

## Meeting Summary

**Project:** Davisville Jr PS  
Local School Community Design Team Meeting No.9

**Project No.:** 11029  
**Date:** Thursday, April 05, 2012

**Present**

Sheila Penny (SP), Chief Architect, TLC  
Shelley Laskin (SL), Trustee, TDSB  
Jeff Latto (JL), Senior Manager, Strategic Building + Renewal, TDSB  
Joseph Lee (JLe), Teachers, Davisville Jr PS, TDSB  
Christine Burke (CB), Project Manager, Strategic Building + Renewal, TDSB  
Rebecca Alles (RA), TDSB  
Lisa Kelleher (LK), Co-Chair – Building & Land-Use Committee, Co-Chair on Davisville School Council  
John Hiddema (JH), Co-Chair – Building & Land-Use Committee, Co-Chair on Davisville School Council  
Ella Lin (EL) CS&P Architects  
Paul Cravit (PC), Principal- CS&P Architects  
Maureen O'Shaughnessy (MO), Principal- CS&P Architects  
Peter Baker (PB), Co-Chair, FoNTRA  
Diane Schunk (DS), Spectrum Parents Association  
Patrick Cerullo (PCe), SERRA  
Chole Richer (CR), Councillor Matlow's office  
Terry Mills (TM), Planner, FoNTRA  
Donna Boyce (DB), Supervisor, Davisville Care Program  
Tricia Boyce (TB), Principal, Davisville Jr PS, TDSB  
Ian Allison (IA), Superintendent of Education, TDSB  
Jeanette Hughes (JHu), Trustee Laskin's Con, Assistant, TDSB  
John Hill (JHi), Parent Representative, Davisville Care Program  
Chris Long (CL), Teacher, Spectrum Alternative Sr. School, TDSB  
Benjamin Hoff (BH) Planner, Urban Strategies  
Shelley Ortved (SO) Oriole Park Rate Payers Association  
Margaret Walker (MW), South Eglinton Residents Association

**Absent:**

John Keenan (JK), Co-Chair Spectrum Alternative School  
Jim Robinson (JR), Family Team Leader, TDSB  
Lida Svanda (LS), Supervisor C.C.C.  
Allan Wexler (AW), Oriole Park Rate Payers Association  
Frank Lewinberg (FL), Planner, Urban Strategies  
Nolan Bentley (NB), CS+P Architects

Speaker Required	Content	Action
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In this meeting, we had hoped to reach a consensus through a review of the design principles and build-to envelope. However, from the meeting with Councillor Matlow this morning, we learned we do not have support from the Rate Payer Associations. There is more solid support from the Parent Council.</li> </ul> <p>From a financial perspective, in order to rebuild the school, the development has to achieve 400,000 square feet of density on the property. In the meeting with the Councillor and the associations, it was generally agreed that the redevelopment will benefit the school, and the school and site design has general support. The challenge is to distribute the required density on the site while meeting the established design principles.</p>	
PCe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How was it determined that 400,000 square feet of density is required to rebuild the school?</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This amount was determined by estimating the cost of a new school (on a square footage basis) and additional contribution to the Board's capital program, as the Ministry of Education does not have capital funds to rebuild the school.</li> </ul>	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the project yields more money from the developer than anticipated, can we reduce the size of the development?</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 400,000 sq.ft. of development potential of this site is the only way that the Board can cover the costs of rebuilding the school.</li> </ul>	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ratepayers are concerned about how the proposed development will fit into the neighbourhood. They need to be part of the process to understand how we came to the conclusions regarding the development and design principles.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LSCDT process is the Board's way of ensuring that the school community participates and is heard. The executive representatives of the Ratepayer's Associations are invited to the LSCDT to allow them to understand the early stages of the design process and to have input and overview of the process. The LSCDT members develop a framework for school and site development that will go to the Board, then be included in the Developer RFP; the Developer will be part of a city planning approval process that will include a broad community consultation and the Developer will be held to the framework established during this LSCDT process. The LSCDT recommendation meets the needs of the school, receives input from the Ratepayers executive representatives and incorporates a community perspective.</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process to reach out to the community and councillor is the right thing. The Official Plan must be respected so as to not upset the residents of the neighbourhood. If 400,000 square feet is what is required to get the funds to build the school, one option may be a 30 storey tower, however there may be other options such as higher priced, lower density development, i.e. luxury homes. We want to move forward - excellent design principles for the new school have emerged.</li> </ul>	
SP TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We can explore whether options may also include a density transfer.</li> <li>The Ratepayers are not always aligned with the city planners. We should consider the emerging context vs. the current planning context. Be clear that this project could improve the community.</li> </ul>	TDSB

Speaker Required	Content	Action
SL TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a middle ground? There is no point going forward without support.</li> <li>There may be support with more information available, i.e. if 400,000 square feet of development is needed just to support the Davisville school site, it may be more acceptable.</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process of involving the community and the Councillor is good, however we should expect setbacks. What is important is how we can build a top quality school on this site while respecting the Official Plan.</li> </ul>	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JH is uncomfortable because they have not been able to disclose enough information to the school community.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board is responsible to every parent in the school.</li> </ul>	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representatives are there as parent – resident – citizen. The community needs to have a less single-minded focus; what is needed in the neighbourhood that this site could provide is a community resource and human scale development.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will be a top-quality school and the development will <u>respect</u> the Official Plan.</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is critical, the intention to ‘respect’ the Official Plan versus ‘meeting’ the current Official Plan requirements.</li> </ul>	
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reality of the south-west corner of the site is that it is not a “neighbourhood”. We should spend no further time on the 30 storey building if it not going to be accepted. The solution will be somewhere between this and the OP, but it cannot conform to the OP.</li> <li>We need to review the Design Principles. We have received some input. We will do what we can to come to consensus and bring it to the Board. If there is no consensus, there will be no project and we will see what the Board will do with this information.</li> </ul>	
DS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What was the Planner’s position?</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>He suggested that this is a residential plan with a school component. He did not support the proposal.</li> </ul>	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is it possible to buy the two house properties to the west to flow their mixed used OP designation onto our site?</li> </ul>	
BH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unfortunately the two houses are also designated residential. Historically school sites were always designated “neighbourhoods” regardless of their specific location. A mechanism is required to recognize the specific site conditions to allow greater density and height.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a willingness to go forward as a team and explore other site options for accommodating 400,000 sq.ft. of residential density and the new school?</li> </ul>	
ALL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All in agreement.</li> </ul>	
DS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There appear to be three concerns: height, the money from the development staying in the community, ratepayers associations need their associations’ support for any development proposal before agreeing to any proposal.</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We agree with the school design principles, but are not in agreement with the proposed density. Can we transfer density?</li> </ul>	
BH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The required density is 400,000 square feet, this will not change. What we are talking about is massing. We have no density to transfer, but we can investigate what the possibilities are. The city does not assess a development proposal on density, they use built-form and design guidelines.</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of survey results, vision statement, and general design principles.</li> <li>Presentation of General Design Principles. Comment: General Design Principle for development to use LEED as a benchmark.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have more clear design principles developed on other projects which we can bring to this project that expand on design excellence and meeting sustainability standards..</li> </ul>	CS&P/TDSB
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of School Design Principles</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What does the word “porous” mean?</li> </ul>	

Speaker Required	Content	Action
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan of the building has openings to permit views through the building and to not be a visual barrier.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principle: Construction as a single phase to minimize disruption and student displacement.</li> </ul>	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Let us say keep students on the school site during the build.</li> </ul>	
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We cannot say 'no portable classes'. Let just say minimize portables and temporary construction.</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How about the outdoor play during construction?</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will minimize the play area. Recess will be at different times. The administration of the school will need to think about a plan.</li> </ul>	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The word disruption is not clear.</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We use this word in our industry. The noise and dust control will get into contract specifications.</li> <li>Presentation of - artificial turf playfield. Regarding the turf, it is cushion like, rubbery, thick material. Not the carpet on concrete that it used to be. (JHi accepted this in regards to his concern with specifying artificial turf on the playing field).</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the boundary of the turf?</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That is a design detail level question.</li> </ul>	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sideline is too close to the property-line.</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The play field will be 90'x230'. Minimum dimension of playfield will be written down on the drawing.</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern with the parents watching the children play on the field. They might sit or stand to watch their kids to play. Is there enough room provided on the plan?</li> </ul>	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a large enough area to be able to watch around the field. It is a level of detail in terms of how that will be designed, but we see it as possible in the current configuration. We can develop 3 good edges around the field, with the exception of the street edge.</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principles continued: The traffic consultant is comfortable with what we are proposing.</li> <li>The traffic design is at a conceptual level. We will have a full traffic study in next stage. The suggested principle was accepted by the group.</li> </ul>	
SL/SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remaining Design Principles were reviewed. It was agreed that the consultants would explore a variety other massing options to achieve the 400,000 square foot development requirement. Options will be presented at the next meeting and their effect on the Design Principles will be discussed.</li> <li>Next meeting will be Tuesday, April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2012 from 6 to 8pm at Davisville School, Staff Room.</li> <li>Adjournment</li> </ul>	