



**West Galt Elementary Schools
Pupil Accommodation Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting #8
March 7, 2012, 5:30-7:30 PM
St. Andrew's Public School Library**

The eighth meeting of the West Galt Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at St. Andrew's Public School on Wednesday, March 7, 2012.

Committee Members Present:

Karen Tomlin, Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Marcia Lubert, Principal Tait Street P.S., Roy Roethel, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's P.S., Trevor McWilliams, City of Cambridge Representative, Barry Frame, Principal Dickson P.S., Nick Chiarelli, Vice Principal, Highland P.S., Karen Destun, Parent Rep., Tait Street P.S., Paula Ouellet, Parent Rep., Highland P.S., Lynn Robb, Parent Rep, Blair Road P.S., Maura Fuller, Parent Rep., Tait Street P.S., Kelly Deml, Parent Rep., Blair Road P.S., Bev Fox, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's P.S., Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning, Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner and Lauren Manske Senior Planner, for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

Other WRDSB Staff Present:

None

Regrets:

Wendy Bowker, Principal Highland P.S., Jodie Hancox-Meyer, Principal, Blair Road P.S., Michelle Schmid, Vice Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Rebecca Raineault, Parent Rep., Dickson P.S., Al Potma, Parent Rep., Dickson P.S., Hayley Orman, Parent Rep., Highland P.S., Ron Dallan, Manager Capital Projects and Lila Read, Superintendent of Education for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Ms. Manske, Senior Planner opened the meeting at 6:00 pm and apologized for the late start (as a result of traffic delays due to the 401 shutdown) and thanked the ARC members for waiting.

2. ARC Meeting #7 – Draft Minutes Approval

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if there were any corrections/concerns with the minutes from the February 15, 2012 ARC meeting and advised that Ron Dallan had made a few corrections to his comments on pages 9 and 11. No other corrections/concerns were noted.

Minutes from ARC Meeting #7 approved with noted changes.

Moved by: Trevor McWilliams

Seconded by: Maura Fuller

Ms. Manske noted 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/west-galt-elementary-schools>

Ms. Manske led the ARC through the presentation, available on-line at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/west-galt-elementary-schools>

3. Public Meeting #2

- **Feedback:**

Ms. Manske noted that [Public Meeting #2](#) was held on Thursday, March 1, 2012 at Blair Road P.S. with approximately 22 members of the community in attendance, consisting largely of the Dickson P.S. community; City Councilor Pam Wolf was also in attendance. The public meeting format consisted of a presentation and an informal open house with display boards and maps and the [draft goals and objectives](#) which are all available on the Board's Website for the review. Those in attendance (as well as those who could not attend) were requested to submit their comments to the ARC through comment sheets which were handed out or via email at boundaryfeedback@wrdsb.on.ca.

Ms. Manske noted that the Scenarios were not formally presented during the presentation but were on display at the back of the gymnasium for viewing during the open house portion of the meeting and Planning staff circulated to answer questions one-on-one.

- C: Marcia Lubert commented that the some of the attendees left the meeting with the impression that these were the scenarios the ARC is currently pursuing and not that they were examples of scenarios that the ARC had worked through and that the ARC would end up recommending one of these scenarios.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that she did advise those present that these scenarios are not final and just because a school is not affected in these scenarios does not mean they will not be considered for changes under this review.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the scenarios displayed at Public Meeting #2 were the scenarios that the ARC decided had merit and would be considered further.
- Q: Were any of the scenarios the ARC had eliminated displayed at the meeting?
- R: Ms. Manske responded that scenarios 1-4 and 7 had been eliminated and therefore had not been displayed.

The following Scenarios were displayed at Public Meeting #2:

- [Status Quo](#)
- [Scenario 5](#)
- [Scenario 6](#)
- [Scenario 8](#)
- [Scenario 9](#)
- [Scenario 10](#)

Ms. Manske responded that tonight the ARC will be looking to narrow the scenarios down further. She noted that the scenarios, as they stand, will not necessarily be what the ARC ends up with. The scenarios are examples that the ARC will work with and tweak to decide what works and what does not work until we come up with the best scenario that the ARC will ultimately be recommending to the Board.

C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that the turnout for Public Meeting #2 was typical for a public meeting and noted that having a turnout of 60-70 people would be considered exceptional. We find that many people prefer to check out the materials online as an alternative to coming out to the meeting.

- **Draft Objectives:**

Ms. Manske noted that she had parsed out the draft objective into draft goals and objectives and discussed them at the meeting. The draft goals are broader in their scope whereas the draft objectives are more narrowly focused.

Ms. Manske noted that she had not received any negative feedback or changes so far and asked if the ARC had any further comments or concerns with the draft goals and objectives.

Q: Marcia Lubert commented that there are a lot of draft objectives and asked whether the ARC could work towards developing a weighting system to determine which objective is more important to meet over another objective; she noted that the idea is to meet as many of the objectives as possible.

R: Ms. Manske responded that past ARCs have not put a weighting on the objectives but that is something that could be done if the ARC feels a need for it. She noted that there are a few conflicting objectives and advised that the ARC will likely not find a scenario that will meet all objectives. The ARC might want to consider objective weights if trying to break a tie between recommended scenarios.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that other Boards relayed their experiences on weighting ARC objectives and cautioned us that deciding what weight to put on an objective can take almost as much time as developing and evaluating scenarios; which is something for the ARC to keep in mind if it would like to pursue weighting the objectives.

Requested Information:

Cambridge New Development Areas (Area E): (see slide 5 of the online presentation)

Ms. Manske shared the following information about Projection Area E New Developments in Cambridge:

Development	Date Registered	No. of Units Registered	# of Units Built	WRDSB Student Yield per unit
58M-450	January 2008	59 Singles	53	0.23
58M-533	December 2011	53 Singles	0	TBD
30T-87023	TBD	47 Singles proposed	TBD	TBD
30T-97003	TBD	41 Singles proposed	TBD	TBD

Ms. Manske noted that to-date; the Board has acquired 10 students from the new development areas with 9 attending Highland P.S. and 1 attending St. Andrew's P.S. She noted that the

Board's yield of students for the area is 0.23 students/unit which is below the Board-wide average of 0.30 students/unit. The Catholic Board appears to be receiving a larger share of students in this area.

Ms. Manske noted that Phase 2 of the Grand Ridge Estates is proposing 178 singles and 120 town houses which should yield approximately 90 students from JK-8. This is in Highland P.S. boundary.

Q: How far down the road before these developments are complete?

R: Trevor McWilliams responded that for Phase 2 of Grand Ridge Estates the developer can make the application now but will likely be at least another 2 years noting that the City of Cambridge has not yet received the development applications for the areas (white area on the map on Slide 5 of the presentation). He noted that the orange areas have already been approved and can be registered for development at any time.

C: Ms. Manske advised the ARC of the following timelines to give an indication of occupancy of units over the past few years:

Year	Number of Homes Built
2008	6
2009	7
2010	11
2011	19
2012	10

4. Scenarios

Ms. Manske advised that the ARC would be breaking out into small groups to look at the remaining scenarios to see if there are some that are not worth pursuing and can be eliminated. She advised that tweaks can be made to the remaining scenarios to refine them. (boundary modifications and/or changes to grades offered at schools)

Ms. Manske handed out packages which included worksheets, maps showing the transportation policy walking distances for each school and a map of coloured dots representing students by school for the review area. She pointed out an area where a large group of 50 students in Area J all attend Highland P.S. and live in the townhouse complex and the low-rise apartments; this area sits on the Highland P.S. school boundary line. If the boundary was to be tweaked and this area redirected to another school it may reduce some enrolment pressure on Highland.

At 6:30 p.m. the ARC broke out into three small groups to discuss all of the remaining scenarios (Status Quo, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10). The ARC members used worksheets to record their results after comparing the scenarios against the draft goals and objectives to determine which scenarios were worth considering further. The ARC reconvened at 7:20 p.m. to briefly discuss their findings before handing back the completed worksheets to Ms. Manske.

(Slide 3 and 4 of the online presentation)

The ARC commented that some of the draft objectives are broad and may need to be refined, including the following:

- *To maintain those school buildings that can provide appropriate, purpose-built facilities (kindergarten rooms, gyms, libraries, etc.) and achieve legislated accessibility requirements at the lowest per pupil cost.*

Action Item:

Ms. Manske noted that this objective may need to be split into two objectives and add the 2025 deadline for accessibility.

- *To increase the number of students housed in permanent accommodation.*

C: Referring to the draft objective above, Mr. Hercanuck commented that when looking at enrolment and a school being 20 pupil places over its built capacity, may indicate the need for a portable and not an addition. It would be hard to determine this if we do not have the capital piece that goes with it.

Q: Mr. Hercanuck asked the ARC if they would be looking for an overall decrease in portables for the review area or a reduction of portables needed at the individual schools.

R: Kelly Deml responded that a similar question came up at a school council meeting and the consensus was that we should be looking at the “big picture”; trying to do the best we can for all the review area schools.

Q: Mr. Hercanuck questioned that conversely is it better to have a scenario that more equally distributes the number of students in portables so that not just one school is loaded up?

R: Barry Frame responded that if one school were to have the need for all the portables this could mean an addition.

R: Ms. Manske responded that this draft objective may be one the ARC will have to look at more closely once we have information about what we could potentially be looking at for requesting capital funding for an addition. It may not be one that can be fully answered right now; or it may give us the incentive to be considering an addition if it means several portables at a school.

Q: Barry Frame asked does the Board have a magic number that takes it from an extra portable to an addition.

R: Ms. Manske responded that it may depend on how long-term the Board believes the population increase will hold (this would depend on the schools historical enrolment and whether it is projecting a steady increase over an extended period of time).

Q: Barry Frame asked if the Board would consider a proposal for a four classroom addition to be reasonable if the enrolment was sustainable.

R: Dennis Cuomo responded that the Board would certainly do a four classroom addition if it was warranted. The Board would have to consider if there is surplus space available in area schools. Since a new addition becomes a harder sell to the Province if students could be accommodated elsewhere. He also noted there is no magic number and that the Board has done classroom additions for various numbers of classrooms.

Q: What would be an ideal size for a 7-8 program?

R: Ms. Manske responded that it would be reasonable to aim for over 300 students. With a French Immersion (FI) program, it would be better with a minimum of 350 students.

Ms. Manske asked the ARC which scenarios they would like to carry forward:

The ARC decided to eliminate:

- **Scenario 6**
- **Scenario 8** - Schools not centrally located within boundary
- **Scenario 9**

The ARC decided to keep:

- [Scenario 10](#) - Schools are centrally located within its boundary
- [Scenario 5](#)

Referring to Scenario 10, Ms. Manske commented that for this scenario the ARC can recommend that the Board maintains both Dickson and St. Andrew's as holding schools until such point the Board receives funding from the Ministry of Education to build the new school. She noted that this would be a phased approach.

The ARC agreed to only consider scenarios that make Blair Road P.S. a JK-6 organization.

Action Item:

Ms. Manske to pull information from worksheets and come up with revised scenarios that adjust boundaries, make Blair Road P.S. JK-6 and adjust numbers for the next ARC meeting.

C: Barry Frame commented that Scenario 5 maintaining status quo but with tweaks in the boundaries and a few grade changes which could be used for a 5 -7 year plan and then transitioning into Scenario 10 for 7-10 years which would allow for a new school to be built and for Dickson and St. Andrew's to close. He commented that it would require revisiting with another ARC in 5-7 years.

5. Future Meeting Dates:

The ARC agreed to go ahead with Public Meeting #3.

- **ARC Meeting #9:** Tuesday, March 20, 2012, 5:30-7:30 pm @ St. Andrew's P.S. Library
- [Public Meeting #3:](#) Tuesday, March 7, 2012, 7:00-8:30 pm @ St. Andrew's P.S. Gym.

Ms. Manske noted that she will present the scenarios that the ARC has narrowed down to and what the ARC is considering recommending to the Board. We will ask for public feedback on the

scenarios. We will present any costing if required for a scenario with capital construction. She noted that at the next meeting the ARC will have to narrow down the scenarios to go to Public Meeting #3.

Q: Can we get the costing information in time for the next meeting?

R: Ms. Manske responded that it is possible as the numbers would be formula based on the Ministry benchmark for a new school for example.

Action Items:

- **Ms. Manske to provide costing associated with the scenarios.**
- **Ms. Manske to send out new scenarios to ARC via email to get ARC comments in time to make any revisions before the next meeting.**

6. Roundtable/Wrap Up

Ms. Manske asked the ARC to let her know by email if they have any further information requests before the next meeting.

Ms. Manske advised the principals to pick-up the updated School Information Profiles and place in their school binders. The School Information Profiles are also available on the [website for the review](#).

Ms. Manske thanked the ARC for coming out and gave special thanks to Paula Ouellet for the tasty treats and the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.