

Correspondence #1

December 2, 2013

To the ARC Committee,

As residents of Freelon we are in the catchment for Millgrove. My daughter is enjoying her second year of school at Millgrove. Looking at a map of West Flamborough and where each of the 5 schools are located it is plain to see Millgrove's location is the only one that can reasonably serve the communities along the eastern boundary. Closing Millgrove would alienate these communities and their families.

Among the recommendations from the ARC committee is to close Millgrove and send our children to either a renovated Spencer Valley school. Since the majority of Millgrove students are bused in we would now be looking at unreasonably long commutes for our children. Can you imagine your 4 year old sitting on the bus for almost an hour just to get to school? Add to that the new all-day every day kindergarten 6 hour schedule then the ride home. Excessive? Yes...and unhealthy for any small child. There is no doubt busing Millgrove children to Spencer Valley would have a negative impact on our children's well-being and education.

I can't help but wonder what impact closing Millgrove would have on our property values. New families may question moving here knowing that the area has no schools within a reasonable distance.

The families of Millgrove choose to live rurally. Part of that includes rural schools. I moved away from Toronto and its 600 plus student elementary schools so my daughter could benefit from the smaller family and community-friendly experience provided by Millgrove. We moved to Freelon because we wanted to live in a rural setting. More and more it seems the urban creep of Hamilton disrupts our lives. Our property taxes have doubled since amalgamation and we have little or no city services to show for it. Can't they at least LEAVE OUR SCHOOLS ALONE!

Our school delivers results! Millgrove's teachers work with the students has consistently produced some of the Board's highest EQAQ results in Math, Reading and Writing. Every grade 3 student from last year met or exceeded the provincial governments EQAQ assessment. As the Flamborough Review put it ..." an achievement unmatched by any other class in Hamilton... In most schools across the Hamilton-Wentworth District board, however, math results are trending in the opposite direction." Not at Millgrove though... our school works.

I have no doubt the families of the other schools feel similar. The provincial government's current education policy forbids schools to have excess space and penalizes school boards that don't close schools. The Provincial government, the Hamilton City council and the HWDSB support an urban Ontario and leave the rural communities unsupported. They strip away our lifestyle and heritage as if it is nothing. Shame on you!

Millgrove School is located in a historically significant building. Do we get to celebrate our 100th anniversary in 2014 or will we be forced to lock the doors as the urbanization of rural Ontario continues unabated.

Sincerely,

J. Parry
A Millgrove Mom

Correspondence #2

Rosalyn & Robert Vanderboom
933 Brock Rd, RR#4
Dundas, ON
L9H 5E4
December 1/13

To the Working committee of the ARC

Regarding Proposed Solutions for the West Flamborough ARC review

As parents of children at Millgrove Public school (MPS) and Spencer Valley School (SVS), we would like to relay our concerns re: the proposed solution of consolidating five schools into two sites, for the following reasons;

1. Based on the geographical size of our West Flamborough catchment area, it is impossible to maintain timely transportation to two school locations. In reducing the number of sites and closing Millgrove school, the transportation times for those at the northern borders of our catchment will increase, which will significantly alter the fatigue and learning ability of our youngest students, by increasing the length of their day.
2. Merits of Millgrove school – Millgrove school has the advantage of a seamless day, with private daycare available to families almost everyday of the year, without adding transportation to attend full year daycare. This is not available at any other school site in West Flamborough.
3. Recommendation to reduce to two sites is not necessarily feasible based on limited septic capacity at all five available sites. Will well water capacity tests be completed?
4. **Value of Millgrove Public school site to HWDSB/Future planning** – this site has the lowest capital expenditures (current and at 10 years) of the five sites. This school site has potential value to provide accommodation support for the unpredictable growth & school accommodation needs of Waterdown. We do not want to experience another waste of taxpayers' dollars, similar to the ongoing high cost of the expropriation process at the Scott Park High school site. Lack of potential future school sites in this area is a real concern, due to the restrictions of the Greenbelt Planning Act. Let's keep three sites and avoid this!

It remains our desire to have our children attend school locally, at Millgrove Public school for grades K-5, Spencer Valley for grades 6-8, followed by Waterdown High school (WDHS). With regards to highschool, it remains important to our family that our children have the opportunity to attend at WDHS, based on proximity and the opportunities available to us in the town of Waterdown,

Sincerely,

Rosalyn & Robert Vanderboom

Cc Karen Turkstra
Cc Robert Pasuta
Cc Judy Partridge

Correspondence #3

Hello,

Thank you for considering our letter in regards to the possibility of closing Millgrove School. We are writing this email to voice our concerns as parents of children attending Millgrove Public school. Millgrove is a wonderful school with fabulous teachers and our children are thriving in this environment. Also, part of what makes them thrive is the close knit community of friends who also attend Millgrove. A smaller environment for the children to learn will provide a more 'one on one' learning experience. They will have ample opportunity to move into a larger school and meet new people when they proceed to their middle school and even more so when they attend high school.

We do feel that closing Millgrove would be a huge mistake for the children. We need to keep their best learning interests at heart and keep the school open. In our opinion smaller schools help in the development of stronger, smarter, and more compassionate children. The children are not likely to slip 'through the cracks' in this type of learning environment where as in a larger school, the potential is far greater. There is less potential for bullying in smaller schools. Combining these schools would open up new problems where this is concerned. Closing Millgrove will deplete the sense of close 'community' our children are taught in this environment. In attending this school our children have met wonderful friends whose entire families come together and support each other both emotionally and physically when there is need. This sense of close community will be lost if our children are thrown into a larger school.

Millgrove is worth fighting for to keep open! We are 100% against the Millgrove school closure.

Regards,

Nicole and Robert Safko

18 Gavin Dr

Freelton

.....

From:"Partridge, Judi" <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>04/12/2013 12:13:36 PM

Thank you for taking the time to send me your comments regarding the Hamilton School Board review of Flamborough West Schools.

First, the decision on school closures is completely out of the city of Hamilton's control, the decision is solely made by the Hamilton School Board. It is my understanding that Millgrove School is being recommended to remain open and receive students from the Greenville School which is recommended for closure.

Karen, would you please confirm which is correct; is Millgrove slated to close or stay open?

As the Councillor for Millgrove School and many of it's students, I would definitely not be in support of a closure now or in future and will actively work to keep it open.

Thank you again,

With kind regards,

Correspondence #4

Karen Hannah

I was looking at the 3 options presented at the ARC meeting last night and the addition of the 4th option (close Greensville and Millgrove and build new on greensville site).

My preference would be either option 1 or 4 to build a new school on either the spencer valley site or greensville site. Spencer valley is already over 40 years old and will or will be running into renovation issues anyway. I think it is best to build new and start fresh with a "super" school that can service all the areas effectively and safely. The greensville site is a "safer" location not as close to the busy roads however the spencer valley site is bigger and can accommodate the need more parking etc that will come with a bigger school and traffic at drop off and pick up times. Being a Greensville parent the current traffic and parking with that school is a nightmare and can be dangerous with all the kids walking around.

Thanks.

Correspondence #5

> To the ARC Committee,

> I wanted to let my support be known for the proposal made by the Greensville parents to build a new k-8 school on the Greensville site. What a fantastic opportunity for the kids and unique opportunity for the board to have a new school that backs onto the (proposed) brand new park!

>

> Kind Regards,

> Becky Miller

Correspondence #6

Shannon Kyles
ontarioarchitecture.com
632 Harvest Road
Greensville
L9H 5K7

Dear Members of the [Millgrove Public School council and interested members of ARC](#),

This letter addresses the current proposals to demolish two historic buildings in the Greensville area; Greensville Public School and Millgrove Public School. I am writing both as a Greensville resident and as an architectural historian.

As a Greensville resident, a considerable percentage of my property tax bill goes to public schools. I don't have children. Why should I pay for the county's parents to educate their children? The reason is obvious. Educating the children in a community helps to enrich the whole community and provide adults capable of making informed decisions when they mature and become parents themselves. Everyone pays for the education of the county's children and the **WHOLE SOCIETY BENEFITS**.

The demolition of these two schools and the provision for ostensibly better schools is thus a matter of

importance to all members of the society and all taxpayers. I would like to set forth a few points that may be relevant to the discussion. I am aware that I am a late comer to this discussion and apologize for not being both better and earlier informed.

My understanding is that there are five schools. Popular sentiment has it that two buildings need to be torn down in order to have revenue shifted to the remaining three schools which will be enriched with more facilities and newer buildings. The children in the areas surrounding the original schools will then be bused to the new schools: the idea is that the new rooms, computers, gyms, and food courts will compensate for the inconvenience of the commute.

By tearing down Millgrove school and building another one in its place or, even worse, sending the children off to another school somewhere else, there is no benefit to the county that I live in. To tear down the historic portion of Greenville Public School is nothing short of vandalism. I would like to offer some points for the discussion.

Sustainability – land fills, green, etc.

The words sustainable and green have lost their meaning over the past few years as everyone from toothpaste manufacturers to taxi cabs tag these onto their marketing platforms. I have never been able to follow the argument that tearing down a perfectly good building, sending it to the landfills, and then re-constructing another in its place is somehow 'sustainable'.

Correspondence #7

Wade & Lori Elliott

20 Tews Lane

Dundas, ON

L9H 7N4

December 5, 2013

Attention: Karen Turkstra and ARC committee members

This letter is in follow-up to the current ARC process and recommendations for elementary school in West Flamborough. My daughter currently attends Greenville School and our second daughter will be entering JK in 2 years' time. I have previously submitted a letter outlining some concerns to Ms. Turkstra and thank you having your response. I have been following closely the process to date as well as had the opportunity to attend a couple of the meetings. Unfortunately I was not able to attend the meeting last night however have received feedback on the 3 proposals that were discussed at the meeting as well as I understand a fourth proposal put forth by a couple of parents from Greenville that suggested building a new K-8 school on the Greenville site and having Millgrove students come to that new school for grades 6-7-8. This fourth proposal is one that I strongly support and have made the suggestion at some of our school parent meetings previously. Realizing that none of us really want our local schools to close, and change is inevitable, the change that ultimately takes place should be both to the benefit of the students overall educational experience as well as being fiscally responsible with a long term vision. In my view, this likely should involve construction of a new school that will be modern and also functional for many years to come rather than attempting major renovations to existing schools that will be costly and likely need further improvements in the near future.

Having said that and recognizing the three proposals that were put forth at the meeting yesterday, each with their own merits I strongly encourage Ms. Turkstra, and the ARC committee members to also consider the idea put forth last night of constructing a new K-8 school on the current Greenville site. This would involve closing

Public Meeting #3 Correspondence

Spencer Valley and moving K-8 students in to the new proposed schools as well as maintaining Millgrove K-5 and having Millgrove students attend the new school for grades 6-8. I think the following points should be considered in support of this:

- The site of Greenville school currently is a slightly more centralized location than Spencer Valley
- Current Greenville site offers adjacent natural resources that both enhance and provide learning opportunities that simply are not found at other locations. Specifically the new Tews Park and Arboretum immediately adjacent to the schools as well as Webster's and Tews Falls both within walking distances and offer many enhanced learning opportunities that are easily accessible and also add to the overall appeal and natural wonder of the area.
- Currently the Greenville site is listed as 4.85 acres which is not an unreasonable size land to also provide adequate play structures and fields.
- Also, as a suggestion – the vacant land adjacent to the east of Greenville – could this be considered to be acquired and enhance further the size of the property. This land appears to be in and about 1 acre which would increase the size of the property to just under 6 acres
- Also, sidewalks and the parking lot and bus turnaround have just recently been refurbished and therefore a significant cost savings in terms of infrastructure would be realized by this work not needing to be done or much less extensive work.
- Specifically with a Spencer Valley locations, sidewalks as well as street lighting does not currently exist which I presume would add a fair bit to a cost projection.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my thoughts and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Wade Elliott

Correspondence #8

Good morning!

I am a parent at greensville school with three children currently attending. I was unable to attend last night's arc meeting but would like to offer my input.

I would love to see the possibility of having a new school built on the current greensville school site. It's a beautiful playground and with the new arboretum being built behind the school I think it would be wonderful. I hope that this possibility is considered.

Thank you.

Shannon Cobham

Correspondence #9

Mrs. Turkstra:

I am a parent of 2 children which currently attend Greenville public school. We live on Algonquin Avenue just south of highway # 5, west of Highway #6, which is part of the proposed boundary change. My son is currently in grade 3 and my daughter in grade 5. My daughter will be attending Spencer Valley in 2014. I have

11/10/2013

concerns that my son will be leaving his friends at Greenville to go to Millgrove for 2 years, then to Spencer Valley for 3 years and on to Dundas for High school, when the Millgrove kids will be going to High school in Waterdown. I don't think it is fair for him to have to leave his friends for 2 years only to return to them 2 years later. My son is very shy and does not do well with change, I feel that there will be too many transitions for him, and they are unnecessary. My daughter will be attending Spencer when my son goes in 2016 it seems silly that now you are going to have a Greenville/Spencer and Millgrove bus going down the same street. In fact all the children that live on this street are in the same situation they all will have older siblings at Spencer Valley. It can also pose a problem for bus times in regards to daycare as the kids will be on two different buses at different times. At present both my kids are on the same bus and would be for the until my daughter enters highschool. I feel that the boundary change is unnecessary and that my son is being used as a pawn to get the Millgrove student numbers up to justify your proposed closures of Greenville. I feel that the boundary change should not be altered as the staff proposal recommends . However if the proposed boundary is changed and Millgrove remains open as proposed and Greenville and Spencer combine, I would ask at this time my son be exempt (grandfathered) from any boundary change and be allowed to continue going to school with his Greenville classmates and his sister.

Thanks for your consideration in this matter. Dawn Tyios

.....

Dear Mrs. Turkstra:

In regards to the staff proposal of Greenville, Millgrove, Spencer Valley, Beverly and Seaton. There is no doubt in my mind from what everyone is saying the schools in the west, Beverly and Seaton definitely need a new school hands down. There is no question about it!

My children attend Greenville school at present, in 2014 the proposed date of closure my daughter will be attending Spencer and my son would be in grade four. (location undetermined due to boundary change)

I feel that what ever decision is made it should not be a band aid solution, and it should be done properly and not rushed. In saying that, if the board is only going to give our area 15 million dollars for example and its going to cost 15 million to build a new school for the west then that is all that should be done. The other schools should be left alone until the board has the proper funding to either renovate properly, or preferably build another new school properly.

I feel that leaving Millgrove open is only a band aid solution and that in time due to declining enrolment Millgrove too will be on the chopping block in the next few years, so what does that mean... more renovations, more kids relocating, more money and time wasted by the board.

I think the decision for Greenville, Spencer Valley and Millgrove should be stayed until the schools on the east side of highway # 6 are up for review. I know this is not how things work, but sometimes we have to look out side the box and if a better solution is possible with the schools on the other side of highway # 6 then lets look at that. I know if I were a Millgrove parent knowing my child would be attending High school in Waterdown I would want my children going to a Waterdown school sooner than later to start making friendships.

If the decision is not stayed then.....Joining Greenville and Spencer is the right thing to do, but again it has to be done properly, and in a realistic time frame. The question is ??? Will Millgrove join us immediately??? or in a couple years, and then will we have more needless renovations, will they go to Waterdown??

Let's think long and hard about this please, it shouldn't be about the all mighty dollar, this is our kids futures!!

When it is all said and done I think which ever site is chosen to combine the schools it should be a new school hands down! Lets face it all the schools are old and in need of more then a renovation! They all have bad air quality, drafts, septic and water issues. Guy Brown in Waterdown was close to the same age as Spencer Valley and they got a brand new school on the same property.

I like the idea of Spencer Valley moving to the Greenville site in a new school. Many families can continue walking to school. (Which is great for the environment) Lafarge is building a new park behind Greenville which could be utilized for education and even cross country practices or meets, the Bruce trail is right there, along with Webster's Falls .

Well, Thanks for listening
Dawn Tyios

Correspondence #10

Hi,

Unfortunately due to sickness I am not able to attend the ARC meeting this evening. I am a Millgrove parent from the N Flamborough area and would like to raise a couple of inquiries pertaining to this review:

I heard that portables are being considered at Spencer Valley to accommodate the merging of junior grades into this school - request that this be reconsidered and adding portables should not be a viable option (I don't feel my education taxes should be supporting my children's learning and development in portable environments! Also with a JK child with asthma I also would have concerns re portable environments and mould tolerance & her health)

Have we considered bus ride times for junior grades for North Flamborough parents and the Spencer Valley location?

As Balaclava school was a consideration for the middle/high school ARC review is this (and if not, why not?) a potential consideration for North Flamborough families Versus Spencer Valley which has a heavier Greenville/Dundas community presence & which does not have a bearing on North Flamborough families (i.e. we consider Carlisle, Waterdown to be part of our every day community)

What will it take to keep Millgrove open?

Thank you for your consideration,
Zara Thurgood

Correspondence #11

To the members of the ARC committee,

After attending last weeks public meeting I write to you again. My name is Kristin Weber and I have 3 children, 2 who currently attend Greensville and 1 who will begin in September 2015.

I initially expressed my interest in a new school building for K-8 students for Greensville, Spencer Valley, and Millgrove on the Spencer Valley Site. I chose this as a logical site because the board already owns the acreage. Now that I have learned and that the city owns over 10 acres around Greensville school, I don't see why we can't keep the school on the same property to take advantage of the already existing playground, safe neighbourhood sidewalks, and the soon to be built learning arboretum.

I know you are entering crunch time to be prepare one proposal for the trustee's but I feel strongly that a new school on the Greensville site is now a new viable option.

Thank you for reading and ALL the time you are committing to our kids!
Kristin Weber

Correspondence #12

Proposal for 3 sites within the ARC Boundary:

Summary of position on the ARC recommendations:

1. I support 3 sites within the ARC Boundary. Given the current information, my position is to keep Millgrove K-5 and strongly support a 3 site model that is supported by the other communities.
2. Above all, I refute strongly any option that involves closing Millgrove as Millgrove's population cannot be served effectively in a 2 site model.
3. Millgrove's location, transportation concerns, demographics and unique assets make closure of Millgrove Public school unacceptable without a reasonable alternative that addresses our major concerns. Options to combine Millgrove with other populations don't work.
4. There are three separate entities within the Flamborough ARC: Millgrove; Spencer Valley/ Greensville (related but separate to Millgrove as Millgrove is unique and cannot be served by a K-8 at either location); Beverly Central/ Dr. Seaton (separate issues and wishes to Millgrove so opportunities for them to figure out their best solution should be made).
5. Discussions trying to figure out how a K-8 would work at Millgrove (Option A presented below) are one way to try to solve transition and equalize enrollment issues, but they are completely irrelevant to me if it isn't realistic and doesn't align with other views from our or other populations. Nonetheless, possible solutions need to be brought forth before anyone can determine whether they are realistic or relevant.

Possible Option A for 3 site proposal:

1. Millgrove Public School becomes K-8 with renovation.
2. Spencer Valley or Greensville - K-8 school based on parent input / assessment of resources.
3. Dr. John Seaton site used for a new K-8 school based on parent input and Beverly Central closes.

Possible Option B for 3 site proposal (recognizing that Option A may not be feasible but Millgrove closure is unacceptable).

1. Millgrove remains K-5.
2. Spencer Valley or Greenville site - K-8 school based on parent input /assessment of resources.
3. Dr. John Seaton or Beverly site - K-8 school based on parent input / assessment of resources.

Detailed Explanation of 3 site proposal:

Option A) Millgrove K-8. Spencer Valley or Greenville K-8. Dr. Seaton K-8.

1) Millgrove becomes K-8 with boundary changes.

- Renovate (properly, not patchwork) and repurpose original 100 yr old building to innovative art centre (art and music rooms), science lab (doubles as grade 8 home room) and one classroom.
- Build new full size gym with change rooms and bathrooms.
- Extend parking lot across front of school and use church parking lot as community partner.
- Current facilities can accommodate 8 classrooms (grade 7 home room doubles as health room), library, computer/ media room).
- Consider possible boundary change to deal with enrollment concerns and provide more equality across the ARC region while respecting Millgrove's desire to maintain a smaller community-based school.
 - Possibly move western boundary to Westover Rd and 4th line and invite approx. 60 additional students (avg. 2/house) to join Millgrove catchment.
 - Possibly move southeastern boundary to include homes east of the Millgrove Side Rd. currently in the northeastern Greenville catchment and invite approx. 30 additional students (avg. 2/ house) to join Millgrove catchment.
 - Recognize community child care partner unique to Millgrove and allow out of catchment to Millgrove for additional enrollment opportunities if room exists.
 - Possible estimated Millgrove catchment enrollment ≥ 275 ($175 + 60 + 30 + \geq 10$)
 - Boundary changes – support from Beverly parents if significant and high quality renovations and additional programming?

2) Spencer Valley or Greenville becomes K-8 and close Greenville.

- Build new school (due to poor condition) on the Greenville site with preservation of remains of heritage building or build/ renovate at Spencer to reflect 21st century learning.
- Recognizing the unique asset of 8 acre site at Spencer and heritage building and possible associated city land assets at Greenville opens up discussion between two sites.
- Move the Spencer Valley boundary to include Greenville catchment with the exception below.
- Consider moving eastern boundary inward to Millgrove Side Rd and Sydenham Rd.
- Consider moving the western boundary westward to coincide with the new Millgrove western boundary at Westover Rd., south of the 4th line.

- Enrollment estimate would be 356 (177 SVS + 197 Greenville – 30 now in Millgrove catchment + approx. 12 from previous BC)
- Recognizing 1.5 proximity Greenville to Spencer Valley

3) Dr. John Seaton site used for K-8 and close Beverly Central.

- Build new school on the site to reflect 21 st century learning and combined needs of Beverly Central and Dr. Seaton catchment (or renovate if BC/Dr. S parents deem reasonable).
- Recognizing unique asset of 14 acres, public voice supporting new school, expected Cambridge urban sprawl to continue into Dr. Seaton catchment which may or may not outweigh transportation concerns
- Beverly Central closes due to smaller site, proximity to both Millgrove and Spencer Valley (if both K-8), and unique asset in acreage at Dr. Seaton site.

The above option recognizes many aspects unique to the Millgrove community and school, as well as considerations from other regions:

- Transportation concerns due to geographical layout of catchment and location of other options for schools.
- Accrued transportation costs of a 2 school model over a 10 year period may be extremely high and meet renovation costs that would be sustainable past that time.
- Existing 100 yr old building in fair condition with unique architectural and heritage value, as well as open large space giving it potential for a creative 21st century interior space IF renovated properly with sustainability and versatility in mind.
- Community partner providing seamless child care around and outside of school times (365 d/yr) which is important to the community.
- Desire for continued out of catchment, relating to the above community partner.
- High EQAO scores – protect high end teachers currently employed at Millgrove
- Repurposed building provides innovative new art centre and new gym provide facilities for extra-curricular activities and attraction for community use. Millgrove has opportunities to partner with Waterdown area community as well for sports/ music/ art needs; thus, we are not ‘competing’ with Spencer Valley/ Greenville for community partners.
- Spencer Valley or Greenville septic restrictions likely prohibitive of one eastern large school site

Option 2: Millgrove K-5. Spencer Valley/Greenville K-8. Dr. Seaton/ BC K-8.

Public Meeting #3 Correspondence

I recognize the current economic feasibility of continuing to allow Millgrove as a K-5 school to service our needs. Student transition issues remain, now that the middle school model is broken and Waterdown is the highschool option. However, the ARC process does not appear to be the most effective forum to deal with these challenges (separate issues for Millgrove) and a 2 site model creates additional problems instead of just solving a problem. A three site model including Millgrove is needed.

Above all, I refute any options with Millgrove closing and maintain value in continuing as a K-5 school:

1. Transportation to Spencer Valley for our junior children from the north part of our region would be too timely and costly, considering our population clusters.
2. Facility is in fair condition (leading condition for all the schools).
3. Facility is a green asset that holds rural heritage significance and large renovation potential that is not present at any other school.
4. High EQAO – protects high end teachers in the region.
5. Continues seamless day in and outside of school times (365 d/ yr) for community child care participants (not available at other schools, lack of official board partnership irrelevant).
6. Alternative suggestions are not suitable for our unique parent demographics due to size of proposed school, location and transportation concerns.
7. Millgrove’s out of catchment does not significantly impact any region as it is spread out. Opening up out of catchment again to Millgrove is a reasonable solution in light of our unique situation and will have the added benefit of continuing or steady enrollment.

.....

Difference between Greensville and Millgrove Public Schools from a rural heritage asset viewpoint:

There has been a suggestion that Greensville’s and Millgrove’s heritage buildings cannot be distinguished due to the fact they are both old. That suggestion is unfounded, based on a phone conversation¹ with Professor Shannon Kyles who is considered an Ontario rural heritage architecture expert².

Both schools include rural heritage properties built in the late 19th and early 20th century which hold tremendous community (local and provincial) value and should be preserved and valued as green assets.³ The Greensville property remains an asset to the HWDSB as a heritage property that may be attractive for private sale without demolition costs, specifically for restoration and preservation purposes. However, the original 100 yr old Millgrove building holds superior economic value to the HWDSB as a green asset for the HWDSB that allows for efficient continued use and versatility in future planning due to: the superior structural integrity^{4,5,6} and good condition⁷ (compared to Greensville’s unknown structural integrity⁸ and poor condition⁹); large open concept square footage that would reduce demolition costs and increase design flexibility for renovation (compared to Greensville’s one classroom with significant limitations and restoration/renovation costs); and layout with respect to the rest of the building which is clearly visible from the road to show preserved heritage and architectural features¹⁰ (compared to Greensville’s original building layout¹¹

being enveloped by more modern renovations and loss of heritage features requiring significant restoration costs). The differentiating feature between the heritage buildings is the Millgrove building green asset that allows for efficient continued use and versatility that melds respect for rural heritage and architecture and 21st century learning needs and efficiencies. The board needs 21st century thinking and decision making.

Additional considerations:

Another differentiating feature between heritage buildings within Millgrove and Greensville is the potential for financially feasible renovation for 21st century learning in line with the guiding principles of the working group. If a K-8 renovation was considered for Millgrove, then serious consideration should be made to convert this large space with innovative modern designs that take advantage of the significant architectural features that lend itself to creative class room designs and a potential art and music space that would attract community partners (brief initial consultation with Key Note studio manager elicited interest, especially when the idea of repurposing the inspiring building was mentioned). The school efficiencies and modernization strategy states that “living within our means while accelerating achievements will require creative thinking across the public.” Respecting the significant rural heritage of the outer shell of the building and the obvious asset in solid design and condition, and calling for innovative and creative use of the interior space by renovating to facilitate 21st century learning needs is a creative but feasible solution that should be considered seriously.

Professor Kyles is so invested to “help with the restoration and adaptive reuse of the Millgrove School for use as a school for the local inhabitants”, she has committed her time and resources to provide scaled measured architectural drawings of the building that can be used as the initial required step for any future renovations and are essential for record of buildings of rural heritage significance. Drawings of this scope are undervalued at \$10000¹ which will be made at no cost to Millgrove School or the HWDSB. Similarly, she will provide drawings for record of the 19th century building at Greensville which she maintains should be preserved.

Footnotes:

1. Phone conversation between Ev Post and Professor Shannon Kyles on Dec. 2nd, 2013.
2. Shannon Kyles is a heritage architecture expert, professor in the Department of Architecture at Mohawk College and the CBC correspondent for architecture on the Fresh Air program. Recently, she has received the national 2013 Award of Merit in Heritage Planning for her website OntarioArchitecture.com and the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee 2012 Education in Heritage award for her work at Mohawk College.
3. Letter from Shannon Kyles to Millgrove Public School Council and interested ARC members dated Dec. 3rd, 2013.

Public Meeting #3 Correspondence

4. Millgrove building is “guaranteed better structurally than anything built after the wars” (Shannon Kyle letter referenced in footnote 3)
5. “Millgrove’s Edwardian foundations will be sound and better made than anything that can be found or made in this age, making it a sustainable and green asset for use now and in the future.” (Shannon Kyle phone conversation referenced in footnote 1)
6. “As a Greenville resident, paying property taxes which are slated for maintenance of public schools, I submit that tearing down Millgrove public school will result in a far inferior building that will cost a great deal more than a restoration and adaptive reuse of the existing building” (Shannon Kyle letter referenced in footnote 3).
7. HWDSB current and 10 year projection FCI for Millgrove Public School are superior to all other schools in the ARC: 24.6% and 32.5%, respectively.
8. “In 1927, Greenville School was given a basement and the long-awaited furnace. The basement almost meant the end of the building. An excavation reached under the west wall, the wall came tumbling down and almost took the rest of the building with it. Thanks to the alertness of the workers, the remaining walls of the building were shored up and the wall was quickly rebuilt.” <http://schools.hwdsb.on.ca/greenville/about/history/first-century/>
9. HWDSB current and 10 year projection FCI for Greenville Public School are significantly inferior to all other schools in the ARC: 131.9% and 162.4%, respectively.
10. http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/elementaryarc/files/2013/10/I.5-Millgrove_SitePlan.pdf
11. http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/elementaryarc/files/2013/10/H.5-Greenville_SitePlan.pdf
12. Brian Cashion, School Director, Keynote Music Studio, 905 690 8010

Correspondence #13

Trustee Turkstra,

I am writing to you as a concerned Greensville School parent in regards to the HWDSB's preliminary proposal:
to close Greensville in June 2014 and consolidate Greensville and Spencer Valley into Spencer Valley
take the southeastern portion of Greensville's current JK-5 Boundary and assign it to Millgrove
Catchment
estimated modification to classroom into FDK rooms
estimated three new classrooms for primary junior students

I have a number of concerns with this proposal.

First the June 2014 closure time line is unrealistic. It is impossible to have the necessary classrooms ready for the first day of school. What happened to the original goal of 2016/2017 school year
If part of Greensville's catchment is given to Millgrove then all primary classes will be splits
this option is a bandaid fix, it doesn't align with the Ministry of Education's goal to have all Elementary Schools in Ontario JK-8 schools because Millgrove remains a JK-5 school
Although Greensville will cost the most to repair, we are at capacity when Spencer Valley and Millgrove are not.

I moved to Greensville because I liked that Greensville was JK-5 and Spencer Valley was 6,7,8. I like the small school climate, creates a unique community within the building.

West Flamborough pays taxes and we are going to get yet another renovated school

Waterdown has two new JK-8 schools and a new high school

I would like to propose that:

Greensville and Millgrove Schools both close

A **new school** is built on the Spencer Valley property and all three schools merge into a JK -8 school

A separate wing is built for the grade 6, 7 and 8's

Neither Greensville nor Millgrove close until the new school is completely ready to house all students on the first day of school in September.

If a brand new school is not possible then I would also like to suggest that Greensville does not close until all renovated classrooms are complete

Regards

Nancy Johnson

Greensville School parent