

## Questions from Town Hall - June 10th

This document summarizes the questions we received from the two Town Hall Sessions on June 10. Answers are provided under each question.

### Housing

#### **What are the rental rates for the affordable units and who will these units be offered to? What guarantees will there be that these units will remain affordable?**

Rents for the affordable units will be per the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) requirements for 79% of Median Market Rent (MMR), which in 2020 was as follows:

- \$474 for a bachelor;
- \$790 for a 1-bedroom unit;
- \$924 for a 2-bedroom unit; and
- \$987 for a 3-bedroom unit.

We will work with Hamilton Housing and local affordable housing providers to create opportunities for deeper affordability.

Our aim is to increase the opportunity for individuals, including Indigenous Peoples, Black people, People of Colour, seniors, women, and members of the LGBTQ2S+ community to access safe, healthy, and adequate homes. We will work with Hamilton Housing to identify the most appropriate populations for this site through the development process.

Redevelopment of this site to deliver affordable housing is an important part of how New Vision United Church sees their mission on the site, along with their continued presence on the site. UPRC's mandate and financial funding is based on the commitment to develop 5,000 new affordable units over the next 15 years.

#### **Who will manage the rental units? Who will maintain the site?**

UPRC will partner with a professional property management company and a local affordable housing provider. UPRC and New Vision United Church will remain actively engaged in the project over the long-term as community builders. New Vision United Church will retain a presence on the site as they have for over 100 years.

#### **What is the proposed unit mix? How many bedrooms are proposed?**

The proposal will include a range of units from studios to three bedroom units (roughly 140-200 bedrooms). The exact unit mix will be finalized as the development vision is refined, ensuring the needs of the community are incorporated.

### **Has UPRC considered collaborating with other developers in Hamilton to deliver both heritage retention and affordable housing?**

Based on our feasibility assessment, other developers would still need to make a similar capital investment to ensure the building is structurally safe to adaptively reuse the building for housing or other community uses. Based on our financial model, the site cannot be redeveloped to save the existing building while providing the same number of affordable units, suite mix and level of affordability.

### **Has UPRC considered utilizing any of the other unused, vacant sites in the city for affordable housing? Why does this project have to be built on this site?**

New Vision United Church believes that they are called to this site as part of their mission, it has been their home for over 100 years. The congregation wants to see this site generate life and activity again. Redevelopment of the site to deliver affordable housing and community amenities is knit into the creation of the mission of New Vision United Church and will allow them to be a part of this site and community for another 100 years.

## **Costs & Funding**

### **What is the estimated cost of demolition of the church?**

We have multiple third-party estimates that it would cost somewhere between \$500,000-700,000 for both the demolition and the abatement. This would include the salvage of architectural items for reuse.

### **How much will it cost to stabilize, restore and adaptively reuse the church? Who undertook this assessment? Have funding sources been explored to help in the restoration/adaptive reuse of the church?**

Order of magnitude costs analysis estimates a cost somewhere in between \$13-14 million for full stabilization, heritage restoration and adaptive reuse. This estimate is inclusive of full project costs – construction (Hard costs), planning, design and approvals (Soft Costs). This assessment was undertaken by ERA Architects, a firm specializing in architecture, heritage conservation, and adaptive reuse, and KPMB Architects, with data provided by MTE Consultants who undertook the structural assessment and designated substance audit.

There are a number of grant opportunities such as the Heritage Hamilton Property Grant Program, Hamilton Community Fund Loan Program, and Commercial Property Improvement Grant Program. Unfortunately, none of the grants provide nearly enough funding to restore the church and allow for the delivery of affordable housing options. The majority of the available grants also require matching funding.

### **Will the City of Hamilton be providing a monetary contribution to this project?**

In the past, the City has worked with developers who are looking to make a portion of their units affordable through incentives. Since no formal application has been submitted yet, there has not been a formal conversation surrounding the topic of monetary contributions from the City for this site.

**How much is required to be able to deliver both heritage restoration & delivery of affordable housing in a project that is in scale with the surrounding community?**

Based on our financial feasibility assessment, the site cannot be redeveloped to save the existing building while providing the same number of affordable units, unit mix, level of affordability and keeping the development at a neighbourhood-scale.

Based on the structural studies conducted, we have estimated the costs to be somewhere between the range of \$8-9 million for heritage restoration. The adaptive reuse costs are a little more challenging to determine without a specific program in place (which would involve mechanical work, new heating and cooling, building of the residential units for example). However, it is estimated to be around \$3-4 million. In total, it would be about \$13 million for the full adaptive reuse of the church.

In order to offset the substantial heritage restoration cost, the resulting redevelopment would have to consist of a large residential tower at the rear of the property to achieve the same number of units. These units would need to be sold as condominium units with the sale profits going back to the restoration of the structure. In addition, the ongoing heritage maintenance and general upkeep work on 24 Main St W would also be impacted by this approach. Preservation of 24 Main St W also ensures the continuation and enhancement of cultural programming.

**Which programs and improvements to 24 Main St W will be funded from the proceeds from the St Giles site? Why can't New Vision use other funding sources (i.e., government grants, endowments, etc.) instead of relying on redeveloping St Giles?**

The revenue anticipated to be generated from the St Giles site is modest and would be used to contribute to the overall ecosystem that is New Vision. The New Vision Music Hall does have a fundraising campaign, as grant and cultural funding often require matching funding. We recognize the costs and complexity of adaptive reuse and what that takes, so please visit the Music Hall website (<https://dowellbyhamilton.ca/>) to understand more about the adaptive reuse of the 24 Main St W building.

**Can the site be subdivided to sell off the portion with St Giles Church on it and use the revenue to fund the redevelopment of the vacant lot behind the church?**

This has been looked into, however, it has been determined that this not a viable option as it would limit the potential of the back site.

**Amenities**

**Can community space be incorporated into the existing church building?**

The existing church building needs significant capital investment to ensure it is safe for community use and significant investments will be required to rehabilitate it. If adaptive reuse is to be explored and fully funded through development of site, the only feasible option is study #3 with the strata tower.

**Will parking be provided underground for all the studies? How much will be provided and will it be for residents and visitors?**

The number of parking spaces provided will depend on the study. However, the goal is to have sufficient parking to accommodate the tenants on site. Spaces will be provided for residents and visitors.

## Heritage

**Can any component of the church be preserved? What will happen to the stained glass windows? Can any part of the building be incorporated into the design of the site?**

Audits have already taken place within the space for cultural assets, in terms of commemoration opportunities involving artifacts and items like stained glass windows. This is something that would be carefully looked at, especially if study #1 is pursued.

A study has been conducted that included facade retention, however, it significantly impacts the financial viability. Retaining the front facade is incredibly capital intensive, given this is where a significant amount of the structural stabilization work is required, to the point where it becomes financially impossible to pursue.

**Does New Vision have a commitment to heritage preservation? Would New Vision's plans for the preservation of 24 Main St W not be better served by getting rid of the building that is surplus to the needs of the congregation?**

We are also proposing to use a portion of the operating revenue from the rental housing developed on the Holton site to aid in the restoration and rehabilitation of the historic 24 Main St W building. Preservation of 24 Main St W also ensures the continuation and enhancement of cultural programming.

New Vision United Church believes that they have been called to this site, as it has been their home for over 100 years. Although the church building is currently in limited use, they want to see this site generate life and activity again. Redevelopment of the site to deliver affordable housing and community amenities is knit into the creation of the New Vision congregation and will allow them to be a part of this site and community for another 100 years.

## Studies & Architectural Design

**How will the project be designed to be family friendly?**

A large portion of the units will be two or three bedrooms and we are also considering including a playground on site for both the residents and larger community.

### **How big is the proposed park space in study #1? Can it be larger?**

Our goal is to create a space that would be big enough for a play structure and enough open space to encourage socialization within the community - approximately 1200-1500 sq ft.

### **Why can't affordable housing be included in study #3?**

Affordable housing could be incorporated into study #3; additional height/ density would be required to make it feasible.

### **What will the church be used for in studies #2 & #3? If the church is retained, who will be responsible for it in terms of maintenance and liability?**

In these studies, it has been left open as to what will happen with the church. In study #2 there are no changes to the church, this could happen at a later date. In study #3, the profits generated from the condominium sales would be invested into the restoration. The use of the space would be determined through community engagement. If the church is retained, UPRC and KPMB will be constantly monitoring it over a period of time.

### **How can you compare options in terms of cost and addressing community needs, when there is no proposed use for the church on the site?**

Study #2 only proposes to stabilize the shell building from an envelope and structural standpoint, it does not propose any work to restore the existing church as a functional space. Therefore it would not be suitable for any proposed future use unless substantial investment was made in rehabilitating, upgrading and restoring the base building (approx. cost of \$8-9 million, no funding source).

There is currently a significant funding gap for study #2 as the market rental does not generate sufficient income to support the same level of affordability. It is not possible to propose a use for the church unless a potential user with significant funds to restore and reuse the existing structure comes forward. Many potential uses that have been contemplated, such as a library, book store, gallery, market, etc, would not have the significant capital available for such an endeavour.

### **Does studies #2 & #3 meet zoning restrictions or will an Official Plan amendment be required?**

Studies #1 and #2 require a Zoning By-law Amendment as the property is currently zoned Neighbourhood Institutional (I1), reflective of its former use. Study #3 would require an Official Plan Amendment as significant height and density would be required on site to facilitate the restoration and adaptive reuse of the existing structure.

### **Can the orientation of the tower in study #3 be changed so that there is more room for public amenity space adjacent to the existing residential neighbourhood? How long a shadow will the tower in study #3 cast?**

Changing the orientation is a possibility. If we did rotate the tower then we would have more space for amenities, however, this might be less desirable for the people who reside along Proctor Boulevard.

We have not completed a shadow analysis for the tower, but we imagine it will cast a large shadow with the proposed building being approximately 25-storeys.

### **Why can't you move ahead with study #1?**

We want to work with the community and are trying to recognize the community's sentiment towards heritage conservation before proceeding with a preliminary concept for the site. In any scenario, it is our aim to use the Church lands toward social impact, while commemorating past uses of the site.

### **What do you consider to be "community scale"?**

We consider 2 to 3-storeys to be consistent with the surrounding low-density residential, with 6-storeys more appropriate along Main Street. The City has recognized the importance of Main Street by designating the site as a Primary Corridor in the Urban Structure of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. Urban Corridors support a range of higher densities and mid-rise forms, consistent with study #1, which proposes a 6-storey built form along Main Street with lower-scaled uses adjacent to existing low-density residential uses.

### **If the church building is preserved, could it be used to accommodate housing? What would the rental mix look like for the rental building proposed behind it?**

The existing church is not safe for use and significant investments will be required to rehabilitate it, making it cost prohibitive to deliver the much-needed affordable rental housing. Based on our financial feasibility assessment, the site cannot be redeveloped to keep the existing building while providing the same number of affordable units and level of affordability.

UPRC is focused on a mix of unit types to reflect the diversity of needs. We typically aim for larger units to help support families and different types of intergenerational living. It is important that we are working to support a variety of needs and not just focusing on one type.

### **How will the redevelopment of the site affect the community's utilities and services?**

This will also be answered further on in the planning process, when the initial technical stages are completed.

### **What influences the architectural design of the buildings? Will more detailed architectural renderings be made available?**

The architectural design is in preliminary stages of development primarily for the purposes of testing the site and soliciting feedback from the community. More detailed drawings and renderings will be made available to the public when a development application is submitted to the City of Hamilton. The design

aims to draw inspiration from the ultimate needs of the building occupants, the local climate (sun, wind etc) to optimize sustainability, to create community building spaces on the site and within the neighborhood context, and to develop a contemporary design that is durable in materiality and design expression.

### **Have you decided what will be built on site?**

The studies we have presented are as far as we have gotten in the process. The intent of the Town Halls is to hear from the community before we put forward a plan for the site to the City of Hamilton.

## **Environmental Impact/Concerns**

### **Will the demolition of the existing church building have any negative environmental impacts?**

We do not have details on the demolition process at this point. However, current regulations for demolition results in less going to landfills than in the past with the recycling and collection of materials. This will be encouraged to the greatest extent possible for this project.

### **Has any preliminary work been conducted to assess the environmental site conditions since the land is now intended to be used for residential?**

Analysis of site conditions and required environmental reports will be undertaken as part of the development process.

### **What precautions will be taken to minimize the impact of construction (i.e., noise level, air quality, etc.) on the surrounding community?**

It is still early in the process and we have not engaged a construction manager yet. However, processes will be undertaken by the construction manager to set up the site and equipment in a safe manner that protects the health and safety of the workers and surrounding community.

### **How many years do you expect it to take for the environmental cost of demolition to be recouped by any new development, however sustainably built? What is the net carbon effect of demolition vs. adaptive reuse?**

This depends on a number of factors and a recoup or “payback” period may not be the best way to look at it. The total carbon emissions (both operational and embodied of the existing and new construction) is what will determine the overall impact of carbon for the project. It is only possible to compare different studies based on a wholistic analysis of all the factors that need to be considered, which include:

1. What condition is the existing building in? In the case of 85 Holton, the existing building needs a lot of work, therefore embodied carbon will be added through the new construction materials used to make the building suitable for use.

2. What is the existing building being reused for? If for housing, then it is inefficient compared to a new housing build, and would be better suited for a use closer to its original function.
3. What is being added to the site? Study #1 and study #2 add the same amount of new build area and same number of residential units to the site, with study #2 having a higher GHG (Greenhouse Gas) intensity construction typology due to being a bigger building with different construction techniques. Therefore, study #2 would have a larger amount of embodied carbon than study #1 before any restoration of the existing building is even considered. The restoration of the existing building adds even more embodied carbon to study #2, which is already higher than the total embodied carbon of study #1.
4. What is the new building constructed with? In study #3, the strata tower would be constructed of concrete, which has a higher total embodied carbon compared to the mass timber and wood frame construction methods that would be used for either study #1 or study #2.
5. What energy source is used to operate the buildings? If the new buildings were to operate on environmentally unfriendly fuels such as natural gas, there would be a faster “payback” period for the proposed low energy use buildings, as their energy efficiency would reduce emissions compared to that of a typical natural gas heated building. However, if the new buildings have zero on site emissions, the “payback” period is slower, but the total carbon emissions would be less than the natural gas heated version.

## **New Vision & UPRC**

### **How will New Vision be involved on site in the long run?**

The New Vision United Church will maintain ownership of the site.

### **Did New Vision United Church ignore the neighbourhood while working on redeveloping the site until UPRC was involved?**

New Vision began exploring the potential for redevelopment in 2015 and engaged a number of developers over a three year period. However, the discussions and plans never evolved to a point where they could engage the community. In late 2020, UPRC commenced work to identify redevelopment options for the site and hosted a joint Town Hall with Ward 3 Councillor (Nann) in February 2021, prior to the Town Halls that were hosted on June 10, 2021.

### **What are the benefits of having UPRC & KPMB collaborate with New Vision United Church? What makes UPRC different from other developers?**

United Property Resource Corporation (UPRC) is a community-building developer working coast to coast



to build mixed income and affordable rental housing to create inclusive and sustainable communities across Canada.

Formed in 2019, UPRC was founded by the United Church of Canada, and works in partnership with faith communities across the country, helping them reimagine their real estate for positive community impact. Our model invests profits back into the local community through the provision of affordable housing, community services, and congregation and neighbourhood programs.

UPRC's affordable housing approach is designed to increase opportunities for individuals, including Indigenous Peoples, Black People, People of Colour, seniors, women, and members of the LGBTQ2S+ community to access safe, healthy, and adequate homes. UPRC and its partners, including KPMB, are working to create socially, environmentally, and financially sustainable communities through development projects that will promote the common good for the next 100 years.

**How are the opinions of those living in the immediate area being weighed in the decision process?**

The Town Hall was an opportunity for us to hear from everyone, whether you are an immediate neighbour or live in the larger community.

**What are the next steps?**

UPRC and New Vision are committed to continuing to engage with the community as the project evolves. While we work with the City to continue to refine our plan, we will be connecting with the community to identify potential uses for the proposed community/commercial space. We plan to return to the Planning Committee later this summer.