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1. Executive Summary
1. Executive Summary

To ask what use heritage buildings should serve in a new park raises fundamental questions about what role parks play in urban life. Some people see parks as passive environments made up of grass, trees and ancillary features. Others use parks as active places for sports and recreation. Still others value urban parks as dynamic public space for community gatherings.

In the summer of 2001, Councillor Joe Mihevc asked Artscape to investigate potential arts and community uses for the five former TTC streetcar barns at 76 Wychwood Avenue, Toronto. Largely abandoned since 1978, the barns occupy 28%* of a 4.3-acre site that City Council has committed to turning into a park at a future date. Artscape’s exploration of re-use options for the barns revealed a variety of opinions within the immediate neighbourhood as to how the former industrial buildings and the surrounding park should relate to each other. The presence of these historic barns has challenged neighbours to articulate a vision for their community, and to define the role of the barns within it.

Interestingly, the debate surrounding the barns provides an important clue about what type of park is needed. Like Toronto itself, the area surrounding the barns is made up of a wide range of cultures, backgrounds and income brackets. The barns could provide a place where members of the community interact with each other, sort out neighbourhood issues, and build respect for their differences. For the barns to play this community-building role, the City of Toronto will need to exercise decisive leadership by deciding which option best serves the public and the interests of local communities.

This report is intended to serve as a tool to help build consensus regarding the future of the barns. It examines a range of options from the demolition of four barns to retention of the essential structure of all five barns. Research has revealed three distinct types of uses that are compatible with the neighbourhood, the adjoining park and the heritage buildings, and that serve the public interest. These uses include 1) community arts space, 2) space for environmental education, and 3) affordable artists’ live/work studios. The report will outline how each of these uses could work and explore the benefits of combining them.

In the process of preparing this report, hundreds of members of the local community have been engaged in meetings, a design charrette, and through surveys. Artscape has been guided by a volunteer Advisory Council and been offered advice from experts in heritage preservation, affordable housing, environmental sustainability, and capital fundraising. The high level of community engagement in this process has allowed us to identify and analyze common ideas, issues, and concerns. This input has been used to craft goals and objectives for evaluating the range of re-use options.

* 28% = percentage of the site, excluding three residential lots and a road allowance for service and emergency access vehicles
The report also identifies assumptions that have been used in determining feasibility. These are based on the alternative development models that Artscape and the City of Toronto have used in three previous collaborations.

Of the options studied in this report, all but one is capable of generating enough revenue to sustain operations. Apart from the uses they serve, they are distinguished by a number of other factors such as the level of capital investment required by the City, the degree to which they serve the public interest or deliver benefits to the community, and their potential to leverage resources from other levels of government and the private sector.

Perspective drawing of the east side of the converted Wychwood Barns (Re-use Option 4)

The evaluation in this report indicates that re-use Options 3, 4, and 5 are closely ranked in terms of overall viability. Each involves a dynamic mix of uses that serves heritage preservation, community arts activity, community gardening, affordable housing, and environmental sustainability. Each promises a unique ecology that appeals to a wide range of interests and offers strong possibilities for community interaction and stewardship.

Fundraising analysis provided in the report identifies that the potential to raise the necessary capital funds from governments and the private sector is related to the strength of the concept proposed for each option. Options that integrate multiple uses have the potential to tap into a broader spectrum of funding. They foster a more dynamic environment that contributes to a more compelling overall case for support. The report concludes that Options 3, 4, and 5 have the best potential to compete for support among funders (government and private sector) that support the arts, environment and green initiatives, affordable housing, and heritage preservation.

Successful fundraising for the ultimate renovation of one or more barns will require strong community support in order to proceed. We hope the information presented in this report builds neighbourhood consensus and permits the City to take another significant step in the process.
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2. Feasibility Study Context

2.1 Study Parameters

The purpose of this feasibility study is to determine whether there are viable ways to adapt the Wychwood Barns for arts and community uses that:

a) leverage capital funds from public and private sources
b) do not require annual operating and maintenance support from the City of Toronto

These challenges reflect the fact that the City currently lacks the resources to redevelop the Wychwood Barns site in the way that it has developed community, recreation, or arts centres in the past.

Councillor Joe Mihevc invited Artscape to undertake this study because Artscape has developed a number of alternative development models in partnership with the City that address similar challenges.

The scope of this feasibility study is limited to exploring issues and design solutions related to the barns. Each re-use option allows for the development of open, green park space, from 72% to 96% of the site. It is understood that the City of Toronto Parks Department will undertake a separate process of community consultation concerning the development and design of a park on the site.

2.2 Research Methodology

The financial challenges noted above have fundamentally influenced Artscape’s approach to research and consultation for this study. They imply that any proposed uses need to attract capital support and generate revenues. This study therefore is not simply about determining and evaluating what the community or City wants or needs. Rather it is about finding a strong, shared vision that balances public interest and community desires in a way that is compelling enough to attract partners and funding.

Artscape has applied an action research* approach to undertaking this study. We started with the assumption that a portion of the barns should be saved for some sort of arts and community use and that the City needs to attract resources and partnerships to make it happen. Our challenge has been to locate many different potential pieces of the puzzle in order to see which ones fit together to make a sustainable
and exciting picture. This is not a simple analytical assignment. It requires that needs be examined, partners be sought, and scenarios be invented. Facilitating this process means actively brokering interests within the community, building partnerships, evaluating combinations of uses, testing the water with prospective funders, seeking consensus in the community, and then stepping back and analyzing the results.

Applying action research techniques to capital project development is a specialized area of practice. It requires an in-depth understanding of the needs, sensitivities, and sensibilities of the arts and other communities to be accommodated, experience in building neighbourhood and community consensus, an understanding of how synergies and resource-sharing can be achieved through partnerships, as well as the technical knowledge of how to renovate and operate facilities of this kind.

*Action Research*

“can best be described as a family of research methodologies that pursue action (or change) and research (or understanding) at the same time. In most of its forms it does this by: 1) using a cyclical or spiral process that alternates between action and critical reflection, and 2) in the later cycles, continuously refining methods, data and interpretation in light of the understanding and discoveries yielded from earlier cycles. In most forms it is also participative (among other reasons, change is usually easier to achieve when those affected by the change are involved) and qualitative.”

- Doug Fleming, School Strategies and Options, Lunenburg, MA

---

2.3 Analytical Approach

This report outlines six options for adapting the Wychwood Barns for arts and community uses. It provides detailed analysis of each option according to the following four broad frames of reference:

1. Impact on local communities
2. The public interest
3. Capital fundraising potential
4. Operating sustainability

The analysis in this report is based upon goals and objectives that reflect common ideas, issues, and concerns. Artscape developed these goals and objectives primarily through community consultation and public policy research. They were also informed by Artscape’s past experience and the specific parameters of this study.
2.4 Sponsors

Funding for the feasibility study has been raised by Artscape from a number of public and private sources. The City of Toronto Culture Department contributed $10,000 to support the investigation of re-use options involving the arts. The Housing, Shelter and Support division of the City helped to procure a $10,000 contribution from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to study the potential for affordable housing. The George Cedric Metcalf Foundation sponsored a $20,000 contribution through The Stop Community Food Centre and FoodShare Toronto to examine the feasibility of a greenhouse and environmental education centre. Additionally, Artscape contributed significant staff resources, overhead and a cash contribution of approximately $20,000.
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3. History of the Site

3.1 Early History of the Barns

The Wychwood Barns sit on a 4.3-acre lot just south of St. Clair Avenue West, and are bordered by Christie Street to the west, Benson Avenue to the north and Wychwood Avenue to the east. The buildings on the site consist of five former TTC streetcar maintenance barns built between 1913 and 1921 (with a small addition in 1958). Despite their current state of neglect, the streetcar barns have a rich and significant history.

In 1911, having recently annexed outlying metropolitan areas, the City of Toronto founded the Toronto Civic Railway (TCR), to provide and expand transportation services to residents. In 1913 the TCR built the first of the Wychwood carbarns to service its 3.1-mile St. Clair route, and in 1916 added a second barn in anticipation of the opening of its Lansdowne route in 1917. In 1921, as the urban railway grew along with the booming city, a new expansion was undertaken, resulting in three new barns being added. Also in 1921, the TCR was subsumed into the newly created Toronto Transit Commission (TTC).

In the quarter century that followed, the Wychwood Barns were a major transportation hub within the city, housing as many as 167 streetcars and servicing 10 routes. The barns also provided employment for hundreds of workers during its heyday. As the age of the automobile was ushered in, however, the relative
importance of streetcars diminished and gradually the barns became less and less busy. By the 1960s and 70s, they serviced only the St. Clair streetcar line until finally, in 1978, the barns were decommissioned altogether. The buildings were occasionally used for special projects, such as the testing of newly purchased streetcars and the retrofitting of the Scarborough rapid transit (RT) trains, but in 1985, the TTC closed the facility.

3.2 Physical Characteristics of the Barns

The Wychwood Barns are an excellent example of early 20th century industrial architecture. The five brick buildings total 53,000 square feet and were built in the classical revival style that was popular at the time, with imposing entranceways and rows of arched windows. All five barns share a similar exterior appearance but the 1921 barns were built using a reinforced concrete structural design whereas the 1913 and 1916 barns feature interior steel frames that allow for a brighter and lighter interior space.

The barns range in size from 199’ to 326’ long and 39’ to 46’ wide. The interiors are approximately 20’ high with a broad skylight running the full length of each barn. At each end of each barn there are wooden garage doors that measure 18’ high and approximately 28’ wide. Additionally, although they were bricked in as each new barn was adjoined to the preceding one, the 1913 and 1916 barns feature long rows of large double-height windows along each wall. The barns are in need of renovation and restoration but they are all structurally sound.
### Recent History of the Barns

In July 1996, the TTC announced its intention to demolish the Wychwood Barns. In response, community members moved to prevent the demolition, motivated in part by a recognition of the heritage value of the buildings as well as by a concern that the lot might be sold off to private developers without regard for the needs of the immediate neighbourhood.

In April 1998, Toronto City Council adopted a report from the Toronto Historical Board recommending that the site be listed in the City of Toronto Inventory of Heritage properties. In November 1998, ownership of the site was transferred from the TTC to the City of Toronto.

In May 2000, after 9 months of consultation, City planning staff and the community-based Wychwood Carhouse Working Committee invited community members to an open house where they were asked to vote for one of four redevelopment options for the barns and the surrounding site. Of 136 voters, 85% chose Option 4, which advocated turning the majority of the site into a park and retaining the original 1913 barn for public use, as well as parceling off and selling 3 residential lots to a developer. (The other three options offered between 44 and 117 units of housing in combination with a range of park sizes, from 32% to 66% of the total site.)

It should be noted that at the time of this vote, an architectural assessment of the barns had not taken place, and few people believed the barns could be re-used or were worth saving.

City Council adopted Option 4 in October 2000, following a letter-writing campaign and the delivery of a substantial petition (763 signatures) by the Taddlewood Heritage Association. City Council commissioned an environmental assessment of the site as well as an architectural assessment of the state of the 1913 barn. The environmental report (Appendix D) was delivered in December 2000, and noted that generally the site was in good condition. One corner of the site, where a tannery had operated before the barns were built, would require soil remediation.
The “Preliminary Architectural, Structural, Mechanical and Electrical Inspection” report prepared by Philip Goldsmith & Company Ltd. Architects was completed in February 2001 (Appendix C). It noted that all of the barns were structurally sound and well suited for adaptive re-use. Furthermore, they contained extensive original elements and unusual features, such as the immense naturally-lighted open interiors. The report recommended saving all five barns. With demolition, “the heritage loss to the community is immeasurable. A significant architectural and community-enriching opportunity is also forfeited.”* If preservation of all five barns were not possible, the report suggests that the retention of the 1913, 1916, and northernmost 1921 would provide the next best solution.

In April 2001, at a Wychwood Barns Community Meeting chaired by Councillor Joe Mihevc, Artscape – represented by executive director Tim Jones – was introduced to 150 community members as an organization that could accelerate the process of redeveloping the Wychwood Barns site for park and public uses. A show of hands strongly favoured inviting Artscape to study the community-oriented arts-related re-use possibilities for one or more barns.

In June 2001, Councillor Mihevc recommended that Artscape conduct a feasibility study examining the feasibility of including live/work studios as one component of a multi-use community-oriented development of the barns. City Council supported this idea by recommending that the Capital Revolving Fund consider a request for funding for Artscape for the study.

* Preliminary Architectural, Structural, Mechanical and Electrical Inspection, Philip Goldsmith & Company Ltd. Architects, (7-3)
In August 2001, Artscape formed the volunteer community-based Wychwood Barns Advisory Council to guide the community consultation process and help develop recommendations on the feasibility of re-use options. Following this, Artscape began the community consultation process outlined in Section 4.

3.4 Neighbourhood Character

The neighbourhood surrounding the Wychwood Barns site is in many ways a typical Toronto neighbourhood, with a mix of types of homes and apartment buildings. Most of the homes are either single-family detached dwellings or duplexes, and were built in the first years of the last century. St. Clair Avenue is a predominant commercial axis, and Vaughan Rd and Bathurst Avenue both offer commercial frontage. The ethnic diversity that typifies Toronto also characterizes the neighbourhood, with substantial Caribbean, Italian, Latin American and Asian communities alongside long-established Anglo communities. Although these communities are not fully integrated, they live side by side - young and old, multi-generation families and students - in what most residents feel is a friendly, safe and functional neighbourhood.

One notable neighbourhood feature is Wychwood Park, a village-like community of 60 or so homes, that was founded in 1892 as an artist's colony. The main entrance to Wychwood Park is located 100 metres south of the southeastern corner of the Wychwood Barns site. Wychwood Park’s quiet beauty (it contains a pond in a small ravine and plentiful greenery) and charm are indicative of its original function as an environment devoted to creativity and community.
The neighbourhood is well served by the TTC. The St. Clair streetcar is a primary transportation axis, as well as a means of access to the subway. St. Clair West subway station is a 10-minute walk from the Wychwood Barns. There is also a bus route along Christie St. that runs south to Christie subway station on the Bloor line. Finally, Bathurst St. is just one block east of the Wychwood Barns site, with a bus that runs south to connect to the Bloor subway line at Bathurst Station.

Ward 21 is deficient in green space, as determined by staff from the City’s Economic Development, Culture and Tourism division in October 2001. Existing neighbourhood parks include Hillcrest (on the west side of Christie St. at Davenport Rd.), which has open green space, tennis and basketball courts, a community garden, wading pool and children’s playground. Two blocks east of the Wychwood Barns, Wells Hill Park, has a small playing field and children’s playground.
Community Consultation
4. Community Consultation

4.1 Goals and Approach

Artscape has undertaken this feasibility study with a strong commitment to a transparent community consultation process. The community is a key partner in the re-use of the barns and continuing community consultation is a priority. However, it is important to note that Artscape’s community consultation was not entirely a “blue-sky” exercise - it was guided by the need to find practical solutions that fit within the parameters of the study (section 2.1). Bearing this in mind, the aims of the consultation process were to:

- determine neighbourhood needs
- encourage dialogue
- liaise and coordinate with City staff
- locate and leverage financial and cultural resources within different communities
- demonstrate a commitment to responsible and sustainable urban development
- develop a shared vision

The consultation process is cyclical and ongoing. Artscape learned about space needs in the non-profit community by surveying artists and community organizations. The results were shared at a public meeting in October where local community members were invited to develop ideas further at a design charette. (The design charette was held on December 11, 2001.) Artscape staff and volunteer Advisory Council members worked with the project architects to develop preliminary design concepts. A preliminary drawing that reflected a smorgasbord of ideas for the barns and for the future park was then taken back to the community on January 22, 2002. Comments and surveys on the preliminary design concepts have been gathered, analyzed and incorporated into the options presented in this report. This report is itself a part of the process as it is intended to allow interested parties to think about issues surrounding the barns and respond before City Council determines the future of the site.
4.2 Elements of Community Consultation

Consultation with local communities has been widespread. The following elements comprised the community consultation that Artscape has organized or participated in while preparing this report:

1. Advisory Council

In August, 2001, Artscape established a 5-member volunteer Wychwood Barns Advisory Council comprised of:

- Elizabeth Cinello (co-founder of Art Starts, a local community arts organization)
- Mallory Gilbert (general manager of Tarragon Theatre, located near Wychwood Barns)
- Roscoe Handford (local resident)
- Michael Kainer (Artscape board member)
- Peter MacKendrick (past-president of local Taddlewood Heritage Association)

The members of the Advisory Council were mandated to act as stewards of the consultation process, to provide guidance and to make ongoing recommendations. This volunteer group has met on a regular basis and spent an average of 85 hours each in the preparation of this report.

2. City Working Group

The City Working Group was convened to ensure that all municipal planning related to the Wychwood Barns was undertaken as part of an informed and coordinated process. The working group, which has met on a monthly basis, included representatives from many City divisions, including:

- Culture
- Heritage Preservation Services
- Planning
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation Services
- Facilities and Real Estate
- Let's Build; Shelter, Housing and Support
- City Council
3. Collaboration with City Councillor

Artscape worked with Councillor Joe Mihevc at many points in its consultation process. Councillor Mihevc actively promoted the consultation process through his community newsletters and extensive e-mail bulletins, as well as by organizing and hosting public meetings.

4. Needs Assessment Survey

In September 2001, Artscape circulated 2,000 Arts and Community Surveys to non-profit arts and community organizations in Toronto to assess the demand for rental space, the financial capacity of the sector, and the willingness of individual community-oriented organizations to provide programming for the neighbourhood.

5. Architect Selection

In October 2001, Artscape conducted a Quality-Based Selection (QBS) process that resulted in the hiring of architects Joe Lobko (Joe Lobko Architect Inc) and Michael McClelland (E.R.A.) from a short list of six highly qualified firms, each of which made a detailed presentation to Artscape’s Wychwood Barns Advisory Council and representatives of the City’s Culture, Heritage and Parks divisions.

6. Site tours

Tours of the interior of the Wychwood Barns have been conducted irregularly since July 2001. Over 130 people have attended tours by Artscape. Councillor Joe Mihevc and his staff have also conducted numerous tours for local community members and continue to do so.

7. Design Charette

On December 11, 2001, Artscape facilitated a well-publicized design charette at St. Matthew’s Bracondale House (around the corner from the Wychwood Barns) to which all members of the public were welcome. A design charette is a forum where participants discuss and develop design ideas as part of an architectural concept-development process. Approximately 150 people attended and contributed ideas and images following a presentation by Artscape and architect Joe Lobko.
8. Public meetings and feedback

Artscape held public meetings in November 2001 (110 people in attendance) and January 2002 (350 people in attendance). These meetings generated enormous feedback, which was their primary intent. That feedback was collected both orally - coming from public speakers - and on paper, through comment sheets that were distributed and collected. (Appendix A).

Additionally, members of Artscape and/or the Wychwood Barns Advisory Council have attended 15 meetings of different local community groups since January 2002, to inform them of ongoing consultation and to get their input.

9. Open letter to community

In February 2002, over 1,000 copies of an Open Letter to the community were distributed to residents of the streets surrounding the Wychwood Barns. The letter was also posted on Artscape’s website. (Appendix H).

10. Fundraising Advisory Panel

Artscape convened a meeting of six independent fundraising experts to review and comment on the relative fundraising potential of the re-use options. Members of the panel included:

- Janis Barlow (Janis Barlow and Associates)
- Margaret Genovese (Genovese, Vanderhoof and Associates)
- Su Hutchinson (The Writer’s Trust)
- Denis Lefebvre (Laidlaw Foundation)
- Jini Stolk (professional arts consultant)
- Susan Wright (Toronto Arts Council)

The analysis of the fundraising panel is detailed in Section 7.3.
11. Independent Community-Driven Activities

Throughout Artscape’s consultation process, there have been ongoing community-driven events focusing on the past, present and future of the barns. Artscape did not organize or sponsor the following events but they are listed here to illustrate the degree to which community members are committed stakeholders in the process and future of the barns.

- “Sweet on the Park” February 16, 2002 – a sold-out $100/plate fundraising gala, presented by the Taddlewood Heritage Association and Councillor Joe Mihevc, was attended by 400 people to raise money for an initial park space on the Wychwood site beginning in September 2002. Taddlewood Heritage Association continues to advocate and fundraise for the site.

- “Seeing the Wychwood Car barns” April 6, 2002 – a celebration of the Wychwood Barns’ heritage significance to the neighbourhood, presented by the Midtown Community Preservation Panel, had a distinguished list of speakers: Terry McAuliffe, Alan Seymour, Dick Watts, Audrey Fox, Paolina Fasula, John Sebert, Mike Filey, and Philip Goldsmith. Also on display was the photographic exhibition “Lost Local Heritage” (historical and contemporary photographs of the same site) by Vid Ingelevics. This event was attended by 300 people.

- “SpringFest/Environment Day” May 4, 2002 – organized by Councillor Mihevc, Taddlewood Heritage Association and Friends of A New Park had many activities: pizza-making, seed planting and exchange, fence-painting, free compost and a bake sale among them. 430 visitors toured the barns and many more were on site.

- Two advocacy groups have formed locally and have their own websites:
  - Neighbours for 100% Green Park: www.truepatriotlove.com
  - Friends of A New Park: www.anewpark.ca

4.3 Findings

This study has launched an intense debate in the local community and across Toronto about important issues and concerns. What is the role of an urban park and what should it look like? What is the value of preserving our heritage? What type of re-uses of the barns will serve the local community and which ones threaten to overwhelm the neighbourhood?

Local communities - especially those closest to the site - are highly engaged in this process and a wide range of needs, ideas and opinions have been expressed on these issues. Artscape has undertaken two surveys regarding the re-use of the barns: one to determine the need for space for the arts and broader non-profit community, and one to gauge community reaction to preliminary design concepts.

Approximately 2,000 copies of the Arts and Community Survey (Appendix G) were distributed to non-profit groups and individual artists to assess space needs. Surveys were distributed on-line, by mail, and in the local community. Toronto Arts Council and The City of Toronto, Arts Services, helped promote awareness.
of the survey through mailing lists and an information bulletin to the arts community. Responses were solicited from artists and organizations interested in renting space at the site. The following is a summary of the responses to the space needs survey:

- Non-profit organizations: 41
- Artist live/work: 45
- Work studios: 29

A few people responded to the space needs survey with programming ideas such as a skateboard facility or public transit museum. If they related strictly to a recreational use, they were forwarded to the Parks Department for consideration. If ideas for programming were not aligned with a non-profit organization (with a track record in the proposed area) and accompanied by an operational plan, they were not considered to be viable. Generally, feedback from the local community indicated strong concerns about uses that would attract significant public visitation to the site such as performance venues, amphitheatres, retail activities, etc.

Artscape received 143 comment sheets and letters in response to the preliminary design concept. The design concept drawing was presented to an audience of approximately 350 people on January 22, 2002 and then posted in Councillor Joe Mihevc’s community office for further viewing. A summary of the findings of the survey is included here and a more detailed breakdown and the survey itself can be found in Appendix A.

Total number of responses: 143

- Responses endorsing adaptive re-use of multiple barns including live-work studios: 56
- Responses endorsing adaptive re-use of multiple barns excluding live-work studios: 23
- Responses endorsing greenhouse/green barn: 19
- Responses endorsing a grass/trees/playground park: 19
- Responses endorsing recreation facility/community centre in park: 9
- Responses endorsing exclusive ‘100% green space’: 9

The community consultation process has been critical to our understanding the breadth of issues affecting the re-use of the Wychwood Barns and is directly reflected in the content of the evaluation framework, which follows in Section 5.
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5. Evaluation Framework

5.1 Introduction

The evaluation framework has been designed as a tool to compare proposed uses for the Wychwood Barns. The evaluation framework is based on four frames of reference:

a. Impact on local communities
b. The public interest
c. Capital fundraising potential
d. Operating sustainability

Specific goals and objectives have been associated with each of the four frames of reference.

The goals and objectives strongly reflect not only the ideas, issues and concerns identified through community consultation, but also current municipal policy, planning practices and Artscape’s experience in facility management and design.

It has been used to analyze the re-use options (re-use plans involving one or more program components) in Section 7.
5.2 Impact on Local Communities

5.2.1. Programs and Activities

Goal

The renovated Wychwood Barns will foster a dynamic and accessible environment that serves local communities by providing public space and community-based programming and activities with a focus on arts and the environment.

Objectives of the Re-use Option

1. Creates opportunities for youth to develop new skills and engage with the community.
2. Involves seniors by responding to their needs with targeted programming and by providing space for interaction.
3. Attracts people at different times of the day and evening to serve greater numbers of local residents and to ensure the safety of the park environment.
4. Animates the barns throughout the year in order maximize the value of the barns to the neighbourhood.
5. Satisfies the expressed desire of community members for a design that integrates external park activities and features with those inside the barns and creates lively access points between them.

Related Policy and Principles

PARKS AND RECREATION

“Special consideration is required for teenagers as they seek out places where they can socialize and assume ownership. If appropriate spaces are not planned to address their needs, teenagers frequently take over areas designed for others and their very presence may intimidate younger children and adults.”

- Excerpted from Planning, Designing and Maintaining Safer Parks, produced by Toronto Parks and Recreation
“The presence of programmed activities or activity generators attract and increase positive use in a park.... Wherever possible, programming and activity generators should be incorporated into a park environment because they reinforce the interconnection between use and safety.”

- Excerpted from Planning, Designing and Maintaining Safer Parks, produced by Toronto Parks and Recreation

PLANNING

“Toronto’s parks and open spaces are a focus for neighbourhood life... But they need to become more than places for active recreation and nature preserves. They can be the setting for a broad range of activities that make city life complete.”

- Excerpted from City of Toronto Plan Directions Report, Toronto at the Crossroads - Shaping our Future

“City facilities and services should provide access to all citizens. Services should be appropriately integrated, easy to access, and available to meet the unique needs of diverse communities. The new official Plan will recognize the need to build neighbourhoods, not just housing. This can be achieved, in part, through the timely provision of social, economic and physical infrastructure.”

- Excerpted from City of Toronto Plan Directions Report, Toronto at the Crossroads - Shaping our Future

“... only a genuine content of economic and social diversity, resulting in different people with different schedules, has meaning to the park and the power to confer the boon of life upon it.”

- Excerpted from The Death and Life of Great American Cities, by Jane Jacobs
5.2.2. Neighbourhood Issues

Goal

The renovated Wychwood Barns will feature an integrated design and activities that are in keeping with the character and flow of the surrounding neighbourhood and will contribute to neighbourhood safety.

Objectives of the Re-use Option

1. Ensures the barns are as safe as possible, providing “eyes on the park” and overall safety to the neighbourhood.
2. Minimizes potential stress on neighbourhood parking.
3. Discourages uses that may substantially increase vehicular traffic.
4. Promotes park stewardship by increasing park stakeholders.

Related Policy and Principles

PUBLIC WORKS

Parking

The City of Toronto Permit Parking reports designated permit parking capacity of the streets surrounding the Wychwood Barns (Area 5-C) is substantially higher than current usage. At the end of last year, out of a total capacity of 1,172 assigned to the streets around the Wychwood Barns site, 161 parking permits were available for purchase. (Appendix B.)

Staff of Works and Emergency Services (WES) is currently assessing parking requirements for each of the re-use options. It will be necessary to consider several factors when establishing the appropriate amount of parking for this project, such as: what are the essential parking demands generated, what is the experience of Artscape with similar buildings, and what is the provision of the zoning by-law. They will also need to consider how the parking requirement will affect the amount of area available for open parkland and ensure that it is consistent with the City’s policies with respect to the minimization of automobile use.
The possible use of the Wychwood Parkette (corner of Hocken Ave. and Wychwood Ave.) for a parking lot was investigated with the City’s Transportation Services. It was concluded that due to the parkette’s location and turnaround capacity, it would not be good planning practice to recommend its use for a parking lot.

The TTC is presently considering leasing a new 200-spot parking lot for employee use that is accessible from the Hillcrest TTC site at Bathurst and Davenport. This will alleviate on street parking congestion in the area. Councillor Joe Mihevc is facilitating these negotiations.

Traffic
Recognizing the level of traffic generated by the previous uses on this site, both in terms of automobiles and streetcars, the amount of traffic generated by the proposed uses will be, in relative terms, minimal. On this basis, WES staff has advised that they have no concerns with the impacts of the traffic generated by any of the re-use options under consideration.

Safety
METRAC (Metropolitan Action Committee) has developed the Women’s Safety Audit, a tool for communities and organizations to use in the development of design and safety strategies. The City of Toronto is currently drafting a policy that will require municipal buildings and properties to perform safety audits and conform to audit recommendations.

PARKS AND RECREATION

“To convey an image of safety, a park must be actively used, well-maintained, and offer a range of programmed recreational opportunities as well as opportunities for informal leisure. Faced with decreasing capital and maintenance budgets, community groups can help fill in the gap. In Canada and the United States, the response to reduced budgets has been to develop a variety of park conservancies and alliances designed to address maintenance, safety, education and fund-raising in public parks. These non-profit civic stewardship initiatives are widespread and the opportunities for positive results are enormous because they give people a greater feeling of control which, in turn, fosters a sense of ownership and pride.”

- Excerpted from Planning, Designing and Maintaining Safer Parks, produced by Toronto Parks and Recreation
5.3. The Public Interest

Goal

Urban citizens benefit from – and share a responsibility for – the overall health of their city, and the renovation of the Wychwood Barns should reflect a commitment to enhancing the health of the city as a whole.

Objectives of the Re-use Option

1. Preserves this significant cultural and architectural landmark, by creatively adapting it for meaningful contemporary uses, as recommended by the Goldsmith Report.

2. Models and promotes ‘green’ principles in urban design and community practices.

3. Supports Toronto’s working artists and not-for-profit community by providing workspace that will allow them to contribute to the neighbourhood and the city.

4. Creates affordable housing.

5. Aligns with the City’s existing public policies.

6. Allows as many programming and activity areas as possible to be fully accessible to disabled community members.

Related Policy and Principles

CITY PRIORITIES

Housing-first Policy for City Land:
Council approved a "housing first" policy that favours the construction of affordable housing on surplus City-owned land. Council set a target of at least 900 new units of affordable housing on City land over the next three years.

- City Council meeting of June 9, 10, 11, 1999.
PLANNING

“Quality design must be part of every significant public street, open space and building. Through this investment we can achieve a higher quality of life... The City can continue to set an example of design excellence through its own capital expenditures and by:

• encouraging the use of design competitions for the design of public streets, parks, buildings and even public furniture, to seek the best design from the design community, and to promote the discussion of design as an important part of citizen’s involvement in the future shape of their neighbourhood and city.”

- Excerpted from City of Toronto Plan Directions Report, Toronto at the Crossroads – Shaping our Future

“The new official Plan will include policies to work towards universal accessibility, including... adopting a single set of development review guidelines to ensure all new buildings, structures and open spaces are designed so that anyone can enter, circulate and leave in physical comfort”

- Excerpted from City of Toronto Plan Directions Report, Toronto at the Crossroads – Shaping our Future

HERITAGE

In 2001, Taddlewood Heritage Association received a Heritage Toronto award “for their efforts to preserve the Wychwood Car Barns and turn the surrounding area into a park”

“Heritage preservation is recognized throughout the world as a fundamental component of a livable city; an essential element that provides people with a feeling of security and a sense of belonging in the place where they live. It is incumbent upon municipal governments to take the principles of heritage conservation into consideration when making decisions that will change the look, shape or feel of their cities.”

- Heritage Preservation Services, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, Culture Division, City of Toronto
“Over the years we have allowed too many of our most precious heritage buildings and spaces to disappear under the wrecker’s ball. We have erased much of our visual collective memory from the streets of Toronto. The demolition of architecturally significant buildings is an irreplaceable loss to the attractiveness of a city. The demolition of a building with historic significance creates an unfixable gap in our sense of who we are and whence we came.”

- Excerpted from City of Toronto Plan Directions Report, Toronto at the Crossroads – Shaping our Future

“The Wychwood Car House is an important heritage feature of the City of Toronto. No other carbarns of this age remain that:

a. display many original elements (such as the overall building form, structure, skylights, raised platforms and equipment)

b. are publicly accessible

c. are an integral historical fit in the surrounding community.

... The removal or alteration of any historic material, or distinctive architectural features should be avoided wherever possible.”

- “Preliminary Architectural, Structural, Mechanical and Electrical Inspection” by Philip Goldsmith & Company Ltd. Architects, 2001

ENVIRONMENT

“Every strategy and policy of the official plan needs to recognize and support the objective of a more sustainable City... Creating a sustainable city means putting an environmental perspective into every aspect of City building.

- Excerpted from City of Toronto Plan Directions Report, Toronto at the Crossroads – Shaping our Future

“One of our greatest opportunities for greening of the city is the promotion of Green Roofs, which involves layering contained soil and planting gardens on the flat roofs dominating the landscape of many districts of Toronto.”

- Excerpted from City of Toronto Plan Directions Report, Toronto at the Crossroads – Shaping our Future
5.4 **Capital Fundraising Potential**

**Goal**

The renovated Wychwood Barns are rooted in a strong and compelling vision, served by a unique and inspired architectural design, and supported by a capital budget that is based on realistic sources of revenue and reasonable expenses.

**Objectives of the Re-use Option**

1. Involves cross-sectoral partnerships that will allow contributions from multiple sources.

2. Leverages the required funding from provincial and federal governments.

3. If the re-use option involves affordable housing, the level of mortgage financing (related to live/work) required will allow unit rents to fall within the City’s affordability guidelines.

4. Appeals to foundations and the private sector.

5. Enjoys the strong support of local communities and neighbourhood.

6. Becomes a model for other community arts development projects.

7. The capital program has the flexibility to consider phasing if appropriate.

**Related Policy and Principles**

“Public-private non-profit partnerships for parks are proliferating across the country – and generating much excitement and interest. One reason is because they work.”

- Excerpted from *Partnerships for Parks*, Urban Institute

“In the end, the [capital] campaign does more than reach a fundraising goal, it fulfills a vision.”

- Susan Barkman, *The Banff Centre for Management*
5.5 Operational Sustainability

Goal

The renovated Wychwood Barns have the essential ingredients to secure a sustainable future: they serve important community needs; help build synergies and connections between tenants and the neighbourhood; and generate sufficient revenues to operate the facility in the short- and long-term.

Objectives of the Re-Use Option

1. Engages local communities and the neighbourhood.

2. Rental and other revenues derived from the re-use option are sufficient to maintain and operate it without requiring new sources of public support for this purpose.

3. Projected rental rates are affordable for the type of tenants proposed.

4. Surplus revenues can be held in a reserve account for extraordinary capital maintenance and repairs.

5. The operating plan promotes interaction, collaboration, and resource-sharing between tenants and facility users.

6. The governance model involves local community stakeholders.

Related Policy and Principles

In April 2002, City Council adopted the Municipal Housing Facility By-Law and, in so doing, adopted a definition of affordable housing: an affordable housing cost must be at or below average rents. Average rents are established by the annual CMHC (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation) rental market survey for the City of Toronto.

- Shelter, Housing and Support, Community and Neighbourhood Services, April 26, 2002
CMHC rent limits for affordable housing:

- Bachelor $698/month
- 1-Bedroom $870/month
- 2-Bedroom $1,039/month
- 3-Bedroom $1,248/month

Additionally, there is an income limit set at 25% of gross household income for affordable housing. For example, an individual or couple occupying a one-bedroom unit and paying a rent of $870, should have an income not greater than $41,760/year at time of initial occupancy.
Program Components
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6. **Program Components**

6.1 **Introduction**

In analyzing the responses to the space needs survey (Appendix G), three themes – and types of program areas – emerged. They were organized into the following program components:

- Community Arts Barn - non-profit arts and community office and programming spaces
- Studio Barn - artist work and live/work studios
- Green Barn - environmental education centre

Two additional components emerged from the design charette:

- Covered street or Wintergarden
- Children’s play area in “ruined” barn

These program components were combined in a number of different ways to create the six re-use options presented in Section 7. Each is distinct yet they all have been shaped by a common vision: the transformation of a historically significant, industrial building into a beautiful, useful and accessible gathering place with an inviting design and character.

The Community Arts, Studio and Green Barns, covered street and play area have the potential to be magical places, enabling community education, recreation and inspiration. They will be places where young and old alike can experience history, nature and art and where everyone can enjoy the richness of a diverse and unique Toronto neighbourhood.
6.2 The Community Arts Barn

Imagine: It's a warm Saturday afternoon in late spring as a dozen book lovers gather for their monthly book club. They stroll through the leafy park towards the Community Space in the old Wychwood Barns, where the gathering is taking place. As they enter the welcoming space through the folding doors that open onto the park, sunlight streams in through the wide skylights high above. As they settle in fresh air fills the hall, along with the sound of children playing in the playground outside.

Nearby, a puppet-making workshop is taking place for a dozen local residents, hosted by one of the handful of non-profit community-oriented arts organizations that rent space in the barn. Later that evening another one of the non-profit tenants will host its weekly storytelling night, which has become a popular destination for families looking for a wholesome local alternative to the lure of the entertainment megaplex downtown.

The next day is the last Sunday of the month, which means that it's time for the afternoon senior's party that is held in the Community Space, featuring a craft show, bake sale and several presentations, as well as a local pianist singing old-time songs. The following Wednesday evening, the Community Space will be given over to teenagers for the monthly Open Mic and Writing Workshop. Throughout the week, teens will visit the barns after school to take advantage of the popular ‘Homework Club’ run by yet another one of the non-profit tenants of the barns.

The 20 or so employees of these non-profit tenant organizations work long hours and often leave work late in the evening, contributing to the safety of the surrounding park. Many of them are park stewards, and after locking up the barns for the night, they make a point of ensuring that all is well in the park grounds on their way home.

This is one hypothetical - yet realistic - sketch of how the Community Arts Barn could be designed to function. It would be a valued home and meeting space for community-oriented non-profit organizations, of which most will have an arts or environment focus. These organizations will have as their mandate the aim of serving local communities with engaging and relevant programming. They will be a well-respected group of established organizations that serve diverse communities in different ways, bringing community members together to exchange ideas and experiences. Their spaces would range in size from 400 - 2,000 square feet, with the majority of the non-profit spaces in most re-use options averaging approximately 600 - 900 sq.ft.
Of the non-profit groups that occupy the Community Arts Barn, one would be designated as the Arts Anchor. This non-profit organization would manage a large space that it can use for its own rehearsals or community-oriented programming, as well as making it available to local groups as a multi-purpose Community Space.

This Community Space would create an inviting, accessible and versatile environment for many local activities. Depending on the re-use option, this community space will be between 1,500 - 3,200 sq.ft. It will be nearly 20' high with broad skylights running the length of the space. In most options, the space will be situated at the eastern end of the barns, so that it will be able to take advantage of either the vast folding doors (18’ high and 28’ across) or arched windows of the north 1921 barn.

The responsibility for overseeing this Community Space is substantial, and includes a commitment to paying for heating, hydro and other expenses. The Arts Anchor will become an important catalyst and facilitator of a wide range of community events, activities and initiatives that make use of its inspiring location and facilities.
The Community Arts Barn will also feature a Community Galleria, a central interior courtyard where people can gather or sit in a protected space, and where small events such as temporary art exhibitions may take place. The Galleria is also the entrance to the tenant non-profit organizations that take advantage of their proximity to one another to leverage each other’s strengths and capabilities: resources – both creative and organizational – are shared and thus new opportunities emerge.

Among the 41 non-profit organizations expressing interest in renting space in the Community Arts Barn are: The Storyteller’s School of Toronto (teaching and storytelling), Canboulay Dance Theatre (dance company and school), Women’s Musical Club of Toronto (park concerts), Na-Me-Res (native arts and crafts workshops), and Harriet Tubman Community Organization (youth support programs and homework club).

The Community Arts Barn varies in scope and size in different re-use options assessed in this study. Some options propose that the community arts tenants should occupy half a barn while in others they occupy an entire barn. In each re-use option, however, the community arts program component is integrated with an unusual and striking design feature – the Wintergarden or Covered Street (also presented in a half or full version depending on the option).

### 6.3 The Covered Street

Imagine: Clouds have been gathering over the city and suddenly the storm breaks. Rain pours down on the children playing in the park, and on the mothers with their baby strollers. But instead of scattering these park users, the rain brings them together, as one and all rush for shelter through the huge doors into the Covered Street. There they wait out the thundershower, taking time to enjoy their carefully tended surroundings, with the heritage features that recall its past life as a streetcar maintenance barn. Some mothers walk the length of the barn, stopping to peer into the interesting displays of paintings, ceramics and other art work in the windows of the adjacent artist’s studios. Others settle in on benches under the many leafy trees. Still others stop to read the public notice board where invitations to upcoming park activities – including an Earth Day fair to be held in the Covered Street – have been posted. Eventually the rain stops and the sun pours in through the massive skylights. Children rush out to play in the playground, but many of the mothers stay where they are, enjoying the peaceful, comfortable and secure environment.

The Covered Street will bring the surrounding park inside the barns by integrating a landscaped public passageway that runs the length of the barns. This passageway will provide access to the non-profit office spaces and work studios, as well as creating a naturally-lighted environment where park users can take
shelter from the elements, and where community events can be held without concern for weather. It will be inside yet outside, offering local residents additional space for meeting, resting, playing or just strolling. The Covered Street will be especially useful for seniors who may like spending time outside but require access to shelter and washrooms that would also be found within the Covered Street.

The full Covered Street in Options 4 and 5 will be able to preserve the integrity of the original 1913 barn in its entirety. Many interesting fixtures and pieces of equipment remain in the barns. The arched windows and heritage features can be restored and parts of the train track preserved. When people are inside they will be able to imagine the streetcars running from one end of the barn to the other, entering the buildings, like themselves, for respite and rejuvenation. By preserving the shell and leaving the barn relatively open, visitors will truly get the sense of the character of the building.

The partially Covered Street in Options 2 and 3 contains community gardens located atop the non-profit arts and community spaces, taking advantage of the skylights and adding greenery to the interior.
6.4 The Studio Barn

Imagine: Walking down Benson Avenue one morning, two residents notice a sign on one of the doors of the artists’ live/work studios in the old Wychwood streetcar barn. ‘Open Studio’, it reads. On a whim, the two neighbours go inside and are welcomed by a pleasant young woman who has crammed every inch of her studio with intricate wire sculptures. The sculptures make an impression on the neighbours, as does the woman herself, and they will often stop and chat with one another in the days that follow. One day the sculptor asks the neighbours to join the park stewardship group, and soon they find themselves taking care of the park side by side with other park stewards, many of whom are artists living in the barns. Now, when the neighbours walk along Benson Ave., they recognize that behind the brick walls of the old barn, a creative and engaged community of talented artists is committed to contributing to the neighbourhood.

Whether they are dancers, painters, sculptors or musicians, artists require space where they can explore and develop their creative practices. Artists tend to work intensively for days or weeks at a time, often working long into the night. Not only do most artists in Toronto find it difficult to locate and lease studio spaces that accommodate these needs, but the burden of carrying two leases is also more than many can afford. As a result, the artists’ live/work loft studio has proven to be highly valuable for working artists, allowing them to live and work in the same relatively small space.

The Studio Barn provides an opportunity to create affordable housing - one of the City’s highest priorities and the program area that generated the most interest in the Wychwood Barns space needs survey. The industrial character of the barns lends itself extremely well to conversion into artist live/work spaces. The live/work use also offers a creative and practical solution to the external challenge of integrating industrial buildings into a residential neighbourhood.
The Studio Barn will be home to between 11 and 22 live/work studios that will range in size from roughly 600 - 1,020 sq.ft. These studios will be suitable for professional artists and their families and will be non-commercial in nature (i.e. they will not be retail outlets but creative studios). There may also be as many as 11 work studios that will be used for art-making but not for living.

Live/work studios typically feature a main-floor work area suitable for all manner of artistic practice, as well as a galley kitchen. A second floor loft provides a bathroom and bed space, and in the larger units a second loft area.

Work studios range in size from 400 - 450 sq.ft., which includes a large storage closet. The work studios would be accessed via the Covered Street and live/work units via Benson Ave. where they would feature a traditional residential front door and landscaping. Work studios might be rented with a live/work unit or independently.

A great advantage to the Studio Barn will be having artists living on site to enhance safety. Although “eyes on the park” are important, people in the park is a far more effective deterrent to criminals and vandals. Residents would play a special stewardship role to help keep the entire site as safe as possible. Stewardship responsibilities would be included in the lease agreement with tenants.

In seeking to create an energy-efficient and environmentally-friendly building, one potentially significant element could be the integration of a ‘Green Roof’ atop the Studio Barn managed by the live/work tenants.

A ‘Green Roof’ is more than a rooftop garden. Although it possesses significant aesthetic value, its greatest values are economic and environmental. Green Roofs, which are used widely in Europe, (over ten million square meters have been created in Germany alone) are planted with grass and other hardy plants primarily in order to:

- save energy: green roofs have a proven capacity to reduce heat within a building by 4 degrees Celsius in the summertime and to substantially insulate warmth within a building in winter
- improve air quality: green roofs help filter windblown air and also promote the conversion of carbon dioxide to oxygen
- filter, manage and purify stormwater: in summer, green roofs retain 70-100% of the precipitation that falls on them
Green roof development involves the creation of "contained" green space on top of a human-made structure. This green space could be below, at or above grade, but in all cases the plants are not planted in the 'ground'. A green roof is an extension of the existing roof, which involves a special root repelling membrane, a drainage system, a lightweight growing medium and plants.

- Green Roofs for Healthy Cities, a Toronto coalition of private sector firms

6.5 The Green Barn

Imagine: It's 5:30 pm on a chilly winter's day, and as they step off the St. Clair streetcar at Wychwood Ave., local residents lean into the biting wind. They're on their way home from work, but more than a few take a detour on their way. At the old Wychwood Barns they pull open a steamy glass door and instantly enter a different world. Inside the Green Barn, the air is warm and perfumed, there are lush plants sprouting from the ground and hanging from the ceiling. A group of children greet the newcomers with enthusiasm and show the newly-sprouted greens they have planted. Teenagers are as proud of the seedlings as the children they've been helping. A few neighbours are sharing tips on growing fig trees and mangoes while others chat, and for a while anyway, the winter chill subsides in a warm and welcoming community greenhouse.
The Stop Community Food Centre and FoodShare Toronto have a dream for a “Green Barn”. The dream is to create and manage a greenhouse, protected garden and neighbourhood bake oven that will literally become a green barn and serve as a centre for year-round gardening, community programming, and environmental education.

The Green Barn would be a public space that is integrated with the renovated barns, the new park and the community around it. It would also act as an inviting and welcoming cultural space that cultivates neighbourhood roots as well as community development, identity, and well-being.

The Green Barn would provide a public space for spontaneous enjoyment and planned activities where people of diverse backgrounds can socialize, attend workshops, eat, meet their neighbours, and learn about gardening, food and nutrition, environment-friendly practices, community development and public art. It would allow local people from diverse backgrounds to grow plants from their homelands and participate in community gardening and clubs.

The Green Barn would be designed to showcase innovative and environmentally-friendly growing, building and energy production methods and provide a place for local schools and others to learn about horticulture and greenhouse production techniques, cultural heritage, environmental issues and the interconnectedness between food, water, energy and the environment. Children and youth could particularly benefit from skills training programs or the hands-on learning of planting seeds and watching them grow.

The greenhouse can extend the local growing season and grow plants from warmer climates that reflect the diverse cultures of the neighbourhood. Both the greenhouse and the protected garden could showcase heritage varieties of plants, both as an educational tool to raise awareness about the importance of biodiversity, and as a way to reference the area’s agricultural history. Open space within the protected garden can act as a natural meeting place. It would be open year-round and would include seating areas and other places for informal interaction.

All of the Green Barn spaces would be open to local residents to visit, volunteer and participate in programs. An outdoor bake oven would give people a place to come together and bake pizza, bread or cinnamon rolls. Existing bake ovens in Dufferin Grove, Riverdale and Christie Pits parks have provided an ideal place for families to bring their kids and fix themselves a delicious lunch.

The Green Barn will come to life through strong local participation. The Stop Community Food Centre and FoodShare Toronto are committed to partnering with other local groups and following a community-responsive approach to programming. From the selection of planting material to the final design of the greenhouse and sheltered garden, community consultation will guide the development of the Green Barn.
6.6 Children's Play Space

The galleria, covered street, greenhouse and sheltered garden are all means of bringing the park into the barns. Yet another integrative possibility is proposed for the southernmost 1921 barn to strip the structure down to its skeletal essentials. This would result in an outdoor space that would offer a wide range of potential recreational uses - including a children's play space - yet retains the memory of the barns. Sheltered to some degree by the external wall of the restored barns on one side and providing some shade, the low-density open space within the “ruined” structure allows for flexibility in the evolution of the facility. As the needs of park users evolve, this open space may become part of a larger sheltered garden, a spot for an ice rink in winter, or an expanded greenhouse or a place for children's play equipment.

This proposed space is not appropriate for other uses not in keeping with the goals and objectives outlined previously, i.e. retail outlet, large-scale performance venue or amphitheatre.
Water park with skeletal heritage structure, Barcelona
7. Options and Analysis

7.1 Assumptions

In assessing the viability of the options in this report, and preparing capital and operating budget projections, Artscape has made the following assumptions:

1. The City will agree to lease the building to the project proponent for a 40-year term for $1/year.

2. The lease will apply to the land that extends a reasonable distance beyond the perimeter of the building footprint.

3. The project proponent will secure mortgage financing for the affordable housing component with the assistance of the Let’s Build Program.

4. The affordable housing component of the project will be exempt from municipal property taxes.

5. Tenants for the artists’ live/work space will need to qualify for affordable housing at the time of their selection according to guidelines stipulated by with the City of Toronto.

6. Tenant selection will be managed by the project proponent, according to a process approved by the City of Toronto.

7. Funds already approved by City Council for site remediation ($445,000) will be available to the project proponent to undertake this work.

8. City of Toronto Public Works staff will undertake traffic and parking assessments for the approved option and make appropriate recommendations.

9. The City of Toronto Staff Working Group will continue their work on the appropriate rezoning and other municipal approvals as required.

10. The City of Toronto will work collaboratively with the project proponent to investigate and implement environmentally sustainable initiatives that may include storm water retention strategies and ground source heat pump systems.
11. Each live/work unit will qualify for a maximum of $46,000 in federal/provincial/municipal funding managed through the City of Toronto’s Let’s Build Program.

12. The tenants selected for the community arts barn will be strong candidates for support from Canadian Heritage’s Cultural Spaces Canada Program or future programs developed by the Province of Ontario.

13. The Stop Community Food Centre and FoodShare Toronto will agree to cover the operating, programming and staff costs related to the Green Barn component.

14. Capital fundraising for all components of the project will be managed by the project proponent.

15. If required, the City of Toronto will issue charitable tax receipts for donations to the capital campaign.

16. The City of Toronto will require a maximum of 400 square feet of space for equipment storage related to park maintenance or programs.

The feasibility analysis for this project may need to be adjusted in the event that any of the above conditions or assumptions cannot be met.
**Option 1A**

**Barns used:**
- 1913 barn

**Uses:**
- 11 artist live/work units
- 10 artist work studio units

**Impact on Local Community:**
- Weak potential for programs and services to serve local community
- Compatible use for residential neighbourhood (housing)
- No common space (indoor) for artists to interact with community
- Will enhance park safety - “eyes-on-the-park”
- Likely to create minimal increase in parking and traffic
- Uses 4% of remaining site (3 residential lots and emergency vehicle access road excluded)

**Public Interest:**
- Serves key City policy in a nominal way – creation of affordable housing
- Serves high priority of space need in arts community – live/work
- Poorly serves heritage preservation – demolition of 80% of barns
- Environmentally unfriendly (compared to other options) – demolition creates landfill, wastes embodied energy and resources

**Capital Fundraising Potential:**
- Capital costs too high to meet City’s affordability targets for housing
- Scale of project too small to merit investment of time and resources

**Operational Sustainability:**
- Not operationally sustainable at affordable rent levels

**Conclusions:**
Option 1A would likely provide the least impact and the least community benefits of all of the options studied. Due to the higher costs of developing affordable housing on this scale, Option 1A cannot deliver housing within the City’s affordability targets and is therefore not viable.
Overall Site Area: 205,504 SF
Building Footprint: 8,263 SF
Option 1B

Barns used: • 1913 barn

Uses: • cluster of 10 offices/programming spaces rented to non-profit organizations
• multi-purpose meeting/rehearsal facility (operated by an arts organization tenant)
• public washrooms

Impact on Local Community:
• Has strong potential to provide community-based programming for all, including youth and seniors, that is available year-round in daytime and evenings
• Has strong potential to give resident organizations a platform to connect with the community
• Increased activity will enhance park safety
• May require a small number of dedicated parking spaces
• Uses 4% of remaining site (3 residential lots and emergency vehicle access road excluded)

Public Interest:
• Serves space needs of non-profit organizations
• Will foster a sense of community and serve as a meeting place
• Poorly serves heritage preservation - demolition of 80% of barns
• Environmentally unfriendly (compared to other options) - demolition creates landfill, wastes embodied energy and resources

Capital Fundraising Potential:
• Impact strictly local – limited fundraising appeal
• Grant programs for capital projects in the arts are very few and highly competitive
• Would likely require City to contribute 90 – 100% of capital funds for arts component

Operational Sustainability:
• Strong potential to engage local community in governance of the Community Arts Barn
• Surveys from potential tenants indicate strong demand and financial capacity

Conclusions:
Option 1B offers the potential for community-based programming without requiring new operational funding from the City. However, the limited local impact of this option will likely impair its chances for success in the current highly-competitive capital grant programs for the arts. For Option 1B to be viable, the City would likely need to contribute 90 – 100% of the required capital costs.
Option 2

Barns used:
- 1913 barn
- 1921 barn (north of 1913 along Benson Ave.)

Uses:
- 19 artist live/work units
- 11 artist work studio units
- Cluster of 5 offices/programming spaces rented to non-profit organizations
- Multi-purpose meeting/rehearsal facility (operated by an arts organization)
- Indoor community gardens
- Partial covered street
- Public washrooms

Impact on Local Community:
- Has strong potential to provide community-based programming for all, including youth and seniors, that is available year-round in daytime and evenings
- Proposed uses compatible with residential neighbourhood: housing
- Has strong potential to give resident artists and organizations a platform to connect with the community
- Will enhance park safety - “eyes-on-the-park”
- May require a small number of dedicated parking spaces
- Uses 13% of remaining site (3 residential lots and emergency vehicle access road excluded)

Public Interest:
- Serves space needs of non-profit organizations and studio needs (work and live/work) of artists
- Will foster a sense of community and serve as a meeting place
- Poorly serves heritage preservation - demolition of 60% of barns
- Environmentally unfriendly (compared to other options) - demolition creates landfill, wastes embodied energy and resources

Capital Fundraising Potential:
- Impact strictly local - limited fundraising appeal
- Grant programs for capital projects in the arts are limited and highly competitive
- Would likely require City to contribute 90 – 100% of capital funds for arts component
- Eligible for support through City’s Let’s Build Program

Operational Sustainability:
- Strong potential to engage local community in governance of the Community Arts Barn
- Surveys from potential tenants indicate strong demand and financial capacity

Conclusions:
Option 2 combines an interesting mix of community arts space and artists’ live/work units that have strong potential to deliver programs and activities that serve the local community. Option 2 presents a strong case for funding for the artists’ live/work units through the Let’s Build Program administered by the City. Given the highly competitive nature of capital fundraising for the arts and the limited local impact of Option 2, it is likely that the City would need to invest 90 - 100% of the capital resources required for community arts space. While Option 2 has the potential to sustain its operations, it provides weak potential to leverage capital support from other governments and the private sector.
Option 3

Barns used:
- 1913 barn
- 1921 barn (north of 1913 along Benson Ave.)
- A portion of the steel frame of the 1916 barn

Uses:
- 19 artist live/work units
- 11 artist work studio units
- cluster of 5 offices/programming spaces rented to non-profit organizations
- multi-purpose meeting/rehearsal facility (operated by an arts organization)
- greenhouse (operated by a community organization)
- sheltered garden and community bake oven
- indoor community gardens
- partial covered street
- public washrooms

Impact on Local Community:
- Has strong potential to provide community-based programming for all, including youth and seniors, that is available year-round in daytime and evenings
- Adds environmental programming, education and greening initiatives
- Proposed uses compatible with residential neighbourhood: housing
- Has very strong potential to give resident artists and organizations a platform to connect with the community - especially through the Green Barn (sheltered gardens, greenhouses, community bake oven, etc)
- Will enhance park safety - "eyes-on-the-park"
- Potential compromise for those wishing maximum amount of grass and trees
- May require a number of dedicated parking spaces
- Uses 18.5% of remaining site (3 residential lots and emergency vehicle access road excluded)

Public Interest:
- Serves space needs of non-profit organizations and studio needs (work and live/work) of artists
- Will foster a strong sense of community and serve as a meeting place
- Serves main priorities identified in Goldsmith report re: heritage preservation (1913, 1916, north 1921 barns)
- Environmentally friendly - includes green agenda, environmental education

Capital Fundraising Potential:
- Combination of uses makes Option 3 a unique model for development - addresses affordable housing, heritage preservation, environmental sustainability and education, community and professional arts
- Strong concept heightens profile of project and extends fundraising appeal beyond immediate neighbourhood
- Strong candidate for funding through City's Let's Build Program (affordable housing)
- Strong candidate for funding through environmental grants programs
- Strong candidate for capital funding for arts (although programs are limited)

Operational Sustainability:
- Strong potential to engage local community in governance
- Surveys from potential tenants indicate strong demand and financial capacity
- Strong synergies between uses will contribute to resource-sharing and collaborations

Conclusions:
Option 3 proposes a dynamic combination of complementary uses to form a unique "ecology". This strong concept makes a compelling case for funding beyond the local community and appeals to programs that support many of the elements proposed (affordable housing, arts infrastructure, environmental education and sustainability, heritage preservation, and public art). The case for capital funding is enhanced not only by the diversity and scope of sources but also by the strong potential for cross-sectoral partnership building. Option 3 has significant possibilities to leverage resources from other governments and the private sector as it resonates strongly with "smart growth" strategies. It will provide a wide range of programs and activities that serve and engage the local community. In summary, Option 3 is viable as it strongly serves all four frames of reference.
Option 4

Barns used:
- 1913 barn
- 1921 barn (north of 1913 along Benson Ave.)
- 1916 barn
- A portion of the concrete frame of the 1921 barn (south of 1916 barn)

Uses:
- 22 artist live/work units
- 11 artist work studio units
- Cluster of 8-10 offices/programming spaces rented to non-profit organizations
- Multipurpose meeting/rehearsal facility (operated by an arts organization)
- Greenhouse (operated by a community organization)
- Sheltered garden and community bake oven
- Public washrooms
- Landscaped covered street, full size

Impact on Local Community:
- Has strong potential to provide community-based programming for all, including youth and seniors, that is available year-round in daytime and evenings
- Proposed uses compatible with residential neighbourhood: housing
- Has very strong potential to give resident artists and organizations a platform to connect with the community - especially through the Green Barn (sheltered gardens, greenhouses, community bake oven, etc)
- Will enhance park safety - “eyes-on-the-park”
- May require a number of dedicated parking spaces
- Uses 23% of remaining site (3 residential lots and emergency vehicle access road excluded)

Public Interest:
- Serves space needs of non-profit organizations (double the space of Option 3) and studio needs (work and live/work) of artists
- Will foster a strong sense of community and serve as a meeting place – larger covered street than in Option 3
- Strongly serves heritage preservation (1913, 1916, two 1921 barns)
- Environmentally friendly - includes green agenda, environmental education

Capital Fundraising Potential:
- Combination of uses makes Option 4 a unique model for development - addresses affordable housing, heritage preservation, environmental sustainability and education, community and professional arts, public art
- Strong concept heightens profile of project and extends fundraising appeal beyond immediate neighbourhood
- Strong candidate for funding through City’s Let’s Build Program (affordable housing)
- Strong candidate for funding through environmental grants programs
- Strong candidate for capital funding for arts (although programs are limited)
- Funding for common spaces (i.e. covered street) may be difficult to procure

Operational Sustainability:
- Strong potential to engage local community in governance of the Community Arts Barn
- Surveys from potential tenants indicate strong demand and financial capacity
- Strong synergies between uses will contribute to resource sharing and collaborations

Conclusions:
Option 4 provides significantly more arts space and common areas for the public and therefore would afford substantially more community benefits than Option 3. It makes an even more compelling case for capital funding but also requires significantly more money to be raised. It will provide a wider range of programs and activities that serve and engage the local community. It is perhaps the strongest from an architectural design point of view and offers greater opportunities for site interpretation (in the covered street). In summary, Option 4 is viable as it strongly serves all four frames of reference.
OPTION 5

Overall Site Area: +/- 205,000 SF
Building Footprint: +/- 37,300 SF

WYCHWOOD T.T.C. BARNS
Toronto, Ontario
April, 2002
Option 5
Overall View
E.R.A. Architects Ltd.
**Option 5**

**Barns used:**
- 1913 barn
- 1921 barn (north of 1913 along Benson Ave.)
- 1916 barn
- A portion of the concrete frame of both 1921 barns (south of 1916 barn)

**Uses:**
- 22 artist live/work units
- 11 artist work studio units
- Cluster of 8-10 offices/programming spaces rented to non-profit organizations
- Multi-purpose meeting/rehearsal facility (operated by an arts organization)
- Greenhouse (operated by a community organization)
- Sheltered garden and community bake oven
- Public washrooms
- Full covered street
- Children’s play space

**Impact on Local Community:**
- Has strong potential to provide community-based programming for all, including youth and seniors, that is available year-round in daytime and evenings
- Proposed uses compatible with residential neighbourhood: housing
- Has very strong potential to give resident artists and organizations a platform to connect with the community – especially through the Green Barn (sheltered gardens, greenhouses, community bake oven, etc)
- Will enhance park safety - “eyes-on-the-park”
- May require a number of dedicated parking spaces
- Uses 28% of remaining site (3 residential lots and emergency vehicle access road excluded)

**Public Interest:**
- Serves space needs of non-profit organizations (double the space compared to Option 3) and studio needs (work and live/work) of artists
- Will foster a strong sense of community and serve as a meeting place – larger covered street than in Option 3
- Strongly serves heritage preservation, memory of entire complex maintained
- Environmentally friendly - includes green agenda, environmental education

**Capital Fundraising Potential:**
- Combination of uses makes Option 5 a unique model for development - addresses affordable housing, heritage preservation, environmental sustainability and education, community and professional arts, public art
- Strong concept heightens profile of project and extends fundraising appeal beyond local neighbourhood
- Strong candidate for funding through City’s Let’s Build Program (affordable housing)
- Strong candidate for funding through environmental grants programs
- Strong candidate for capital funding for arts (although programs are limited)
- Funding for common spaces (i.e. covered street) may be difficult to procure

**Operational Sustainability:**
- Strong potential to engage local community in governance of the Community Arts Barn
- Surveys from potential tenants indicate strong demand and financial capacity
- Strong synergies between uses will contribute to resource-sharing and collaborations

**Conclusions:**
Option 5 builds on Option 4 by adding the shell of the southernmost barn for a children’s play space in the heart of the park. The added area would not likely have an impact in terms of fundraising potential or capital cost. It would enhance the park by providing designated play space but offer less open green space. It would preserve the essential memory of the entire TTC complex. The children’s play space proposed in Option 5 could offer an interesting partly-shaded environment for the public to use and allow for flexibility for future uses. In summary, Option 5 is viable as it strongly serves all four frames of reference.
7.3 Fundraising Analysis

As noted earlier, this study has benefited from the advice of a wide range of experts who have been hired as consultants (architects, engineers, etc) or who have volunteered their time. The findings of the volunteer fundraising advisory panel were especially significant in distinguishing the relative viability of the options. The panel felt that the user community of the barns – the neighbourhood – would likely be the core fundraising constituency. Panel members agreed that few of the non-profit groups that had expressed interest in tenancy would likely have the capacity or profile to attract the level of capital investment required. They also noted that the location of the site (in the middle of a residential neighbourhood) severely limited the potential for corporate naming rights.

The panel stated that the three components of the project had very different fundraising potential. Due to the existence of affordable housing programs through the City, they found the artists’ live/work component the fastest and easiest form of capital support that could be raised. The environmental elements including the Green Barn and common green spaces (community gardens/covered street) were considered to have strong potential for funding from foundations and government programs serving the environment. The Community Arts Barn was considered to be the most challenging due to lack of programs and foundations supporting arts infrastructure development of this scale and the highly competitive nature of the field at this time.

The fundraising panel agreed that securing sufficient capital funds and financing for the Studio Barn and the Green Barn was a strong probability. When asked about the relative fundraising potential of the options involving a Community Arts Barn, the panel identified a very significant difference between the options. They found that Options 1B and 2 had a limited local impact and would not fare well in a competition for arts infrastructure funds. Options 3, 4, and 5 were considered to have dramatically improved fundraising potential because the options offered a stronger and more cohesive overall concept that appealed to a wider range of interests. The panel therefore made a key finding: Options 3, 4, and 5 had the potential to appeal to constituencies beyond the neighbourhood – something they considered essential given the capital costs under consideration. The panel also observed that in order to leverage support from other levels of the government and the private sector for the arts component, the City of Toronto would need to make the lead donation equivalent to one third of the capital costs. Therefore, a contribution from the City has been included in the capital budget for the Community Arts Barn.
### 7.4 Comparative Capital Budget Analysis

#### Wychwood Barns Capital Budget - Comparative Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th>Option 1A</th>
<th>Option 1B</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto - confirmed</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/Prov/Mun Housing - Let's Build</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>874,000</td>
<td>874,000</td>
<td>1,012,000</td>
<td>1,012,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In kind donations</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green/Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual donations</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate donations</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal and/or Provincial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>1,870,000</td>
<td>2,040,000</td>
<td>790,000</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual donations</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate donations</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Revenues:</td>
<td>1,001,000</td>
<td>2,331,000</td>
<td>3,609,000</td>
<td>4,405,000</td>
<td>5,262,000</td>
<td>5,327,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Financing re: Housing</td>
<td>1,668,000</td>
<td>1,986,000</td>
<td>1,986,000</td>
<td>2,264,000</td>
<td>2,264,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Revenues and Financing</td>
<td>2,669,000</td>
<td>2,331,000</td>
<td>5,595,000</td>
<td>6,391,000</td>
<td>7,526,000</td>
<td>7,591,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous materials removal</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,887,858</td>
<td>1,639,398</td>
<td>3,941,659</td>
<td>4,478,352</td>
<td>5,339,022</td>
<td>5,363,791</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design allowances and contingency @ 15%</td>
<td>283,179</td>
<td>245,910</td>
<td>591,249</td>
<td>671,753</td>
<td>800,853</td>
<td>804,569</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>188,786</td>
<td>163,940</td>
<td>394,166</td>
<td>447,835</td>
<td>533,920</td>
<td>536,379</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development fees and levies (re: housing)</td>
<td>11,605</td>
<td>20,045</td>
<td>20,045</td>
<td>23,210</td>
<td>23,210</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management @ 5%</td>
<td>133,391</td>
<td>116,434</td>
<td>279,638</td>
<td>319,420</td>
<td>376,210</td>
<td>379,418</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising salaries</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising expenses</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Expenses</td>
<td>2,667,819</td>
<td>2,328,682</td>
<td>5,592,757</td>
<td>6,388,405</td>
<td>7,524,197</td>
<td>7,588,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Deficit)</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes re: Wychwood Barns Capital Budget - Comparative Analysis

General:

Order of magnitude cost estimates for each option in this report has been independently analyzed by A.W. Hooker Associates. A detailed breakdown of their work is listed in Appendix E. The breakdown of revenues and expenses per program component has been extrapolated from cost estimates on a per square foot basis and may be subject to change.

Revenues

1. Environmental cleanup and site remediation totaling $445,000 were included in an implementation report approved by Toronto City Council in December 2001. Council directed that funds for these items be derived from the sale of the 3 residential lots on site.

2. The City of Toronto administers the Let's Build Program that provides funding for the creation of affordable housing. The contribution through Let's Build has been estimated at $46,000 per unit for all options involving live/work space. The per unit contribution may be adjusted downward pending a more precise breakdown of costs by program component. Funding through the Let's Build Program is subject to review through a competitive application process.

3. The affordable artists' live/work component presents opportunities to solicit in-kind donations of materials and labour.

4. There are numerous Canadian charitable foundations that support environmental and greening initiatives. The Green Barn concept received enthusiastic response in testing with foundations that focus on this area including one foundation that expressed strong interest in making a significant contribution.

5. The fundraising advisory committee noted that the ‘green component’ in Options 3, 4, and 5 had strong potential to draw individual donations from the local community and neighbourhood.

6. The fundraising advisory committee noted that the ‘green component’ in Options 3, 4, and 5 had strong potential to draw corporate donations from local businesses and corporations with a philanthropic interest in the environment.
7. The Community Arts Barn is eligible for funding through the Cultural Spaces Canada Program of the Department of Canadian Heritage. This $80 million grants program focuses support on projects that make the arts more accessible to Canadians. Cultural Spaces Canada funds up to 1/3 of eligible capital project costs in a highly competitive process. The arts component of the project may be eligible for future programs of the Ontario Government including the second round of SuperBuild that may have new funding criteria.

8. The fundraising advisory committee noted that all options with an arts barn component would require a lead donation of at least 1/3 of the capital costs for this component. Given the highly competitive nature of fundraising in this field, the fact that the City of Toronto owns the site, and the desire to leverage funds from other levels and the private sector, the committee agreed that the City needed to make a lead cash investment in the project to demonstrate their serious commitment and attract other partners. For Options 1B and 2 however, the committee expressed strong reservations that the overall concept was not strong enough to successfully compete for funding and advised that for these options to be viable the City would need to fund most or all of the capital for the arts component.

9. The arts component presents opportunities to solicit support from individuals. The fundraising advisory committee stated that the people who lived in the local community were the most likely supporters of the project.

10. A number of Canadian charitable foundations make capital contributions to arts projects including the Ontario Trillium Foundation ($75,000 maximum).

11. Corporate donations for the arts component are most likely to come from businesses located in the area.

12. Support for affordable housing involves a mix of funding (see note 2) and financing. The mortgage financing required has been determined by subtracting the estimated funding and fundraising related to housing from the estimated cost of the live/work component.

**Expenses**

13. The estimate for hazardous materials removal was derived from the environmental study commissioned by the City of Toronto.

14. Please see Appendix E for a detailed breakdown of construction costs.
15. Please see Appendix E for a breakdown of design allowances and contingencies.

16. Consultants include architect fees, engineers (mechanical/electrical, environmental, structural), and cost consultants.

17. The development fee noted is the $1,065 per unit levy on new housing units by the Catholic School Board.

18. The project management fee is an allowance for the project proponent to cover overhead and soft costs related to managing the capital project.

19. An allowance for community development staff and materials has been included to allow for ongoing community input and involvement prior to the opening of the facility.

20. One or more dedicated fundraising staff will be required to meet the fundraising revenue projections.

21. Fundraising expenses would include the cost of materials and events.
### 7.5 Comparative Operating Budget Analysis

**Wychwood Barns Annual Operating Budget - Comparative Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th>Option 1A</th>
<th>Option 1B</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rental Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom live/work units - $1,248/mo.</td>
<td>89,856</td>
<td>134,784</td>
<td>134,784</td>
<td>134,784</td>
<td>134,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom live/work units - $1,039/mo.</td>
<td>49,872</td>
<td>24,936</td>
<td>24,936</td>
<td>24,936</td>
<td>24,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom live/work units - $870/mo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,320</td>
<td>31,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor live/work units - $698/mo.</td>
<td>8,376</td>
<td>67,008</td>
<td>67,008</td>
<td>67,008</td>
<td>67,008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist work studios units - $12 p.s.f./yr.</td>
<td>39,912</td>
<td>54,340</td>
<td>54,340</td>
<td>54,340</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community arts units - $12 p.s.f./yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>125,916</td>
<td>59,724</td>
<td>129,312</td>
<td>129,312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Barn</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancillary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>188,816</td>
<td>125,916</td>
<td>341,592</td>
<td>357,192</td>
<td>458,300</td>
<td>456,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest and principal on mortgage</strong></td>
<td>153,984</td>
<td>183,348</td>
<td>183,348</td>
<td>209,004</td>
<td>209,004</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land lease</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property taxes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,316</td>
<td>21,872</td>
<td>29,272</td>
<td>41,866</td>
<td>41,866</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating and cooling</td>
<td>5,226</td>
<td>4,937</td>
<td>13,740</td>
<td>15,359</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>8,041</td>
<td>7,595</td>
<td>21,139</td>
<td>23,629</td>
<td>29,880</td>
<td>29,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General maintenance</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service contracts</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds/landscaping</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning contract</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance salary/benefits</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management overhead</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expense</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit/legal</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>8,103</td>
<td>9,058</td>
<td>11,454</td>
<td>11,454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy and bad debt</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>5,124</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td>6,851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital reserve allowance</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>6,832</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>9,166</td>
<td>9,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>6,832</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>9,166</td>
<td>9,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>217,305</td>
<td>100,385</td>
<td>336,391</td>
<td>356,412</td>
<td>456,312</td>
<td>456,227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>(28,489)</td>
<td>25,531</td>
<td>5,201</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes re: Wychwood Barns Annual Operating Budget - Comparative Analysis

General:

One of the major objectives of the re-use options is to deliver affordable space for the proposed use(s).

For budgeting purposes:

- The City's affordability targets for rental housing have been used.
- For artist work studios and community arts spaces, affordability was established by examining the range of gross rents paid by artists and organizations that are tenants in properties operated by Artscape.

Revenues

1. Revenues derived from the Green Barn include the recovery of taxes and utilities from the Stop Community Food Centre and FoodShare Toronto estimated to be $4 per square foot per annum. It is understood that as the operator of the Green Barn, The Stop Community Food Centre and FoodShare Toronto would raise the funds for the operations of the Green Barn (greenhouse, sheltered garden, bake oven) including: programming, staff, maintenance, plant materials, watering systems, etc.

Expenses

With the exception of the items noted below, expense projections are based upon Artscape’s experience operating a portfolio of five properties.

2. The mortgage payment amounts reflect the money required to finance the live/work units as indicated in the capital budget projections. The interest rate used in calculating the mortgage payment is 8.0% on a 20-year amortization basis. It is assumed that the annual depreciation would be equal to the principal payment.

3. The land lease on the entire project is calculated at $1 per year.

4. Property taxes have been calculated at $2 per square foot for the tenanted spaces with the exception of the live/work units. The operating projections assume that the City will agree to exempt property taxes on the live/work units - a recently approved mechanism for the City to stimulate creation of affordable housing.

5. The deficit in 1A demonstrates that this option cannot meet the City's affordability targets for new rental housing. It follows that this option would not qualify for Let's Build assistance and is therefore not viable.

The surpluses in Options 1B and 2 would only be generated if the City agreed to pay all or a substantial portion of the capital costs required. While these options could theoretically sustain themselves with even lower rental rates, they do not satisfy the study's parameter’s regarding leveraging funding from other levels of government and the private sector.
7.6 Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Summary</th>
<th>Option 1A</th>
<th>Option 1B</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2 LOCAL COMMUNITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1 Programs and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For youth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seniors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime and evening</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2 Neighbourhood issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: Local Community</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 THE PUBLIC INTEREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1 Heritage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2 Environment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3 Arts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4 Affordable housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.5 Policy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.6 Accessibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: Public Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 CAPITAL FUNDRAISING POTENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1 Funding from multiple sectors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2 Fed./Prov. funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3 Affordable housing targets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4 Funding from foundation and private sector</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.5 Galvanizing support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.6 Development model</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.7 Potential for phasing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: Capital Fundraising Potential</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 OPERATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1 Engages community</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2 Sufficient revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3 Affordability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4 Capital reserves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5 Collaboration/resource sharing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.6 Governance involves community stakeholders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: Operational Sustainability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL VIABILITY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Park in redeveloped industrial land, Germany
8. Conclusion

Urban parks have evolved to serve many different needs and purposes. The re-use of the Wychwood Barns and the surrounding park development has the potential to rally the local community around a common cause and create public space and an ongoing mechanism to foster interaction, cooperation, education, and recreation.

This report has detailed a range of re-use options that are capable of generating sufficient revenues to sustain their operations. It also outlines the assumptions and conditions that will be required to make them viable.

Analysis of Options 3, 4, and 5 indicates that each has strong potential to serve the local community and the public interest, leverage funds from governments and the private sector, and sustain its operations over time. These options offer an interesting new model for community arts infrastructure development that draws inspiration from the past and from the local neighbourhood - Wychwood Park was created as an artists’ colony in 1892. They also propose a dynamic partnership that serves pressing community needs for space while promising extraordinary community-building potential.

Many cities in North America are exploring “smart growth” solutions to the challenges of managing growth and the environment. Options 3, 4, and 5 resonate strongly with this new thinking about development as they combine arts, affordable housing, heritage preservation, environmental education, and green initiatives while celebrating the history of public transit. To position a project like the re-use of the Wychwood Barns for funding in today’s highly competitive environment, the concept needs to be unique and dynamic. We believe Options 3, 4, or 5 have this potential.

At the beginning of this document it was stated that the fate of the barns and the surrounding park rests in the hands of the City. Decisive action and strong community leadership is also required at the local level to determine the solution that can be embraced by a large majority of stakeholders. This report is offered as a tool to build consensus around the possibilities and opportunities that the Wychwood Barns present for the neighbourhood.

In conclusion, we would like to pay special tribute to the volunteer members of the Wychwood Barns Advisory Council, architects Joe Lobko and Michael McClelland, Councillor Joe Mihevc and his staff, and the staff of the Culture, Planning, Parks, Heritage and Housing Departments, who have worked beyond the call of duty to make this report possible.

Toronto Artscape
May 2002
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SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Total number of responses: 143

Responses endorsing adaptive re-use of multiple barns including live-work studios: 56

Responses endorsing adaptive re-use of multiple barns excluding live-work studios: 23

Responses endorsing greenhouse/green barn: 19

Responses endorsing a grass/trees/playground park: 19

Responses endorsing recreation facility/community centre in park: 9

Responses endorsing exclusive ‘100% green space’: 9

DETAILED SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Note: Detailed findings catalogue explicitly articulated comments only.

QUESTION 1

What did you like about the preliminary plan you saw tonight?

• good design (40)  • eyes on park/safety (8)  • something for everyone (4)
• greenhouse (15)  • bake oven (7)  • revitalization of St Clair (4)
• multi-use/integrated concept (15)  • groves (6)  • nothing (4)
• green ideas (12)  • it improves the neighbourhood (6)  • entrances (3)
• heritage aspect (12)  • skating rink (5)  • piazza (3)
• skeleton of barns kept (8)  • artists live/work (4)  • ponds (3)
• Covered street/Wintergarden (8)  • playing field (4)  • NW and SE corners (2)
• artists as neighbours (8)  • playground for kids (4)  • amphitheatre (2)
QUESTION 2
If you were present at the design charrette does it reflect your ideas

11 individuals indicated that they had been present at the design charrette. Of these:
- 8 said the plan did reflect their ideas
- 3 said the plan did not reflect their ideas

QUESTION 3
would you improve the preliminary plan?

- eliminate parking (18)
- decrease density of uses and built space (16)
- demolish all but the 1913 barn (14)
- add youth element i.e. basketball court (13)
- more green space (12)
- more for kids (9)
- demolish all the barns (9)
- demolish all but 1913 and 1916 barns (8)
- no pond (8)
- add seniors’ programs (7)
- boys and girls club (5)
- remove playing field (3)
- add multi-purpose room (3)
- use landscape architects (3)
- more tree plantings (3)

- add artificial skating rink (3)
- no amphitheatre (3)
- no farmers’ market (2)
- add coffee house (2)
- put crosswalk on Christie (2)
- move parking to Christie (2)
- no north 1921 barn (2)
- improve presentation to community (2)
- enclosed dog run (2)
- add kids gym (2)
- add running track (2)
- no bake oven (2)
- no art barn (2)
- add kilns (1)
- add woodworking studio (1)
- enlarge amphitheatre (1)

- add baseball diamond (1)
- enhance Benson Ave. (1)
- add gazebo (1)
- add climbing wall (1)
- add treehouse (1)
- use one barn for a TTC museum (1)
- minimize housing (1)
- no skating rink (1)
- add emergency phones (1)
- add water fountain (1)
- add snack bar (1)
- add swimming pool (1)
- add lawn bowling (1)
- more North/South axes (1)
- add cardinal point entrances (1)

QUESTION 4
Other comments?

- no artist’s live/work (20)
- Artscape should not be involved (13)
- don’t want increased traffic (8)
- we want a better process (7)
- Artscape should remain part of process (7)
- why is Artscape here? (5)
- this is a good democratic process (4)
- finances should be discussed at meetings (4)
- which artists will get to live there? (4)
- I am appalled by my disrespectful neighbours (4)
- move the parking to the Wychwood Ave parkette (3)
- worried about safety (3)

- studios yes, housing no (3)
- create a covered skating rink (2)
- add more wilderness (2)
- add underground parking (2)
- the neighbours do not own the land, the city does - should reflect the city’s diversity (1)
- the plan is impractical (1)
- plan is like places in Paris (1)
- people need to be able to choose (1)
- more low-income consultation (1)
- community = local residents (1)
- community does not = local residents (1)
- add more sports areas (1)

- add supportive housing (1)
- where are the non-white constituents? (1)
- use a streetcar as a change room for rink (1)
- ensure day and night facilities (1)
- it should be used all year round (1)
- add supportive housing (1) • learn from 1313 Queen St West in Parkdale (1)
- where have all these naysayers been for the past 2-3 years - not at the meetings I attended (1)
- focus on park not barns (1)
March 28, 2002

Ms. Annie Hillis
Toronto Artscape Inc.
60 Atlantic Ave., Suite 111
Toronto, Ontario
M6K 1X9

Dear Ms. Hillis:

Re: Statistics for Permit Parking Area 5C

This letter will confirm the telephone conversation that you had with Vince Loffredi of my office on Friday March 22, 2002, regarding statistics pertaining to permit parking area 5C.

Permit parking area 5C has a total of 1,179 on-street parking spaces for which 1,018 permits have been issued. Our records also indicate that this parking permit area does not have a history of becoming waitlisted.

I trust this information is of assistance. If you require any further information, please contact Vince Loffredi at 416-338-5890.

Yours truly,

Bob Bonner, Supervisor
Permit Parking, District 1
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Wychwood T.T.C. Car Barns
76 Wychwood Avenue,
Toronto, Ontario

for The City of Toronto

Philip Goldsmith & Company Ltd. Architects
Halsall Associates Limited
M & E Engineering Ltd.
Historica Research
Tom Brown, Q.S.

February 19, 2001
Executive Summary

The Wychwood Car House is an important heritage feature of the City of Toronto. No other car barns of this age remain that:

a) display many original building elements (such as the overall building form, structure, skylights, raised platforms and equipment),
b) are publicly accessible, and
c) are an integral historical fit in the surrounding community.

Visual investigations of the Wychwood TTC barns have concluded that the building is suitable for adaptive re-use, however localized deterioration requires remedial work. The full extent of repair requires further investigation and testing.

There are two types of car barn construction on the site:

1) steel column and steel truss frame with brick and block infill at the earliest two barns (circa. 1913 and 1916), and
2) reinforced concrete post and beam structure with brick and block infill at the 1921 barns.

The earliest barns have been protected, although altered, by the later additions and are in good condition. The most significant deterioration occurs at the perimeter of the building (i.e. at the 1921 barn additions) where the exposed concrete foundation and columns show a large extent of surface delamination. Recommendations include perimeter below grade concrete repair and protection, and above grade replacement of deteriorated concrete surfaces. Concrete roof beam and roof slab deterioration is also evident at the two southern 1921 barns, due to failure of the roofing membrane and skylight. Other forms of building fabric deterioration typically involve water penetration at the roof, skylights and windows. This damage is repairable and has not yet significantly compromised the structural integrity of the building.

Mechanically, it is recommended that the existing steam heating system and office a/c units be replaced. Some re-use of existing cast iron radiators and washroom fixtures may be possible. The existing water service requires re-piping and retrofit in order to comply with code requirements. The building has a functioning, 40 year old sprinkler system which should be maintained. Electrically, the existing system requires rewiring to suit future building needs. The fire alarm system requires maintenance and possible upgrading.

Demolition issues involve the removal of heritage barns, the extent of building restoration required with respect to partial demolition, and costs associated with the work.
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Executive Summary

Candec Consultants Limited have carried out an environmental assessment of the soil and groundwater conditions at property located at 76 Wychwood Avenue in Toronto (The Site). It is bound on the north by Benson Avenue, on the east by Wychwood Avenue, on the west by Christie Street, and on the south by residential dwellings. It has an area of 4.32 acres. It is our understanding it is being considered for one or a combination of parkland, heritage or recreational purposes. The purpose of the assessment was to determine the degree of soil and ground water contamination that was present. This information was then to be used to estimate the scope and cost of cleaning up and decommissioning the property to permit its redevelopment for the purposes being contemplated.

The primary basis for the approach that has been adopted in the execution of this assessment is the criteria that are set out in the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Energy’s June 1996 Guidelines for Use at Contaminated Sites in Ontario, revised February 1997 (herein after referred to as the “Guidelines”), along with the companion documents pertaining to the sampling and testing of water, soil and sediment.

The Site is located in a highly developed area of the City of Toronto. The area is serviced by the municipal sewer system, and is supplied by potable water from the municipal source. There are no active wells in the area, from which water is extracted to supplement the potable water supply for the area. Consequently the ground water is classified as non-potable.

Based on the findings of this assessment, clean-up work will have to be executed at the Site in order to achieve compliance with the Guidelines pertaining to properties in areas having non-potable ground water and that are to be used for residential and parkland purposes.

It has been estimated that the footprint of the zones of impacted soil is 825m². Therefore assuming that the thickness of the fill stratum is uniformly 1000mm, the volume of impacted soil that will have to be removed is 825m³. This is a conservative volume estimate because the maximum thickness of the fill stratum observed in the test pits is 960mm and it is has been assumed that the impacted zones extend to the next nearest locations that are known to be devoid of impacted soil.

The data that has been collated reveals that the natural soil does not need to be remediated, based on the absence of any parameters that exceed the Guideline limits. On this basis it can also be concluded that no chemical contaminants are being leached out of the overlying impacted fill soil.

This assessment has been executed by personnel with Candec Consultants Limited who are suitably qualified and possess the expertise to carry out the scope of work that was requested on this occasion. We warrant that it has been executed in a manner that is consistent with the standards of the industry.

It should nevertheless be understood that the nature of the assessment does not permit us to provide you with a guarantee of the precise magnitude of the contaminated waste that will be generated but only a reasonable guide to probable expectations. In this regard, any previously undisclosed condition that is subsequently revealed is not expected to exceed the recommended contingency allowance of 20%.
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## A.W. HOOKER QUANTITY SURVEYOR'S REPORT

### OPTION 1A, OPTION 1B, OPTION 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHELL / STRUCTURE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>QUANT 1A 13433 SF</th>
<th>TOTAL ($)</th>
<th>QUANT 1B 12663 SF</th>
<th>TOTAL ($)</th>
<th>QUANT 2 35584 SF</th>
<th>TOTAL ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundations</strong></td>
<td>Allowance for restoration of existing</td>
<td>$1 SF</td>
<td>8263 SF</td>
<td>$8,263.00</td>
<td>8269 SF</td>
<td>$8,269.00</td>
<td>23455 SF</td>
<td>$23,455.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowance for new footings (for upper floor)</td>
<td>$0.5 SF</td>
<td>5170 SF</td>
<td>$2,585.00</td>
<td>4394 SF</td>
<td>$1,970.00</td>
<td>12129 SF</td>
<td>$6,064.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lowest floor structure</strong></td>
<td>Construction fill (4'-0&quot; deep)</td>
<td>$6 CY</td>
<td>1071.13 CY</td>
<td>$6,426.78</td>
<td>1071.91 CY</td>
<td>$6,431.44</td>
<td>2046.59 CY</td>
<td>$12,729.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granular under slab say 8&quot;</td>
<td>$28 CY</td>
<td>205.045 CY</td>
<td>$5,741.25</td>
<td>205.194 CY</td>
<td>$5,745.42</td>
<td>582.031 CY</td>
<td>$16,296.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper floor structure</strong></td>
<td>Slab on grade</td>
<td>$4 SF</td>
<td>8263 SF</td>
<td>$33,052.00</td>
<td>8269 SF</td>
<td>$33,076.00</td>
<td>19740 SF</td>
<td>$78,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter garden / green house slab</td>
<td>$6 SF</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3715 SF</td>
<td>$22,290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New mezzanine floor - wood flooring</strong></td>
<td>New mezzanine floor - wood flooring</td>
<td>$12 SF</td>
<td>5170 SF</td>
<td>$62,040.00</td>
<td>4394 SF</td>
<td>$52,728.00</td>
<td>12129 SF</td>
<td>$145,548.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartment staircases</td>
<td>$3,350 NO</td>
<td>11 NO</td>
<td>$36,850.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>19 NO</td>
<td>$63,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circulation staircases (inclds hand rail)</td>
<td>$5,300 NO</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
<td>$5,300.00</td>
<td>3 NO</td>
<td>$15,900.00</td>
<td>2 NO</td>
<td>$10,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof structure</strong></td>
<td>Restoration concrete deck (mop) (1921 barns)</td>
<td>$2 SF</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>15186 SF</td>
<td>$30,372.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration of steel frame (1913 &amp; 1916 barns)</td>
<td>$2 SF</td>
<td>8263 SF</td>
<td>$16,526.00</td>
<td>8269 SF</td>
<td>$16,538.00</td>
<td>8269 SF</td>
<td>$16,538.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steel deck &amp; sheathing (1913 &amp; 1916 barns)</td>
<td>$3 SF</td>
<td>8263 SF</td>
<td>$24,789.00</td>
<td>8269 SF</td>
<td>$24,807.00</td>
<td>8269 SF</td>
<td>$24,807.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External walls</strong></td>
<td>Restoration of concrete frame (1921 Barns)</td>
<td>$3 SF</td>
<td>11029 SF</td>
<td>$33,087.00</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>18932 SF</td>
<td>$56,796.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration of brick façade (no ddt openings)</td>
<td>$3 SF</td>
<td>11029 SF</td>
<td>$33,087.00</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>18932 SF</td>
<td>$56,796.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windows &amp; entrances</strong></td>
<td>Operable garage doors 12'-0, part glazed</td>
<td>$6,500 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>47000 LS</td>
<td>$47,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operable garage doors 28'-0, part glazed</td>
<td>$15,000 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>47000 LS</td>
<td>$47,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H/F metal man doors incld hardware</td>
<td>$1,200 NO</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>4 NO</td>
<td>$4,800.00</td>
<td>8 NO</td>
<td>$9,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartment Exit external doors incld hardware</td>
<td>$1,200 NO</td>
<td>21 NO</td>
<td>$25,200.00</td>
<td>11 NO</td>
<td>$13,200.00</td>
<td>19 NO</td>
<td>$22,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glazed exit doors - double incld hardware</td>
<td>$5,000 PR</td>
<td>0 PR</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 PR</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>500 PR</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glazed exit doors - single incld hardware</td>
<td>$2,500 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2 NO</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special hardware allowance (disabled)</td>
<td>$3,500 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof finish</strong></td>
<td>Roof finish</td>
<td>$550 NO</td>
<td>245 LS</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>11 NO</td>
<td>$6,050.00</td>
<td>8 NO</td>
<td>$4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace glazed skylights, aluminium double glazed</td>
<td>$30 SF</td>
<td>1821 SF</td>
<td>$54,630.00</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1821 SF</td>
<td>$54,630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERIOR FITOUT</strong></td>
<td>Modified bitumen w/ insulation (mop)</td>
<td>$6 SF</td>
<td>6448 SF</td>
<td>$38,688.00</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>6448 SF</td>
<td>$38,688.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartment Type 1</td>
<td>$13,000 NO</td>
<td>6 NO</td>
<td>$78,000.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>9 NO</td>
<td>$117,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartment Type 1A</td>
<td>$14,000 NO</td>
<td>4 NO</td>
<td>$56,000.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartment Type 2</td>
<td>$11,000 NO</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
<td>$6,160.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>8 NO</td>
<td>$88,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartment Type 3</td>
<td>$4,000 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>$550 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>4 NO</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
<td>4 NO</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts anchor</td>
<td>$550 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public circulation</td>
<td>$550 NO</td>
<td>11 NO</td>
<td>$6,050.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>8 NO</td>
<td>$4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support facilities</td>
<td>$500 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.W. HOOKER QUANTITY SURVEYOR'S REPORT

OPTION 1A, OPTION 1B, OPTION 2 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>OPTION 1A 13433 SF</th>
<th>OPTION 1B 12663 SF</th>
<th>OPTION 2 35584 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millwork &amp; specialties</td>
<td></td>
<td>QUANT TOTAL ($)</td>
<td>QUANT TOTAL ($)</td>
<td>QUANT TOTAL ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 1</td>
<td>$5,600 NO</td>
<td>6 NO $33,600.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
<td>9 NO $50,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 1A</td>
<td>$5,600 NO</td>
<td>4 NO $22,400.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
<td>2 NO $11,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 2</td>
<td>$5,420 NO</td>
<td>1 NO $5,420.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
<td>8 NO $43,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 3</td>
<td>$5,420 NO</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0 SF $0.00</td>
<td>$0 SF $0.00</td>
<td>$0 SF $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3 SF $735.00</td>
<td>1796 SF $5,388.00</td>
<td>2052 SF $6,156.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8 SF $3,160.00</td>
<td>$2,992.00</td>
<td>$11,448.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for millwork to Greenhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.25 SF $3,358.25</td>
<td>1560 SF $0.00</td>
<td>$8,896.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for signage, art etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.25 SF $3,358.25</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$8,896.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New green house</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00 SF $0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.00 NO $0.00</td>
<td>0 SF $0.00</td>
<td>15000 LS $15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green house planting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 SF $0.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full grown trees 6m to winter gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00 NO $0.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller trees to community gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00 NO $0.00</td>
<td>0 NO $0.00</td>
<td>20 NO $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous allowances</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.0 SF 13433 SF $13,433.00</td>
<td>12663 SF $12,663.00</td>
<td>35584 SF $35,584.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire stopping &amp; sealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.4 SF 13433 SF $5,373.20</td>
<td>12663 SF $5,065.20</td>
<td>35584 SF $14,233.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulking &amp; sealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.3 SF 13433 SF $4,029.90</td>
<td>12663 SF $3,798.90</td>
<td>35584 SF $10,675.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for unmeasured items</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.5 SF 13434 SF $33,585.00</td>
<td>12664 SF $31,660.00</td>
<td>35585 SF $88,962.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE WORK (30’-0 band around building)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11989 SF $11,989.00</td>
<td>11989 SF $11,989.00</td>
<td>5995 SF $5,995.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration with in boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1176 CY $7,056.00</td>
<td>888 CY $5,328.00</td>
<td>13433 SF $15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete hard surface paving (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2875.8 SF $11,503.20</td>
<td>3974 SF $15,896.00</td>
<td>7500 SF $15,896.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New planting (80%), incld sod</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5 SF 11503.2 SF $57,516.00</td>
<td>11503 SF $57,516.00</td>
<td>15896 SF $79,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical service site connections</td>
<td>$100,000 LS</td>
<td>1 LS $100,000.00</td>
<td>1 LS $100,000.00</td>
<td>1 LS $100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered garden, hard landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4 SF 0 SF $0.00</td>
<td>0 SF $0.00</td>
<td>0 SF $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered garden, planting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1 LS 0 LS $0.00</td>
<td>0 LS $0.00</td>
<td>0 LS $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCILLARY WORKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.0 SF 47283 SF $141,849.00</td>
<td>47277 SF $141,831.00</td>
<td>32091 SF $96,273.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial demolition &amp; removal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.0 SF 8263 SF $16,526.00</td>
<td>8269 SF $16,538.00</td>
<td>23455 SF $46,910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form window &amp; door openings (allowance)</td>
<td>$750 NO</td>
<td>26 NO $19,500.00</td>
<td>24 NO $18,000.00</td>
<td>52 NO $39,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance unmeasured alterations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1 SF 13433 SF $13,433.00</td>
<td>12663 SF $12,663.00</td>
<td>35584 SF $35,584.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL &amp; ELECTRICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$199,000.00</td>
<td>$226,000.00</td>
<td>$499,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$365,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground source heat pumps (Trench &amp; back fill)</td>
<td>$10 LF</td>
<td>3000 LF $30,000.00</td>
<td>3000 LF $30,000.00</td>
<td>7500 LF $75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$892,870</td>
<td>$856,692</td>
<td>$1,684,290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL REQUIREMENTS &amp; ALLOWANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td>$99,109 $95,083</td>
<td>$166,192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,430 $68,535</td>
<td>$134,765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,789 $25,701</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$49,554 $47,548</td>
<td>$97,102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$148,663 $142,639</td>
<td>$280,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# A.W. Hooker Quantity Surveyor's Report

## Option 3, Option 4, Option 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
<th>Quant</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shell / Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for restoration of existing foundations</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>23455</td>
<td>$23,455.00</td>
<td>28752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for new footings (for upper floor)</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>12129</td>
<td>$6,064.50</td>
<td>13741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for new footings (for upper floor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular under slab say 8&quot;</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>$4,872.00</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab on grade</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>$7,760.00</td>
<td>21212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter garden / green house slab</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>7415</td>
<td>$44,490.00</td>
<td>11240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for restoration of existing foundations</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>15186</td>
<td>$30,372.00</td>
<td>15186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of steel frame (1913 &amp; 1916 barns)</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>8269</td>
<td>$24,807.00</td>
<td>16456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of brick façade (no ddt openings)</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>18982</td>
<td>$56,946.00</td>
<td>21160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows &amp; entrances</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5942</td>
<td>$237,680.00</td>
<td>5942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operable garage doors 12'-0, part glazed</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
<td>21212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operable garage doors 28'-0, part glazed</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>21212</td>
<td>$32,067.00</td>
<td>21212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM metal man doors incld hardware</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8829</td>
<td>$8,600.00</td>
<td>8829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Exit external doors incld hardware</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>15186</td>
<td>$19,900.00</td>
<td>15186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed exit doors - double incld hardware</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4577</td>
<td>$25,215.00</td>
<td>4577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed exit doors - single incld hardware</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3568</td>
<td>$8,920.00</td>
<td>3568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special hardware allowance (disabled)</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>$4,795.00</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof finish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace glazed skylights, aluminium double glazed</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>6377</td>
<td>$191,310.00</td>
<td>8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Fitout</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitions</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$117,000.00</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 1</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 2</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$44,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts anchor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public circulation</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of brick façade (no ddt openings)</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>4577</td>
<td>$13,731.00</td>
<td>4577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel railing to mezzanine floor edge</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>$18,750.00</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
<th>Quant</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**A.W. HOOKER QUANTITY SURVEYOR’S REPORT**

**OPTION 3, OPTION 4, OPTION 5 – continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>OPTION 3 39284 SF</th>
<th>OPTION 4 46193 SF</th>
<th>OPTION 5 46193 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millwork &amp; specialties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 1</td>
<td>$5,600 NO</td>
<td>9 NO</td>
<td>$50,400.00</td>
<td>8 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 1A</td>
<td>$5,600 NO</td>
<td>2 NO</td>
<td>$11,200.00</td>
<td>2 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 2</td>
<td>$5,420 NO</td>
<td>8 NO</td>
<td>$43,360.00</td>
<td>8 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Type 3</td>
<td>$5,420 NO</td>
<td>0 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public circulation</td>
<td>$3 SF</td>
<td>2052 SF</td>
<td>$6,156.00</td>
<td>1004 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support facilities</td>
<td>$8 SF</td>
<td>1431 SF</td>
<td>$11,448.00</td>
<td>1929 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for millwork to Greenhouse</td>
<td>$0 SF</td>
<td>3600 SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3600 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for signage, art etc.</td>
<td>$0.25 SF</td>
<td>39284 SF</td>
<td>$9,821.00</td>
<td>46193 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New green house</td>
<td>$100.00 SF</td>
<td>3600 SF</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
<td>3600 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior landscaping</td>
<td>$1.00 NO</td>
<td>15000 LS</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>20000 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior landscaping (All inclusive)</td>
<td>$0 SF</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green house planting (Tropical)</td>
<td>$50,000 NO</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full grown trees to winter gardens</td>
<td>$0 SF</td>
<td>14 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>20 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller trees to community gardens</td>
<td>$0 SF</td>
<td>11 NO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>20 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous allowances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous metals</td>
<td>$1.0 SF</td>
<td>39284 SF</td>
<td>$39,284.00</td>
<td>46193 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough carpentry</td>
<td>$0.7 SF</td>
<td>39284 SF</td>
<td>$27,498.80</td>
<td>46193 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire stopping &amp; sealing</td>
<td>$0.4 SF</td>
<td>39284 SF</td>
<td>$15,713.60</td>
<td>46193 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulking &amp; sealing</td>
<td>$0.3 SF</td>
<td>39284 SF</td>
<td>$11,785.20</td>
<td>46193 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for unmeasured items</td>
<td>$2.5 SF</td>
<td>39285 SF</td>
<td>$98,212.50</td>
<td>46194 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE WORK (30’-0 band around building)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration following removal of barns</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>By others</td>
<td>By others</td>
<td>By others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration with in boundary</td>
<td>$1.0 SF</td>
<td>9725 SF</td>
<td>$9,725.00</td>
<td>11282 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction fill (4ft deep) to above</td>
<td>$6 CY</td>
<td>1440 CY</td>
<td>$8,640.00</td>
<td>1671 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete hard surface paving (20%)</td>
<td>$4 SF</td>
<td>4451.8 SF</td>
<td>$17,807.20</td>
<td>5138.8 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New planting (80%), incld sod</td>
<td>$5 SF</td>
<td>17807.2 SF</td>
<td>$89,036.00</td>
<td>20555.2 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical service site connections</td>
<td>$100,000 LS</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered garden, hard landscaping</td>
<td>$4 SF</td>
<td>746 SF</td>
<td>$2,984.00</td>
<td>1030 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered garden, planting</td>
<td>$1 LS</td>
<td>20000 LS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>20000 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCILLARY WORKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$3.0 SF</td>
<td>32091 SF</td>
<td>$96,273.00</td>
<td>23094 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial demolition &amp; removal</td>
<td>$2.0 SF</td>
<td>23455 SF</td>
<td>$46,910.00</td>
<td>32452 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations</td>
<td>$6 CY</td>
<td>1440 CY</td>
<td>$8,640.00</td>
<td>1671 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form window &amp; door openings (allowance)</td>
<td>$750 NO</td>
<td>46 NO</td>
<td>$34,500.00</td>
<td>58 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance unmeasured alterations</td>
<td>$1 SF</td>
<td>39284 SF</td>
<td>$39,284.00</td>
<td>46193 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL &amp; ELECTRICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>$513,000.00</td>
<td>$652,000.00</td>
<td>$652,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$390,000.00</td>
<td>$575,000.00</td>
<td>$575,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground source heat pumps (Trench &amp; back fill)</td>
<td>$10 LF</td>
<td>7500 LF</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>9000 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$2,193,038</td>
<td>$2,617,199</td>
<td>$2,639,513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL REQUIREMENTS &amp; ALLOWANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General requirements</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$175,443</td>
<td>$209,376</td>
<td>$211,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor fees</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$65,791</td>
<td>$78,516</td>
<td>$79,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design allowance</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$243,247</td>
<td>$287,382</td>
<td>$290,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction allowance</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$121,714</td>
<td>$145,255</td>
<td>$146,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$365,141</td>
<td>$435,764</td>
<td>$439,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ATTENTION:
Artists and Non Profit Organizations
Interested in Low-cost Space

ARTS AND COMMUNITY SURVEY

TORONTO ARTSCAPE’S FEASIBILITY STUDY
FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF
THE WYCHWOOD BARNs

Release date - September 10, 2001
I  Summary

Toronto Artscape is a non-profit organization that creates and manages arts facilities while building communities and revitalizing neighbourhoods. Artscape has been contracted by the City of Toronto to assess the possible uses of the historic Wychwood TTC Barns building complex. Located at 76 Wychwood Avenue on a 4.3 acre site, the land surrounding the barns is slated to become a public park at a future date.

This Arts and Community Survey is a key opportunity for artists and non-profit arts and community organizations to contribute their ideas to the process of shaping a responsive and inspired vision for the Wychwood Barns. Please fill out the accompanying questionnaire and return it to the address below to add your voice to this important community consultation. The future of the buildings depends on community input.

The attached document includes:

II  Introduction
III  Background
IV  The Opportunity
V  Advisory Council
VI  Survey of Space Needs for Non-Profit Organizations
   • Assessment criteria
   • Submission procedure
   • Timetable
VII  Survey of Space Needs for Individual Artists
   • Eligibility
   • Submission procedure
   • Timetable
VIII Questionnaires
   • Non-Profit Organizations
   • Artists

Contact & Return Address

Annie Hillis
Toronto Artscape
60 Atlantic Ave., Suite 111
Toronto, ON  M6K 1X9

Tel:  416 392 1038 ext. 29
annie@torontoartscape.on.ca
II Introduction

The City of Toronto is exploring alternative ways of redeveloping the Wychwood Barns site located at 76 Wychwood Avenue. Formerly a TTC streetcar and bus service garage, this now vacant site occupies approximately two city blocks. Extensive public consultations conducted by the City have demonstrated strong support for turning the site into a public park and retaining a portion of the industrial heritage buildings for arts and community uses.

Funding for the Wychwood Barns redevelopment is currently included in the City of Toronto’s long-range capital forecast. The community and local City Councillor Joe Mihevc are determined to move forward with the project on a much quicker time frame. A community reference group is now developing plans to raise funds to begin the park development. City of Toronto staff members are working to coordinate the many aspects of planning related to the project. Toronto Artscape has been contracted by the City to develop a plan and assess the feasibility for re-using a portion of the buildings.

This Arts and Community Survey will help Artscape determine current space needs that can be addressed by the project. Artscape’s goal will be to recommend a dynamic mix of tenancies, a renovation and retrofit plan that is feasible, and an operational model that is self-sustaining.

Transforming a portion of the Wychwood Barns into an arts centre can serve to anchor the local arts community and provide opportunities for artists and the community to interact. The area has a rich legacy of arts activity; Wychwood Park was established as an artist’s colony in 1892. The Wychwood Barns Arts and Community Survey provides an exciting opportunity to galvanize the energy and creativity of the community. All thoughts, ideas and dreams are welcome.

III Background

The Wychwood TTC Barn complex is located on a 4.3 acre site between Wychwood and Christie avenues, south of St Clair West along Benson Ave, Toronto.

The facility consists of five attached, brick buildings that range from 198 to 326 feet long and 38 to 44 feet wide. Built between 1913 and 1921, the barns were the central hub of the Toronto Civic Railway until 1921. From 1921 to 1978, they were one of seven streetcar houses operated by the TTC. At their peak, the barns serviced ten routes and 167 streetcars. During the 1980s, the Wychwood Barns served as a testing and development facility for new streetcars and for the retrofitted Scarborough RT trains.

The Wychwood Barns are an excellent example of early 20th century industrial architecture. The Toronto Historical Board has listed the site as historically significant. A conservation plan prepared by a heritage restoration expert will guide site development. Inspection reports (environmental and architectural) are available for review by contacting (416) 392-7460.
IV The Opportunity

The Wychwood Barns redevelopment presents an exceptional opportunity to integrate the following potential uses into the new park:

- non-profit arts and community organizations to rent year-round programming and/or office space
- artists to rent studio space
- low-income artists to rent work/live space.

Other ideas and dreams may also be discovered as part of the survey process.

The following assumptions have been made concerning renovation and operation of the building:

- funds for capital renovations will be raised from governments, foundations, individuals and corporations
- the City of Toronto will agree to lease whatever buildings are saved to a non-profit operator for $1 per year
- the buildings will operate on a cost-recovery basis without requiring ongoing support from governments
- tenants will have long-term leases; rent will include the cost of maintenance, taxes, utilities, administration and other direct operating costs.

Based on a similar model, Artscape offers rental rates for units in its five other properties that range from $10 - $12 (gross) per square foot annually. In other words, the average cost of a 500 square foot studio is $458 per month, taxes and utilities included.

The Wychwood Barns feature high ceilings (up to 20’), tremendous natural light with a central skylight running the entire length of the building and exposed brick walls. It is located minutes from Bathurst/St. Clair in a thriving and safe multicultural neighbourhood. Streetcars and the St. Clair West subway station are also within walking distance.

Apart from the advantages of the space itself, tenants of the Wychwood Barns will constitute a unique community of arts and community groups and arts professionals. Additionally, tenants will benefit from the security of tenure afforded by locating in a city-owned building. If the project is deemed feasible and sufficient capital funds can be raised, occupancy will be planned for late 2003 or early 2004.

V Advisory Council

Artscape has established a five-member Advisory Council to guide the Arts and Community Survey and feasibility study process. It is comprised of: Roscoe Handford, artist and local resident; Michael Kainer, Artscape board member and lawyer; Mallory Gilbert, general manager, Tarragon Theatre; Peter MacKendrick, artist/building restoration expert and past-president of Tattlewood Heritage Association; Elizabeth Cinello, artist/arts administrator and founder of ArtStarts.

The role of the Advisory Council will be to:

- develop a vision/mission/mandate for the Wychwood Barns
- recommend a dynamic mix of tenancies
- develop a short list of organizational tenants
- provide guidance and advice on major policy decisions
- assess the project’s feasibility
VI Survey of Space Needs for Non-Profit Organizations

Applicants may include non-profit arts organizations, social service groups or community organizations. The Wychwood Barns Advisory Council will assess applications according to the criteria listed below. A short list of candidates will be announced in late fall. As part of the process, short-listed candidates will work with the project’s architect to ensure design of the buildings meets their needs.

Please note that formal offers of tenancy will not be made to short-listed candidates until:

- The project is deemed feasible.
- Operating assumptions have been successfully negotiated.
- City Council has given approval.

Assessment Criteria
The following assessment criteria will be used in determining a short list of organizational tenants:

1. Suitability of intended use of site.
2. Degree to which the intended use is made accessible to the public and/or value of positive contribution to the site, park and neighbourhood.
3. Compatibility of intended use with heritage aspects of the building.
4. Organizational and financial capacity.

Submission Procedure
1. Complete the attached questionnaire for non-profit organizations with as much detail as possible.
2. Submit a letter of intent describing how the proposed use of space relates to the assessment criteria listed above.
3. Attend tour and meeting on September 24 to see the site and ask questions.
4. Mail or deliver to Artscape no later than Monday, October 15, 2001, 5:00 pm. No faxes please. We regret that late submissions cannot be accepted.

Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 10, 2001</td>
<td>Survey distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 2001</td>
<td>6:00 pm Site tour, 76 Wychwood Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:45 pm Meeting following site tour for applicants at St Michael and All Angels Church, 611 St Clair West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2001</td>
<td>5:00 pm Survey deadline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII  Survey of Space Needs of Individual Artists

Part of the barns may be used to create low-cost work or work/live studios for artists. Responses to this section of the survey will be used by the Advisory Council in determining the extent to which space is desired by individual artists (may include individuals, collectives or ensembles) who meet the eligibility requirements.

A committee comprised of professional artists will review artists’ applications to assess eligibility. Applicants who successfully meet the eligibility criteria will be placed on a preliminary contact list. All artists on this list will be kept informed of the progress of the site redevelopment through meetings or mailings.

**Eligibility**
Two factors will be used to determine eligibility.

1. Artists must be professional. In the case of collectives or ensembles, the majority of members must be considered professional.

   The professional status of applicants will be assessed according to the following guidelines.
   An artist is considered professional if she/he:
   - has presented her/his work to the public by means appropriate to the nature of her/his work.
   - is represented by a dealer, publisher, agent or similar representative.
   - devotes a reasonable proportion of her/his professional time to promoting or marketing her/his artwork.
   - receives or has received compensation for her/his work.
   - has received professional training.
   - has received public or peer recognition.
   - has membership in a professional association relevant to her/his artistic ability.

   Please note: Applicants do not have to meet all of the above guidelines in order to be considered professional. The Advisory Council will not be asked to assess the merit of applicants’ work.

2. The intended use of the studio must be non-commercial in nature (i.e. the principal use of the studio is to paint, sculpt, write or otherwise create works of art as opposed to the display and manufacturing of goods for sale).

**Submission Procedure**
1. Complete the attached questionnaire for artists.
2. Submit:
   - an artist’s CV (outlining education, employment, exhibition, performance, composition, publication, grants, etc. relating to your artistic practice)
   - a brief letter detailing what you intend to do in your space and why you’re interested in the Wychwood Barns.
3. Attend tour and meeting on September 24 to see the site and ask questions.
4. Mail or deliver to Artscape no later than Monday, October 15, 2001, 5:00 pm. No faxes please. We regret that late submissions cannot be accepted.

**Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 10, 2001</td>
<td>Survey distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 2001</td>
<td>6:00 pm Site tour, 76 Wychwood Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:45 pm Meeting following site tour for applicants at St Michael and All Angels Church, 611 St Clair West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2001</td>
<td>5:00 pm Survey deadline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONNAIRE
Wychwood Barns Arts and Community Survey

For Non-Profit Organizations:

Name or Name of Organization: ___________________________________________________
Contact: ______________________________________________________________________
Address: ______________________________________________________________________
Tel/Fax: ______________________________________________________________________
Email: ________________________________________________________________________

Please attach the following documents to your questionnaire:
• Mandate and history of organization (one page):
• Annual operating budget for 2001
• A copy of letters patent to confirm non-profit status
• A letter of intent describing how the use of space relates to the assessment criteria (see page 5)

1. Describe your current space and rental arrangements.
   Monthly rent: _________________________________
   Square footage: _______________________________
   Location: ____________________________________

2. What are your space requirements?
   Minimum: ___________________________________
   Maximum: ___________________________________

3. Number of staff:
   Full-time: ___________________________________
   Part-time: ___________________________________

4. Do you have special requirements related to:
   Parking: ______________________________________________________________________
   Sound: ________________________________________________________________________
   Ventilation: ____________________________________________________________________
   Toxic waste disposal: ____________________________________________________________
   Other: ________________________________________________________________________

5. Is your organization affiliated with or a member of any professional arts service organizations?

6. Is your organization involved with any community groups based in the Hillcrest/Bracondale
   Hill/Humewood neighbourhoods?

7. Do you know of any other artists or non-profit organizations that would like to receive an Arts and
   Community Survey?

Please return to Artscape by October 15, 2001. Thank you.
QUESTIONNAIRE
Wychwood Barns Arts and Community Survey

For artists interested in work studio space:

Name: ____________________________________________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________________________
Tel/Fax: ____________________________________________________________________________
Email: ____________________________________________________________________________

Please attach the following to your questionnaire:
• An artist’s CV (see pg 6 of the survey)
• A brief letter detailing how you propose to use the space

1. What is your area of artistic practice?

2. Describe your current space and rental arrangements.
   Monthly rent: __________________________________________
   Square footage: ________________________________________
   Studio location: ________________________________________

3. What are your space requirements?
   Minimum: _____________________________________________
   Maximum: _____________________________________________

4. Do you have special requirements related to:
   Parking: ______________________________________________
   Sound: ________________________________________________
   Ventilation: ____________________________________________
   Toxic waste disposal: _________________________________
   Other: ________________________________________________

For low-income artists interested in work/live space:

Fill out this section as well as the section above.

5. Current monthly rent on your place of residence: ____________

6. Utilities: ______________________________________________

7. Other Housing-Related Expenses: ___________________________

8. Number of Adults: _________________________________
   Number of Children: ________________________________

9. Are you on Housing Connections’ Coordinated Access List?
   Yes _____   No ______

Please return to Artscape by October 15, 2001. Thank you.
March 7, 2002

An Open Letter to Residents of Ward 21
Re: Wychwood Barns Feasibility Study

Dear Residents,

I am writing to clarify Artscape’s role in the Wychwood Barns Feasibility Study and to dispel any confusion or misinformation that may be circulating in the community.

Contrary to some reports, no plan for the redevelopment of the Wychwood Barns has been recommended by Artscape. The City of Toronto invited Artscape to study potential ways to re-use the barns or a portion thereof for arts and community uses. We are in the process of examining the viability of a number of scenarios that do not require ongoing City operating or capital support. In May of 2002, we intend to issue a report that outlines a range of options we have studied and offers professional opinion on those that are viable. We expect that once City of Toronto staff members have reviewed our report, they will forward any recommendations to Midtown Community Council and City Council.

As part of our feasibility study process, we are working closely with Councillor Joe Mihevc and City staff to ensure community participation in the development of potential concepts and designs. In December, we helped to facilitate in a design charrette attended by more than 150 people. Comments and feedback at that meeting were synthesized into a preliminary concept drawing that was presented at a January community meeting attended by more than 300 people.

We regret that the format of the January meeting did not allow us an opportunity to respond to questions, comments and concerns. After the meeting, we learned that some in attendance believed that Artscape was presenting a final plan as opposed to preliminary concepts. In fact, Artscape is studying the viability and impact of seven different scenarios including ones that involve no barns, one barn and a combination of barns.

After we have analyzed the capital and operating feasibility of the options and completed our research, we will release our report and be on hand for whatever public meetings the City chooses to organize. Our report will include detailed analysis of feedback, comments and concerns.

I hope this letter helps to answer some of the questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Tim Jones
Executive Director
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What is Toronto Artscape?

Artscape is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to enhance the quality of life and the economic vitality of the City of Toronto by creating new and improved spaces for the arts, culture, community and creativity.

Artscape's projects provide public spaces that are vibrant, inclusive, and accessible to all. They are designed to meet the needs of diverse communities and to encourage a sense of ownership and pride.

History of Artscape

Artscape was founded in 1996 — much earlier than you might think — when the real estate market was booming and developers were snapping up land whenever they could to make way for higher-paying tenants. Artscape was an underdog in the community, standing up against the forces of gentrification. It was the first organization to advocate for the rights of artists and the arts community to have a say in the use of public spaces.

Artscape's mission is to ensure that arts and culture spaces are accessible to all. It does this by delivering programs and activities that support the creative community and by working with developers and government to ensure that arts and culture spaces are an integral part of the city's fabric.

The organization has supported over 30 projects, including the creation of over 1,000 new arts and culture spaces. These spaces include galleries, theatres, community centres, and artist studios. Artscape has also worked to ensure that the arts community is involved in the decision-making process at all levels of government.

Artscape's work has been recognized with numerous awards and honours, including the Order of Canada and the Governor General's Performing Arts Award. The organization continues to grow and expand its reach, as it works to ensure that the arts community is a vital part of the city's future.
Parkdale Arts & Cultural Centre

1313 Queen Street West

Before — a police station

Toronto Councillor David Miller and others attend a group exhibition by Artscape tenants

Parkdale’s former police station is the site of Artscape’s first mixed-use project providing low-cost artist/live/work space alongside offices for non-profit arts and community groups. Developed in partnership with the City of Toronto and Parkdale Business Improvement Area, the Parkdale Arts and Cultural Centre is home to the Parkdale B.I.A., Parkdale Liberty Economic Development Corporation, Vietnamese Youth and Women’s Association, Kababayan Community Centre, Gallery 1313, and live/work tenants.

Revitalizing local economies and strengthening communities
Artscapes opened the first legal artist-live/work space in Toronto in 1995. Known to neighbours and passersby for its beautiful gardens (designed and created by Artscapes tenants), the redevelopment of 900 Queen helped bring a downdeserted part of Toronto's art and gallery district back to life. 900 Queen is a stunning example of affordable housing that works, the sense of pride and ownership felt by its tenants resonates beyond its walls far into the community.

Artscapes President: Jack MacKenzie,
Toronto Mayor Barbara Hall, MPP Rosario Marchese,
Toronto Councillor Joe Pantalone and others
at the opening of 900 Queen Street West

Pioneering artist-live/work space
Come be inspired

A group of artists at the Artscape Centre for the Arts

The Artscape Centre for the Arts is a place for artists to stay and work in Toronto. It is a shared workspace for artists, and provides a dynamic mix of events that attract artists and other professionals. The Centre has been home to a wide range of events and activities, including workshops, exhibitions, and performances. It is an integral part of the cultural fabric of Toronto and a hub for creative expression.
60 Atlantic Avenue

In partnership with the Toronto Economic Development Corporation, Artscape helped transform Liberty Village from a derelict and largely vacant industrial district to a dynamic community full of artists, designers, and new media companies. Today, 60 Atlantic has become an essential anchor for the arts in Liberty Village as gentrification pushes many of the artists who helped save this former industrial wasteland — out of the neighbourhood. 60 Atlantic serves as the headquarters of Artscape, Tapestry, New Opera Works, ARRAY/MUSIC, Canadian Electronic Ensemble and provides work studios to 40 individual artists.

Mayor Mel Lastman visits the studio of Artscape tenant Gerard Gauzi

Project Leadership and Endorsement: Mike Murphy, Toronto Economic Development Corporation; John and Dianne Armstrong, Canada Council, Ontario Culture and Recreation Council; City of Toronto; Government of Ontario

Anchoring the arts in Liberty Village
96 Spadina Avenue

Artscape's first low-cost, work studio building opened in March 1991. For more than ten years, the seventh and eighth floors of the Daring Building have provided 10 studios in the heart of the gallery district for individual artists, as well as offices for the Small Theatre Adminstrative Body, and a home for Redhead Gallery.

Mayor Art Eggleton, Artscape's Billie Bridgman and board member David Renaud

Building public/private sector partnerships
Message from the Board President & Executive Director

2000-2001 marked another exciting year of expansion and innovation at The Stop. As the cover of this report indicates, we are entering our 20th year of fighting hunger and building community with a new name and a fresh logo that we feel capture the breadth and depth of our mandate. The early volunteers who built The Stop’s food bank would be proud to know that their commitment to social justice has blossomed into a community food centre that is a model for others working in the sector.

And now with the “boom” economy in full retreat, the importance of The Stop’s approach (direct programming, education and advocacy) cannot be underestimated. As always, we are bracing ourselves for how economic slow-down will affect the more than 7,000 people who use our programs, as well as the many thousands more who struggle on their own. One thing is for certain: they won’t be purchasing homes in the expensive developments that are mushrooming in our community. With so many area residents living in poverty, it can be surreal to pass billboards advertising townhouses “From $250,000 and up”—and this on property that once contained factories and businesses employing some of those same community members.

Yet this is the context in which The Stop provides a range of programs that help people not only make ends meet, but move forward with their goals, push for equitable public policies and build an inclusive community. As you will read in the body of this report, we have been especially busy on the program front this year: from innovations in running the food bank and Healthy Beginnings, to brand new breakfast, lunch, drop-in and kitchen programs. And all of it has come directly from listening to what community members have to say. For example, in July, as part of our strategic planning implementation work, we hosted a feedback dinner that brought together 75 program participants and volunteers to discuss gaps in services and ways we can improve what we do.

But The Stop did more than just direct programming this year. At city council, local forums, conferences, all-candidates debates and rallies, staff, board members and program participants spoke out against government withdrawal from investment in social infrastructure, a retreat that is wreaking havoc on the lives of individuals and families in our neighbourhood.

Our ability to nurture civic involvement, maintain programs and realize new ideas raised by community members rests on an incredible team of volunteers, funders, staff and community partners. You will not find a more dedicated group anywhere and we thank you all for your unwavering support in 2000-2001. Of course, we will be leaning on you again this year. Some of our plans include: expanding into new office/program space; re-imagining our food bank; developing stronger anti-discrimination policies; translating program materials into several languages; increasing parent/infant programs; supporting the new Food Justice Coalition; attempting to convert old streetcar barns into a greenhouse/walled garden; and building an outdoor bake oven. It’s an ambitious platform, but we are confident, because history has shown us that The Stop and its champions find a way to get things done. Peace.

Celia Harte, Board President
Nick Saul, Executive Director

Mission Statement

The Stop is a non-profit organization committed to:

- meeting the needs of low-income people by providing access to healthy, nutritious food;
- implementing services and programs that support the ability of individuals and groups to address the problems of food access and insecurity;
- participating in initiatives that seek to address the causes of—and solutions to—hunger.
Program Updates

Urban Agriculture

- The Stop’s urban agriculture program includes community gardens, environmental education, community building, advocacy and leadership development.
- A new full-time Urban Agriculture Co-ordinator means more workshops, gardening, educational work with local schools, tours, trips and social events.
- From June-October, food bank members received fresh produce grown in the Earls court garden.
- 700 children and youth were involved in environmental education.
- A new partnership with Bishop Barronco/Thomas Merton Catholic High School and its greenhouse means we can now garden year-round.
- We supported the establishment of Hillcrest Park Community Garden, a volunteer-led initiative at Christie and Davenport.
- We launched a quarterly newsletter to keep West End gardeners connected.

Healthy Babies, Healthy Families

HEALTHY BEGINNINGS (HB):

- 182 women participated in this pre- and postnatal nutrition and support program this year. An average of 65 women attend HB each week.
- 96% of babies born to mothers in the program had healthy birth weights and we were successful in encouraging a high percentage of women to breastfeed.
- Increased financial and staff support from the City’s Children and Youth Action Committee enabled us to reach more women in the community.
- A front desk worker was hired to greet women and do some program administration. This has increased the effectiveness of HB.
- We provided group education on a variety of topics, including pregnancy, childbirth, food and nutrition, child development, maternal health and parenting.
- Key partners include Toronto Public Health (Hillcrest), Davenport-Perth Neighbourhood Centre, and the Toronto Housing Company.
- We partner in the running of a Mother Goose program (parent-child bonding through rhymes, songs and finger plays) that provides an opportunity for women to come together in mutual support.

FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM (FSP):

- 16 high-risk families benefited from this program, which provides one-on-one peer support on issues related to child development, nutrition, parenting, violence prevention, community resources and personal health.
- All families received direct financial support to purchase necessary items such as cribs, strollers and clothes.
- A policy and procedures handbook was developed to increase the effectiveness of the FSP.
- Our yearly program evaluation confirmed that participants felt less isolated and better able to handle stresses related to parenting.
- We facilitated a comprehensive training for the Family Support Workers. This moved the team (five women who speak eight different languages) toward an understanding of “best practices” for peer support.

“I have a mental illness and I haven’t worked for a while, so I got myself hooked up in a program called Work Adjustment and it helped me find this place called The Stop. The staff has been supportive, gardening has helped me with the work transition and it has been a great experience.”

“[My peer visitor] is very attentive and caring about my needs and my baby’s needs. She supported me with paperwork about the birth of my baby and helped me look for clothing and other basic items.”

Talking points: Workshops keep people informed about issues that affect their daily lives.
Community Kitchens

- The Stop's community kitchens continued to provide opportunities for people to gather to enjoy a nutritious meal, break down social isolation, collect community information and share ideas on how to eat healthily on a limited budget.
- Additional staff support enabled us to launch three new cooking initiatives: Cook With What You've Got (monthly, with an emphasis on special diets); Pelham Park Cooking Drop-in (每月, focus on seniors with mobility issues); Women's Cooking Group (monthly, focus on health issues).
- On average, 20 people attend Meals Made Easy, our weekly cooking program.

The Morning Drop-in (MDI)

- The MDI had an extremely successful first year: 850 individuals used the program to access a nutritious breakfast (three times per week), community information, haircuts, recreational activities and workshops.
- A key theme of the workshops was women's health. These gatherings provided women in the program with an opportunity to share their experiences and learn more about health issues.
- Program participants mounted a play called "No Room in the City," about Toronto's housing crisis.
- A nurse practitioner visits monthly.
- A community advisory committee helps to steer the MDI's work.
- 21 volunteers contributed 530 hours to the program.

Food Bank

- 575 individuals used the food bank this year—an incredible 40% increase over last year.
- 55 volunteers contributed 4,068 hours to help run the food bank.
- We remain committed to hearing and responding to what food bank users have to say about the program. In addition to the suggestion box (to which we post responses), we have a community advisory committee and an annual Community Feedback Dinner.
- All food bank users became food bank members when we created a membership card—with rights—this year (see left).
- We purchased foods that better meet the needs of our multicultural community.
- Strong partnerships with area service providers ensure that food bank users have access to an array of supports, including settlement/immigration (Davenport-Perth Neighbourhood Centre), housing (West Toronto Community Legal Services) and free replacement of lost or stolen government identification (Syme-Woolner).
Afternoon Drop-in

- Financial support from the Tippet and Geoffrey H. Wood foundations enabled us to launch this new program.
- The drop-in operates at the same time as the food bank and provides enhanced resources to food bank users: more space, staff, community information and referral, workshops and social recreational activities (arts and crafts, weekly movie).
- Participants completed a mural project in the community room.
- As with the Morning Drop-in, a safe, supportive environment ensures that problems related to such issues as health, housing and income get addressed before a crisis erupts.

The Stop Café

- The Stop Café is new this year.
- On average, 70 people receive a nutritious lunch twice a week through a partnership with Second Harvest (which provides the food) and the Learning Enrichment Foundation (which prepares the meal).
- The program feels and looks like a café with table service and menus.
- Since the lunch is served during food bank hours, it has reduced people’s stress as they wait to pick up their food hamper.

Volunteer Program

- Volunteers make The Stop work. We are proud of the diversity and commitment of the 110 volunteers who contributed 9,700 hours to the organization this year. The breadth of our programming is largely due to the dedication of these incredible people.
- Additional staff resources mean we now have a more structured and effective volunteer program: weekly orientations, proper screening and matching of volunteer skills/interests with programs, three recognition events per year and ongoing training.
- We also provided groups, including corporations, local organizations and schools, with volunteer experiences.

"Last year was difficult for me. I couldn’t get out of the house. I needed something to do. Since I’ve become a volunteer at The Stop, it’s been great. I’ve met people and made connections for part-time jobs. Being here has really changed my life."

TEAMWORK: The food bank also offers information, advocacy and referrals

In addition to the above programs, we continue to run the Good Food Box, Voicemail and Homelessness Prevention.
Healthy food delivery projects piloted

Fresh Food Salad Bars Wow Kids

Will that be deep fried mystery meat or a wholesome meal conforming to Canada's Food Guide? You might think that children in school food programs would choose the former. In fact, in eleven schools in Santa Monica, California where they have piloted 'farmers market salad bars,' program participation has increased anywhere from 300% to 2063%.

Toronto children in two schools will have the chance to test the salad bar model in a new pilot organized by FoodShare's Field to Table School Produce Distribution Project and the Toronto Partners for Student Nutrition, supported by Canadian Feed the Children.

Salad bars will feature sliced fruits and vegetables, as well as fresh, minimally-processed foods from other food groups, like whole grain bread, grilled chicken, tuna salad, peanut butter, chickpeas, eggs and nuts. For more information, contact Joanne Porter at 416-392-1658.

'Good Food at Home' for women with breast cancer

"Our health care system will pay for any amount of chemotherapy for someone with cancer, but finding support for something as simple as healthy food--inside hospital or out--is a much greater challenge," says Kate Sigurdson, coordinator of a new pilot, the 'Good Food at Home' project, aimed at supplying a test group of women with breast cancer with practical food supports.

There is increasing evidence of the importance of food--especially fruit and vegetable consumption--in the prevention and treatment of disease. Most women diagnosed with breast cancer are very concerned about what they're eating, but many lack the energy, information, money or social supports to be able to make healthy food a priority at this vulnerable point in their lives.

"When you're first diagnosed with cancer, it's enormously stressful," says Kate. "Shopping and cooking for yourself and your family can be a worry. And of course this is the time when you are especially in need of the nurturing that can come from good food."

A variety of ways to work with women at different stages in their treatment will be tested by the pilot. Forty volunteers recently diagnosed with cancer will participate, receiving a combination of home-delivered meals prepared by FoodShare's kitchen, ready-to-eat fresh fruit and vegetables, healthy eating workshops and opportunities to explore peer support group alternatives. Elements of the program will be evaluated with research assistance from Cancer Care Ontario. Funding for the project has been provided by the Ontario Chapter of the Canadian Breast Cancer Foundation.

"We are making a real effort to reach out to women who aren't already well-connected to breast cancer resources -- perhaps because they are from low-income or immigrant communities, or because they don't have a well developed support network," says Kate. For more information call 363-6441 ext. 30.
As FoodShare sees it...
by Debbie Field, Executive Director

Are we putting your ideals into practice? Get involved!

Whenever I travel, I become even more grateful for Toronto’s social infrastructure. Though often taken for granted, our rich network of community organizations just doesn’t exist elsewhere. Although under attack by government cutbacks and neglect, our community sector remains strong, making Toronto a more livable City. As the yearly struggle unfolds to protect City funding of community groups, I wish policy makers would wake up to the benefits of spending more on programs that build a more cohesive civil society. (Did you know that the total yearly budget for community grants and public health is less than the entire disputed computer expenditure?)

I believe that FoodShare is an important example of an organization that makes this a unique and wonderful city. Our work to bring about community empowerment and broader social change through grassroots food action puts into practice the democratic ideals of progressive people. I hear from people all the time about how our work inspires hope in what can often seem to be a dreary political landscape where it is difficult to make change.

But to really make change and build a movement, we need other people to get involved—people from all classes and walks of life, in a variety of ways. Every year at this time we invite our 18,000 "Friends of FoodShare" (all our newsletter readers) to attend our Annual General Meeting. This year it will be on Saturday, May 11th, and we will combine electing a new board and receiving the audited financial statements with the pleasures of a meal, a chance to see some of our projects and a sale of organic and heritage plants and seedlings that have been grown at our Field to Table Centre. Please join us, if you can, at what is always a very enjoyable day.

If you want to help shape FoodShare’s future, you can become a voting member. By signing up, you will indicate your support for our mission to “work with communities to improve access to affordable and healthy food—from field to table.” You will receive an AGM package in the mail, including information about those running for the Board of Directors.

Recently, several friends have chastised me for never asking them to donate to FoodShare, even though they read the newsletter, and order the Good Food Box. If you value our work in helping to improve thousands of people’s access to food, and in creating more space for the growing, cooking and eating of healthy food in Toronto, you can also support us financially to ensure our groundbreaking policy and practical work continues.

And finally, you can get involved at a personal level: organize a Good Food Box drop-off, get a student nutrition program started at your child’s school, make informed consumer choices (buy local, and if possible, organic), join a community garden, grow your own chemical-free garden, make healthy home-cooked food a part of your everyday life, work to get healthy food for all onto the political agenda, join the Food Justice Coalition. Stay in the loop by signing up for our email newsletters.

To sign up for one of our e-bulletins or to become a voting member, contact Kathryn Scharf, 416-392-1657 (phone), 416-392-6650 (fax) or kathryn@foodshare.net. Membership deadline is April 12 (make sure to include your street address). To donate, contact Kathryn, or you can use the convenient, secure website www.canadahelps.org.

Letters

Kathryn: My partner & I always love picking up our small Good Food Box and getting the newsletter, with such informative and interesting news and recipes much needed by a non-cook. Also appreciated are details about the unusual fruits included... Love getting lots of potatoes and other good keepers.- H.H.

Hi Debbie: This is Donna MacDonald, FoodShare’s first executive director, 1985-87. (a long, long time ago). I found your website and I thought I would say hello...and congratulations on your incredible and most wonderful development of the organization to be all it can. While some things seem to have remained the same(from my reading of homelessness and hunger in Toronto), FoodShare has certainly evolved into a very progressive agency that has forged ahead with some incredibly fascinating community-based initiatives... D.M., Florida

Dear Laura & FoodShare people: Thanks a lot for your help and mentorship. I don’t think that Toronto would have nearly the number of gardens it does have without all your hard work. I sometimes wonder how FoodShare does it... S.T. on behalf of Friends of Hillcrest Garden
Program Updates

Urban Agriculture

- The Stop's urban agriculture program includes community gardens, environmental education, community building, advocacy and leadership development.
- A new full-time Urban Agriculture Co-ordinator means more workshops, gardening, educational work with local schools, tours, trips and social events.
- From June-October, food bank members received fresh produce grown in the Earls Court garden.
- 700 children and youth were involved in environmental education.
- A new partnership with Bishop Marrocco/Thomas Merton Catholic High School and its greenhouse means we can now garden year-round.
- We supported the establishment of Hillcrest Park Community Garden, a volunteer-led initiative at Christie and Davenport.
- We launched a quarterly newsletter to keep West End gardeners connected.

Healthy Babies, Healthy Families

HEALTHY BEGINNINGS (HB):
- 182 women participated in this pre- and postnatal nutrition and support program this year. An average of 65 women attend HB each week.
- 95% of babies born to mothers in the program had healthy birth weights and we were successful in encouraging a high percentage of women to breastfeed.
- Increased financial and staff support from the City's Children and Youth Action Committee enabled us to reach more women in the community.
- A front desk worker was hired to greet women and do some program administration. This has increased the effectiveness of HB.
- We provided group education on a variety of topics, including pregnancy, childbirth, food and nutrition, child development, maternal health and parenting.
- Key partners include Toronto Public Health (Hillcrest), Davenport-Perth Neighbourhood Centre, and the Toronto Housing Company.
- We partner in the running of a Mother Goose program (parent-child bonding through rhymes, songs and finger plays) that provides an opportunity for women to come together in mutual support.

FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM (FSP):
- 16 high-risk families benefited from this program, which provides one-on-one peer support on issues related to child development, nutrition, parenting, violence prevention, community resources and personal health.
- All families received direct financial support to purchase necessary items such as cribs, strollers and clothes.
- A policy and procedures handbook was developed to increase the effectiveness of the FSP.
- Our yearly program evaluation confirmed that participants felt less isolated and better able to handle stresses related to parenting.
- We facilitated a comprehensive training for the Family Support Workers. This moved the team (five women who speak eight different languages) toward an understanding of “best practices” for peer support.

"I have a mental illness and I haven’t worked for a while, so I got myself hooked up in a program called Work Adjustment and it helped me find this place called The Stop. The staff has been supportive, gardening has helped me with the work transition and it has been a great experience.”

"(My peer visitor) is very attentive and caring about my needs and my baby's needs. She supported me with paperwork about the birth of my baby and helped me look for clothing and other basic items.”

"DIG IT: Volunteers make the garden come to life"

"BABY TALK: Sharing childcare tips at Healthy Beginnings"

"TALKING POINTS: Workshops keep people informed about issues that affect their daily lives"
Events

Baby Food Train-the-Trainer Workshops
March 26th, April 2nd, April 9th, April 16th, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.
North York Community House

A workshop series for people who would like to learn how to teach the basics of making baby food and baby nutrition to groups of new parents in their communities. For more information, please call Jennifer at 416-392-6653.

What's Cooking Workshop
Thursday, April 11, 9:00AM-1:00PM
Field to Table Centre, 200 Eastern Avenue

A range of experienced cooking program organizers will share their experiences. What model will work best for your group: community kitchen, community dining, cooking class? You be the judge. Come ask your 'burning' questions, share your challenges with others doing the same work. Day will include a cooking demo and workshop on balanced, healthy meal planning. For more info or to register, contact Jennifer at 416-392-6653.

FoodShare Annual General Meeting and Spring Fair
Saturday May 11 - 9:30 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.
Field to Table Centre, 200 Eastern Avenue

The "Much More Than an AGM AGM". Seedlings and garden amendments produced at the Field to Table Centre and by local small businesses from 9:30 to 1:30. Sprouting and "Cooking Out of the Box" workshops start at 10:30. AGM: 11:30 - 12:30. Lunch at 12:30. Come for all or part of the day. To RSVP, or to become a voting member of FoodShare, please contact Kathryn at 392-1657, 392-6650 (fax) or kathryn@foodshare.net. Membership deadline is April 12.

Annual Garden Tour Upcoming in June
Don't miss the annual Community Garden Tour sponsored by the Toronto Community Garden Network. Check our website at www.foodshare.net for details and updates on this or other events.

“Seeds” ctd. from page 3

hybrid varieties became the norm. So instead of the “Marvel Stripped” tomato sporting flaming orange stripes, or the tangy sweet “Black Krim” variety, we now have the “Hardwearing Pink Cardboard Tomato” with the texture of a tennis ball, a tendency to rot from the inside out and the capacity to travel thousands of miles without damage.

Heirloom varieties are also different from hybrids in that they are open-pollinated, meaning that a they can reproduce themselves ‘true to type’ by natural pollination methods, while the hybrid varieties are either sterile or revert to one of the parent’s forms, meaning that seed saving is not possible.

If you’ve ever tried to reproduce the delicious flavours of your grandparents’ garden with plants grown from commercial seed and been disappointed by the results, or if you think it’s a good idea to preserve our gardening history and plant diversity— or if you just plain like the sound of “Speckled Cranberry Egg” beans— then consider planting some heirloom varieties. Hey, you can start by dropping by our plant sale on May 11!

From material on www.garden.com. See also Seeds of Diversity Canada at www.seeds.ca for more info on seed saving activities and sellers.

Working toward Food Justice

The Toronto Food Justice Coalition is now up-and-functioning, after the founding meeting in November 2001. The FJC is an opportunity for agencies involved in food programs to network, coordinate training, share resources and collaborate on creating a collective advocacy voice. Interested individuals can also be involved in working groups.

Working groups have been organized around Networking, Training, Advocacy and ‘The Growing Season’ Report Implementation. Some initiatives that are already underway: a provincial advocacy campaign geared to the next election, a directory of resources for program providers, a lobby effort to get local politicians to get behind the City’s on-paper commitment to food security. For more info contact Jennifer Reynolds at 392-6653 or jennifer@foodshare.net.

FoodShare

Toronto

www.foodshare.net