



**Lower Stoney Creek Accommodation Review  
Working Group Meeting #1  
January 20, 2016 - 6:00 pm  
Education Centre, 20 Education Court, Hamilton, ON - Room EC-201C**

## Minutes

### Attendance

**Committee Members** - Kim Adam, Heather Archibald, Candice Babbey, Jeff Gillies (Chair), Ljuba Lush, Monique Moore, Marilyn Murray, Joelle Narancic, Irina Omari, Mubina Panju, Dave Quinn, Sarah Solter, Christine VanEgmond, Linda Wallace

**Committee Member Regrets** - Patrick Coulter, Denise Rainford

**HWDSB Resource Staff** - Lisa Barzetti, Robert Fex, Tara Gasparik, Jeff Gillies, Ian Hopkins, Ian Pellizzari, Jackie Penman, Brian Playfair, Pam Reinholdt, Sandie Rowell, Jenny Seto-Vanderlip, Ellen Warling

**Trustees** - Jeff Beattie

**Public** - 1 public attendee present – Hamilton Community News (1)

**Recording Secretary** - Kathy Forde

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Jeff Gillies welcomed everyone to the meeting and provided opening remarks. A roundtable of introductions followed.

Trustee Jeff Beattie offered greetings and expressed appreciation for participation and volunteer efforts. Committee members will lend community voice to the proposals that go forward. Ideas and dialogue will assist in planning for the future. Many of the schools under review are getting old. An opportunity exists to share ideas on what the next generation can experience. A thorough and insightful approach will be essential to make the most of this opportunity.

### 2. Housekeeping Items

Meeting norms were reviewed. Respect will be essential for a positive process. Work will evolve based on general consensus. Voting will occur only when needed through a show of hands or ballots (one vote per school). Members concurred. Correspondence will be shared with members for Information. Updates will be posted regularly on the HWDSB website at <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/reviews/>. The member contact list will be added to the binders for member information only. Members concurred.

### 3. Schedule and Timelines Discussion

Potential meeting dates, locations, school tours and Councillors' availability for attending meetings were discussed. Wednesdays will remain the preferred weekday for meetings. Councillor availability for Public Meeting #2 will be confirmed through Trustee Beattie (proposed meeting April 13 may change to April 12). All other dates remain. Collegiate Avenue will host the next working group meeting. A variety of locations for subsequent meetings will be determined through the principals. Tours will also be arranged. Members concurred.



#### 4. Overview of Accommodation Review Binders

Ian Hopkins provided an overview of binder contents. Details focused on background data, the school profile report, facility assessments, enrolment projection methodology, mapping and the feasibility study, which examines the realities and various scenarios. There are no predeterminations. The committee has the opportunity to develop options as desired. Initial options as starting points can be adjusted, refined or developed as best suited to the committee. In the end, the proposal that trustees select will ultimately depend on Ministry funding.

The Initial Report Recommendation Option includes current thinking as a starting point:

- Rebuild Collegiate Avenue, Eastdale and Memorial (SC) - Anticipated occupancy September 2019
- Close Green Acres, Mountain View and R.L. Hyslop - Anticipated June 2019
- New Construction - 500 pupil place school on Collegiate Site anticipated opening September 2019
- New Construction - 460 pupil place school on Eastdale Site anticipated opening September 2019
- New Construction - 550 pupil place school on Memorial (SC) Site anticipated opening September 2019

As part of the Initial report, an Alternative Option provides another possible scenario:

- Close R.L. Hyslop in June 2018
  - Students residing west of Lake Avenue directed to Green Acres (34% of students)
  - Students residing east of Lake Avenue and west of Gray Street directed to Collegiate Avenue (20% of students)
  - Students residing east of Gray Street directed to Eastdale (46% of students)

#### 5. Questions & Answers

*Q. Are utility costs available for older schools in comparison to new schools?*

A. There is no exact comparison available. Ian Hopkins will research the efficiencies.

*Q. Are renewal costs calculated to estimate long-term school maintenance costs?*

A. Maintenance, capital and renewal costs fluctuate depending on the extent of the work completed and life cycles. Renewal funds are limited, however different funding envelopes and grants are available with various rationale. Planning is important for both renewal and new build funding. The older the school the greater the need for repair.

*Q. Enrolment at Memorial seems low but senior homeowners in the area are selling to young families so you would expect enrolment to increase. Are these factors considered?*

A. Yes, it is a gradual trend. Enrolment numbers provide trends based on historical data. Some non-Catholic families are going to Catholic schools. Often families are interested in attending new schools.

*Q. Do out-of-catchment rules change in an accommodation review with an influx of students to new schools?*

A. Schools with low enrolment are open to out-of-catchment but caps do occur when enrolment is high.

*Q. Are the timeframes for construction/renovations and the transition of children considered?*

A. It is good to anticipate impacts on the function of children in their schools while construction or renovations are occurring. Transition awareness and planning would occur to ensure all factors are considered.



*Q. What is driving numbers for a “500” student school?*

A. It is a Board driven number referenced through a JK-8 model with a school size of 500-600 students. A school of this size maximizes the opportunity for ministry funding, provides two to three classes per grade and provides optimal programming. Research shows that fewer transitions are better for students.

*Q. Are there guidelines on square footage?*

A. A ministry template specifies square footage for different areas in the school. Typically, classrooms for grades 1-8 students measure 700-800 square feet.

*Q. Would all new schools be built at the same time?*

A. Yes, that is the idea but it depends on the options put forward, approval and funding.

*Q. During construction will our kids go to another school?*

A. The only site able to accommodate construction on existing property while running the school is Memorial (SC) due to property size and street proximity.

*Q. Can trustees choose part of Plan A and part of Plan B, or is it all or nothing?*

A. Ideally, one business case is put forward. The Ministry may pick a hybrid but from experience funding is received mostly with new builds. Where schools are intertwined the plan would need to stay intact. Staff are already raising awareness on the need for new schools in the community and lobbying for capital dollars noting existing schools are already past their 50 year life span. The committee needs to provide its best thinking to move forward on a proposal.

*Q. If we go through the process recommending three new schools and we get a negative response, where do we go from there?*

A. It’s important to be responsible in terms of cost effectiveness and to ensure the Ministry understands community needs. Outcomes are unknown at this stage. It may also take two or three submissions to the Ministry to get the funding needed. Good opportunities exist for multiple submissions including School Consolidation Capital Funding and Capital Priorities Submissions.

*Q. What is the frequency for submissions?*

A. Annually and also submitting six months apart. This process creates the vision. We can pursue funding in different ways if necessary. Greenville is an example of how plans progress.

*Q. What is the format for the public meeting?*

A. Members will provide input on the format, which will be further discussed. Presenting information and gathering feedback at the first public meeting will be essential.

## 6. Adjournment

The session adjourned at 8:40 p.m.