



ELMIRA BOUNDARY STUDY
Minutes of Working Group Meeting #2
April 23, 2013
From 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
Riverside Public School

The second Working Group Meeting of the Elmira Boundary Study Working Group, involving [John Mahood](#), [Park Manor](#) and [Riverside](#) Public Schools, was held at Riverside Public School on Tuesday, April 23, 2013.

Attendees:

Brent Hatcher, Principal, Riverside PS, R. Playford, Parent Representative, Riverside PS, Tracey Williams, Parent Representative, Riverside PS, James Bond, Principal, Park Manor PS, Sabrina Windatt, Parent Representative, Park Manor PS, Tracy Tait, Principal John Mahood PS, Liz Robinson, Parent Representative, John Mahood PS, D. Sinclair, Parent Representative, John Mahood PS, John Scarfone, Manager of Planning, Township of Woolwich, Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, and Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary.

Regrets:

Diane DeCoene, Area Superintendent of Education, Becky Riddle, Parent Representative, Park Manor PS, Lauren Manske, Senior Planner, Ron Dallan, Manager of Capital Projects.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, welcomed members of the Working Group, and Board staff present at 1:05 PM.

Mr. Hercanuck led the group through the presentation (available online at <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/elmira-boundary-study>)

2. Draft Minutes Review

Mr. Hercanuck asked members if there were any errors or omissions in the draft minutes from Working Group Meeting #1 (April 9, 2013). No errors or omissions reported.

Minutes approved

Moved by: Sabrina Windatt Seconded by: Deanna Sinclair

Mr. Hercanuck advised that the minutes will be posted on the Board's website at: <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/elmira-boundary-study>

3. Relevant Board Policies and Procedures (slides 3-10 of the online presentation)

Board Policy is a position adopted by the Board that provides the framework for a course of action. It is a commitment by which the Board is held accountable to its public. Adoption of new board policies or revision of existing policies is solely the responsibility of the Board.

Board Administrative Procedure is a course of action developed to implement and support an approved Board policy.

The following Board Policies and Procedures which relate to construction/sizing of schools and alignment of attendance boundaries were provided to the Working Group by email prior to the meeting:

- [Board Policy 3002 - Elementary School Size and Configuration](#) (slide 4)
 - *Recognizes that the Board operates a number of elementary school models (JK-5, JK-6, JK-8, 7-8), that support student success.*
 - *JK-8 model is preferred to meet curriculum and development needs but there are a variety of other factors to be considered as well*
 - *School size recommendations: JK-8 (500-650 pupil places), JK-6 (350-400 pupil places). Based on recommended number of classes per grade.*

Mr. Hercanuck noted that this policy is a not always achievable due to site constraints or transportation distances. He also noted that the Board is moving away from the JK-5 feeding a 6-8 model; and moving toward a JK-6 feeding either a 7-8 (preferable if there is a Senior Elementary) or feeding into a JK-8.

He also advised that we can look at balancing enrolments between the study area schools if we feel that schools may be disadvantaged if they do not have at least 2 classes per grade.

- [Board Policy 4009 - Student Transportation](#) (slide 5)
General Transportation Policy:
 - *Transportation may be provided to students living beyond the following distance to their assigned school:*
 - *Junior and Senior Kindergarten: beyond 0.8 km*
 - *Grades 1-8: beyond 1.6 km*
 - *Grades 9-12: beyond 3.2 km*
 - *In some cases transportation may be required for students under these distances due to lack of pedestrian infrastructure or unsafe conditions.*

Transportation is not provided for students attending choice programs (i.e., French Immersion) outside of the home school boundary.

When creating school attendance boundaries we try to develop boundaries that make sense by taking walking distances into account to allow for the highest amount of walk-in student population.

Slides 6 and 7 of the online presentation show walking distance maps for John Mahood, Riverside and Park Manor Public Schools, indicating the following:

- *Yellow lines indicate walking distance of 800 metres (areas within 0.8 km of the school)*
- *Red lines indicate walking distance of 1600 metre (areas within 1.6 km of the school)*
- *Broken down into projection areas (A-M)*
- *New subdivision to be added later (currently streets do not exist)*
- [Administrative Procedure 4260 - Student Transportation](#) (slide 8)
 - *WRDSB Transportation policy administered by [Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region](#) (STSWR)*
 - *Transportation Distances are guidelines; 'reasonable flexibility' may be exercised up to 200m.*
 - *Some schools may be designated as 'walking schools' (i.e. no transportation other than for special needs)*
 - *Guidelines for the establishment of bus stop locations (Distances)*
 - *Guidelines for limiting students time on bus (max. 55min.)*
 - *Bell times, student drop off (latest times)*
 - *Transportation to an alternative address*

STSWR is a separate legal entity established by the Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB) and the Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB) to plan and oversee the delivery of student transportation in the Region. While the responsibility for establishing transportation policies remains with the individual school boards, STSWR is charged with applying the policies and procedures set by the boards in a consistent manner across the system.

- **Board Policy 4012 - School Attendance Areas** (slide 9)
 - *Board is responsible for determining school attendance area boundaries*
 - *Students are expected to attend their designated home school as determined by home address and school attendance area boundary (Exceptions – French Immersion, Spec. Ed., Out-of-boundary requests)*
 - *Board reserves the right to alter school attendance area boundaries but shall make every effort to consult with affected community*
 - *Multiple criteria taken into account when determining/altering school attendance area boundaries (e.g. walking distance, school capacity, school proximity, enrolment projections etc.)*
- **Administrative Procedure 4990 - Facility Partnerships** (Slide 10)
 - *Board's Capital Planning process will address future needs of students, identifying where additional school capacity is needed or no longer needed.*
 - *This process will help determine suitable potential facilities for partnership opportunities*
 - *Board maintains a pre-approved 'Community Partners' list whom are notified when opportunity for a partnership is identified by the Board*
 - *The partnership must be compatible operating in a school setting, not compromise the overall learning objectives for students, be cost neutral for the Board, and ensure health and safety of students.*

Mr. Hercanuck advised that the [Facility Partnerships Policy](#) is a directive of the Province to make more efficient use of provincial resources (schools) especially for those boards with declining enrolment. The WRDSB does not have this issue and is growing in enrolment with 350 portable classrooms and adding the equivalent elementary enrolment of at least one elementary school each year.

The partnership projects are required to be revenue neutral to the Board.

The Board maintains a list of preapproved partners and informs them annually on our [current construction projects with potential for partnerships](#).

Q: Sabrina Windatt asked who would be a pre-approved partner.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that child care providers such as the YWCA, Conestoga College and Creative Beginnings are some pre-approved partners who may partner on new school construction. He noted that with the new Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) program and the Board run extended day component, child care providers are concentrating on the infant to toddler (0-3.8 years) care, which is currently not as profitable; but they have built some of these child cares in new schools.

Please [click here](#) for more information on Board [Policies](#) and [Procedures](#).

4. Elmira Projection Areas/Enrolment Projections

Elmira Projection Areas (A-M) (Slide 11 of the online presentation)

Mr. Hercanuck noted the following:

- Existing school attendance area boundaries are further divided into smaller 'projection areas'
- Projections areas are delineated by major features/natural barriers (roads, streams, existing elementary school boundaries)
- In some cases projection areas follow property lines to include/exclude all residents on a street.
- Projection areas will be used as 'building blocks' to construct alternative scenarios.

Enrolment Projections for Areas (A-M) (Slide 12 of the online presentation)

Mr. Hercanuck noted that he has provided 3 types of enrolment information for each of the areas (A-M):

1. Past Enrolment (2002-2011)
2. Present Enrolment (2012)
3. Future Enrolment Projections (2013-2023)

Regular Track, French Immersion (FI) and out-of-Boundary students have been accounted for in each projection.

The Lunor Subdivision is labeled Projection Area A. Mr. Hercanuck noted that the projections for this area may change based on any new information received from Mr. Scarfone today.

The French Immersion projections are done separately so we can look at the possibility of moving the program to another school.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that there are only a few students from the Boundary Study area that attend out-of-boundary (i.e., attending a school outside the area).

Q: Sabrina Windatt asked how many FI students do we have currently and do we know how many others have applied for the program but did not get in.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the projections are based on the current enrolments as well as average outcomes from other new subdivision areas from across the Board; he also noted that the FI program requires 21 students to offer the program at a school.

The Working Group further discussed the FI program and the possibility of being able to offer 2 classes of the program in the area, based on the demand and the possibility that some students may not want to travel into Waterloo to attend the next closest FI program.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that assembling and coming up with new scenarios is done by using the projections for each area (A-M) taking the total number of students, minus the FI students and minus the out-of-boundary to determine a total number for the projection area. Then the FI students are added back in.

Q: Liz Robinson asked if projection areas give any consideration to the types of families that move into new subdivisions; in regard to the demand on the French Immersion program.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that the projections look at the types of housing units and typical yields the Board expects from these types of housing units.

R: Mr. Hercanuck added that generally, the Board yields 0.3 students per unit or 30 students per 100 housing units. These yields vary depending on the area; (new developments may yield higher numbers, and older neighbourhoods have lower than the average student yields; newer starter homes will have more Kindergarten/junior elementary students whereas larger higher-end homes yield more students in senior elementary and secondary grades.

Q: James Bond asked if new subdivisions tend to yield more FI students.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that we can look at that based on demand, but will have to wait for the demand to occur.

It was noted that while John Mahood PS has a walk-in population, the FI students that attend for out-of-boundary would have to be driven in by parents, which adds to the ongoing traffic concerns at the school. **The Working Group may want to look at where the FI students are coming from.**

C: Mr. Cuomo noted that parents from the new school boundary can request FI at their home school.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that Learning Services considers it best to concentrate the program at one facility so as not to duplicate program resources.

5. Presentation – Woolwich Township Staff re: Elmira Development

Mr. John Scarfone, Manager of Planning for the Township of Woolwich and Community Representative on the Elmira Boundary Study discussed the development outlook for the Settlement of Elmira including growth areas.

Mr. Scarfone discussed the following three handouts as follows:

1. [Elmira Greenfield Growth Areas](#)

Map outlines the Township's boundary and growth areas for residential development from 2013 to post 2043.

Under the Region of Waterloo (Region) Official Plan, it is envisioned that the long-term extent of residential development for Elmira is that it will grow to Floradale Road, Listowel Road and out to the railway tracks.

He noted that, in the future, it is possible that, the Township and Region could alter the boundary for development of employment lands in the east or south section of the settlement.

Elmira's current settlement limits are directly east of the yellow areas. Should the Township extend its limits in accordance with the Regional Plan, any future (post 2043) residential development will be in these yellow areas outlined on the handout.

Development is based on population/jobs minimum densities required by the Region for Elmira and not on number of residential units. The minimum density that the Region requires the Township to achieve in Elmira is 45 people and jobs (p/j) per hectare.

Elmira has a moderate growth rate strategy with a target of 3% per year or approximately 315 people per year (average of 90-100 residential units).

The Township controls growth in order to properly plan for future community facilities (such as libraries, schools and recreational facilities).

The Red areas on the map are the imminent (estimated development 2013-2025) areas of growth which have been assigned sewage capacity. When the two developments come on stream (Lunor in the north end and Birdland in the south end) both developments would share in the annual population growth of 315-360 p/j per year.

Red areas – Short Term (2014-2025) Residential Development

Includes the following developments:

- Lunor – 2013-2025 with 3085 p/j (people and jobs per hectare)
- South Parkwood area owned by Birdland - 2014-2020 with 785 p/j
 - No plan of subdivision yet
- Hawksridge – 2014/2015 with 150 p/j
 - Concerns raised with respect to land use compatibility (adjacent rail line)

Yellow areas – Long Term (Post 2043) Residential Development

Located outside the current settlement limits and requiring settlement expansion.

Orange areas – Mid Term (2025-2043) Residential Developments

Includes some of the Lunor Subdivision lands with development pushed out to post 2025 due to sewage capacity allocations.

Q: Mr. Hercanuck asked how many people per unit are expected.

R: Mr. Scarfone responded that yields are expected to vary depending on the type of unit:

- 3.3 people per single family unit
- 1.8 people per apartment unit
- 2.4 people per townhouse unit

C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that historically more students have been generated out of single family units than townhouse units; but noted that things are changing. The Board is noticing higher yields from town houses and semi-detached housing lately.

2. Lunor Development Phasing Plan of Subdivision

- Phasing of subdivision occurring counter-clockwise with the School site (yellow) in **Phase 1A**, allowing the Board to get land as soon as the subdivision registers.
- Park (green) will be in **Phase 4**.
- Township waiting on letter of credit from Lunor before servicing can commence.
- Pre-servicing will occur Spring of 2013
- Estimated 159-188 units (440-490 people in **Phase 1**):
 - 57 singles
 - 30 semi-detached
 - 16 townhomes
 - 34-51 unit apartment

Q: Tracey Williams asked when Lunor will be breaking ground.

R: Mr. Scarfone responded that they are expected to break ground within the month to begin servicing and construction of roads and grading of lots to get ready for building permits in the fall-winter of 2013.

Q: Mr. Hercanuck noted that the enrolment projections have student yields from the Lunor development beginning October 2014 and asked if we might expect students sooner.

R: Mr. Scarfone responded that it could potentially be sooner but fall of 2014 is a reasonable assumption for population yields from this area.

3. [Lunor Subdivision - Land Use Map](#)

Detailed map of the Lunor Subdivision with street names and housing types.

Colour coded areas as follows:

- Light Yellow – Single Family units
- Darker Yellow – Flexible (to be identified at time of registration)
- Orange – Town Homes
- Brown – Multi-unit Apartments
- Red – Commercial areas (including Fire Hall to replace existing Elmira Fire Hall)
- Blue – Storm Water Management
- Green – Open space, park and connections to trail systems
- Purple – WRDSB School Site

Areas **100** and **101** are Blocks included in later phases and ensure the Lunor Drive extension, provide for road access and align with Barnswallow so traffic does not funnel.

Mr. Scarfone noted that the development will be controlled within the projected 3% annual growth rate for Elmira (315 p/j per year)

Q: Mr. Hercanuck asked if the subdivision has a 90/100 unit cap.

R: Mr. Scarfone responded that the Township controls the growth development by assigning an annual growth supply for the Lunor development. The developer can register a plan that amounts to a three-year growth supply; should they use up this supply in the first year, they will have to wait until the three years are up to register the next phase or allocated supply.

Q: Mr. Hercanuck asked if the annual allotted growth (90-100 units) for Elmira would be split between the two subdivisions (Lunor and Birdland).

R: Mr. Scarfone responded that there is some unused share since 2010 and Lunor has been given a larger share because Birdland will not come on until 2014 but at that point the annual growth (315-360 p/j per year) will have to be shared between the two developments with Birdland developing out to 2020.

Q: James Bond asked what the breakdown of p/j (people to jobs) is expected to be.

R: Mr. Scarfone responded that the lions share is expected to be people with relatively few jobs resulting mostly from home business, the commercial areas and the school.

Mr. Scarfone noted that the next phase (out to the planning horizon of 2031) would see 1100 units resulting in 4000+ people.

C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that the Board basis its projections on a 10-year term which is the timeframe for a student to go from JK to Grade 8.

C: Lunor would be able to develop faster if the Township did not have a cap on population growth.

C: Breslau developed out over 6-7 years putting a lot of pressure on its school.

Mr. Scarfone noted that they are looking at similar population caps for Breslau with a need to address schools and such areas to plan and finance work. He noted that Woolwich encompasses Breslau to Heidelberg and north to Floradale and Maryhill; with the following growth areas in order of growth potential: Elmira, Breslau and St. Jacobs (limited growth).

C: Mr. Hercanuck advised that he may have to adjust the enrolment projections for *Projection Area A* based on today's information.

Mr. Scarfone noted that the Township is undergoing an Official Plan Review which may result in minor variations but he is not anticipating any major changes to the growth plan.

Mr. Hercanuck thanked Mr. Scarfone for attending.

6. Roundtable

Meeting Dates

- Working Group #3: Tuesday May 7, 1:00 – 2:30 PM at John Mahood PS
- Working Group #4: Tuesday May 21, 1:00 – 2:30 PM at TBD

Public Meeting # 1: Date/ Time TBD.

Working Group to hold off setting Public Meeting #1 until we have something to bring to the community.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that he would bring some sample draft objectives to the next working group meeting to spark discussion. He asked the Working Group if they had any draft objectives to add and advised that they could email them to him.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the draft objectives will address the following:

- Interim Plan
- Board Policy
- New Elmira development area information/revised projections (based on not all growth in area "A"; growth to be shared with Birdland subdivision)

Mr. Hercanuck to provide some initial scenarios for discussion.

Mr. Hercanuck asked if there is any additional information the working group would like for the next meeting. None was requested.

Action Items:

- **Working Group to email any draft objectives or request for additional information to Mr. Hercanuck.**
- **Mr. Hercanuck to provide the following items for next meeting:**
 - **sample draft objectives**
 - **initial scenarios for discussion**
 - **revised projections (based on not all growth in area "A")**

Future Meetings:

Working Group Meetings:

- **Working Group #3: Tuesday May 7, 1:00 – 2:30 pm at John Mahood PS**
- **Working Group #4: Tuesday May 21, 1:00 – 2:30 PM at TBD**

Public Meetings:

- **Public Meeting #1: Date/ Time - TBD.**