



**Woolwich & Wellesley Townships Elementary Schools
Pupil Accommodation Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting #10
March 6, 2012, 6:30 – 8:00 PM
Three Bridges Public School Library**

The tenth meeting of the Woolwich & Wellesley Townships Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at Three Bridges Public School on Tuesday, March 6, 2012.

Committee Members Present:

Paul Milne, Principal St. Jacobs P.S., Vlad Kovac, Principal Floradale P.S., Wayne Dunham, Principal Three Bridges P.S., Krista Edwards, Parent Representative Linwood P.S., Brenda Martin, Parent Representative Floradale P.S., Susan Marchiori, Vice Principal Linwood P.S., Cindy Weber, Parent Representative Linwood P.S., Christine Shantz, Parent Representative Floradale P.S., Steve Snyder, Parent Representative Three Bridges P.S., Elmer Horst, Parent Representative Three Bridges P.S., Keith Trask, Parent Representative St. Jacobs P.S., Susan Martin Community Representative, Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning, Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary, Lauren Manske, Senior Planner and Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

Additional WRDSB staff present:

None

Regrets:

Geoff Suderman-Gladwell, Principal Linwood P.S., John Krupicz, Parent Representative St. Jacobs P.S., Diane DeCoene, Superintendent of Education, Ron Dallan, Manager of Capital Projects, Facility Services, Nick Landry, Manager of Enrolment, John Scarfone, Manager of Planning, Township of Woolwich, Sarah Peck, Planner, Township of Wellesley.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Mr. Hercanuck, Senior Planner for the Waterloo Region District School Board opened the meeting at 6:30 pm and welcomed members of the ARC.

2. ARC Meeting #9 – Draft Minutes Approval

Mr. Hercanuck asked members if there were any errors or omissions in the draft minutes from ARC meeting #9 (February 22, 2012). None were raised. Mr. Hercanuck advised that he had received an email from John Krupicz noting a change on page 5 from “ranting” to change to “ranking”.

Minutes approved with noted change.

Moved by: Christine Shantz

Seconded by: Krista Edwards

Mr. Hercanuck advised that hardcopies of the minutes will be sent out to the schools for the school binder and the minutes will also be posted on the Board website at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/woolwich-and-wellesley-townships-elementary-schools>

Mr. Hercanuck led the ARC through tonight's presentation, available online at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/woolwich-and-wellesley-townships-elementary-schools>

3. Draft Issues/Objectives:

- 1. Ensure equitable student access to a community school by having defined attendance area boundaries that relate geographically to the community it is located in.**
- 2. Where possible organize school attendance boundaries to minimize distance to school (time on bus).**

Mr. Hercanuck noted that at the last meeting the ARC discussed Draft Issues/Objectives Numbers 1 and 2, the inability of the STSWR to guarantee the bus routes and time on bus, and recognizing that minimizing the distance to school does not necessarily guarantee minimizing the times on the bus (which is determined by bus route). Mr. Hercanuck asked the ARC if they had considered whether they would like to remove or rewrite Draft/Issue Objective Number 2 as this statement as it is written, while possible, is not guaranteed.

The ARC agreed to keep Draft Issue/Objective Number 2 but to remove the (*time on bus*) portion.

Mr. Hercanuck reviewed the list of Draft Issues/Objectives (see slides 3 and 4 of the online presentation for the complete list) and asked the ARC if there are any additional concerns. None were expressed.

Action Item:

Mr. Hercanuck to revise the wording to remove (*time on bus*) from Draft Objective 2.

4. Additional Requested Information

Mr. Hercanuck commented that at the last meeting there was concern and questions about the validity of the ranking system used for gymnasiums through the Board and questions around gym heights and whether a school had a double or single gym.

Gym Space Benchmarking JK-8 Schools:

The ARC had asked for comparisons of JK-8 facilities and the presence of a single or double gym. Mr. Hercanuck noted that slide 6 of the online presentation shows the gym space benchmarking for JK-8 schools within the Board. There are 21 JK-8 schools in the Board and most of these facilities have double gymnasiums except for: Floradale P.S., St. Jacobs P.S., Three Bridges P.S. and Conestogo P.S.

Mr. Hercanuck commented that when considering capital construction the Board uses the guideline that a school must have a capacity or enrolment over 400 pupil places to be considered for a double gym. He noted that none of the schools (Floradale, St. Jacobs, Three Bridges or Conestogo) have either an enrolment or on-the-ground (OTG) capacity* greater

than 400. He did note that once Full-Day Kindergarten (FDK) is implemented at St. Jacobs P.S. the OTG/enrolment could reach that threshold. He also reminded the ARC that a ranking of #1 means it is the smallest per square foot of all the schools on the list.

School	Oct 2010 Enrolment	OTG	Gym Programming Spaces	JK-8 Gym Rankings based on:	
				Gym ft2/Student Enrolment	Gym ft2/OTG
Floradale P.S.	251	322	1	16	8
Linwood P.S.	469	510	2	7	2
St. Jacobs P.S.	319	348	1	6	1
Three Bridges P.S.	83	92	1	21	20

* OTG – Ministry of Education number that gives the loading of rooms in a school (capacity of built structure)

Mr. Hercanuck commented that Three Bridges P.S. had ranked better because of the low enrolment which puts less per pupil need on the gym.

Q: Does that mean Three Bridges P.S.'s gym is ideal?

R: Wayne Dunham responded that they do not have any problems with programming the gym to meet the daily physical activity program needs of the student population.

Q: Mr. Hercanuck asked Paul Milne and Vlad Kovac if they are experiencing any programming problems with school gymnasiums.

R: Mr. Milne responded that St. Jacobs P.S. does have problems with programming the gym space.

R: Mr. Kovac responded that Floradale P.S. is not experiencing any programming problems with its gym.

C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that at the last meeting Geoff Suderman-Gladwell commented that there is a big difference in a double gymnasium versus two single gymnasiums in terms of programming; and commented that while Linwood P.S.'s gym is on the small side Mr. Hercanuck would suspect that Linwood P.S. is doing okay with the two programmable gym spaces available there.

Mr. Hercanuck suggested that the ARC consider any pressure the scenarios could put on or take away from the gymnasium programmable spaces at the schools under review.

C: Paul Milne commented that he is not sure how realistic it is to use the OTG capacity of 348 for St. Jacobs P.S. because it has rooms that are not being used for the purpose requested by the Ministry of Education. He noted that at an enrolment of 330 St. Jacobs required a portable in the past.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded such uses become an issue and noted when the Board prepares a business case for funding; the Ministry does look at the OTG (and how a classroom should be loaded) and bases funding on it; regardless of how the school is actually using

its spaces. He noted that for portable allocation (which is an internal Board process) we do look at functional capacity, not OTG.

Library Assessments:

Mr. Hercanuck also provided additional information on the assessments for the libraries within the review area showing how the review area schools ranked compared to the rest of the Board based on the 2006 Score. The chart on slide 8 lists all the school libraries within the Board that scored less than 20 points out of a possible 30 for the Canadian Association for School Libraries 2006 assessment; with subsequent significant changes listed. Linwood P.S. was the only review area school to rank higher than 20 and therefore not make the list.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that no subsequent assessment has been done since 2006.

Review Area Results:

School	Score (2006)	Subsequent Significant Changes Since 2006
Floradale P.S.	15	Old school closed – new school new library.
<i>Linwood P.S.</i>	20+	N/A
St. Jacobs P.S.	18	May have had some millwork done.
Three Bridges P.S.	13	Library moved to new location in school. Some improvement.

A memo from Anita Brooks Kirkland, Board Library Consultant to Mr. Hercanuck dated March 1, 2012, advises that the library assessment list may give a better sense of where the needs are in the elementary school libraries and pointed out the importance of taking into account that the assessments for the schools on the list that have not had a renovation might not receive the same score if we were to assess the facility today. The Board has been able to address some of the concerns in the schools without doing a renovation and this might improve the score from 2006. Likewise, stresses on other schools might result in lower assessments than what was received in 2006.

Mr. Hercanuck commented that the ARC may want to consider the ranking of St. Jacobs P.S.’s library as part of the review.

St. Jacobs P.S. and Construction:

Mr. Hercanuck commented that at the last meeting it was brought to his attention that the school information profile for St. Jacobs P.S. had checked off a box indicating that the site could not handle an addition. Mr. Hercanuck apologized for the error and noted that St. Jacobs P.S. could handle an addition depending on the construction size (noting the site might make it challenging). Facility Services (see slides 9 and 10) advised (should the Board receive funding in 2014 for the FDK addition) construction could be done adjacent to the existing Kindergarten room on the south side of the building. The Board is anticipating two 1226 square foot classrooms. The creative play area would have to be relocated to make room for the addition.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the current Kindergarten classroom near the library would be converted to a regular classroom.

Action Item:

- **Mr. Hercanuck to update St. Jacobs P.S. School Information Profile to indicate site can handle an addition.**

Q: Elmer Horst asked why the Board would consider building an addition to add more students and take away the playground; does the Board consider how the school would cope if the enrolment should increase again down the road? St. Jacobs P.S. has issues; undersized programmable spaces and accessibility as well.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that there have been discussions at the Board around these issues and noted that this is the way the Ministry gives out the money; first it was for primary class sizes and now it is for FDK they give it out a little at time for specific programs construction, which does not always make sense for facilities in the long run.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that these issues are part of the business case; we are looking at what is happening in terms of enrolment in the area, what we would have to do to accommodate this enrolment through this accommodation review and that is why we are looking at the gyms, libraries and maintenance needs at the schools. We are trying to assemble solid school organizations, grade structures and look at what we have to do to accommodate that and that will become part of the Board's business case to the Ministry of Education. The business case for example, could outline the costs for upgrades, accessibility and additions with a reduction in site size versus for a little more money, a brand new school with no maintenance costs for 5-7 years.

C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that St. Jacobs P.S.'s site is rather tight at 4.5 acres for a JK-8 facility and it is not located next to a municipal park which the Board likes to do with its schools. There may be some heritage issues with the original school building.

Mr. Hercanuck advised the ARC that these are all pieces that we will have to put together and come to a conclusion at the end to see if it makes sense for the students and the community.

Q: Christine Shantz asked if the Board would have any land in the area on which to build a new school.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that they have some ideas but not sure if they are the most appropriate.

C: Ms. Manske commented that the ARC might come up with a scenario that takes some students away from St. Jacobs P.S; if we do not think there is enough room for growth the solution may be to "right size" the population to the facility and that is something we could look at doing in this review.

C: Elmer Horst commented that St. Jacobs is growing and the town is not getting any smaller; and suggested that the ARC view it as such.

C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that we have looked at removing students from St. Jacobs P.S. with Scenario 5 that takes the 7-8 program from St. Jacobs and buses them to Floradale P.S. but commented that it might be a tough sell.

Q: Elmer Horst asked if this would be efficient.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded no, that is not generally how the Board likes to operate but it is a scenario that the ARC still has on the table. He does not suggest that it is a good or bad scenario – just that it is an option that we have.

St. Jacobs Additional Development:

Referring to the map (from the [Township of Woolwich Official Plan](#)) on slide 11 of the online presentation, Mr. Hercanuck advised the ARC that the Board was circulated with a Draft Plan of Subdivision proposing new residential development in St. Jacobs. He noted that the development is referred to as Valley View Lands and the first phase of the development was built in the past few years and is located off of Water Street, north of Old Scout Place, in the south end of St. Jacobs. The new development is proposing between 144-154 residential units. Timing for the development is unclear but could be approximately 2-3 years according to the Township; it still has to go through an environmental impact study. It is the last remaining green field development (an area that has never been developed before) in St. Jacobs. Mr. Hercanuck noted that he has revised the enrolment projections and scenarios to include this new area.

Mr. Hercanuck advised that a residential development of 144-154 residential units would likely give the Board a yield of approximately 45 students over the long-term in St. Jacobs Town. He noted the Board's average yield of students per house is 0.30; for every 100 houses the Board would get about 30 students. He noted that the yield for newly constructed areas tends to be higher based during the initial 7-8 years of the development but that eventually levels off to the average that we see across the Board. The Board builds for the long-term and not for the peak. The Board would accommodate the peak with portables so as not to be left with empty classrooms once the subdivision matures. We could expect about 45 additional students from this area (projection area K). Tonight's handout contains the revised projections (additional 45 student increase) for area K, for all scenarios in which it is included.

Mr. Hercanuck also advised the ARC that the Board has the authority to request a school site in the new development area but cautioned that the location would not be centrally located within the community and not conducive to a walk-in population. He noted that St. Jacobs P.S. is better situated as it is centrally located in the Town of St. Jacobs and to the new development area as well and another option might be to acquire some additional land around the current St. Jacobs P.S.

C: Mr. Hercanuck pointed out that the black dashed lines, surrounding the map on Slide 11, depicts the Settlement boundary.

Q: Paul Milne asked how the 45 additional students were included into the revised enrolment projections for area K.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that considering that the first phase of development took 4-5 years to build out; he began adding an additional 15 students per year starting with year 2014 and ending with 2016.

Q: Steve Snyder asked whether the Township's boundary was set in stone or if it could be expanded in the future.

R: Dennis Cuomo responded that the Official Plan sets the boundary line to limit all development to within that area and until the Region and/or the Township expand that area out and determine that there is no more development land in the Village and more land is required, then they will have to revise their Official Plan. Official Plans are revisited every 5-10 years. The Township would consider expanding the boundary line only if it could provide servicing capacity (sewer and water) to this area. Referring to the yellow areas on the map, he noted that there are still a few areas of infill within the town that could be used for residential development and this is likely what will develop first.

Q: Elmer Horst commented that future development looks to be set for the south area and asked if the Board is aware of which direction development will happen should the Township decide to expand the Town boundary.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that through his discussions with the Planner for the Township of Woolwich, they do not feel any justification for increasing their line past where it currently sits; the Region of Waterloo however, has set the gray dashed line boundary (as shown on the map on slide 11) for the Settlement Area which would be the direction the Township would go when and if it decides it is necessary. Regardless of any future development the current St. Jacobs P.S. site would still be central to the Town of St. Jacobs and be the best location to serve the community from that perspective.

Q: Steve Snyder asked if the Board has the authority to request land already in use to use as a school site.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that the Board does have the authority to expropriate land but would have to have a very significant reason to do so.

5. Scenario Discussion

Mr. Hercanuck advised that there are two new scenarios; Scenario 8 and 9 and noted that the handouts include all scenario and maps revised to include the increase in numbers for area K.

Scenarios 8 and 9 were sent in via Wayne Dunham.

Scenario 8: (slide 13 of the online presentation)

Similar to Scenario 1 with a portion of Hawkesville (area E1) attending Three Bridges P.S.

- Includes a defined boundary for Three Bridges P.S.
- Three Bridges P.S. boundary comprised of areas G, I, J and E1
- St. Jacobs P.S. boundary comprised of areas H, K and L
- Linwood P.S. loses area E1 to Three Bridges P.S.
- Area E1 (Hawkesville) represents approximately 35-45 students gives Three Bridges P.S. an enrolment of 130-140 and taking away from Linwood P.S. now at 450 would be sitting with surplus capacity but still a solid organization for a JK-8.
- No change for Floradale P.S.
- St. Jacobs P.S. with 340-360 enrolment with the influx of the area K students by the end of 2016 included.

Q: Would this scenario include Three Bridges P.S. offering a Kindergarten program?

R: Yes, it would include putting a Kindergarten program in at Three Bridges P.S. to provide equitable program opportunities.

C: Ms. Manske advised that it is important to note that the new built capacity for St. Jacobs P.S. with the 2 additional Kindergarten rooms would be around 400.

R: Mr. Hercanuck noted that 400 capacity would be about correct for St. Jacobs P.S. in the event the Ministry does fund the Board's FDK request. However, the Board has not yet heard back from the Ministry as to whether its request has been approved for the final year of FDK.

Q: Ms. Manske asked if Linwood P.S. capacity increasing by only 9 spaces with FDK is due to an internal conversion rather than an addition.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that Linwood P.S. is going through an internal conversion to accommodate the FDK program; while adding 2 classrooms of 26 students we are also removing and repurposing another classroom which will result in a net gain of 9 in terms of OTG capacity.

Scenario 9: (see slide 14)

Also a modification of Scenario 1;

- Adds the area encompassed by Line 86, Listowel Road, Floradale Road and Steffler Road to the Three Bridges P.S. boundary. (adds 5 students)
- Takes the area noted above, away from the Floradale P.S. boundary. (removes 5 students)

Elmer Horst lives in this area and his children have been grandfathered to attend Three Bridges P.S. because they attended Three Bridges P.S. prior to the Board setting the transportation boundary.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the numbers for this scenario remain essentially the same as for Scenario 1 because this area which we have moved has "historically" yielded 5 students; for the projection numbers he took 5 away from Floradale P.S. and added 5 to Three Bridges P.S. He advised that, for projection purposes, he is using the historical yield numbers despite the view that the area contains a few young Mennonite families which have yet had children attend school.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the ARC has 10 scenarios on the table (including Status Quo) and the goal for Public Meeting #2 is to:

- Go over what an accommodation review is and why the Board is undergoing a review in this area.
- Issues faced and discussed by the ARC.
- The draft objectives developed.
- Where the ARC is in the process and what is expected to happen at each step.
- Present the scenarios in either the presentation or through an Open House portion of the meeting where we would have display boards and Planning staff would mingle and answer questions one-on-one about the scenarios.

Mr. Hercanuck advised that typically, presenting 4 or 5 scenarios (including Status Quo) works best to not overwhelm the public and asked for the ARC's assistance to narrow down the scenarios to the ones the ARC would like to present at Public Meeting #2.

The ARC was given worksheets to serve as a guide to find the scenarios the ARC would like to present at the Public Meeting.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the 10 scenarios could be considered as falling into the following 3 categories:

1. Status Quo
2. Three Bridges P.S. remains open (scenarios 1, 8 and 9)
3. Three Bridges P.S. is closed (scenarios 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7)

Mr. Hercanuck asked the ARC: For simplicities sake, could we provide one scenario from each category to present to the public?

The ARC discussed the scenarios and decided that any scenarios taken off the table for Public Meeting #2 could be brought back again if there was merit to do so.

The ARC discussed the possibility that the Board may not retain all of the current population of Three Bridges P.S. if the school were to remain open with the proposed changes to the program options and noted that once the ARC agrees on a scenario(s) to recommend to the Board; we will have to sit down and discuss with the community to get their thoughts and noted that the numbers for the scenarios may need to be revised depending on the outcome of those discussions.

It was noted that the scenarios which shift students from the other review area schools to Three Bridges P.S. would be a hard sell to parents and may only work for the more rural areas (Scenario 1).

Mr. Hercanuck advised that Facility Services staff are scheduled to attend the next ARC meeting to answer questions about the challenges and limitations of a site rebuild while the existing school remains in operation; and the feasibility of additions and implementation of accessibility measures.

It was noted that with regard to the historical 25 understandings, those who chose to attend Three Bridges P.S. would have the ability to opt out of certain programs but the programs should be included for those who wish to use them. This may require an increase in the amount of resources at the school to accommodate those who do not attend the program being offered.

- C: Keith Trask requested that the scenarios to keep Three Bridges P.S. open should include any assumptions about a more generic curriculum being taught which should be considered just as important as the defined boundary.
- C: Paul Milne commented that where programming conflicts with personal belief (i.e., sex education and evolution) the parents can discuss with administration and the children can opt out of those programs and for Three Bridges P.S. the numbers for those opting out might be greater than for those at other schools in the Board.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that the ARC may need to explore further the last objective “reasonable accommodation of cultural differences” to figure out how the scenarios keeping Three Bridge P.S. open would work to achieve this objective going forward.

The ARC agreed that there is a need to explain what a defined boundary for Three Bridges P.S. would mean and give a clear description of what this assumption means for those who will now have to attend and for those who will continue to attend Three Bridges P.S. should the ARC recommend either of the scenarios (1, 8 or 9).

- C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that the area would now draw in a population of perhaps a different cultural background than that which already attends Three Bridges P.S. and therefore would require the provision of opportunities for them that might not be offered here now and we will try to meet the standard we try to achieve at all of our schools.
- C: Mr. Cuomo commented that scenarios 1, 8 and 9 are basically the same with the only real difference being the boundary. The ARC can determine later which boundary would make the most sense for the community. We can also explain at the Public Meeting that the boundaries may change depending on public feedback and what the ARC decides is the best for those involved.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that Scenario 8 keeps Three Bridges P.S. open and would include moving students from other schools and having them attend Three Bridges P.S. as their home school (50 students who currently attend St. Jacobs P.S. in areas G, I and J would now attend Three Bridges P.S.
- C: Paul Milne commented that from a numbers perspective, Scenario 8 does not make sense because it will result in Linwood P.S. being underutilized in 2020 and Three Bridges P.S. being well over capacity with 142.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that 142 for Three Bridges P.S. could also go a long way towards reducing the number of combined grade classes which can be a problem when you have a school with an enrolment under 100 pupils. He also noted that Three Bridges P.S. would likely require an addition to accommodate the Kindergarten program if it were to remain open.
- C: Ms. Manske responded that the projected 142 number includes the numbers for 2 additional grades that do not currently attend Three Bridges P.S. (JK and SK).

The ARC agreed not to take Scenario 8 to the public meeting and to go forward with a scenario that keeps the numbers within the built capacity recognizing that there may be challenges for programming should we go with the Grade 8s at Linwood P.S. or the potential for multiple grade classes with the enrolment at Three Bridges P.S.

- C: Christine Shantz noted that a problem with Scenario 9 is that the 86 highway goes around the outer edge of the boundary and that is where the bus would come from Wallenstein and take the students to Floradale P.S. which does not really make sense in terms of transportation.
- C: Elmer Horst commented that the bus comes that way now to pick up his children and transport them to Three Bridges P.S.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that Mr. Horst's family is being grandfathered for transportation but once his children are done at Three Bridges P.S., this special arrangement will cease to be given to his address.

The ARC agreed to take the following scenarios to Public Meeting #2:

- Status Quo
- Scenario 1

The ARC agreed to resume discussion of the scenarios for Public Meeting #2 at ARC #11 meeting on March 21st at Linwood P.S.

Action Items:

- **Mr. Hercanuck to revise scenarios and projections to included new proposed capacity for St. Jacobs P.S. with FDK.**
- **Mr. Hercanuck to add program change assumptions to scenario 1.**
- **Mr. Hercanuck to invite Township of Woolwich Planner to speak to the ARC about the new development pieces.**
- **Mr. Hercanuck to add to agenda for next meeting, scenario category discussion for scenarios going to public meeting #2.**

6. Future Meeting Dates/Times

ARC Meetings:

ARC Meeting #11- Wed., March 21, 2012 from 6:30-8:00 p.m. @ Linwood P.S.

Public Meeting #2 is confirmed for Wednesday, April 4th at Elmira District Secondary School and noted that the ARC is welcomed to attend but their attendance is not mandatory.

Public Meeting #2:

Wednesday, April 4, 2012 from 7:30-9:00 p.m. @ Elmira District Secondary School.

Mr. Hercanuck thanked the ARC members for attending and adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

FUTURE MEETING DATES:

ARC MEETINGS:

ARC Meeting #11: March 21, 2012, 6:30-8:00 p.m. @Linwood P.S., Library

PUBLIC MEETINGS:

Public Meeting #2 – April 4, 2012, 7:30-9:00 p.m. @ Elmira District Secondary School