



**East Kitchener-Waterloo Elementary Schools Pupil  
Accommodation Review  
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting # 5  
December 8th, 2009 - 4:30 pm**

The fifth meeting of the East Kitchener-Waterloo Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at Margaret Avenue P.S., on December 8, 2009.

**Committee Members Present:**

Elke Whitmore, Principal of Bridgeport P.S., Frank Ewald, Principal of Lexington P.S., Naya Markanastasakis, Vice Principal of Elizabeth Ziegler, covering for Kelly Wilkinson, Elizabeth Brown, Development & Technical Services Dept., City of Kitchener, Tara Bridger, parent – Bridgeport P.S., D.L. Brown, parent – Suddaby P.S., Cindy Shirley, parent – Elizabeth Ziegler P.S., Amy Stewart, parent – Margaret Avenue P.S., Kelly Miller, parent – Elizabeth Ziegler P.S., Michael Reinhardt, parent – Bridgeport P.S., T. Gilhuly, parent – Lexington P.S., Peter Brown, parent – Lexington P.S., Don Snider, parent – Prueter P.S., Mary Hingley, recording secretary, Chris Smith, Manager of Planning, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner and Lauren Manske, Planner for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

**Regrets:**

Mark Schinkel, Area Superintendent, Gregg Bereznick, Area Superintendent, Ian Gaudet, Controller, Facility Services, Kelly Wilkinson, Principal of Elizabeth Ziegler P.S., Janet Hale, Principal of King Edward, Leisa Kuntz, Principal of Prueter P.S., Darlene Stubbs, Principal of Suddaby P.S., Brian Ward, Principal of Margaret Avenue P.S., Carrie Dawson-Thomas, parent – Margaret Avenue P.S., Susie Fowler, parent – Suddaby P.S., D. Welsman, parent – King Edward P.S., Laura Dick, parent – Prueter P.S., Carolyn Laurie, parent – King Edward P.S.,

**1. Welcome/Introductions**

Chris Smith, Manager of Planning opened the meeting at 4:35 pm and welcomed members of the ARC.

- Ms. Manske had a number of handouts for the ARC including:
- an updated list of the Draft Review Objectives.
- a chart listing the neighbouring schools in East K-W review area including the Waterloo Catholic District School Board (this from an earlier ARC request).
- a WRDSB boundary map detailing the East Kitchener-Waterloo area schools.

**2. Meeting # 4 – Draft minutes approval**

- Mr. Smith asked the group if there were any corrections/concerns with the minutes from the November 24<sup>th</sup> ARC meeting.
  - No concerns or corrections were raised.
  - Minutes from the November 24<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved.
  - Mover: Lynn Brown and seconded by: Cindy Shirley

### **3. Discussion about request to add an additional ARC representative from the Bridgeport North neighbourhood**

- Tara Bridger (parent rep from Bridgeport P.S.) had asked the ARC to consider adding another parent rep from Bridgeport North – specifically the Falconridge Drive area. She felt that the Falconridge community should be represented especially if we are talking about building (or not building) a school on the vacant site.
- In discussion with the group, the ARC felt that a third rep from Bridgeport P.S. was not necessary; all of the other schools just have two.
- Mr. Smith added that the ARC does look at the bigger picture, not just their own schools.
- Ms. Bridger agreed. She will however work with Elke Whitmore to find someone to cover for her when she goes on maternity leave in early May. Ms. Bridger will remain as the voting ARC member.

### **4. Ongoing: Draft Review Objectives, School Valuations – School Information Profiles**

#### **Draft Objectives**

- Mr. Smith advised that the objectives are an on-going process and can still be adjusted. He asked the ARC if they felt the objectives cover what we need, and if they have any other ideas or suggestions to please bring them forward.

#### **School Valuations – School Information Profiles**

- Mr. Smith noted that we are still waiting on templates from a couple of the schools, and will share the information with the ARC when we have it compiled.

### **5. Discussion of Preliminary Scenarios**

- Ms. Manske referred the group to the handouts detailing the WRDSB JK-6, 7/8, and secondary school boundaries. Ms. Manske also noted that if there are any other resources the ARC needs to please let her know.
- Ms. Manske then led the group through some preliminary scenarios:

#### **Status Quo**

- The draft enrolment projections are based on future development that is on the books, there is no speculative data included.
- Projections based on anticipated occupancy dates for new builds.
- Looked at similar developments in the WRDSB to estimate student yields per unit.
- Typical dwelling type yields are: single .3, semi .25 and townhouses .25.
- Ms. Manske used the Eastbridge development numbers for the projections here which saw a higher than average yield at: single .45, semi .3 and townhouses .21.
- In older areas the average yield per unit was .15 to .2 (JK-8).

#### **Questions/Comments:**

Ms. Mankse noted that due to the development in the review area we will certainly need a built capacity solution at least in the short-term.

C – Lexington’s population shows a decrease in the status quo scenario due to a previously approved boundary change that will take place in 2012.

### **Scenario 1**

- *Two new JK-6 facilities (Lexington & Falconridge), 7/8 program remains at Margaret Avenue.*
- Approximate cost: \$14 million (very preliminary estimate).
- Does not address the JK-8 model.
- Bridgeport has just undergone a major addition/renovation, and would be underutilized. The decrease in enrolment would mean a loss of staff and resources, and a loss to the school community.
- Mr. Smith noted that this scenario would result in a couple of smaller schools and organizations, but would however address our community school objective.
- Prueter decreases in enrolment, this is a concern. Any new students brought there would have to come from the east or west, out of other existing school catchments, with the boundary being the highway currently and Bridgeport right across the bridge.
- Prueter has a large site at 7.12 acres, making it a possible site for an addition.

Q – Are the boundary changes between Lexington and Sandowne reflected in this scenario?

R – Yes, that is why the projections start in 2013, also with any new construction planned and the timelines for that, it would be 2013 before any major construction could be completed.

Q – Will the new schools in this scenario be smaller?

R – Yes, approx 275. As stated earlier it does address the community issue but not the 7/8 model.

Q – The type of renovation for the other sites – do we need to worry about that?

R – Yes, but this will be common to multiple scenarios, for example long-term accessibility goals – all schools should eventually be made accessible.

Q – The new school numbers in this scenario are low: Falconridge at 291 and Lexington at 263, what are the Good Schools Standing Committee recommendations for school size?

R – Based on the 2 classes per grade goal (JK-6) and more than 2 classes per grade (7/8), they suggest a JK-6 organization of approximately 350 – 400 students and a JK-8 organization of approximately 500 – 550 students. Please note that these numbers came before the advent of the Early Learning Program which will bump up the actual student usage. Their report and suggested guiding principles are in your ARC binders if you want a more detailed look.

Q – What are the numbers from Area E?

R – Area E shows 96 JK-6 students by 2017. There is a draft enrolment projection by area summary sheet available that Ms. Manske will send to the ARC.

Q – Are there timelines on these scenarios? For example if the Lexington facility was to be dismantled, would we bus those students somewhere else until a new facility could be built?

R – That would be part of an implementation plan that could involve some staging. We could use the Floradale or Ryerson idea, whereby the new school was built out in front of the existing school (as long as the school site could handle it).

### **Scenario 2**

- *Two JK-8 facilities (Falconridge and Prueter), Margaret Avenue closes, and Lexington gets reconstructed.*

- Approximate cost: \$22 million (very preliminary estimate). Note: with the closure of Margaret Avenue in this scenario you may have revenue generated by the sale of the property.
- Other boundaries stay the same except some minor changes between Bridgeport and Lexington.
- Prueter was chosen for the JK-8 site because of its site size. Would require a second or larger gym and at least two additional classrooms, lockers, etc. The addition would be fully accessible.
- There would also be other upgrades needed for the senior program.
- Implication of scenario: Courtland gains Area T – this is up for further debate.
- Does address a JK-8 model north and south of the expressway.

Q – Building a JK-8 at Falconridge, why not Lexington?

R – It is possible, however will come down to geography only as basic “public” sites are the same: (Falconridge site size: 5 acres plus 6.73 acres of parkland, Lexington is 6.3 acres plus 5.24 acres of parkland) and Lexington currently has a building on its site.

Q – Could Bridgeport house 7/8 with the new addition and its central location?

R – Mr. Smith noted that the real issue would be how to get students there. As a JK-8 facility, yes they could handle it; however, the parking area and access/egress would have to be changed.

Q – What about converting Margaret Avenue to JK-8 and closing Prueter?

R – Prueter would be easier to retrofit based on what we saw on the school tour, and it has a better/larger site than Margaret Avenue. It would be easier to build a new addition at Prueter than making Margaret Avenue accessible.

C – This scenario would provide more walk-ability for the 7/8’s, and addresses the school community objective.

### **Scenario 3**

- *New JK-8 facility (Falconridge), 7/8 addition to Elizabeth Ziegler, Lexington and Margaret Avenue close.*
- We have not worked out an approximate cost for this scenario at this point. We will get that information for you, if this is a scenario we wish to pursue.
- Stronger 7/8 numbers in this scenario.
- There are implications to the Courtland and MacGregor boundaries.
- Elizabeth Ziegler has a 10 acre site, so there is room for an addition.
- Suddaby 7/8’s could go to Courtland instead of Elizabeth Ziegler, which is good for Courtland because it is under capacity.
- The Falconridge #’s by 2019 at 800 is high. This number is assuming full development has taken place, and we could likely have overstated the numbers a bit.

C – Mr. Smith noted that this is the first look at the scenarios, we run them by you for feedback and any ideas, and then we can work on getting some figures/prices from facilities, etc.

C – Area M is in MacGregor’s boundary, when people buy into that area they assume they will go there, but instead this scenario has them going to Elizabeth Ziegler.

R – Area M does not represent a lot of students and that is why many of the students at MacGregor have to travel so far to get there for 7/8.

R – MacGregor is on our priority list for reviews; however it’s about 2 years out.

C – There are 2 different areas that feed Elizabeth Ziegler, new families in one area, and the other area has students mixed amongst the university students.

Q – Are we taking these scenarios to the Public Meeting? Lexington would like this version of scenario 2 with a JK-8 on their site.

R – We can re-jig the scenario and look at that. The drawback to Lexington is the site, and working with/around the current structure.

#### **Scenario 4**

- *New JK-6 facility (Lexington)*
- Is basically Status Quo with a minor boundary variation.
- Keeps the 7/8 program centralized.
- Healthier numbers at JK-6 schools.
- Bridgeport numbers are high.
- Lexington numbers are stronger with Area E (although it would require students to cross University Ave.)

Q – What if the 7/8's from Waterloo were taken away from Margaret Avenue?

R – Margaret Avenue could not survive that; the remaining numbers would be too low to support the program/organization.

Q – What about a scenario with Margaret Avenue as JK-6?

R – We will work some numbers, and give you the details.

Q – Would transportation be provided to cross University Avenue?

R – Yes, if it was deemed to be unsafe under Board policy.

Mr. Smith noted that Waterloo Council has asked the Region to put a light at University Avenue and Pastern Trail (Area H) to cross the St. Matthew's students. An adult crossing guard is already there; which meets Board standards.

Q – Regarding physical distance – could Area D walk to Bridgeport?

R – We will look at that and get back to you.

Q – Would the Falconridge site have Areas C to F walk?

R – A distance calculation will have to be worked out, but with no sidewalks initially, transportation might be a factor. We are looking for the most central site and will assume sidewalks exist. We can give you the current walk distances to the various schools.

Mr. Smith noted that we can re-jig some of the scenarios; we will be meeting again before the Public Meeting to firm them up to take to the public.

#### **6. Roundtable**

- Public Meeting # 2 is scheduled for January 26, 2009 and we are still working on the location. We hope to hold it at Margaret Avenue.
- We will present preliminary scenarios, and have break out sessions for smaller group discussion, then reconvene for broader discussion.

Q – Could Bridgeport host the Public Meeting?

R – There is a parking concern there; also they are just wrapping up the construction.

- Planning staff noted that the break out sessions from past public meetings have worked very well. People feel more comfortable speaking in a smaller group setting.
- The Principals will be called upon to help act as facilitators for these sessions.

C – It was noted that the ARC may benefit from attending the Public Meeting; ultimately feedback from these meetings factor in any recommendations.

Mr. Smith added that the ARC is welcome to attend, but it isn't mandatory and the ARC members will not be centered out. It is valuable to hear other perspectives as well.

- Ms. Manske noted that the notice we send out via the schools will state that we are looking at preliminary scenarios.
- Planning staff will get the notice out to the schools in a timely fashion with as much lead time as possible.

## **7. Future Meeting Dates**

- The next ARC meeting is Tuesday, January 12, 2010 at 4:30 pm at Margaret Avenue P.S. in the library.
  - Planning staff will bring the preliminary scenarios, and we will use this ARC meeting to fine tune them before the Public Meeting.
  - Planning staff will post the preliminary scenarios on our website the week before the Public Meeting.
- Mr. Smith thanked all for coming, and the meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

---

### **Future Meeting Dates:**

**Tuesday January 12<sup>th</sup> 2010 @ Margaret Ave P.S. – 4:30 – 6:00 pm**

**Public Meeting #2 – Tuesday January 26, 2010, location TBD**

**Tuesday, February 9<sup>th</sup> 2010 @ Margaret Ave P.S. – 4:30 – 6:00 pm**