CS&P Architects

Meeting Summary

Project:	Davisville Jr PS
	Local School Community Design Team Meeting No.10
Project No.:	11029
Date:	Tuesday, April 23, 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 Constituency Assistant, TDSB
Ian Allison (IA), Superintendent of Education, TDSB
Benjamin Hoff (BH), Planner, Urban Strategies
John Keenan (JK), Co-Chair Spectrum Alternative School
Shelley Ortved (SO), Oriole Park Rate Payers Association

Absent:
Jim Robinson (JR), Family Team Leader, TDSB
Margaret Walker (MW), South Eglinton Residents Association
Allan Wexler (AW), Oriole Park Rate Payers Association
Lida Svanda (LS), Supervisor C.C.C. (Fatima Hnasuou (FH) present on her behalf)
Tricia Boyce (TB), Principal, Davisville Jr PS, TDSB
Frank Lewinberg (FL), Planner, Urban Strategies
Katherine Hancock (KH), City of Toronto
Patrick Cerullo (PCe), SERRA
Chloe Richer (CR),Councillor Matlow's office
John Hill (JHi), Parent Representative, Davisville Care Program
Chris Long (CL), Teacher, Spectrum Alternative Sr. School, TDSB

Speaker	Content	Action Required

SP
- In tonight's meeting we will not be spending much time on 'The What We Heard' section so as to give more time to the Architects' presentation.
- People have asked what will happen if there is not a consensus - as discussed at the beginning of the process, If there is not a consensus then there will not be a project.
- People have asked where the income from selling a part of the land for residential development will go - as discussed at the beginning of the process, these funds will go back into the School Board's general capital fund.
- The suggestion of a land density transfer is not something that the Board or City would support, so it is not an option.

PB
- Does the required 400,000 SF of building include the school?

SP
- No, approximately 78,000 SF for the school is additional to the 400,000 SF.

PC
- Presentation – as a result of last meeting we thought it was best to revisit our first steps and generate a series of additional options. We have illustrated this work in pictograms.
- In short there is the original Point Tower Option (30 storeys). Options 1 & 1B demonstrate what would be possible if the entire site was sold to a developer. In Options 2, 3, 4 & 4B the site area required for the development increases (the school site area decreases) as the boundary gradually moves to the east and consequently the development building heights are lowered. Options 5, 5B & 6 are a change of strategy to concentrate all development to the south (Davisville) portion of the site. Option 6 slips the school underneath so to avoid having to relocate students off site due to phasing issues.

LK
What does the green arrow represent?

PC
- The green arrow denotes pedestrian access.
- The single red arrow denotes underground parking access.
- The red arrow denotes vehicular access.

BH
- We have received significant opposition to the 30 storey option and in light of this we see 20 storeys or lower as a more appropriate approach to the site.
- This is not a hard science and these things just have to be tested and discussed.

PC
- Option 1 and 1B indicate what may be possible if a developer builds residential on the whole site. These options were developed for information only. Maximum heights shown are four to six storeys across the site.

JH
- Why are we even showing this?

BH
- Options 1 and 1B are options that would be consistent with the official plan. Option 1 conforms to the OP with residential heights set at 4 storeys. In general, anything above four storeys does not conform with the Official Plan, but may be consistent with the Official Plan.

SL
- All options with a school and residential on site to reach 400,000 SF of density will require an Official Plan Amendment as this can not be achieved within the 4 storey height limit set in the Official Plan.

PC
- Options 2,3,4& 4B description: Option 2: 20 storey tower, with more height

	along the midrise buildings along the mews and 6 floors above the school; Option 3: 20 storey tower, smaller open space for school as residential density taking more school open space; Option 4: 20 storey tower, with courtyard residential taking over more school open space; Option 4B: 14 storey tower, with courtyard residential density taking more school open space, 4 storey school required. • Each option gradually reduces the height of the tower.	
MO	• Note as the height of the tower is decreased the other residential blocks are increased in height and the Built-To envelope is filled in or more school open space is required in order to lower the residential building heights.	
BH	• From a planning perspective Option 4 (Courtyard scheme) makes more sense in heights as it transitions to lower residential on Millwood Road.	
PC	• Option 5 and 5B develop more density along Davisville and place the school along Millwood where the building heights are lower. In these options the students would need to be relocated during construction.	
PC	• Option 6 relocates the mews to the east edge of the site, all open space is contiguous along the edge of Millwood with all residential and school development along Davisville edge. This option has some interesting potential as more open space is allowed for and students would not have to be relocated off the site as shown in Options 5&5B. A residential bar sits over the school and could be developed in a number of ways. No future school growth is possible in this option.	
PB	• Where is the entrance to the school?	
PC	• Through the schoolyard – facing Millwood	
DS	• What would the height along Davisville be?	
PC	• The maximum in this model is 16 storeys, but this can move up or down if we are asked to develop this option further.	
DS	• Where is the mews in this scheme?	
PC	• On the eastern edge of the site.	
MO	• The existing open space is 90,250 SF and this scheme produces approximately 86,500 SF	
PC	• Presentation of - perspectives of Option 6 and precedents: - A precedent of development that was originally proposed. (Located on Wellesley between Jarvis and Sherbourne) - Precedents of schools underneath residential blocks (Market Lane Junior and Senior Public School; Downtown Alternative School). - Integrated school and residential projects: North Toronto Collegiate Institute - Precedents of residential massing of bar buildings: (Osdorp Multi-Functional School, The Netherlands)	

	- Other residential mid-rise examples: (River City; District Lofts)	
PB	• Could the field and the hard surface be flipped?	
PC	• Yes, in order have a direct approach to the front entrance.	
BH	• This scheme accomplishes a lot of the planning objectives. However, the City continues to favour a point tower and podium approach. This scheme is unique and it would take some discussion with the city as it calls for a tall mid-rise which is more difficult. It would need to be refined and articulated in terms of massing.	
SP	• To recap: Options 1 we all do not want to consider as there is no accommodation for the school on the site. (All agreed) Options 2, 3, 4 & 4B spread the building mass out across the site as the tower is lowered. Options 5, 5B is uninteresting as children are required to relocate. Option 6 is interesting and we wanted the architects to test this. Initially, the concern was the shadows; however this demonstrates that the shadows can be reduced. There are still areas of hard surface play that is constantly in shade and would be icy and require a lot of salt/maintenance.	
TM	• Moving the access to the far east of the site works quite well. Whatever development happens along Yonge Street will also need to address the back lane in a complementary way.	
PB	• I like this option and how the main entrance faces Millwood Road and the secondary entrance addresses Davisville. I think it has a lot of merit.	
SP	• What do you think about the height?	
PB	• I think we would get an agreement on that - obviously there would need to be a planning amendment.	
TM	• There is a recent development proposal on the south side of Davisville that got knocked down to 12 storeys. • East on Davisville Avenue there is deliberate attempt to make Davisville a two lane street. However, at this end of Davisville Avenue an additional North lane could be added as something that can be used as a drop off. This development has an opportunity to create a landscaped edge along the street.	
MO	• Option 6 incorporates many of the principles in the original scheme such as terracing the outdoor spaces, courtyards and a plan for 21st century learning. There are still the same relationships within the school i.e. kindergarten, gym and ground floor uses.	
SL	• At the School Council meeting there were reservations in having residential over the school. The school community will need to fully understand what this means and I think we can help the community understand the benefits of this arrangement. • I am concerned about constant shadow at the entry to the school however I understand that there will be some shadow.	

Speaker	Content	Action Required
TM	• Are you suggesting that Option 6 be built up more towards the west?	
SL	• Although 20 storeys is a lot less than 30 it is still quite high.	
MO	• Just to reiterate your biggest concern is that all of the schoolyard directly adjacent to the school is always in shadow.	
	• Another difference between Option 6 and the Option 2 is the nature of the Mews.	
JLe	• I like it that Option 6 creates a lower precedent for what may be developed at the intersection of Davisville / Yonge in particular.	
MO	• A study could be performed to review the building heights to get better results. We could look at a hybrid of Option 2 and 6 and push more density to the southwest corner.	
JH	• There is a visceral effect of 'building over children'. The identity of the school would need to be studied. Another concern from parents is the separation of uses with the residential, the next question is safety and fire.	
MO	• Perhaps we need to develop Integration Principles in addition to the School Design and Development Principles that we have already established.	
PC	• Many of these things are covered in the Building Code but we can reinforce them here.	CS&P
SL	• What else are the parents saying?	
JH	• Some parents were shocked that 30 storeys were even being discussed given the municipal government's perspective. It was a few more then we expected.	
LK	• There are also others that were talking way down the road about interior design.	
JH	• We are informing people that there is a greater school need that we need to design for and this is the reason for this process. This is foundational to the acceptability of the process and this is something the parents do not fully understand.	
MO	• Did this community not go through the ARC process that determined this?	
SL	• Yes, they did. We will need to set up a meeting with school community parents right away to discuss this further with them.	SL/TDSB
LK	• There seems to be a gap between the ARC recommendation and that which is being proposed now. Parents do not understand the jump in number of students for the new school.	
IA	• This is the only ARC of 3 in the family of schools that did not yield a school closure.	
DS	• There is a lack of understanding amongst the community as to how much it is going to cost to build the school and the amount of income expected to be received from a developer and the TDSB to allocate elsewhere. If this can be expressed more clearly, the community may feel better about it.	

Speaker	Content	Action Required
SP	• We are working hard to retain the community's green space. And just as the design team has some work to do, BLU has some work to do in educating the parents.	
JH	• It is not so much about giving the logical reasons for the process to the parents but taking time to engage and expose people to what this is about.	
SP	• We are here representing the school and we don't have a "butterfly that is ready to hatch". Until we have consensus around this table, I don't think we are ready to engage the community.	
PB	• We should look at marketing and addressing the objections of the community.	
SO	• Should something about the ARC be mentioned here?	
LK&JH	• Yes, we understand the process but the information regarding the numbers has not been filtered down.	
SL	• We briefed LK&JH regarding the ARC at the beginning of the process. We should consider engaging the school community to help them understand.	SL/TDSB/BLU
SP	• What have our Architects heard?	
MO	• We heard that there is interest in a hybrid of schemes in order to eliminate shade on the playfield. We will come back with two or three options based on Options 2 & 6.	
DS	• I would like to comment on the heights as the open space and shadows are paramount to this project. I don't mind 20 storeys if it achieves the more important school objectives.	
BH	• 20 storeys is a way to get density up in the air and we don't think we should push too low. The city is not comfortable dealing with buildings that are 15 storey slab buildings, so we may need to go up to 20 storeys. It will be balance of building typology and heights.	
SL	• The rate payers are not interested in a 30 storey tower. If we are going to go forward it has to make sense to all the players and there will need to be a compromise. I want to be mindful of what we are hearing to not waste time on something we know won't get agreement within the entire group. The key is to have an agreement at this table.	
TM	• Is City planning being consulted?	
SP	• At a staff level we have been meeting with City Planning.	
TM	• Who is the Planner? And he/she on board?	
JL	• David Oikawa and Tim Burkholder.	
SP	• Are the ratepayers prepared to offer their initial thoughts?	
TM	• A lot of people are prepared to accept development but want to know how much is being asked of them to sacrifice – they would be interested in knowing if the project is revenue neutral.	

Speaker	Content	Action Required
SP	• For example, North Toronto received $23M income from the developer and the building cost $50M. But the board had money to contribute at that time.	
DS	• I would like to see a 20 storey scheme.	
IA	• Next meeting will be at 3:45 – 5:15 May 8th, 2012	