



**Preston Area Elementary Schools Boundary Study**  
**Minutes of Public Meeting # 1**  
**March 4, 2009**  
**William G. Davis Public School, 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**

The first Public Meeting of the Preston Area Elementary Schools Boundary Study was held at William G. Davis Public School on March 4, 2009.

1. Welcome/Introductions

- Chris Smith, Manager of Planning welcomed members of the public, school communities, Trustees, and Board staff present for the evening, and made the following introductions:

Trustee Cindy Watson, Gregg Bereznick, Area Superintendent, Dudley Brown, Principal of William G. Davis P.S., Rob Rebellato, Principal of Grand View P.S., Don Oberle, Principal of Preston P.S., Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, Lauren Manske, Planner, Mary Hingley, Recording Secretary.

Regrets: Greg Jespersen, Principal of Parkway P.S.

Approximately 59 members of the public were also in attendance.

2. Purpose of tonight's Public Meeting/Boundary Study Definition

- Mr. Smith noted that the purpose of tonight's public meeting is to let the community know about the boundary study to investigate the boundaries and enrolments at Preston, Grand View and Parkway Public Schools.
- We didn't include Coronation and Ryerson schools, because Coronation is full and has good numbers from the current catchment; it is the biggest JK-6 school in Preston. Ryerson was the subject of a boundary study last year resulting in the recommendation for a new school and boundary to relieve Silverheights P.S.
- William G. Davis will continue to be the senior grade 7/8 school for the Preston community.
- Mr. Smith advised that we asked the study area principals and two school community representatives per school to sit on a Study Working Group, which acts as a steering committee for the study.
- With the Working Group, we identified the issues, and developed Study Objectives which we would use as a guide for evaluating the options or scenarios that get developed.
- A boundary study can look at existing boundaries, programs and facilities, but does not consider school closures. This is another similar, but more formal process called an Accommodation Review.

- Mr. Smith wanted to point out some key items that you will probably want the Board to have regard for:
  - Once we have what seems like a reasonable option, we then need to figure out what transitions we will need to consider for students, for example, phasing changes in to minimize moves where possible, and any building or accommodation issues that need to be addressed.
- Mr. Hercanuck addressed the meeting and went through the background on why the Board is undertaking a boundary study in this area, as well as an overview of how the process works, and detailed the scenarios that the Working Group has developed so far.
- A boundary study is undertaken when the Board is considering a change to one or more school catchments. We change school catchments for a number of reasons:
  - a) We may be opening a new school and need to define its boundaries and refine the boundaries of the adjacent schools.
  - b) We may change the grade structure of an elementary school. For example from a JK-6 school to JK-8.
  - c) We may need to balance enrolment and facilities, one school may have too many students for its facility while another in the study area may have too few.
  - d) A municipality may approve a new development and that area may need to be assigned to a school that can accommodate additional students.

#### Boundary Study Map and Enrolment:

- A map of the study area was displayed as part of the presentation (the full presentation will be posted on the Waterloo Region District School Board website).
- Mr. Hercanuck noted that the Preston area receives students from two non-adjacent areas: Pioneer Tower and the Dickie Settlement-Homer Watson area.
- Preston P.S. is almost 100 students over capacity currently and has 5 portables, while Grand View P.S. is under capacity. The two enrolments shown for the schools are total students and total FTE. Total students are the number of bodies that attend the school while FTE stands for Full Time Equivalent (students in kindergarten attend only half time, the Ministry of Education counts each kindergarten student as half a student).

#### Development:

- Whenever we talk about a school experiencing enrolment pressure, it's almost always related to development. A map was displayed outlining the development occurring and slated to occur in the area. The Pioneer Tower area has a good deal of development happening, this is what's pushing Preston's enrolment numbers up beyond its capacity. As well, there is a large plan in Parkway's boundary (a Mattamy Homes subdivision).
- Area A will yield up to 223 students, the Kanmet development within Preston's boundary will yield up to 26 students and the Mattamy plan within Parkway's boundary about 120 students.

#### Preston Site:

- As stated earlier, Preston is almost 100 students over capacity, with 5 portables. While we have a number of other schools in the Board with 5 portables, it is Preston's site size relative to the number of portables that makes it such a concern.

- Preston's lot size is 2.98 acres, one of the Board's smallest sites. This has to do with how things happened a number of years ago with the old Preston Elementary being converted to a senior's facility. So with increasing enrolment, the portables are infringing on Preston's play space as well as making supervision difficult with obstructed sight lines. This also crowds the facility's other infrastructure, parking, etc.

#### Status Quo Projections:

- Part of what we do when deciding if we are going to undertake a boundary study is not only look at what the current situation is but try to project into the future. Perhaps today's issues are a short term anomaly that will self resolve, and we don't need to unnecessarily inconvenience anyone. So we do status quo projections where boundaries and program stay the same.
- Because of the development in the Pioneer Tower area and the Kanmet development we expect Preston P.S. to continue to grow. Grand View on the other hand is projected to further decline as the neighbourhood further matures. Parkway is expected to decline slowly for the next few years, but should increase when the Mattamy plan comes on line. Coronation has no new development plans but seems to have reached an equilibrium, so we expect its numbers to remain solid at a good size for the foreseeable future.

#### Boundary Study Process:

- The boundary study process begins with identifying the issues and opportunities within each school community, for example, enrolment pressure at Preston and declining numbers at Grand View.
- Out of these issues we form the objectives of the boundary study, which is what we want the result or conclusion of the Boundary Study to accomplish. We use the objectives to measure the success of various options/scenarios that are developed.
- Scenarios can involve new construction (new school or addition), program change, portables or keeping things the way they are (status quo). The only thing we can't look at in this process is school closure. There is a very formal process the Ministry of Education says we have to follow to look at school closure, an Accommodation Review; the Board has not given us the mandate to start that process.
- Scenario development and evaluation can go through multiple iterations as evaluating the scenarios leads to ideas for new ones or modifications to existing ones.

#### Working Group:

- The Working Group is comprised of the school principals, parent representatives (usually 2 per school), and Planning Department Staff.
- The Working Group does the initial work of identifying issues, developing draft objectives and scenarios. They are also a link back to the larger school community, and a link from the community to the Working Group.
- We then hold a Public Meeting to solicit feedback from the larger population on the draft objectives and scenarios. The Working Group reconvenes after the Public Meeting to review that feedback, perhaps adjusting the draft objectives, working out new scenario ideas, etc. When we get down to one or two lead scenarios, we start compiling more detailed information. We look at costing out new construction, if any, and transportation. We also look at transitions – if the scenario is what we want to do, transitions are how we get there.
- Once we confirm the lead 1 or 2 scenarios, a report is taken to the Board, for the Trustees to ultimately vote on.

Draft Objectives:

- As mentioned earlier, the draft study objectives are developed by the Working Group to identify the goals of the study and act as a measuring stick for the scenarios. We say draft because we would like to receive public comment on them. They are as follows:
  - **Address over and declining enrolment issues, aligning facilities and enrolment in the longer term.**
- When we refer to long term, we are talking about one generation through a JK-8 school or around 10 years.
  - **Have regard for some organizational and class objectives of the Good Schools Committee Report.**
- The Good Schools Standing Committee guidelines are objectives we like to have in every boundary study. The committee was comprised of a group of trustees who looked at sizes and organizations of elementary and secondary schools, and their affects on students. They suggest guidelines for the optimal size of schools, based on a suggested number of classes per grade. This is a challenge in this boundary study as the report recommends optimal elementary school size of approximately 350 to 400 students, larger than the capacity of any school in this study. However, we can try to balance as best we can between the schools to create an equitable environment.
  - **Be financially feasible.**
- We want the eventual solution to be financially feasible. We often get asked if this means the Board will choose the cheapest option, the answer is no (but the Board does have to be able to afford it). That is also why we have other study objectives; cost is not the only concern.
  - **Address any resulting student transitions, and avoid fragmentation of communities.**
- Once we have decided on a few lead scenarios, the question becomes how we get there. What we are referring to here, is if the solution involves moving students from one school to another how can we transition them with the least disruption, perhaps looking at grand parenting or measures like that.
  - **Determine any facility issues or upgrades that would facilitate boundary changes, enhance program delivery, and address accessibility concerns.**
- Once we have solutions, what are the opportunities at the facilities for upgrades or enhancements that will help with transitions and equitable facilities? We know that there are some concerns around Grand View and accessibility; part of the recommendation could be that accessibility upgrades are looked at.
- Mr. Hercanuck reiterated that the draft objectives can be modified, and the public was invited to comment on them, if they feel anything has been missed.

### Projections:

- When we do enrolment projections and scenario development we typically take the existing school attendance boundaries and further sub divide them along what we believe to be reasonable, natural breaks, such as major roads, streams, wood lots, etc.
- Then we look at the historic enrolment patterns and current future development in each of those individual areas and do a projection for each area. To create scenarios we take these pieces and assemble them in different ways.
- The boundaries shown in the presentation may not necessarily represent the final boundaries, but it gives us a start point in which to look at various options.

### 3. Scenario Review

#### **Scenario A**

- In Scenario A, Area D goes to Grand View, Area J goes to Preston, essentially making King Street the boundary between the two schools.
- This option was proposed because it had been brought to the Working Group that crossing King St. was an issue for some in the community, as the City does not provide crossing guards.
- It should be noted that this scenario, or any scenario involving the movement of Areas D or J between Preston and Grand View could increase walk distances for students closer to the other school.
- Preston's numbers would come down from their current size perhaps eliminating 2 portables in the short term. In the midterm, when factoring in all day/every day kindergarten, they could have more portables than they do now, but the numbers do settle a bit in the long term.
- Parkway decreases, but comes up as the Mattamy plan comes on board. Grand View's numbers increase slightly, but declining pattern remains.
- In swapping areas between Preston and Grand View the net change between the two schools does not amount to that much, and even less when the development in Pioneer Tower is included.

#### **Scenario B**

- Scenario B involves the shifting of 2 areas, Area D would move to Grand View, and Area B moves to Parkway; both from Preston.
- Preston's numbers come down more than in Scenario A, and looks like approximately 3 or so portables in the mid term.
- Parkway is a little higher in the near term, due to the addition of Area B, and again their numbers increase once the Mattamy plan comes on.
- Grand View remains that same as the last scenario, pretty much at capacity.
- It has been noted that under this scenario, students from Area B would be closer to their home school, and depending on how transportation is organized could result in a shorter bus ride for them.

#### **Scenario C**

- Scenario C involves moving Area A (or the Pioneer Tower area) to Grand View from Preston. All other areas remain where they are.
- Preston's enrolment decreases to just under or at capacity, probably needing at least 1 portable. Parkway remains unchanged from Scenario B.
- Grand View's numbers increase from the addition of Area A, and would likely need at least 2 portables in the short term, more later as the Pioneer Tower development peaks.
- One of the challenges with higher enrolment at Grand View, is while the site is larger than Preston (at 5.5 acres), it is in two parts because of the hill, leaving a much smaller area in which to place portables.

#### **Scenario D**

- Scenario D moves Area D to Grand View from Preston. All other areas remain where they are.
- Similar to Scenario B, Preston's numbers come down in the short term but increase in the mid term as the Pioneer Tower development peaks.
- Parkway's situation remains unchanged from some of the previous scenarios, and Grand View's enrolment increases to about capacity.
- Mr. Hercanuck concluded the scenario review, but noted that a point should be made that applies to all of the scenarios, regarding programming changes for kindergarten. All of the scenarios involve the movement of an area to a school with a different kindergarten day (all day/alternate day vs. every day half day). For example, in Scenario D, Area D would change from a school running all day/alternate day to a school running every day/half day. Implementation of all day/every day kindergarten has not yet been mandated.
- At this point, the following questions were asked:

Q – Why is there no option of Pioneer Tower going to Parkway?

R – The Working Group did look at a scenario that had Pioneer Tower and the Blair Area at Parkway. The problem being, when the development happens in 2014, the school would double in size, while the other two are underutilized.

Q – Due to the current economic times, which are at a standstill, is this taken into account?

R – Yes; however we do expect the development to go forward sometime in the next few years, and so does the City of Cambridge.

Q – How many students are affected from Area D (Preston to Grand View)

R – 111 students.

Q – Is Grand View air conditioned?

R – The Principal, Mr. Rebellato replied, no.

Q – Are there extra curricular activities at Grand View?

R – The principal advised that yes they do offer programs.

Q – Is the gym and library large enough to cope with the extra students?

- Mr. Hercanuck advised that in order to adhere to the agenda for tonight's meeting, we will break up into 4 groups to discuss the scenarios, and that all questions will be addressed when we reconvene.

Q – Parkway enrolment – how can you predict it?

R – Mr. Hercanuck advised that projections are based on historic data and development plans.

#### 4. Scenario Discussion – Break Out Sessions

- Mr. Smith advised that we will provide 4 break-out rooms for smaller group discussion of each scenario, and explained how their comment sheets, picked up at the beginning of the meeting pre-selected their room. A facilitator will lead the group through each scenario, and have someone scribe any comments/questions. We will reconvene in approximately 45 minutes.

Q – This is a public forum, do we have to go into these break out rooms, or can we just settle it now?

R – Mr. Smith commented that the Working Group has developed the scenarios for the purpose of gaining some feedback from the larger population. Reviewing each scenario in a smaller group setting will hopefully provide understanding of the issues for each school. He also commented that the break out session format has worked very well at other Public Meetings, prompting good discussion and valuable feedback. At this point there is no recommendation, so not a matter of “settling”.

- Mr. Smith reconvened the group at 8:50, and asked the facilitators from each group to give a brief summary of their discussions.
- Group # 1, Facilitator: Rob Rebellato
  - Mr. Rebellato advised there was good discussion, they recognized lots of challenges.
  - Could Area A be subdivided, and Area D be re-worked?
  - There was no concern for safely crossing King St.
  - No one scenario really came out as a lead.
- Group # 2, Facilitator: Don Oberle
  - Proposed a new scenario that has Area A splitting then overlay it onto each existing scenario.
  - There was discussion around the aspect of community.
  - Recognition of equitable numbers.
  - Reviewed Scenarios B, C, and D – put A aside.
- Group # 3, Facilitator: Chris Smith
  - Reviewed Scenario A, then got into a lively discussion of issues.
  - Looked at splitting Area A.
  - Talk of community, more definition requested.
  - Concerns with transitions and change, however agreed that doing nothing is not an option, can't have Preston just keep growing.
- Group # 4, Facilitator: Lauren Manske
  - Good discussion took place, wanted to see Scenario A dropped.
  - Concern over movement of Area D, no issues crossing King St.

- At 111% capacity over all (total) in 2014, there is concern that this is too high and we need to build to capacity instead of having portables.
- Suggested addition at Parkway to address the growth.
- Mr. Smith thanked the facilitators and recorders for their work, and provided some parameters on timelines and Working Group goals:
  - The goal is to have the Trustees make a decision before the end of the school year; June 2009. Any boundary changes can take a year, so we are looking at the 2010/11 school year.
  - How does the Working Group make decisions? They try to work on consensus, and meet the study objectives.

## 5. Questions/Other

Q – Scenario 4 (D) included an addition, then was taken off, why are we talking about it again?

R – Scenario D did not start out with an addition, if Areas A & B went to Parkway, it would double in size, requiring an addition. This would help Preston, however, would not address Grand View.

Q – Study looks at numbers, probably not getting additions or a new school.

R – No additional school is planned; we can look at additions, or some portables.

Q – Clarification asked for: Can we possibly take the 24 students from Area B and send them to Blair Road P.S. in the Galt community?

R – Probably not, that would change their senior and high school boundaries. They are part of the Preston community, and their small numbers don't really swing a scenario one way or the other.

Q – The draft objectives – are they weighted? Is one more important than another?

R – There is no numerical value assigned to the objectives, we judge scenarios by “meeting or not meeting” the objectives.

Q – The Mattamy plan site projections, what are the enrolment numbers, and what calculation was used?

R – Mattamy – currently 400 units (still draft at this point)

Kanmet – 80 townhouses, 111 apartment units

calculation used: yield by type of development/units and we adjust based on observation and experience.

Q – Concern raised that the first slide showing Preston's projections (the graph) did not include the Kanmet development.

R – The initial numbers were done back in the summer for the Board report including Mattamy and Pioneer Tower. The Kanmet numbers are not in there as the project appeared to stall; we have included these numbers going forward, and are in the projections for the scenarios presented this evening.

Q – There have been changes/discrepancies noted in the Working Group meeting minutes, this is not appropriate or fair, is it common practice?

R – You raise a good point, we are aware of the change made to the Feb. 23, 2009 minutes, regarding capacity and a spelling error. In future, all changes or amendments will be noted and dated. Mr. Smith added that the notes taken at the meetings are not

verbatim, and they are notes, not minutes (the more formal minutes are taken at Public Meetings).

Q – A concern was noted that the meeting notes are not complete; they had to talk to the principal or a member of the Working Group to get more detail.

R – We will make sure to have at least 2 members of the Planning Staff at the meetings, to help get the gist of all that is discussed.

Q – Regarding the Kanmet numbers, it was asked in the break out session if the numbers were included and was told yes, but they are not.

R – There were 2 different projections shown tonight – a chart in the presentation reflected the numbers/projections from the summer, so did not include the Kanmet development numbers. The numbers/projections reflected on the scenarios do however include the Kanmet development numbers.

Q – How does the Trustees make their decision, what criteria is used? Is it a show of hands?

R – They get a report, minutes of Public Meetings and background ahead of time; they call us, check the website, etc., and is ultimately decided by a vote of the Board.

Q – How was the Working Group committee selected?

R – The Board approves the study; the principals from each school are included and asked to have to 2 representatives from their school community. Mr. Oberle, principal of Preston advised that he came to school council to choose their reps. Both reps ended up being from the Pioneer Tower area, so he asked to add another rep from Preston before any scenarios were developed.

– The working group members are asked to represent their school community as a whole (not just their immediate area).

– Mr. Oberle added that the Working Group members have been global in their thinking, with no personal thoughts; decisions are based on the enrolment numbers. He wanted to commend them for the work they are doing and the holistic approach they take.

Q – Are these Working Group meetings open to the public?

R – Not closed, so I'll say yes, in an observation capacity only, they are open to the public.

Q – No proper minutes are taken at the meetings – I want to attend the next meeting to see what goes on. Who chairs the meetings?

R – Planning Staff.

Q – Looking at Area A, they have 2 reps, why not take one off and replace with an Area D rep?

R – As noted, reps were selected by school and not by the areas created for analysis purposes. We can take that back to the Working Group for discussion. Alternates have been discussed in the past, however it's difficult to keep each person up to date, and things tend to need repeating, which hinders the pace and continuity of discussion.

Q – Concerns regarding crossing King St. and the Shantz Hill.

R – There is still a guard and a light at Shantz Hill, no longer guards on King St.

Q – During group discussion Scenario B numbers worked best. Can we look at transition and perhaps grand parenting for Preston students? This could offset the emotional trauma because it may not affect their children.

R – Once we have a lead scenario that is a possibility. It could take longer to implement, and transportation may be a factor.

Q – People did not know this was even an option, they assumed that the boundary changes would take place in 2010, and their children would automatically move. They would feel better if grand parenting was possible.

R – Transition is part of the objectives, once we have the lead scenario; we look at how to make it happen smoothly.

Q – This is a growth area, in 4 to 5 years we are over 100% capacity. Can't you close one school and build a new one?

R – At numbers of 103% total, 2 schools are 114%, not significantly over-capacity. Boundary studies cannot close schools. Your suggestion could be a scenario in an Accommodation Review – which this isn't.

Q – It probably takes 5 years to build a school – they are operating inefficiently now.

R – We would have to go to the Board for a full Accommodation Review, and this would mean school closure, possibly 2, and every boundary would change then. Once decision is made, it takes about 2 years to open a new school.

Q – Can I make up my own scenario and present it to the Board?

R – Yes, you can register as a delegate and come to the Board meeting. You can also give us your ideas to run the numbers – that's why we are here. If you leave it until the Board meeting, may be too late to be considered fully.

Q – What gets taken back to the Working Group after this meeting?

R – From the early feedback, maybe we eliminate Scenario A, two groups said they didn't like it. Splitting Area A was brought up to look at. We take all of tonight's information back. Concerns with changes/transitions, some don't want portables. Doing nothing is not an option, however.

Q – What is the maximum capacity for a school for the Board? Preston shows 122% in 2014.

R – It is not the same for each school, it depends on the facility, do they have a single or double gym? We could add portables or an addition. For example, we are building two new schools of 300 – 320 capacity with a single gym, so each of these schools would be okay at that capacity. However, Lester B. Pearson P.S. with a double gym but 1,000 students is 400 students over design capacity, therefore could justify a third gym.

Q – The percent capacity carries no weight?

R – No, as stated we have to look at each school to see what the impact might be, for example – 122 students with 1 gym, could handle 200 more students but the Learning Resource Centre (library size) might be an issue.

Q – The percent capacity acceptable at Preston and Grand View – can we have this for the next meeting?

R – Yes, we can identify this by type of space.

Q – Capacity does not include portables?

R – Yes, that's correct.

Q – There is an inconsistency, moving to Grand View, are portables better there than at Preston?

R – Grand View does have surplus space, so it would require fewer portables and has a bigger site to do so.

Q – In the February 23, 2009 notes, it was mentioned that Grand View had space issues with portables, and the scenarios had more students.

R – More portables would be required under another scenario. Mr. Rebellato, Principal of Grand View, said that in conversation with his custodian, there were portables in the playground behind the parking lot in the past, where the play structure is now. Mr. Smith noted that Grand View is a larger site, and they could handle 1 or 2 more, but need to be close to the school building (they have to be a certain distance to washrooms, etc.).

Q – Could it be shown on each scenario the portables that would be required?

R – Yes, we can detail that for the scenarios.

Q – Regarding the lot sizes for Grand View vs. Preston. The acreage on top of the hill at Grand View is the useable site.

R – True, we would not place portables down at the bottom of the hill.

Q – Would this cause supervision problem?

R – Not especially for the playground; each school has to deal with this.

Q – How many portables can Parkway hold?

R – They had 5 at one time; the site can easily hold 5 or 6, not that this is a desirable arrangement for long.

Q – A question was addressed to Mr. Rebellato; why isn't there a crossing guard at the bottom of the hill at Grand View?

R – The City has looked into it, and made that decision. Mr. Smith added that crossing guards are employees of the City and during boundary studies we look at the potential new crossings and ask City Traffic staff to determine if a guard is warranted.

Q – A further question was addressed to Mr. Rebellato; my children would end up going to Grand View, and I have never been there, can I arrange a tour?

R – Mr. Rebellato advised yes, just give the school a call to arrange a date and time. Mr. Smith added that as part of the process the Planning Department can help facilitate Open Houses if that would be helpful.

Q – If infrastructure upgrades are part of the solution – what recourse does the public have if it doesn't get done? For example if a library upgrade was recommended and it did not happen.

R – These recommendations would be included in the report to the Board, and the Trustees adopt or decline the recommendations. If accepted the work will get done. In spite of the economic downturn, we still get grants based on the number of students. If it is not included in the report, you can register as a delegate and raise it at the meeting.

Q – Trustees have power to force us to make changes, school boards can be tight with the budget, and these things might get cut.

R – Staff endeavours to identify corollary issues in the Report. Yes, the Trustees can take items out, and as a delegate you can take the issue up with them. The Trustees in our experience however are good at picking these things up.

Q – If that was the case Preston would not have 5 portables, the government does not move quickly, past history says the upgrades won't happen before the kids have moved on.

R – Additional students can result in adding portables which mean more staff, upgrades to the library, parking, etc. These are facility operating issues. This can all be built into the Report and recommendation.

Q – If Preston decreases the number of students, there will be a decrease in the money for activities.

R – Funding for instruction and school activities is based on the number of students. It is often the case that bigger schools might have more activities, but this is usually a matter of more volunteers to draw from.

Q – The drama club at Preston, there won't be enough money now, will it disappear?

R – Mr. Oberle advised that the drama club is run by volunteers, whereas the chess club is funded by school council initiatives and the school community. Mr. Smith added extra activities are based on the staff and their interests. A small school has less staff; therefore there may be fewer programs, as there is a smaller number of staff to draw on.

Q – The population of schools has to impact spending, i.e. accessibility upgrades.

R – Mr. Smith added that this is an opportunity to do some work, have accessibility upgrades added into the report; but provision of accessible facilities is not based on the students moving there.

Q – Suggestion was made to rename the scenarios – confusing to have Scenario A through D, when we have the area maps labeled alphabetically as well. Also, it's difficult to find the resource material on the website; can more information be added like the maps and the reference material that the Working Group uses?

R – Yes, we will add the additional resource material, and try to improve link.

Q – A comment was made to the Working Group – they are appreciated, and it is realized that they all want what's best for the students; they are not looking to harm them. It was also mentioned about the air quality in the basement classrooms at Grand View, is it a concern?

R – Mr. Rebellato responded that he has had Bill Keith, Health, Safety and Security Manager test and re-test the air quality and has been assured that it is fine. Mr. Smith noted that this issue arose a few years ago and work was undertaken at that time.

Q – Where do we go from here?

R – We take the feedback and comments from the Public Meeting back to the Working Group. We determine if we have a couple of lead scenarios, do we have some changes to make from the Public Meeting and so on. We develop new or refined scenarios, detail those and we'll come back for another Public Meeting, for your comment.

Q – Do you have a date for the next Public Meeting?

R – Not at this time.

Q – Where are the dates posted for the Working Group meetings, and when is the next meeting?

R – Future meeting dates are listed on the Working Group Agendas available on the website. The next meeting is Tuesday, March 10, 2009 from 4:30 – 6:00 p.m. at Preston P.S.

Chris Smith thanked all for coming, and gave the contact numbers and Board website information for the public to access with any questions or comments:

Website:

[www.wrdsb.on.ca](http://www.wrdsb.on.ca)

- Under: Boundary Studies and Accommodation Reviews, follow link to: Preston Area Elementary Schools Boundary Study

Email:

[boundaryfeedback@wrdsb.on.ca](mailto:boundaryfeedback@wrdsb.on.ca)

Phone:  
519-570-0003 ext. 4419



**Waterloo Region  
District School Board**

**Preston Area  
Elementary Schools Boundary Study  
2008-2009**

***Public Meeting***

Wednesday March 4, 2009  
William G. Davis Public School

**Break-out Sessions  
Summary**

**Scenario A – Area D to Grand View, Area J to Preston**

Opportunities	Challenges
	Doesn't meet over and under enrolment – “throw it out”
	2014+, PPS capacity at highest
	Low enrolment still exists at Grand View
	Portables – reduce space for outside play, congests halls and lunchrooms
	Increases walk for Eagle St. end of Area D/Bishop St (end of Area J)
	Fragments the community – affects day care, after school activities and existing relationships within the PPS community

**Additional Comments:**

- Suggest send on of buses to Grand View and leave one bus at Preston
- Crossing King St is not a concern. Walking on side streets instead of King where there are no lights/stops is a concern
- Can Preston Public have a representative sit on Working Group from Area D – perhaps one of Area A representatives could step down
- Instead of looking East and West, go North and South with the boundaries
- “Scrap it”

**Scenario B – Area D to Grand View, Area B to Parkway**

Opportunities	Challenges
Build neighbourhoods (ie. D and G areas)	Possible busing issues (extra bus, double runs, double stops)
Area B to Blair Road school?	Grandview would require portables
More balanced enrolment for all three schools	All scenario A challenges for students in Areas D and J remain the same
PPS can remove portables	Perception that Grand View does not have the facilities that PPS has

**Additional Comments:**

- 2014 projections are most important because they are more imminent and probably more accurate
- Parkway has the largest site – can improvements/additions be built there to provide space for Mattamy and Pioneer Tower students?
- Divide current areas – i.e. Area A (Pioneer Tower) to go to different schools (1/2 to PPS, 1/2 to GVC)
- Seems most logical
- The numbers work with this option

**Scenario C – Area A to Grand View**

Opportunities	Challenges
Community A stays together	Burst Grand View – doesn't meet objectives
Community in Preston stays together	Portables remain at both sites
Parkway has 10 acres and fewer topographical issues for an addition or portables	Grand View over-capacity
	Preston slightly under
	Challenging for Grand View – adding portables and the site is tough to add on to

**Additional Comments:**

- Suggest nip and tuck areas D & J to balance Grand View and Preston Public
- Suggest modify this scenario with a bit of A
- Was school capacity in the area looked at when Pioneer Tower area was planned? Concern that projected numbers for Area A may be greater than is shown
- Divide Area A to provide students to PPS and Grand View – would balance numbers for both schools
- Concern as to whether or not A has been considered to be split

**Scenario D – Area D to GVC**

Opportunities	Challenges
Builds relationships between D & G kids	Still balloon of students at Preston Public in 2014
Prevents people from having to cross King St	Still have 2-3 portables at Preston Public; have 1-2 portables at Grand View
Balanced numbers	Crossing street issues for D if they go to Grand View
Virtually no portables at any schools – except maybe PPS in 2014	
An improvement for Preston	
Equalizes all schools in the long-term	

**Additional Comments:**

- Can students from Area B go to Blair Rd. school?
- Look at adjusting all schools in review, changing to K-8 schools
- Crossing King St is not an issue for Area D – they are better off crossing King St. at the lights instead of going through cross streets with no stop signs
- There is currently no crossing guard along King St
- This scenario looks good for Preston

**General Questions/Comments:**

- Asked why the lines cannot be adjusted – segregating sections? (“D”)
- Air quality concerns at Grand View (information will be available)
- Can students register at a new school in preparation for the boundary change?
  - Not recommended until a decision on boundaries are finalized
- Suggested building new school for Mattamy development = Parkway under capacity
- Suggested Area A: two buses is a natural decision to bus to separate schools
- Concerns of size of Area A and B transfers capacity issues at any school. Numbers are more accurate in the shorter term
- Asked if Area A and B were transported to other schools would the remainder of students support 3 schools?
  - No
- Grand View should stay status quo
- Is there an air quality issue at Grand View?
  - A parent responded that there have been tests done and there was no issue – their child has asthma and is in one of the lower level classrooms and they are OK
- Concern about the Board not following through on projects (ie. Fixing issues)
- In 2014 the total capacity of the area is at 111%, why not build capacity – a permanent addition at Parkway? Adding capacity would actually fix the problem and bring the facility up closer to what the Good Schools Standing Committee is recommending
- There have been a lot of friendships made between Areas C and D, please don’t split them up
- Don’t agree with splitting up communities – especially Area A – they are just as much a community as everywhere else
- At the end of the day it’s about the child’s education, not the 4 walls around them
- Can there be the populations of the areas on the maps for next time?



**Waterloo Region  
District School Board**

**Preston Area  
Elementary Schools Boundary Study  
2008-2009**

***Public Meeting***

Wednesday March 4, 2009  
William G. Davis Public School

**Comment Sheet  
Summary**

Moving “Area D” from Preston P.S. to Grand View P.S. would increase walk distance for some people.

Crossing King St. at a light is less of a concern than crossing multiple streets (on way to Grand View) without traffic lights.

You are looking at breaking up the Preston community. Area A not fragmented under any scenario.

There are already two busses going to/from Area A. Split “Area A” take one bus to Grand View P.S., leave one at Preston P.S.

“Area A” is more Kitchener than Cambridge why don’t they go there for school? If they don’t then why are you asking an established community to change schools when Pioneer Tower people are the newcomers?

There should be a representative on the Working Group for Area D.

Clearly there is some concern that Area A is over represented compared with Preston on the Working Group. I think it’s fair to suggest that one representative from Area A should be balanced by two representatives from Preston.

What about look at making each school K-8 including William G. Davis?

There was far more interest in keeping/protecting the sanctity of Preston neighbourhoods status quo than focus on balance, reducing portables or what’s best for the students overall.

Attendees came in upset ... some of that was tempered by the end.. one person from Area D agreed with option B provided full grandfathering is in effect... this is likely the winning scenario.

Put an addition on Parkway to accommodate Deer Ridge. Subdivision on Limerick Rd. was there for 30 years and still hasn’t been developed.

Addition built on Parkway, 10 acres of flat space, would allow for growth so Area A could move to Parkway.

There are many seniors still living in their homes which could affect all areas in downtown Preston.

I know you are not to look at closing a school, but possibly it would be most economical in the long run. With the building of a new school, would have a better site, more efficient etc. Close the oldest, least efficient school.

The work is far from done. Many Scenarios still need to be worked up. The choices A, B, C, D don't fix all three problems addressed.

All Scenarios but C involve fragmenting a community which is in contradiction to the objectives.

Removing "D" (from Preston) would drastically fragment a community that is based on schoolyard socialization. People have built safe relationships with other families, found childcare, found carpool relationships will now be drastically affected. Bussed kids and families won't be impacted the same way.

The process is much better than it was even 10 years ago.

I personally do not mind my child having to change schools, as long as they will enjoy the same or better opportunities that they have enjoyed at Preston P.S.

I would like more investigation into transitioning and grandfathering for Area D students under scenario B.

Sadly any change will fragment the Preston P.S. community. Although they arrive via school bus, the Deer Ridge population is a part of our school community. We are all parents and friends who work together to provide the best school experience for our children. We hope to see a scenario where Deer Ridge could stay together, and the core of Preston could stay together. Enlarge Parkway to accommodate Deer Ridge and Mattamy.