

## Meeting Summary

**Project:** Davisville Jr PS  
Local School Community Design Team Meeting No.11

**Project No.:** 11029  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 8, 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  
Chloe Richer (CR), Councillor Matlow's office  
Lida Svanda (LS), Supervisor C.C.C.  
Tricia Boyce (TB), Principal, Davisville Jr PS, TDSB  
John Keenan (JK), Co-Chair Spectrum Alternative School  
Margaret Walker (MW), South Eglinton Residents Association  
Chris Long (CL), Teacher, Spectrum Alternative Sr. School, TDSB

**Absent:**

Jim Robinson (JR), Family Team Leader, TDSB  
Allan Wexler (AW), Oriole Park Rate Payers Association  
Frank Lewinberg (FL), Planner, Urban Strategies  
Katherine Hancock (KH), City of Toronto  
Patrick Cerullo (PCe), SERRA  
John Hill (JHi), Parent Representative, Davisville Care Program  
Shelley Ortvad (SO) Oriole Park Rate Payers Association

Speaker Required	Content	Action
JL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No items to address that are outside of the presentation by the consultants.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TDSB is looking into a potential policy change through the Official Plan review for TDSB neighbourhood designated sites that fall under certain criteria in order to respond to intensification which in turn brings significant student capacity needs to certain areas of the City. The only way for TDSB to fund the rebuilding of schools is through residential development.</li> <li>The TDSB and consultant team are continuing to meet with the local planners. We met with City Planners Tim Burkholder and David Oikawa this morning. The message was that if there is no policy change they would not write a favourable report for any option that exceeds seven storeys. They agreed to review the options (to be presented this afternoon to the LCSDT) under the lens that there were to be a policy change.</li> <li>Today we would like to review the options with the frame of reference that we will be successful in getting a policy change and try to reach consensus.</li> </ul>	
BH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is still possible to be granted approvals for a proposal that exceeds the 7 storeys, especially if the local Councillor is on board.</li> </ul>	
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If there is no consensus around the table, then there is no project.</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the Planning meeting was anything mentioned in terms of other developments in the area and the context?</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Urban Strategies opinion, the north-east corner of Yonge and Davisville could see an application for a 24 to 30 storey tower. However the planning department considers midrise applications more appropriate at this intersection.</li> </ul>	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Official Plan, Yonge Street is declared an avenue which has a prescribed type of building form to deal with issues of sunlight, etc. We are interested in a contemporary planning framework in this area, a study in which the city should undertake.</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we are looking at the Davisville site in isolation then we are missing the boat.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TDSB believes in local community schools that are responding to the City's plan for densification. TDSB does not benefit from development charges. Without this type of development the Board has no capital for school replacement or renewal. As David Crombie said: "if these projects fail they will fail from a lack of imagination."</li> </ul>	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How are we viewed by the City? As developers?</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As public institutions.</li> </ul>	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would propose that the area surrounding the site be considered in terms of what will happen development-wise in the future. The school has the capability of being the change maker – so that Davisville becomes tamed.</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vision can be presented to the City to influence the safety along Davisville.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but we cannot become the City. Let's look at these options and see which option is preferred taking into account the context.</li> </ul>	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presented Option 1. Two point towers (20 storeys) with no development</li> </ul>	

Speaker Required	Content	Action
	proposed over the school and a reduced playing field.	
TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are shadow issues on the playing field with the two towers at the southwest corner.</li> </ul>	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the towers adhere to the tall buildings tower floor plate guidelines?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes.</li> </ul>	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presented Option 2. One point tower (16 storeys) with a residential bar over the school, articulated into two distinct buildings.</li> </ul>	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the school plan the same in each option?</li> </ul>	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the community space go through the building?</li> </ul>	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes.</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intent was to take the height off of Davisville by distributing the density over the school.</li> </ul>	
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How are the shadows at the entrance to the school?</li> </ul>	
NB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is only the school building that is casting the shadow out front and not the residential component.</li> </ul>	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presented Option 3. 16 storey tower with development over the school, development running north towards Millwood, and a smaller playing field.</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is potential for a school addition in this option on the eastern edge of the site.</li> </ul>	
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presented Option 4. Two slab towers (15 storeys) with no development over the school, development running north towards Millwood, and a reduced playing field.</li> </ul>	
NB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are shadow issues on the playing field.</li> <li>Floor plates in this scheme are approximately 1000 sq.m.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does Option 4 have more open space than the original 30 storey scheme?</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, the 30 storey scheme had a different school configuration that afforded more open space.</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In summary we have evaluated these schemes with the previously established design principles. We have yet to put weights against these principles.</li> <li>Comments and questions?</li> </ul>	
JL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can you explain why Option 3 scores so low on site?</li> </ul>	
MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a function of the reduction in open space.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Which of these options strikes the best balance between all the</li> </ul>	

Speaker Required	Content	Action
	requirements/established principles?	
DS TM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would be good to see the shadows studies of the wrapping scheme.</li> <li>There seems to be diminishing returns on the options which wrap as an L at the southwest corner of the site. Open space is lost in these options. Is the SW corner of the site a parcel worth holding on to in order to make the corner site at Yonge &amp; Davisville more attractive?</li> </ul>	
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't think the TDSB can speculate in the real estate market.</li> </ul>	
SP MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the presentation with the options be sent out to the group?</li> </ul>	CS&P
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes and we will add the shadow studies.</li> <li>Can any of the options be eliminated now?</li> <li>Keep Option 1 (unanimous)</li> <li>Keep Option 2 (unanimous)</li> </ul>	
DS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building over the school is more a perception concern and parents could embrace this with further education and understanding.</li> </ul>	
JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are interested in how the school could have a distinct identity when integrated with a residential development.</li> </ul>	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 3 (BH would like to see this option remain for consideration as it has potential with respect to approvability at the City)</li> <li>Keep Option 4 (unanimous)</li> </ul>	CS&P/TDSB
IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Next meeting will be held at Davisville PS Staff Room on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012 4:00 – 6:00pm</li> <li>Adjournment</li> </ul>	