well-documented public plan to save an important cultural property -- through a relocation approved directly by the Ontario Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks through a Part 11 Order Request (attached) and endorsed by LACH - was suddenly overturned in favour of demolition with no previous public discussion. Demolition was never an option in any of the formal documentation. In addition, there was no detailed cost analysis presented for this recommendation and no regard for the important status of the building in the reversal report. All the public documentation details how the property was to be retained due to its unique features and historical status, and not whether it was important to save only if it was inhabited by the past owner- a publicity red herring problem, but not a valid reason to demolish.

The important value of the heritage property lies in the heritage property itself; the expropriation settlement with the owner does not affect the property's very important heritage status. This puts the City in the conflicting position of buying an important heritage home only to demolish it, against all the other values contained in the London Plan and past Strategic Plan goals that should be guidelines for such a decision.

The need to move the building was decided for two reasons, as far as ACO-L can determine from the Minister's decision: the use of the crane might endanger the building's integrity, and the site is needed for a major utilities upgrade to the area. How did the City move from relocation to demolition under the Ministerial conditions?

ACO-L questions the validity of the estimated 'new' cost of \$900,000 to \$1,100,000 to relocate 100 Stanley. The accounting for any extra new costs were never detailed or tabled in any of the reports. Therefore ACO-L undertook its own research into moving costs and contacted two of the most well-known and reputable heritage building movers. It is our understanding that none of the usual heritage building movers were asked to quote on this move, which concerns us as well. The Laurie McCulloch Building Moving Company quote is attached. Both quotes ACO-L received were inclusive of all project costs and are well within the original Wharncliffe South budget allocated for moving the heritage home across the street. Both quotes came in under \$400,000 for the full move.

Even with some incremental additions, such as an engineer overseeing a moving company and minor repairs, the cost for moving the structure across the street is a straight-forward and very short move, and the impact on the building and any traffic issues would be small. How costs could be double what the ACO received as quotes needs further investigation and discussion, and a chance for the public to examine how the City calculated these "ballooned" costs that will cost the public an unreplaceable heritage resource.

The original full costing in the Wharncliffe South budget must have included the basic cost of relocation and a very healthy budget for the accommodation, storage and moving costs of the owner's effects. The City's settlement with the owner might have been higher than expected than the original 2017 budget included, but the extra budget for effects would have covered a large piece of the overall moving budget. Londoners understand the nature of construction cost inflation, yet, even with the settlement, there must still be room in the budget for saving this important property and recouping a large part of the moving cost through resale.

We would like to present our arguments in more detail, and have the Civic Works consider these questions about the sudden doubling of the moving budget and the move to demolish - rather than save - this very important heritage property. Given that retaining the original plan for 100 Stanley Street relocation should still be within the Wharncliffe South Improvement budget; that the stated public goal was always to retain this significant part of our Heritage Resources; and, given that there is a every possibility to re-coup a large part of the moving costs through resale, the ACO-L believes that there needs to be more investigation and discussion of the demolition recommendation.

Thank you for your time and attention, we hope our request for a Public Delegation affords us the opportunity to discuss these matters in more detail.

Joseph O'Neill, Brenda McQuaid

Vice President, ACO London Board Member, ACO London

Cc: Ms. Audrey Pascual, Secretary, Civic Works Committee, sent via email