

Report on Consultation of September 27, 2003

PARKING LOT/AFFORDABLE HOUSING Questions, Answers and Comments

Process

The following process questions and comments were received. A meeting is scheduled for Saturday, October 18 to discuss the Framework for Negotiation and receive input. An additional meeting is planned for November to allow further discussion before the proposed November Vestry. Terms of the agreement will be circulated beforehand.

- The committee has already started negotiation with Teron. We have the terms - these need a series of meetings to discuss these and finances before a vote.
- I am concerned that giving approval to negotiate implies approval for the whole package.
- Why are we voting immediately after the Teron etc. explanation?
- We need more time to consider the presentation and the already described terms of negotiation.
- You have already negotiated. We should have a thorough presentation to the congregation before proceeding further.
- By November Vestry, we will have spent 7.5 hours in consultation. What effect does this have on our decision-making ability as a community?
- How does entering into negotiations tomorrow in fact start to decide what we will do, without even knowing it?
- I believe it is inappropriate for a developer to present to the Vestry something in his own self interest on the day of the vote.
- We need a process where the process of the committees is transparent to the congregation - where's the presentation by the Affordable Housing Committee and why?

General

- A committee has worked hard and likely considered other options but for the rest of us - what were they? Why aren't they better?
- Have you got other prices for this building/lot property?

The first question asked by ARC was whether it was worthwhile to sell the parking lot. The independent analysis done by ZW Group indicated that the only way St John's would stand to gain from the sale of the parking lot, assuming it wished to retain its parking, was by undertaking the development itself. This was rejected as being too risky. Four developers were then approached to work in partnership. The Teron offer is the only offer received with a financial proposal. We are being offered an estimated \$430,000 more than the value of comparable land. (See Larger Development as well.)

- Has an independent appraisal been done on the value of the parking lot? (St John's)

Yes, by Regional Reality. The report indicated that, as of the date of the report, the maximum selling price of land purchased for residential construction was \$105 per square foot, giving a value of \$1.37 million.

- How do we know that \$1M is a good offer for our property?

We are in fact being paid \$1.8 million for the property - \$800,000 to construct the parking and \$1 million for renovations.

- Do we know what the proposed condo will cost to construct? Do we know how much revenue it is expected to generate? If we know the above, can ARC share its numbers?

The condominium units are being sold at a lower than market price. The value of the development is roughly \$15 million.

- Why are there no plans included for alternate transportation methods - e.g. bike lockers in the condos, bike racks at the church - elimination of our dependence on cars?

A space has been allocated for bikes in the garage of the condo. The exterior landscaping of the church will include space for a bike rack.

- Is there to be a garden at the back of the apartments. Who is acceptable to use it - the apartment dwellers, the church or the public, including those attending The Well.

Yes, there is a garden at the back of the apartments. Owners of the units facing the back will own a strip of the garden to the back of the property. It will not be available to the public or to St John's unless St John's were to own ground floor space at the back.

- Why are we looking at mainly one bedroom apartments? Families (single parent) need 2 bedrooms.

Two bedroom apartments can also be built if there is a demand but these will start at \$150,000, a price that is not affordable to low income people.

- The parking lot will not be worth any less next or the years after that. We are selling an asset, so must be very careful that the money is used to increase our long term assets, not reduce them.

We are retaining the level of parking we already have, which like the parking lot will increase in value. In fact, underground parking is more valuable and we will no longer have snow removal costs. In addition we have the opportunity through a non-profit corporation to purchase units which the non-profit corporation will own when the mortgage is paid off. Finally, the \$1 million will be used to improve our facilities.

- Will we be able to have some functional space on the main floor for temporary offices/meeting/education/choir while we are undergoing our renovations?

No, unless St John's chooses to purchase space on the ground floor for its own use.

- Why the three feet - i.e. how much to demolish back wall of Chapel and Chancel and rebuild it?

The 3 feet does not cut into the church building – the church building is set back over 6 feet from the property line.

- How much per hour would someone have to earn to be able to afford to buy a condo?

A minimum annual income of about \$32,500 or about \$17 per hour would be required for a one bedroom unit costing about \$100,000. A minimum downpayment of \$5,000 is required, leaving \$95,000 mortgage, which would cost about \$600 per month at 6% amortized over 25 years. Taxes and condo fees are estimated to add an additional \$300.

Comments

Do not begin construction in Aug 2004 until Chamber Music Festival is over.

I would like an ecological/sustainability approach to be central to new development.

Larger Development

- Somehow this does not seem to be a very imaginative option. Why aren't we looking at the parking lot and all the ancillary space together and seeing what kind of building to build.
- Why not have the condo building go up to the wall of Chapel/Chancel and have church space part of condo development?

These possibilities were considered but rejected because of the additional cost to St John's associated with so much new construction, the complexity of joint ownership, and the time required to develop such a design.

- Has there been serious attention given to including the properties and owner on MacLaren St in the development?

Yes. We spoke to the owner of the MacLaren St properties who was open to being approached by a developer interested in St John's. No developer was interested in including this property as part of the proposal.

Parking and new indoor parking lot

- Has any thought been given to where we park if we sell the parking lot while the apartment building is under construction?
- Have we checked with the officers mess to ensure we will have the use of their lot during and after the construction of the apartment building?

Little has been done on alternative parking since we first needed to know if there was support for selling the parking lot. It is possible to park at City Hall but parking is not free.

- At present we have the capability to squeeze more cars onto the lot. This capability will be lost with one level of underground parking.
- How will we cover the lost revenue from the parking lot during construction?
- During the construction of the building we will lose parking income. The only source is interest on mortgage but if paid off quickly and closing deal is later, we will lose income.
- Are we prepared to lose \$70,000 over 2 years from parking revenue during the condo construction?

The temporary loss of parking revenue is part of the total financial equation and must be taken into account in our analysis. Construction is expected to take about one year. Parking will likely be available once the exterior structure is up, about 6 months from the start of construction.

- \$800,000 for 38 spaces costs \$21,052 per space. City of Ottawa cash in lieu of parking is \$7,500. Why is there a large difference in the cost?

The City of Ottawa does not charge the true cost of creating a parking space.

- Church should take as much of the parking area as possible for optimum Sunday parking and also for max revenue generation.

The issue regarding owning a second floor of parking is the need to purchase that parking at a cost of \$800,000, likely requiring a down payment of \$200,000. This would reduce the amount of money available for church renovations. Also, first priority would be given to residents of the condominium limiting the amount of additional parking for St John's.

- In a setting like ours, if the garage is accessible to anyone wishing to use the church facilities, how will we avoid having to step over sleeping bodies, especially in bad weather. I had experience with this in Calgary where we never let anyone return to her car alone because of the undesirable characters seeking refuge in the parkade.
- Security is a concern. Video cameras just don't do the job. Even if they are monitored 24 hrs/day, no help is available quickly, and the cost of a 24 hour/day monitoring is prohibitive.
- Access to the church buildings will involve negotiating one's way out of the underground garage. Usually underground garage exists are isolated stairways and/or elevators, neither of which situation is conducive to personal safety.

The question of security is very important and needs to be taken into account in the design and future management.

- Who is responsible for management and maintenance of the parking lot: when St John's owns one of the two floors? When St John's owns both floors?

The responsibility for the management of either one or both floors of parking needs to be worked out. St John's may continue to manage its own parking or contract this out. There will be a business case analysis.

Terms of Agreement

- Let's make sure we get the most money for the land. Money should be received up front.
- What protection have we if the developer in midstream encounters difficulties and walks away to leave the project half done?

We believe we are getting the most money possible for the land. The terms of the agreement will provide for financial protection so that we would never be financially worse off than if the project had not started. We have hired a highly recommended lawyer, Janet Bradley, to act on our behalf.

- Will we have a say as to the outside looks of the building, so it is compatible with our church?

Yes, see the Framework for Negotiation (no. 11)

- I believe St John's should sell the parking lot. Bill Teron should build the condominium. In the initial contract, St John's people should have the first option to purchase the condominiums.

People of St John's will have priority in purchasing condominium units.

Structural Questions

- Are we assured the soil will support proposed building?
- What about the water table in the parking lot? I thought it was too high and therefore very expensive and complicated to deal with.

Teron Inc received a copy of the soils report. The plan is to build the building on piles driven to bedrock and a parking garage that is only 2 levels, which takes account of the high water table.

- If the condo is built first and the new section after the condo is done, how is construction affected - is it hampered? Foundations impact? big machinery?
- How will construction in the parking lot affect the structure of our building?

Teron Inc will be required to provide the appropriate structural supports to ensure the integrity of St John's. (See Framework for Negotiation, no. 10)

Vision re Affordable Housing

- No shared vision re affordable housing.
- How did we decide as a parish that housing is a priority ministry? No time, no vestry, no process, little parish discussion.
- I am very much in favour of St John's being able to offer affordable housing, especially when it is located right beside St John's.

In April 2002 members of the parish were asked if they were interested in Affordable Housing. About 20 people attended an initial meeting. A committee was established and since then has prepared a number of information bulletins and then in November 2002 a parish survey. Parishioners of St. John's were asked to provide their views regarding the potential role for St. John's in addressing the affordable housing crisis in Ottawa. The 40 responses received indicated a high level of support for affordable housing, including both personal time and financial commitments. No one indicated that St John's should not be involved in affordable housing. The Loblaws Gift Card program has recently been established as a concrete way of raising money for affordable housing.

The response to the request for financial assistance to purchase a house for our newly arrived refugee family was also significant - over 65 pledges.

While there has been no formal statement by the congregation as whole regarding affordable housing as a priority, the high level of interest indicates that it is a priority for many. The Affordable Housing Committee is the largest social action committee at St John's.

On receiving the Teron offer, the Affordable Housing Committee has done a considerable amount of research, around both the purchase of affordable condominiums and also the option for St John's to purchase for rental. This will be presented to the congregation.

Parishioners are always welcome at meetings of the Affordable Housing Committee.

Rental Units

- I am a senior looking forward to one of those rent-to-income apartments. Will parishioners have priority?

If St John's receives funding support from the city, all subsidized units are offered to people at the top of the Social Housing Registry. Units available at market rent could be offered to parishioners on a priority basis. If St John's or other faith communities provide rent support, the selection of tenants would then be more flexible.

- As a parishioner who is already in the system (I'm receiving ODSP and therefore live in a subsidized apartment building of the city), would I have first choice or rather be considered before those on the registry list?

The possibility of transferring to another subsidized unit would have to be investigated.

- How could it work putting condo owners with low rent housing?
- I am opposed to "mixture" - condominium with low rental units.
- We had difficulty managing the In from the Cold program and we have concerns about security at St John's already - what impact will rent to income have next door?
- City sponsored units mixed with rental units or purchased units could be a recipe for serious difficulties.

All new social housing today is a mixture of subsidized renters and those paying market rent. The condo owners would be paying the equivalent of market rent. Purchasers would be informed that some number of the units will be rental and it will be their decision whether to purchase based on this information. Appropriate management and people support are important elements in reducing problems.. Note: The Well, not St John's, managed the In from the Cold programme.

Ownership and Administration of Rental Units

- Church administration should not be involved with the administration of the condo unit - especially with the mix of low and high incomes.
- St John's should not become an owner. A separate corporation should be set up.
- Totally in favour of affordable housing but it should be kept separate from the church with a board to run it. You cannot mix low rental with owners unless intense supervision.
- I have doubts the Parish should get into the rental business - even though the intent is good.
- Low rental units are very difficult to administer and very time-consuming.
- Rental units will cost us money when people renege on rent.
- These projects need to be administered separately not by individual non-professional volunteers. (P.S. Shepherds of Good Hope are already running 50 low rental units. They would be qualified to run them.)
- Must not manage property ourselves.
- Is the parish prepared for the liability issues around the renting/ ownership of these spaces?

The Affordable Housing Committee has discussed the above points at length and has recommended that a separate non-profit corporation be set up to purchase rental units should this concept be acceptable. The by-laws for the corporation would define the level of involvement of St John's in the management of the corporation. For example, all members of the Board could be members of St John's or the corporation could have no link whatsoever with St John's. There is also the possibility that an existing non-profit housing corporation would purchase some units. An experienced non-profit housing corporation could also be contracted to manage the rental units.

All of the issues around the rental units need a full discussion with the congregation. The present Framework provides for the purchase of rental units as an option not an obligation.

- Will we be part of the condo association? We want to have some input over the years so down the road the condo does not change its focus.

St John's level of involvement with the condominium association will depend on the extent of its ownership of units. At a minimum, we expect to have some role through the ownership of parking.

- Who will manage the condo building? There has been talk of the church being the landlord. Is this the case, or will management fall elsewhere?

The condominium will be managed by a condominium board who will decide on whether to contract out the day-to-day building management or to self-manage the condominium.

Comments regarding purchasing space in condo for St John's use

I think taking up space in a condo building for our offices is not advisable as we would lose control of decisions regarding the building i.e. condo board decides.

The ground floor option comes with many problems and issues . We should keep the Teron building separate from St John's facilities.

Suggest ancillary space be kept entirely separate from condo space and planning for use be done accordingly for the long term future

Absolutely no.

Results of Questions re Condo Use

1. St John's should consider purchasing space only if the cost is less than creating new space in St John's and can be converted to condos or other use for sale in the longer term
 - a. YES – 18
 - b. NO – 4
2. St John's should consider purchasing space – to save time, even if cost is similar to creating new space in St John's
 - a. YES – 0
 - b. NO – 13
3. St John's should have all its space within the present St John's building even if this is a more expensive option
 - a. YES – 16
 - b. NO – 4

COMMENT MADE ON THIS SHEET: This all pre-supposes we're going ahead with the condo project.

ST JOHN'S RENOVATIONS
Questions, Answers and Comments

Process

The following comments will be taken into account in future consultations with the parish.

- Parishioners need more say, not to be controlled by ARC.
- What is the consultation process for the renovations to this space? Why isn't it in writing from start to finish?
- If we're going to put so much emphasis on the worship space, perhaps it's time to resurrect the doctrine and worship committee.
- A huge power dynamic/struggle has been set up over the use of space and choice of projects. We don't seem to be working together.
- Why has a trained process person outside of parish not been engaged thus far?

RENOVATION PRIORITIES: as per sticky dot counts

- New plumbing, heating, wiring etc 48 dots
- Renovate The Well 39 dots
- New Christian Education classrooms 32 dots
- Renovation of community shop 12 dots
- Better admin -reception, office space 12 dots
- More meeting space 9 dots
- Renovate music area 2 dots
- New Elgin St entrance 9 dots
- New Somerset St entrance 7 dots
- Restore Nave 33 dots
 - Fix floor - 6
 - Lighting - 5
 - Acoustics -5
 - New configuration - 3

ANCILLARY SPACE
Questions, Answers and Comments

- Space for the Community Shop has not improved.

The Fire Code requirement for an exit from the second floor required an exit hallway, eliminating the expansion of the Community Shop into the hall. This must be looked at further to see if there are other options..

- Fix water drainage for foundations – make sure they are OK and put bridges over ditches so anyone able or disabled can get into Church and Well in process.

Elimination of water problems is included in the design. The landscaping will cover all work.

- While the concept of the Atrium entrance off Elgin St is very beautiful – as a person with some mobility issues and a regular volunteer at the Well, how would those of us with walkers and/or wheelchairs get into St John’s to take the lift to the Well. There appears to be stairs.

The entrance for persons with disabilities is the Somerset Street entrance which leads to the elevator to The Well.

- Cloister Garden Entrance – this proposal reminds me of the Rideau St bus mall. As well as providing a “garden” like entrance to the Church, it will also provide added security issues. How will this be controlled so it will be safe to the public using this entrance? What about drug dealers and the like using this shelter?
- Will the Elgin St Atrium be locked (iron decorative gate) every evening to keep wanderers from sleeping on our park benches overnight?
- Security for Elgin St entrance – what arrangement from the street for night?
- If we create a beautiful inviting cloister, how will we ensure that folk can use it. Security vs. welcoming.

Part of the master plan is to make the space between the community shop and church building a new cloister. The plan includes paving, lighting, and other features that would attract people. Security is an important concern. The Elgin Street entrance will be locked at night. As well, a video camera could be installed.

- Pavers at all entrances: What will the degree of slope be on the entrances? This is a concern during the winter for ice and snow accumulation. Also slipperiness during a rainfall or freezing rain? Handrails at the entrance for people with limited mobility.

Access and safety for persons with mobility problems is a prime concern and so all necessary safety measures will be taken. The pavers would be just as safe as sidewalks or asphalt.

- Is the walkway from Elgin St going to be heated?

Yes.

- Will ARC be more open and transparent about sharing raw information reports?

All consultants reports are available in the church office as requested at the Sept. 21 meeting. A summary of the results of each of these studies has been shared with the congregation.

- There doesn't seem to have been much change to the plan since the comments made in May.

In May, the designs for the ancillary space were not provided and there was no entrance off Elgin Street. The purpose of the Sept. 21 presentation was to present the full design and obtain feedback on it.

- How much of the renovations/ARC costs (\$4.1M) would have to be done anyway for electrical, plumbing, heating, Nave floor, drainage etc?

This is an important question. The estimate for the plumbing, heating and wiring is \$1.5 million. We are now examining the cost report to estimate the costs for different parts of the renovation.

Comments

Priority should be given to Well space and other areas in the basement including electrical, plumbing, including Sunday school.

The proposal/vision that incorporates a lot of night lighting concerns me because of ecological issues, especially as our power is largely supplied by nuclear/coal (dirty) sources.

The focus on "light" as well as heating issues has negative ecological implications – and a huge cost of power.

Too much space is assigned to circulation space in the Somerset St Atrium and 2nd floor.

Back-up generators for any new elevators in church and condos.

THE NAVE
Questions, Answers and Comments

- I would like to keep the present configuration and enter the nave from the Elgin St. entrance.

Regardless of the new configuration, the plan is to have an entrance off Elgin Street. However, depending on the views of the congregation, it may be through the present area between the community shop and church proper.

- Place the choir where the present organ is located, build a balcony, put the organ in the Chapel, have the altar in the choir area, and keep the door to the Chapel.

The choir is too large to be placed in the north transept. The organ would be inaudible if placed in the Chapel. A balcony would be a very expensive undertaking, would make choir and organ coordination impossible. Furthermore, most people have expressed a desire to be able to see the choir. If the altar were placed in the present chancel, it would then be behind the proposed summer altar choir position.

- The organ seems to be in a place of prominence.

The present organ is going to be noticeable wherever it is placed. Not only is it a very valuable instrument, but it is also a rather fine piece of art. Placed at the east end of the present Chancel, and lit softly, it would be less prominent, but still usable.

- The choir wants to feel part of the congregation, hence the need for a new configuration.

The choir constitutes no fewer than 40 to 45 people on any given Sunday. This represents at least 20% of the congregation, and therefore these people should feel that they are part of the worshiping body. Isolated, as they are, in the chancel, they feel remote.

- As a server, I do not see a need for a whole room just to slip on a robe.

A separate room provides security from theft (which has been a problem) and a space to communicate with and organize servers. For example, if the captain of servers has to plan the movements for a service i.e. how four or five servers are to move around the church during the service, at present there is no place to do this.

- In this process, I believe we are being challenged to build two sanctuaries. One, the renewing of our Church; and two, the renewing of our souls and spirit within our church family. It is a quest to grow in trust to God and to listen to one another – to sense His will. I will rebuild the “temple.”

The renovations we are about to consider will have an impact not only on the physical plant, but also on the whole family of St John's. With improved facilities, the leaders of ministries will have the potential to do even greater work at the church; greater work at the church will result in strengthened commitment. We will literally be strengthening the temple of God, which is ourselves.

- Air conditioning is important.

Air conditioning is still being considered as a possibility. We have to admit that we often live in a terribly humid environment, especially during the summer months. Other churches have air conditioning, and if it is affordable, we would like to follow suit.

- Do not change the central position of the three windows behind the altar.

If the Ascension window configuration is chosen, there will be a tri-partite window behind the altar. If the Nave altar configuration is chosen, the present plan is to move the windows at the east end, into the north transept, as the east wall would back onto the new Somerset Street atrium.

- By having an altar that can be hidden, are we ashamed and embarrassed to call ourselves Christian when we invite the public into our worship space?

There is a great concern on the part of ARC that the sacredness of our building be in no way compromised. Cecilia has taken great pains to ensure that if or when the altar is moved, it is to a place that marks it as ever present and in a place of holiness.

- I am concerned that there is over emphasis on the choir, and the church as a concert hall.

It is true that music is a vital ministry offered at St John's but it is an adjunct to worship, providing an outlet for vocal expression, and, hopefully, stirring the hearts of the congregation. Concerts are a way of attracting people into our church, who may choose to come again – to worship. Any ministry doing well is bound to draw attention to itself.

- As a choir member I am NOT concerned about being in a different room from the congregation.

In general, this is not the feeling of the majority of choir members, but musically, we are trying to have all worshippers in the same space, to use the choir's musical leadership to greatest advantage, and to reduce choir movement during services.

- I am concerned that so much emphasis has been put on worship space with the Nave turned around. It seems like a foregone conclusion, despite divisiveness in the congregation.
- Why do we seem to be addressing only one of the proposed designs?
- Why is ARC still focusing all the ideas on Config. 3? There were other configurations presented and they have not been considered.

It is true that a major focus has been placed on turning the Nave around, and this is in large part due to the suggestions and conclusions of our architect. Cecilia did a careful analysis of our problems and the needs of the various ministries. Her overall design comes from having analyzed our concerns. Following her suggestion would eliminate a number of major difficulties presently experienced, including security, the multiple entrances to the building, trying to maximize seating, etc. However, this is NOT a foregone conclusion; ARC is looking at other configurations. Considerable consultation will have to take place with the congregation before the final decision, whatever it is, is reached by the congregation.

- There are many comments from the June 8th discussion groups (7 pages of notes) that have not been considered.

We believe that, excluding comments on the Nave configuration, most of the points from the June 8 consultation have been taken into consideration in the design that has been presented. Comments on the ministry areas, the Somerset Street entrance and in particular its appearance, and the need for an entrance on Elgin Street have largely been addressed. There was not agreement regarding the Nave configuration, including the location of the choir and organ, and so this will continue to be subject to much further discussion.

- One of the prime concerns of the new Nave, I thought, was to increase seating. Seating is actually diminished. Why? What is the new seat count?
- I am concerned about the loss of seating in any of the plans that move the altar to the back of the church.

It is true that we hope to increase the number of seats in the church. Using a consistent method of seat counting for all configurations, the Ascension window configuration provides the greatest seating capacity (an estimated increase of 40 additional seats), with all members of the congregation facing the altar and able to see it.

- In the design for Nave in the round, why does the altar take up so much space?

Placing the high altar in any position other than its present location, means taking up more space. The altar is to be the most prominent feature in the Nave, and as such must have sufficient space to make it distinctive. If placed at the Chancel steps, it would extend a fair distance into the Nave, also putting the choir and overflow congregation behind both the choir and altar.

- What is the cost of a new organ? What is the cost of moving the old organ?

A new electronic instrument could be purchased for around \$150,000. The cost of moving the present organ is around \$35,000.

- Cecilia asked to do a survey at the beginning of her employment for this project; the Nave committee said, no! Why was this very important survey over-ruled?

A major survey was completed by members of ARC at the beginning of the project.

- What can be done to improve acoustics without major relocation of the altar?

Acoustics CAN indeed be improved without relocation of the altar. The major problem of the acoustics is all the soft, wooden, non-reflective surfaces of the Nave walls, ceiling, and floor. A further problem associated with the acoustics, is the buried position of the choir, in the chancel. This can be solved only by moving the choir into the Nave.

- More air is needed, by putting screens on the windows, which should open, but not allow pigeons and West Nile virus carrying mosquitoes to enter. Fix all the windows so they are easy to open. More light. Take out the new side windows beside the Ascension window. Put these new windows elsewhere. Replace dull plain windows with clear windows.

Lighting is a MAJOR concern, which, though temporarily addressed by the new clear glass in the Nave chandeliers, will be examined in minute detail. Having stained glass windows that open is a major problem. In windows where there is no stained glass, clear glass is an option. However, included in the design are dormer windows to increase the lighting, and “air conditioning” to address the heat. In addition to improving the light from windows, new lighting fixtures would be installed as described in the Sept. 21 presentation.

- I favour restoration and renovation but no major changes to the body of the church. If the choir could have a sound system and change the seats to face the congregation, the problem of choir not hearing could be solved.

Having the choir remain in its present place and turning the stalls to face the congregation leads to many difficulties, including: reducing the focus on the altar because the choir is directly behind the altar facing the congregation; continuing to have the organ in a different space from the choir; and separating the choir from the congregation, not to mention the difficulty of having a choir four rows deep.

FUNDING AND FINANCING

Questions and answers

Giving capacity

- I can't give more nor can others (3 people).
- Those who can give more should.
- Members of congregation must take greater ownership/responsibility for the plan.
- Where will the money come from – we are dreaming – the finances must determine what we can do.
- Given current deficit and loss of parking lot for 2 years (and possibly community shop too) we'd lose more revenue.

The objective of a feasibility study will help determine what money could be available through “giving” and what needs to be done before fundraising begins. Professional fundraisers work from their experience in assuming it is possible to raise about three times current parishioner giving levels.

Professional fundraising

- Professional fundraisers are an irritant; poor return for the efforts; their share of the return is big.
- Professional fundraisers are better able to tap into money.
- Professional fundraisers will squeeze those of with little though there are some who can give more.
- Why do we need a professional fundraiser?

Professional fundraisers do produce results. It is thought that you can raise two thirds more by seeking this help. Solid lay leadership and leadership from clergy are also critical to successful campaigns.

The process

- Why is a feasibility study being proposed before we know what we want as a parish? (2 people)

More discussion about what we want will take place before a possible feasibility study. However, the feasibility study will help us to define choices based on objective questions and data collection.

- Concerned that the consultation on fundraising will be given more emphasis than the consultation on vision.
- We have been asked to agree on a vision without cost - no clear sense of capacity – why can't ARC give us ballpark numbers?

ARC has worked with Architect Cecilia Humphries and initial costing of the whole vision is estimated to be in the \$5M range. It is clear that other cost options need to be developed and ARC will be considering how to do this.

- Need a non-interested party help us with the whole process.

This is a possibility when a number of issues need to be discussed over a short period of time.

- Will \$1 million be adequate for repairs?

Initial cost estimates are \$1.5M for infrastructure improvements (plumbing, electrical, and mechanical systems)

Other commitments

- How will the diocesan deficit affect this?

At the moment, the Diocesan deficit will be dealt with through reducing costs in the Diocesan budget.

- Shouldn't we do more for the diocese as a large parish (e.g. – residential schools)?
- What about our other commitments (refugees, residential schools, etc) ?

We will have to consider all demands on the Parish as we make decisions about the level of financial commitment that will be realistic for us to take on.