



**West Galt Elementary Schools
Pupil Accommodation Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting #3
November 15, 2011, 5:30-7:00 PM
Highland Public School Library**

The third meeting of the West Galt Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at Highland Public School on Tuesday, November 15, 2011.

Committee Members Present:

Wendy Bowker, Principal Highland P.S., Nick Chiarelli, Vice Principal, Highland P.S., Barry Frame, Principal Dickson P.S., Maura Fuller, Parent Rep., Tait Street P.S., Marcia Lubert, Principal Tait Street P.S., Trevor McWilliams, City of Cambridge Representative, Hayley Orman, Parent Rep., Highland P.S., Paula Ouellet, Parent Rep., Highland P.S., Rebecca Raineault, Parent Rep., Dickson P.S., Roy Roethel, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's P.S., Michelle Schmid, Vice Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Karen Tomlin, Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary and Lauren Manske Senior Planner, for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

Other WRDSB Staff Present:

None

Regrets:

Kelly Deml, Parent Rep. Blair Road P.S., Karen Destun, Parent Rep., Tait Street P.S., Bev Fox, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's P.S., Jodie Hancox-Meyer, Principal, Blair Road P.S., Vanessa Meal, Parent Rep., Dickson P.S., Lynn Robb, Parent Rep, Blair Road P.S., Karen Tomlin, Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, Lila Read, Superintendent of Education, Ron Dallan, Manager Capital Projects, Abigail Dancey, Manager of Communications, and Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Ms. Manske, Senior Planner opened the meeting at 5:30 pm and welcomed members of the committee.

2. ARC Meeting #2 – Draft Minutes Approval

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if there were any corrections/concerns with the minutes from the October 25, 2011 ARC meeting.

None were raised.

Minutes from the October 25th meeting were approved.

Moved by: Trevor McWilliams

Seconded by: Wendy Bowker

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. Community Representation

Ms. Manske stated that she had contacted the Kinbridge Community Association and Community Living Cambridge to see if they had interest in providing a community representative for the ARC. To date she has not had a reply to her request.

Ms. Manske noted that she had been approached by a grandparent with grandchildren in 2 of the review area schools and a daughter teaching at another review area school, expressing interest in being a community representative. Ms. Manske asked if the ARC members thought that this could be a conflict. The ARC agreed that it is best to have a community representative that does not have any ties to a specific school(s). Ms. Manske will notify the person who expressed interest.

Ms. Manske noted that she is still waiting to hear back from the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) who will be meeting later this week.

Ms. Manske advised that it is possible that the ARC may have to proceed without community representation.

4. Municipal Presentation Re: Building Activity/Community Planning

Trevor McWilliams, City of Cambridge

Trevor McWilliams, Senior Operations Manager for the City of Cambridge and ARC Municipal Representative led the ARC through the presentation available online at:

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

Mr. McWilliams noted that his [presentation](#) tonight will give an overview of the development plans for the review area of West Galt.

Mr. McWilliams gave an overview of the Background Policy Guidance the City of Cambridge must follow; noting that Policies are determined at the Provincial level filter down through the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and those policies filter down to the City of Cambridge. He noted that all aspects of the higher level policies must be included in the lower level policies.

Referring to Slide 3 of the presentation and **Provincial Policy Statement (2005)**, which states that *Planning authorities must direct intensification and redevelopment to built up areas and establish minimum density targets*. Mr. McWilliams pointed out that this statement instructs that cities must do more with less and must stop growing out, using up greenfield space which is too expensive to develop and fund with current taxation. He noted that under the Regional Official Plan (ROP), Cambridge will not be permitted to continue unrestricted Greenfield growth.

Referring to Slide 3 – **Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006)**, Mr. McWilliams advised that all plans for development in Cambridge must contain the following:

- *A plan for sustainable growth throughout Ontario.*
- *Defined built boundary and developable greenfields.*
- *By 2015+, minimum 40 percent of all new residential development must be within the built up urban areas.*
- *Urban Growth Centres, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas key focus areas to accommodate reurbanization.*
- *By 2031, must achieve minimum intensification targets for Urbanization Growth Centres. (City becoming more dense, housing becoming more dense)*
- *Protect Employment Areas.*

Referring to Slide 4 – *Background – Policy Guidance*, Mr. McWilliams outlined the Background Policy Guidance that is contained in the comprehensive review of Official Plans for both the Region and the City and noted that the policies in the Region's Official Plan must be included in the City's Official Plan.

Slide 5 - outlines the projected population growth for the City of Cambridge noting that 2006 data records the population at 123,900 and is projected to reach 173,000 by 2031. Mr. McWilliams noted that the City is not growing faster than others but is actually holding pretty steady. He also noted that some areas of Cambridge are growing faster than others.

Slide 6 - outlines the new residential activity by unit type for the City from 1973 through to June 30, 2011. Mr. McWilliams noted that the information is gathered from building permit activity and the years of lower growth coincide with recession years, noting that after which would come years of substantial growth. Mr. McWilliams stated that the City does expect to see increases again, but not to the same level of extreme growth. He noted that the data is accurate from June 2011 which notes about 220 building permits.

Slide 7 – outlines the percentage of housing units by types built from 1981 to 2010. Mr. McWilliams noted that the dominance of single family homes is decreasing as we are running out of greenfield areas, thus we will see more apartment buildings, condominium and townhomes to better utilize the available space. He noted that condos are making a comeback as they are more affordable type of housing for younger people and seniors alike.

Slide 8 – map showing the status of Plans of Subdivision for the City of Cambridge. Mr. McWilliams noted that there is not a lot of development going on and that some of the plans are proposed and some are old and may never go forward.

Slide 9 – map outlining the West Galt Area of Cambridge plans for development with the school locations included. Mr. McWilliams noted the following larger areas of development:

- Cambridge West MESP (Master Environmental Servicing Plan – includes plans for waste and wastewater servicing, transportation, natural environment drainage work, utilities assessment, fiscal impact, staging and implementation and community planning) - 700-900 unit plan which is located in the Blair Road PS boundary area
- Grand Ridge Estates (Phase 2) with 175 singles/120 townhouses located in the Highland PS boundary.
- Daisyfield with 26 singles, located in the Tait Street PS boundary.
- Gallery Developments with 30 Apartments located in the Dickson PS boundary.

Mr. McWilliams noted that his [handout](#) included a close-up of the development areas which directly affect the Accommodation Review area and opened the floor for questions.

Q: How long until these plans come to fruition?

R: Grand Ridge Estates - no application for Phase 2; may take many years and could happen tomorrow.

Daisyfield – the property has been annexed but there has been no development application. There has been pre-consultation proposing 26 singles which may not fit the Region's density requirements but is across the street from other single family dwellings and that many developers would view this type of plan as more compatible with existing homes.

Gallery Developments – 30 apartments on a triangular shaped site.

Cambridge West MESP - These plans are developer driven with the City overseeing. It could take anywhere from 2 to 5 years and can be derailed if the economy goes down. These plans have been on the books for 12 years. Was set at 700-900 units but because of buffer requirement may decrease.

Q: How involved is the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) in the Cambridge West MESP?

R: The Region of Waterloo and the GRCA are part of our Steering Committees and provide the City with information and data on what land is developable and what is not.

Q: How did the gravel pit on the edge of southwest Galt get past the GRCA?

R: The original Tullis Estates Gravel Pit was approved and it bounded an ESPA area. Not sure how they got it approved - It is on the other side of the wetland area from Grand Ridge Estates who purchased additional land beside the pit to protect their subdivision.

Q: Do you have maps or is this information available online?

R: I can provide maps at a future meeting. There is a staging report available online but it is not up-to-date. I will provide a copy of this presentation to Lauren.

Q: What is happening with the small development area 30T-93015 near Tait Street PS on the handout?

R: This is a one lot plan of subdivision on Grand Ridge Drive which is now registered. It is unlikely that we will ever see a development on the Galt Ridge again given current environmental concerns.

Q: Why are there no plans marked for Triangular development area on the bottom of Grand Ridge Estates development?

R: May be removed from Cambridge MESP in the future.

Q: Is the Transglobal development government housing?

R: To my knowledge, it is not subsidized housing.

Action Item:

Trevor McWilliams to provide maps.

5. Requested Information:

- **French Immersion (FI)**

Referring to Slide 3 of the presentation (available online at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/west-galt-elementary-schools>) which outlines French Immersion enrolment in Cambridge, Ms. Manske noted that the table shows how many students are enrolled in FI from out-of-boundary and the total FI population as a percentage of the overall school population for each school.

The demand for the French Immersion Program in the Review Area:

- Highland PS - 35% with 77 out-of-boundary students
- St. Andrew's PS - 25% with 22 out-of-boundary students
- Galt CI - 12% with 94 out-of-boundary students (only 43 in-boundary students in FI)

Q: How many kids drop FI when they move on to high school?

R: Ms. Manske responded that the Board sees a drop when students move from Grade 6 to Grade 7 if FI is not offered at their home senior elementary school and again from Grade 8 to High School.

Q: Why does Elgin Street PS only offer FI to Grade 5?

R: When a school first offers FI it starts at Grade 1 only and adds the extra grades as the original class moves up to the next Grade. The Grade 5 class was the originating FI Grade 1 class. They will add Grade 6 next year.

Q: Are there plans for Ryerson PS to offer more grades?

R: Yes, as the Grade 1 class progresses same as at Elgin Street PS.

Q: How many families get declined for the FI program?

R: Ms. Manske responded that they might not always get their first choice of school and she doesn't know how many turn down the program when they are given an alternative to their first choice, but the Board offers a space for each student requesting the program.

Q: How many students are needed to run a FI class?

R: Usually the minimum is 18 students.

Q: Do they all have to be from the home school? Can there be 3 and then the rest from out-of-boundary?

R: It would be dependent on whether the school has the space to run the program and to house the additional students (siblings) that come along with the FI student. Those kinds of numbers would not be strong enough to initiate a FI program at a school.

- **Accessibility** (Slide 4)

Ms. Manske noted that at the last meeting we discussed a chart for accessibility and noted that she was unable to uncover the meaning of the field 'Building Accessible' - and therefore removed it from the chart and pointed out that the Accessibility to Area of Instruction is the more critical component.

Ms. Manske also noted she removed 'Bus Access' as there is uncertainty of where this information came from.

- **Adjacent Boundaries:** (Slides 5 and 6)

Public and Catholic

Ms. Manske noted that Slide 6 shows a breakdown of current enrolment for adjacent schools, including both Public and Catholic schools.

Q: Do the projections that were presented previously include the growth expected for the Blair Road PS development areas?

R: They do not account for the MESP Development Area as we didn't know the unit counts. Ms. Manske noted that she will provide revised estimates to include this development and provide an in-depth assessment with 3 scenarios to show a steady/stable growth, high growth (if plan does not happen) and low growth (if plan happens).

Q: Isn't Lincoln Avenue PS closing next year and Avenue Road PS getting an addition and the new school Moffatt Creek PS and also there are boundary changes for Alison Park and Chalmers Street which will form boundary for Moffat Creek PS?

R: Yes. Chalmers Street students will go to Moffat Creek PS for grades 7 and 8. Central PS will go to Stewart Avenue for grades 7 and 8. Moffat Creek PS opens as a JK-7 as the Grade 8 class from Lincoln PS will remain at Lincoln until the school closes in June 2013. Ms. Manske noted that this is a way the Board minimizes transitions for students even though it costs more to maintain the facility and provide administration for the that one grade.

Action Item:

Ms. Manske to revise enrolment projections.

6. Objectives

Ms. Manske provided the ARC with a handout of [Draft Review Objectives](#) and noted that the ARC does not have to keep them all and would recommend that they go with less as it would make reviewing scenarios less complicated.

Ms. Manske asked the ARC to breakout into small groups for 10-15 minutes to look over the draft objectives.

When the group reconvened, Ms. Manske asked the ARC if they thought anything was missing from the draft objectives. Nothing was identified as missing.

The ARC though it would be a difficult to optimize energy costs at schools and determine which schools have the higher energy costs.

Ms. Manske noted that we will have this information as part of the School Information Profiles – so it does not have to be an objective.

Ms. Manske noted that once the ARC develops scenarios we will get them costed out. We will look at what an option costs for staffing, if we add a facility, or how much we save or have to spend if we close a school or combine 2 schools (i.e., if we would have 1 less Principal, Vice Principal, secretary and custodial staff for the same number of students).

Q: Does the Board go with the solution that saves the most money?

R: Ms. Manske responded that in her experience with the Board they do not necessarily go with the cheapest options, they go with what they feel is right for the community – the most well-rounded solution.

Q: How much does a school addition cost?

R: Depends on size and type – most recently, a 6 room addition for FDK at Forest Hill PS in Kitchener had a \$2M budget; this also included other upgrades needed for that facility.

Q: How much does it cost to build a brand new school?

R: A brand new JK-8 school for 650 pupils is approximately \$12M based on our most recent schools (Moffat Creek, Cambridge, new Woodbine in Kitchener and new Grand River South, Kitchener).

Ms. Manske noted that when the ARC is ready to do scenario costing, Ron Dallan, the Manager of Capital Projects will attend our meetings and cost out any capital requirements. Ms. Manske noted that there is a cost per square foot for brand new schools as well as for additions and retro fits which she will get from Mr. Dallan.

Q: Can we put on a second story addition to the schools?

R: No, in all likelihood the schools were not built to add on a second floor addition.

Q: The Highland PS addition hasn't started yet can we put a second floor on that addition?

R: That has not been planned for.

Q: Does the Board have any land set aside for a new school in the Cambridge West MESP development area?

R: Yes, both the Public Board and the Catholic Board have requested sites for that area. Ms. Manske noted that it is important that a site is in the 1st phase of development. The Board has to decide if we build right away or find temporary accommodation (holding school) for the initial phase of the development. As part of this review we can discuss what school this might impact.

Ms. Manske asked the ARC to take the draft objectives home and read them again.

The ARC agreed to keep all objectives as draft for the next public meeting and solicit feedback from the community. Ms. Manske noted that no date has been set yet for the public meeting.

Action Item:

Provide cost per square foot for band new schools and well as for additions and retro fits for future meeting.

7. Roundtable

None

8. Future Meeting Dates:

School Tour:

Saturday, November 19th starting at 9:30 a.m. at Blair Road P.S. and carpooling to each school in the review. Ms. Manske will send out a reminder email.

ARC Meetings:

ARC Meeting #4: Tuesday, November 29, 2011, 5:30-7 p.m. at Highland P.S. Library.

Public Meetings:

TBD

Ms. Manske thanked everyone for coming out and the meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.