

## South Milton & Milton SE #13 ps Boundary Review

Date: Wednesday, October 3, 2024 @7pm

Meeting Place: Elsie MacGill - Library

### BRSC Members:

Donna Danielli, Naveed Ahmed, Jennifer Fowler, Romer Abalos, Frederick Thibeault, Michelle D'Aguiar,

### BRC Members:

Danielle Masanto, Khaled Elnabolsy, K. Mark Tomecek, Tanmay Mathur, Mahish Agha, Pavan Kumar, Imran Haq, Himanshu Raina, Sachin Deshpande, Shikha Sareen, Nimrah Kiyani, Robyn Seeds, Areej Ghaza, Ginni Malik, Laura Mitchell, Anam Yousu, Erica Clarke

### Presentation

Superintendent Dean Barnes honors the land and territory

Welcome from the Trustees; Trustee Naveed Ahmed welcomes the BRC.

Trustee Donna Danielli sends her regrets.

### Part 1

- a) Housekeeping Items
  - i) Today's goals
    - (1) New Parent member
      - (a) Welcoming Tanmay Mathur
    - (2) FI program Size
    - (3) Secondary Plan Clarification
    - (4) Present new information
    - (5) Review Options 1 to 3, present options 4-5
    - (6) Breakout session for option review
    - (7) Debrief
      - (a) New scenarios
  - ii) Approval of meeting notes from the previous meeting.
    - (1) To be posted on the website.
  - iii) The timeline was presented to emphasize the current stage of the boundary review process.
  - iv) The minimum program size of the FI program is explained to the group.
    - (1) At least 40 students per grade (grades 2 & 3) and 35 students for older grades
    - (2) If the program is too small, the HDSB runs into resource issues for the program.
  - v) Secondary plan information
    - (1) The BRC was shown the South Milton Secondary Plans and provided an overview of how secondary plans were handled in the

past. Discussions included the opening of new schools and student movements.

- b) Mentimeter results
  - i) The results from the previous Menti are reviewed.
    - (1) Proximity to schools and student experience are the top
    - (2) Traffic and walking is brought up as a big concern for parents.

## Part 2

- a) Presentation of Options
  - i) Criteria for the options
    - (1) Geographic Area and Barriers
    - (2) Balance of Overall Enrolment
    - (3) Viability of Programs
    - (4) Stable Long-Term Boundaries
    - (5) Student Experience
    - (6) Proximity to Schools
    - (7) Other...
- b) Walking Maps
  - i) The maps show how far 1.6 km is from each of the schools involved.
- c) Option Review (& New Options)
  - i) Status Quo and Option 1-3 are quickly refreshed with the BRC.
  - ii) Option 4 (new) - taking any new development area and sending them to a school that has space.
    - (1) Anne J. Arthur PS**
      - (a) Removes areas east of Regional Road 25 (areas 5 & 6)
      - (b) English catchment expanded to include new development and existing development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave. (area 11 & 12)
    - (2) Boyne PS**
      - (a) Removes new development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave and east of CNR tracks. (area 11)
    - (3) Hawthorne Village PS**
      - (a) Expanded to include new development west of CNR tracks (Area 9)
      - (b) Expanded to include new development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave. (area 17, 19, 20, 21)
      - (c) Holds Milton SE #13 ps students for 2025 & 2026.
    - (4) Irma Coulson PS**
      - (a) FI boundary expanded to include Hawthorne Village expansion south of Louis St. Laurent Ave.
    - (5) Cedar Ridge PS (Milton SW #12 ps)**
      - (a) Catchment size reduced as a result of Milton SE #13 ps opening.
      - (b) FI to attend Milton SE #13. (phased in)
      - (c) Britannia Corridor included in projections (ENG)

**(6) P.L. Robertson PS**

- (a) FI program includes Rattlesnake Point PS.
- (b) Expanded to include Milton Education Village. (MEV)

**(7) Rattlesnake Point PS**

- (a) Removes new development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave. (Areas 9)

**(8) Tiger Jeet Singh PS**

- (a) Expanded to include students within walking distance west of the school. (areas 5 & 6).
- (b) Catchment expanded to include new development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave. (area 15)

**(9) Viola Desmond PS**

- (a) New development west of Ontario St directed to Tiger Jeet Singh PS (area 15)
- (b) New development and existing community west of Bronte St to be directed to Anne J MacArthur PS. (area 12)

**(10) Milton SE #13 ps**

- (a) Established a new boundary between Thompson Rd and James Snow Pkwy.
- (b) FI projections include Britannia Corridor.

iii) Option 5 (new)

**(1) Anne J. Arthur PS**

- (a) Removes areas east of Regional Road 25 (areas 4-6)
- (b) English catchment expanded to include new development and existing communities south of Louis St. Laurent Ave. (area 11 & 12)
- (c) FI catchment expands to include Rattlesnake Point PS. (grades 2-8)

**(2) Boyne PS**

- (a) Removes new development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave and east of CNR tracks. (area 11)
- (b) Adds new development east of Regional Rd 25 (area 6)

**(3) Hawthorne Village PS**

- (a) Expanded to include new development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave. (area 17)
- (b) Holding School for Milton SE #13 ps

**(4) Irma Coulson PS**

- (a) FI boundary expanded to include Milton SE #13 ps.

**(5) Cedar Ridge PS (Milton SW #12 ps)**

- (a) Catchment size reduced as a result of Milton SE #13 ps opening.
- (b) Adds new development west of Ontario St. (area 15)
- (c) FI to attend Tiger Jeet Singh PS. (phased in)

**(6) P.L. Robertson PS**

(a) Catchment expands to include new development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave.

(b) Expanded to include Milton Education Village. (MEV)

**(7) Rattlesnake Point PS**

(a) Removes new development south of Louis St. Laurent Ave. (Areas 9)

(b) Includes Milton Education Village

**(8) Tiger Jeet Singh PS**

(a) Expanded to include students east of Regional Rd 25. (areas 4 & 5).

(b) FI catchment expanded to include Cedar Ridge PS

**(9) Viola Desmond PS**

(a) New development west of Ontario St directed to Cedar Ridge PS (area 15)

(b) New development and existing community west of Bronte St to be directed to Anne J. MacArthur PS (area 12).

**(10) Milton SE #13p**

(a) Established a new boundary between Thompson Rd and James Snow Pkwy.

(b) ENG projections include Britannia Corridor.

**Part 3**

- a) Breakout session
  - i) \*See below for notes from the groups
- b) Menti will be sent out to the members for commenting on the options

**Part 4**

- c) What's next
  - i) The next meeting will be on October 8th - Virtually.
  - ii) We will reassess what was discussed in this meeting.
  - iii) The meeting ends 9:33 pm

# BREAKOUT SESSION NOTES

## GROUP 1

3 criteria (top ranked as per Mentimeter Survey)

- Geographic Area and Barriers
- Student Experience
- Proximity to Schools

## OPTION 1

- Looks pretty good - minimize # busses?
- VIO - under max capacity
- PLR, Rattlesnake, Milton 13 - very close to capacity by 2030
- Con - revisit the option to take action within 5 years
- Con - the schools that have portables will still have a lot of portables (PLR, VIO)
- VIO and PLR - still need more relief
- Con - portables increase for all schools, red for certain schools
- Closer to status quo (+ve) so not too many students moving

## OPTION 2

- 5 schools with alot of portables (lots of red)
- VIO 2029 action required
- A number of schools where action is required by 2030
- Rattlesnake and VIO require more action and relief

## OPTION 3

- Looks like the best option overall (seems to check a lot of the criteria)
- PLR 2031 action required
- AJM, TJS, Boyne - still have a lot of portables
- Can be worked with slightly adjust accommodation

## OPTION 4

- Still a lot of portables
- Increase the number of buses? Example is TJS and Zone 15
- Concerns regarding length of time on busses
- Split cohorts potential for grade 8 created?

- VIO - viable boundary in the long term
- More information regarding development timing of certain zones
- Not the favorite in the group

## OPTION 5

- VIO, PLR, Rattlesnake, Boyne - still have a lot of portables
- Better than #4

Options 3 and 5 right now are the best ones that we would like to consider further.

Some observations:

- AJM - quite a bit of room and looks good in both scenarios
- Boyne - can more pressure be alleviated in #3? Looks good in #5
- Cedar Ridge - looks good in #3 and #5
- Hawthorne - no portables in either scenario, potential to add to this school?
- Irma - share similar community, within each others walking communities
- PLR - still have issues with both scenarios

Option 3 - more schools looks more “comfortable” for longer time

## GROUP 2

3 criteria (top ranked as per Mentimeter Survey)

- Geographic Area and Barriers
- Student Experience
- Proximity to Schools

Identify how each school's total enrolment is in each option:

- AJM: Good in all options
- BOY: Option 3 is the worst
- CR: Option 5 is the best, 4th is worst
- HV: Good in all options
- IC: Good in all options.
- PLR: Good in all options
- RS: Option 3 is the best then Option 2 and 1
- TJS: Good in all options
- VD: Option 5 is best then 4 and 3
- M13: Option 4 is the best

These rankings are strictly numerical, not looking at boundaries or walking/bus.

Overall Option 3 was best then 4 and 5.

## OPTION 1

- Did not like some of the school utilization.

## OPTION 2

- Did not like some of the school utilization.

## OPTION 3

- Only Milton 13 had bad utilization and there is a new school coming when the numbers get too high for the school.
- Good for FI in all schools
  - Some schools have a little less FI but this can be balanced with variants in the option.
- Using lots of school busses.

## OPTION 4

- Does not work in the future
- Lack of walking options

## OPTION 5

- Was a good alternative to Option 3. But not great for every school.
- Issues could be solved with variants in the option.

# LARGE BREAKOUT SESSION

- Another option that could be considered is taking FI out of the south and sending FI to the north with phasing
  - Such as a 3a or a 5a

## Group 2

- Ranked each of the options and how each of the schools numbers fared into the.
- Ranking was based on capacity, not looking into the other factors (strictly numerical).
- Option 3 was ranked the best with option 4 and 5 following
  - From 2024 to 2030 was the focus as there is a school proposed after that time.
  - PLR there was an issue but it was in 2031.
  - Only Milton 13 had numbers however, there is a new school coming when there is action needed with the numbers
  - Good for FI in all schools
  - Some school have a little less FI but can be balanced
  - Con: High bussing
- Option 5 was second as it met some of the criteria.
- Option 4 was okay but had bad walkability
- Option 1 and 2 was weak on the capacity in the schools

## Group 1

- Question regarding Zone 18 - McCann farm, not yet sold, unknown status
- Scenarios 3 and 5 are the top options to consider in the group
- Student experience points that should be considered - number of portables, blacktop, play area, stability of enrolment, field and gymnasium time, washroom facilities
- Washrooms - the Board overbuilds to accommodate for enrolment and max portables
- In general, would like to see more details in numbers to help analysis
- Further tweaks on #3 and #5 would be great