

Meeting Summary

Project: Davisville Jr PS
Local School Community Design Team Meeting No.12

Project No.: 11029
Date: Tuesday, May 22, 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
Nolan Bentley (NB) 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
Terry Mills (TM), Planner, FoNTRA
Donna Boyce (DB), Supervisor, Davisville Care Program
Jeanette Hughes (JHu), Trustee Laskin's Con, Assistant, TDSB
Ian Allison (IA), Superintendent of Education, TDSB
Benjamin Hoff (BH) Planner, Urban Strategies
John Keenan (JK), Co-Chair Spectrum Alternative School
Shelley Orved (SO) Oriole Park Rate Payers Association
Chloe Richer (CR), Councillor Matlow's office
Tricia Boyce (TB), Principal, Davisville Jr PS, TDSB
John Hill (JHi), Parent Representative, Davisville Care Program
Lida Svanda (LS), Supervisor C.C.C.
Margaret Walker (MW), South Eglinton Residents Association
Patrick Cerullo (PCe), SERRA
Jim Robinson (JR), Family Team Leader, TDSB

Absent: Allan Wexler (AW), Oriole Park Rate Payers Association
Frank Lewinberg (FL), Planner, Urban Strategies
Chris Long (CL), Teacher, Spectrum Alternative Sr. School, TDSB

Speaker	Content	Action Required
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Meeting Minutes We have heard from several people around the table that it would be helpful to the process for the consultant team to recommend an option of the 4 options that were sent to the team for their consideration since the last meeting. We have asked the consultant team to make a recommendation based on open space, height and integrated development and how these relate to the school foremost, and school program. 	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of previously presented 4 options with shadows studies Presentation of a key issues summary matrix of the 4 options Key issues: outdoor play area, sunlight, integrated development, building height Each option presents a similar school plan, and similar sized field. Option 1&2: Both have the larger open spaces of the 4 options, stretching along the length of the site along Millwood Rd. Option 1 is composed of (2) 20 storeys towers at the southwest portion of the site, with no residential development over the school. CS+P are uncomfortable with the amount of shadow that this option carries over the playing field, and do not recommend this option. Option 2 presents a 20 storey tower at the southwest corner of the site with the remaining residential density distributed along Davisville, with residential built form integrated over the school (maximum 12 storeys total) along Davisville, with height transition to neighbouring low-rise residential to the east. Option 3&4: Both have significantly smaller open spaces than options 1&2 with residential buildings wrapping back along western edge of the site to Millwood in the attempt to reduce development heights. CS+P advise that this is not sufficient open space for an elementary school of this size, and therefore do not recommend either option, even though heights of these options are lower than options 1&2. Option 3 has a 16 storey building on the southwest corner with a maximum of 11 storeys of residential development, a portion of which is integrated over the school. The residential development steps down along the western edge from 8 to 4 storeys towards Millwood. Option 4 proposes (2) 15 storey towers at the southwest corner of the site with a mews running between them from Davisville to Millwood. The residential development steps down along the western edge from 8 to 4 storeys towards Millwood. Significant shadowing of the open space and play field make this option undesirable. 	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option that we have evaluated as by far the best option to move forward with is Option 2. Presentation of Integrated Development Principles for Review 	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like the wide sidewalk along Davisville. Millwood has the opportunity to be a quiet link. 	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likes all buildings away from Millwood, with only open space along Millwood. 	
DS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think breaking up the massing and keeping the most open space and minimizing shadows on the playground is the right thing to do. 	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pushing the density to Davisville Avenue and moving the commercial traffic off Millwood Road are good things. Good for traffic and houses along Millwood – they become ‘houses on the park’. 	

Speaker	Content	Action Required
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We felt as a team that the continuous green space along Millwood Road is important. 	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option is much less monolithic than previous versions, which is positive. 	
DB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The childcare will need to have fenced play to the east. (MO agreed) 	
DS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is great that all the residential addresses face onto Davisville, and only the school address is on Millwood. The building section also shows how the school is buffered well from the residential component. 	
LS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the young children's play area too narrow? 	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is about a 25' – 30' wide area, the proportions can be resolved in the detailed design phase, but the area allocation shown is appropriate. 	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I appreciate the car drop off area internally to the block of the residential building as this improves traffic. I also like that mature trees can be saved on the north side along Millwood in this option. Could there be a lane on the west side though? 	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The governing piece is the core for the tower and how this relates to the drop-off. It would be very difficult. 	
DS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the school bus drop-off lane work? 	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mews would have gates or bollards to close the area off during the day for school uses i.e. additional play area. The lane would only be used for school traffic. There would also be a 5 - 6' wide sidewalk/walkway leading from Millwood to Davisville. 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is underground parking and servicing still in this scheme? 	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, there is below-grade servicing and parking for the school. The build-to envelope presented is to give developers some flexibility within the spirit of this option. It also allows for some flexibility in terms of seeking municipal approval. The maximum density of residential building is 400,000 sq.ft. within this build-to envelope. 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What we would be taking to the Board is a maximum of 400,000 sf of development (apart from the school area) within this build-to envelope, along with the school and development principles, the site plan locating the school, residential development and open space. 	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In other developments (i.e. Alexandra Park Revitalization) 20% is presumed to be the land value. 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are not TCHC and we do not have a model like that. 	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the reasoning behind the 400,000sf? There is quite a bit of resistance out there to alot of density in the community. 	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As consultants, we have done the math, and understand the land value of this site. In some ways putting everything on the table in terms of income required would be compromising the school board's position. 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have an opportunity to go forward and get ministry and school board approval if we can say clearly that this school will not put a burden on the Board's capital building program. Even with board approval, this project will still need city approvals – we will need an official plan amendment and rezoning of the site. Next step after Board approval, would be to select a developer to work with and then approach the city with a joint development application 12 – 15 months from now. 	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the various conversations I have had with people in the community, if you get people to think of the importance of schools then there might be an opportunity to get the Councillor on board with this as a community project. 	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Last meeting we talked about city building. We know what is going to happen in along Millwood Road with the open space, but the development will have 	

Speaker	Content	Action Required
SO	<p>a big impact on Davisville Avenue with its narrow sidewalks and we feel the need to voice these concerns to the City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oriole Park Residents are not city building professionals but we are respectful citizens. We support the building of a new school but the development needs to also be planned within the broader community context in mind. The community also will only support the amount of residential development required to fund this school. • The community would support a retail traffic corridor (not on the school site) that was parallel to the western boundary of the site. • Millwood Road should be strictly a residential street, potentially with 1 lane only in front of the school, with the remaining right of way becoming additional open space for school use. • We need to have a continued study of what is the future of the Yonge-Davisville corner. • Davisville Avenue is overbuilt for cars and under built for pedestrians. This school should provide leadership in 'taming' Davisville Avenue. • Finally, the proposed residential unit break down should be no less than 50% one bedrooms, no studios, leaving the rest for larger 2 or 3-bedroom family units. 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for responding and honouring the confidentiality of these plans that were sent to everyone at the table after last meeting. These are all noble aspirations that the school board has no authority over. 	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But you have influence to support these city issues and a list of recommendations could be put forth to the city? 	
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can capture these, but we wouldn't be able to guarantee the outcomes as they are city issues. 	
CR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an update on the City's consideration for a policy change to the Official Plan? 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No there is no update - the TDSB is meeting at a staff level with the city to discuss this potential. Are you able to update on the city wide initiative that Councillor Matlow put forward for a joint school board city working table? 	
CR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is another person in our office working on this initiative and he will be in contact with the school board shortly. 	
BH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I want to touch on some of these visionary points from the surrounding community. Part of this process may be to have a traffic study performed and this will be a recommendation to the city – i.e. looking at 2 lanes only on Davisville and 1 lane on Millwood. 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We cannot guarantee this would happen though. From the ratepayers, we would suggest creating a list of 'off-site' city-building recommendations that you would like to see considered by the City as the TDSB moves through the next stage. We would be able to attach this list to our applications as they move through the process. • Is there consensus with the option that is being recommended at this table? 	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will get you something quickly. To answer your question of are we in agreement, the answer is – Yes 	
SO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes 	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, I would endorse this. With a few little caveats such as a berm along Millwood, a decent soccer field (North Lea size is preferred), a running track, a playground structure with a soft ground. (e.g. Cedarvale PS). 	

Speaker	Content	Action Required
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once the list is forwarded to the TDSB, we can meet with the ratepayers to review. Do we have consensus then on the principles, the build-to envelope, the siteplan? 	
PCe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did I hear that the envelope would allow more than 400,000sf GFA and are we confident that the playing field is large enough? 	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the playing field and open space is adequate for the proposed number of students on site. And to answer the second question, it is a loose height envelope in which not more than 400,000sf of development can be built within it. 	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think we are on the right track; the fact that the ground plane is friendlier is a positive. We have learned that parents need to be more informed. I am comfortable taking this out to the community as the preferred option. What do you need from us? 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We understand that you don't speak for all your constituents and that this is a LSCDT meeting and this is what you are recommending that the school board take to the board (which meets in October). Keep in mind there are a lot of steps ahead. Any other questions before the show of hands? 	
JLee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I like it. 	
LS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I like it but the Child-Care parents will need to park. (MO – drop-off can happen on Davisville) 	
JK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One concern from Spectrum is that this be a permanent place for it and not just a short term home. Is there any room for growth? 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program has built into it accommodation for future growth. Spectrum is included in the building program and future growth but we cannot guarantee that you will never be asked to move. This concern related to Spectrum is not within the scope of this process. 	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is 10% excess capacity in the program and in earlier discussions room for expansion had been discussed but the site is limited for additional expansion considerations. 	
DS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do we have any more information about the community space? 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not have any public / community interest on this space as of yet. This is still in process. 	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do we have support and consensus from the Local School Community Design team to move forward on this option? All in favour? (all hands raised) Note: Chloe Richer had left the meeting prior to the vote being called. Note: Davisville parent representatives John Hiddema and Lisa Kelleher voted in favour on the condition that the proposal be ratified by the Davisville Building and Land Use committee, then by a vote in favour by the school community and finally by a subsequent vote in favour by the Davisville School Council. Those opposed? (none) A package of material will be sent to BLU for their next meeting. The school board will meet with the residents associations to discuss their list of 'off-site' city-building recommendations. A meeting date will be worked out for a meeting with BLU and a potential open house. Thank you to the Design Team & Adjournment 	