



**STAFF REPORT  
ACTION REQUIRED**

**Schools as Community Assets: Review and Prioritization  
of 23 Toronto District School Board Properties**

<b>Date:</b>	June 13, 2016
<b>To:</b>	Executive Committee
<b>From:</b>	Deputy City Manager & Chief Financial Officer Executive Director, Social Development, Finance and Administration
<b>Wards:</b>	All
<b>Reference Number:</b>	AFS#23149

**SUMMARY**

---

Toronto District School Board (TDSB) has identified up to twenty-three school properties for potential surplus declaration and disposition between 2016 and 2018/19. This report documents the City's assessment and prioritization of these properties as community assets. It is intended to help the City respond strategically, rather than reactively, when TDSB sites are circulated for sale.

To assess the school properties, City has developed a Community Asset Evaluation Framework which considers schools as sites for advancing equitable provision of child care, green space and community programming and for responding to future growth.

The City has clarified that it is not opposed to the redevelopment of schools in principle, but does want to see school properties that represent significant community assets retained for continued public access and community use. Moreover, the potential disposition of school sites needs to be carefully assessed against the future growth and natural life cycle changes of the various communities throughout the City. The opportunity to establish new schools is limited in terms of access to appropriate sites and the high cost of land. The City encourages school boards to consider retaining some school sites as Core Holdings to provide flexibility to address future growth.

Any discussion about the City's response to surplus school properties must be considered within the context of the City's severely constrained financial context, including \$29B in unfunded capital projects, as reported by the City Manager in May 2016.

This report underscores that the City of Toronto lacks the financial resources and the mandate to retain provincially-funded public infrastructure, such as schools, in the public domain. Reflecting that there is broader public interest in retaining some of these sites, this review also helps to identify the wider range of provincial, public sector and community sector parties that have a role to play in securing surplus school buildings and school lands for continued public use, where needed. The Province of Ontario has a responsibility to ensure that, where appropriate, publicly-owned infrastructure remains accessible for public purposes, and to address the school funding formula that is driving some school boards to sell off valuable community assets.

Given current and future capital and operating pressures, the City of Toronto's ability to purchase surplus school properties is severely constrained and limited to the highest-priority community assets at best. Out of the twenty-three TDSB properties reviewed, only one property was rated as a highest priority community asset: Thistletown Multi-Service Centre. This report recommends that the City negotiate to acquire Thistletown in order to protect community access to this site, which has been leased by the City for community services for nearly thirty years.

Conditions shaping this review and the TDSB list of properties for consideration continue to be dynamic. The results of this review reflect current conditions as of June 2016. A profile of City interests in each of the twenty-three TDSB properties is included as an Appendix.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

**The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer and the Executive Director, Social Development, Finance and Administration recommend that:**

1. City Council adopt the Community Asset Evaluation Framework, described in Appendix 1, and the findings of the June 2016 evaluation of school properties as community assets in Toronto, reported in Tables 1 and 2 of this report;
2. City Council approve the following directions for five school properties, should these properties be declared surplus and approved for disposition:
  - a. City Council authorize the Chief Corporate Officer to negotiate and submit an offer to the Toronto Lands Corporation for the acquisition of the property municipally known as 925 Albion Road (Thistletown Multi-Service Centre), funded from the remaining balance of the Land Acquisition Reserve Fund allocated to the School Lands Acquisition Framework and with additional

- contribution of funding from the Parkland Acquisition Reserve Funds, and on such other terms and condition as may be acceptable to the Chief Corporate Officer in consultation with the Executive Director, Social Development Finance and Administration, and General Manager Parks, Forestry and Recreation, and in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor;
- b. City Council encourage the Government of Ontario to pursue its expressed interests in acquisition of the property municipally known as 155 McNicoll Avenue (McNicoll Public School) and in acquisition of the property municipally known as 65 Hartsdale Drive (Silver Creek Public School) properties; both of which are sites for delivery of provincially-funded children's mental health and developmental services;
  - c. City Council strongly encourage the Toronto District School Board and the Community Hubs Secretariat of Ontario to explore with all interested parties the feasibility of ongoing public use of all or a portion of the property municipally known as 200 Poplar Road (Sir Robert Borden Business and Technical Institute);
  - d. City Council direct the General Manager of Children's Services to work with the Toronto District School Board to relocate child care spaces from 100 Allanhurst Drive (Buttonwood Hill PS) and ensure no net loss of spaces in the local community;
3. City Council adopt the following "Eight Principles for Redeveloping School Properties for Strong Communities" and request that school boards operating in Toronto, the Toronto Lands Corporation, the Ministry of Education, the Community Hubs Secretariat of Ontario and other relevant entities adopt these principles to preserve and maximize community benefit during the disposition of school properties:
- a. New development or additions to existing school facilities and lands must be consistent with the City's Official Plan and Council approved design guidelines.
  - b. School boards must ensure that they accommodate long-term growth projections prior to disposing of school sites and coordinate with the local municipality on population growth planning.
  - c. Schools boards should accommodate any child care program that would be impacted by the disposition of a school within other school facilities to ensure that there is no net loss of child care space in the local community.

- d. Redevelopment of school sites should accommodate community facility space that will be displaced as a result of the disposition of a school facility to ensure no net loss of community space in the local area.
  - e. Redevelopment of school sites should maximize both the onsite provision of public parkland and the provision of privately owned but publicly accessible open space.
  - f. The provision of a full range of housing, including affordable housing, should be secured as part of any site generally greater than 5 ha. Affordable housing will be encouraged on all sites that can support multi-unit redevelopment.
  - g. Built heritage resources will be evaluated prior to the disposition of a school site.
  - h. Where appropriate, provision of joint facilities, either with the school board, the City, a private developer, or any combination thereof, for community service purposes, is encouraged;
4. City Council direct the Executive Director, Social Development, Finance and Administration, in coordination with the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, the General Manager of Children's Services, the General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation, and the Director of Real Estate Services, to work on a regular basis with school boards in Toronto to assess the City's interests in school properties as community assets and to report to Council as required;
  5. City Council recommend that school boards operating in Toronto work with the City to assess the impact of new and planned transit and future growth when considering the disposition of school properties and to consider retaining some school sites as Core Holdings to provide flexibility to address future growth;
  6. City Council send a letter to the Minister of Education and the school boards operating in Toronto to acknowledge recently improved board-to-City communication related to surplus properties planning and to encourage the parties to strengthen board-to-board communication and disclosure on these matters;
  7. City Council direct the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer to report back to Council with options for replenishing the School Lands Acquisition Reserve Fund to \$15 million by the 2018 budget cycle, in order to serve as a funding strategy for future surplus school property acquisitions;
  8. City Council direct the Director of Real Estate Services in consultation with the General Manager Parks, Forestry, and Recreation, the General Manager, Children's

- Services and the Executive Director, Social Development Finance and Administration, to prepare a business case outlining capital and operational financial considerations and referencing the City of Toronto June 2016 Review of Toronto District School Board properties as community assets as part of any request to utilize the school lands acquisition reserve fund for future acquisitions;
9. City Council strongly encourage the Ministry of Education, the Community Hubs Secretariat and other relevant provincial ministries, to work with school boards to establish a publicly-accessible inventory of community agency tenants and community services provided in publicly-funded schools and an inventory of space available in schools for community use; and
  10. City Council forward this report to the Minister of Education, the Community Hubs Secretariat, and the four school boards operating in Toronto.

## **Financial Impact**

This report recommends that the City negotiate to purchase the 4.5 acre property known municipally as 925 Albion Road, funded from the remaining balance of the Land Acquisition Reserve Fund in the amount of \$5.4 million allocated to the School Lands Acquisition Framework and with additional contribution of funding from the Parkland Acquisition Reserve Funds, and on such other terms and condition as may be acceptable to the Chief Corporate Officer in consultation with the Executive Director, Social Development Finance and Administration, and General Manager Parks, Forestry and Recreation, and in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.

The Toronto Lands Corporation, the real estate arm of the Toronto District School Board, has publicly reported that TDSB properties have ranged in value between \$2 million/acre and \$7million/acre. An appraisal of the property has not yet been conducted. An adjustment to the Parks, Forestry and Recreation Capital Budget will be required once more precise costs for this acquisition have been determined.

Altogether the City has identified six properties representing priority community assets that could be considered for acquisition. The total investment to retain these properties in the public domain could range from \$48 million to \$168 million. This value dramatically exceeds the City's available resources for school lands acquisitions. Staff recommend that the City work with stakeholders to identify alternate primary investors for these properties.

The Deputy City Manager & Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information.

## **EQUITY IMPACT STATEMENT**

Twenty-three TDSB school properties were reviewed and prioritized as community assets for Torontonians. An equity lens was applied to assess the relative importance of the properties for advancing equitable access to child care, green space and recreation, community programming and for responding to future growth. Properties were prioritized if they were located in areas that have been designated by City Council as Neighbourhood Improvement Areas (NIAs), if they were located in neighbourhoods that have high rates of social marginalization based on the Ontario Marginalization Index, and/or if they were located in neighbourhoods or wards that are inequitably resourced in terms of (i) access to community spaces for meeting; (2) access to licensed child care spaces; or (iii) access to parkland.

## **DECISION HISTORY**

On March 31, 2016, City Council directed staff to conduct an assessment of municipal interests in TDSB sites identified for potential disposition between 2016 and 2019 and to report back to Executive Committee by June 2016. Council also urged the Province of Ontario to coordinate actively across ministries, school boards, and other public sector bodies to retain surplus TDSB properties that represent valuable public infrastructure, particularly properties where provincially-funded services, including mental health services, child and youth services, and community and social services are already being delivered. City Council also urged the Province of Ontario to apply appropriate financing tools to ensure that seller school boards are made whole through the disposition of school properties to public sector entities.

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2016.EX13.20>

On April 1, 2015, City Council adopted item 2015 EX4.4, Schools as Community Assets, which defined the City's four municipal interests in school properties: schools as sites for child care and early learning; green space; community programming; and responding to future growth.

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2015.EX4.4>

On February 10 and 11, 2015, City Council requested the Ministry of Education and TDSB to review the current method for assessing school utilization and to reserve consideration of selling school properties that may be of interest to the City. Council directed the City Manager to develop a plan to protect publicly accessible green space, open spaces, and sports facilities on TDSB properties and to identify opportunities for the City to engage with the Ministry of Education and School Boards in determining which schools are maintained for public purpose and those to be disposed of to fund capital improvements.

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2015.EX2.1>

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2015.MM3.12>

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2015.MM3.14>

In 2010, City Council approved the School Lands Acquisition Framework and the School Lands Acquisition Funding Strategy. Council authorized funding from the Land Acquisition Reserve Fund (LARF) in the amount of \$7 million, \$5 million and \$3 million in each of the years 2011, 2012 and 2013 respectively to help fund school land acquisitions that have been identified as a priority for the City. The School Lands Acquisition Framework specified that its dedicated funds in the LARF should be accessed only when a property has been assessed as meeting multiple corporate needs, as having multiple partnership opportunities, and when no other funding source is available for the acquisition. <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2010/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-29044.pdf>  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2010/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-32904.pdf>

In 2011, City Council approved \$5.8 million of the \$15 million School LARF to use to purchase a portion of the former Timothy Eaton Business and Technical Institute to create Bridletowne Neighbourhood Centre. In 2015, Council approved the use of an additional \$4.2M from the School LARF to be used to acquire lands from the surplus David and Mary Thomson Collegiate Institute for a new child care centre. The current amount remaining in the School LARF is \$5.4 million. <http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2011.EX9.16>  
<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2015.EX6.6>

## **ISSUE BACKGROUND**

### **Schools as Community Assets: 4 City Interests**

The City of Toronto has acknowledged the need for Toronto District School Board to rationalize its property portfolio, in light of an ageing building stock and a growing and changing population. The City has clarified that it is not opposed to the sale of school properties in principle, but has also noted that in many neighbourhoods, school buildings and school fields represent important community assets for Torontonians. Loss of these properties could harm community well-being and negatively impact equitable access to local services. The potential disposition of school sites must also be carefully assessed against the future growth and natural life cycle changes of the various communities throughout the City. The opportunity to establish new schools is limited in terms of access to appropriate sites and the high cost of land. In light of these considerations, City Council has defined a fourfold interest in schools as "community assets". Schools may be important sites for:

- Child care and early learning;
- Green space and recreation;
- Community programming; and
- Responding to future growth.

## **Toronto District School Board Property Dispositions Plan, 2016-2018/19**

In February 2016, in response to a Directive from the Minister of Education, Toronto District School Board submitted a ten year capital plan, including a plan for school closures and dispositions. In March 2016, the Board released a chronologically-ordered short-list of twenty-three properties scheduled for potential surplus declaration between 2016 and 2018/19, including non-operating sites and a few operating schools that are designated or may become designated for closure. At present these facilities and lands are being used variously for: provincially-funded children's mental health and developmental services; privately-funded education, City of Toronto-funded recreation services; licensed child care services and non-profit community services.

### **Properties for Circulation in Fall 2016**

Trustees will vote on surplus declaration for the first five properties at the June 22, 2016 Board of Trustees meeting. Should these properties be declared surplus they will be transferred to the Toronto Lands Corporation, the real estate arm of TDSB for disposition, following procedures outlined under Ontario Regulation 444/98 of the Education Act. Toronto Lands Corporation would initiate the disposition process for these properties in Fall 2016. The first step would be a 180-day circulation to public sector entities, including other public school boards, provincial ministries, and the City of Toronto. Public sector entities would be required to negotiate acquisition of the properties at fair market value. The five properties are:

- Thistletown Multi Service Centre (City Ward 1; 925 Albion Road)
- Buttonwood Hill Public School (City Ward 4; 100 Allanhurst Drive)
- Silver Creek Public School; (City Ward 4; 65 Hartsdale Drive)
- Sir Robert Borden Business and Technical Institute; (City Ward 43; 200 Poplar Road)
- McNicoll Public School (City Ward 24; 155 McNicoll Avenue);

On a property-by-property basis, TDSB has consulted stakeholders to prepare for potential disposition of these five properties. A request for early expressions of interest was circulated to public sector entities including the City. Separate facilitated meetings were organized for elected officials (Trustees, City Councillors and Members of Provincial Parliament), and for local residents and community stakeholders.

To date, City staff and City Councillors have participated in these consultation activities. However it is not in the City's strategic interest to continue to respond to the potential loss of twenty-three schools in twenty-four months on a property-by-property basis. Particularly in a context of limited financial resources, a more thoughtful approach is warranted that looks at the sites through a city-wide equity lens and prioritizes them as community assets. A comparative review and prioritization of the full slate of TDSB properties is needed to help support the City to respond effectively, rather than reactively, when TDSB sites are circulated for sale between 2016 and 2018/19.

It should also help to identify the wider range of provincial, public sector, and community-based investors that have a role to play in securing, where there is a public interest, surplus



school buildings and school lands for continued public use. The City of Toronto lacks the financial resources and the mandate to retain provincially-funded public infrastructure, such as schools in the public domain.

### **Financial Constraints**

Any discussion about the acquisition of surplus school properties must be considered within the context of the City's severely constrained financial context, including \$29 billion in unfunded capital projects, as reported by the City Manager in May 2016.

Toronto Lands Corporation, which is the real estate arm of TDSB, has estimated that the market value of the surplus school properties under review will range from \$2 million/acre to \$7 million/acre. Given an average lot size of 4.05 acres (median is 3.2 acres), fair market value of a single property may range between \$8 million and \$28 million. Combined, the total fair market value of the twenty-three TDSB properties could exceed \$640 million.

The real estate costs in Toronto, and the provincial requirement, under Ontario Regulation 444/98, for the City to pay fair market value on school properties, would put most of these properties, even the high-priority sites, out of the reach of the City of Toronto. The funding envelopes available to the City to invest in school properties are described below.

### **School Lands Acquisition Reserve Fund**

The City has one dedicated envelope of funds to purchase school properties – the School Lands Acquisition Reserve Fund, which Council established in 2010 by setting aside \$15 million from the Land Acquisitions Reserve Fund for acquisition of school properties representing multiple strategic interests for the City. This Fund is restricted for use only when alternate resourcing is not available to the City through other capital budgets and reserves. It was not designed for a situation when a large number of schools would be put up for circulation over a short period of time and when alternate funding resources for school properties may be exhausted. The School Lands Acquisition Reserve Fund has been drawn upon twice, to purchase a portion of the Timothy Eaton Business and Technical Institute site in 2011 and a portion of the David and Mary Thomson Collegiate Institute site in 2015. The approximately \$5.4 million remaining in this Fund will certainly be inadequate to respond to the number of properties of priority interest that are likely to be circulated by TDSB over the next few years. This report recommends that the City apply the remaining funds in the School LARF to finance in part Thistletown Multi Service Centre. The report also recommends that the Chief Financial Officer explore existing commitments against the Lands Acquisition Reserve Fund and report back to Council on the feasibility of replenishing the School Lands Acquisition Reserve Fund for any future school property acquisitions that Council may seek to approve.

### **Parkland Acquisition Reserve Funds**

The Parkland Acquisition Reserve Funds provide funding for the acquisition of property for new parks and to develop parks and recreation facilities as part of the Council-approved Parks, Forestry & Recreation Capital Budget. The Parkland Acquisition Reserve Funds may provide funding for a few key school sites where District or City-Wide priorities have been identified and there is sufficient funding in the applicable Reserve Fund. Given the

number and valuation of the surplus schools being considered for disposal by TDSB, the Parkland Acquisition Reserve Funds is inadequate as a funding source.

### **Children's Services Capital Budget**

The Children's Services Capital Budget supports growth in licensed child care capacity in under-served communities. City Council approved a Capital Strategy to guide capital investment in child care expansion when it considered the Children's Services Service Plan in 2015. The strategy recognizes that there is an overall need for space, particularly in areas of the city where there are not enough spaces to serve families. In addition to the Child Care Capital Reserve Fund, capital expansion is supported by development charges, Section 37 agreements, and modest debt funding. Children's Services actively pursues partnerships with other City Divisions and service partners to secure space and to reduce the cost of development. Funding available for capital is determined through the City budget process.

## **COMMENTS:**

### **Community Asset Evaluation Framework**

Working in coordination, Social Development, Finance and Administration, Children's Services, Parks, Forestry and Recreation, and City Planning have developed a Community Asset Evaluation Framework for reviewing the City's four interests in TDSB properties. (See Appendix 1 for a full discussion of the Community Asset Evaluation Framework and notable findings from the review of the sites).

The Community Asset Evaluation Framework advances the consideration of the value of schools from the broadest city-building perspective. It captures the multi-dimensional role of schools as community gathering and program spaces, child care space, green, open and active recreational play space, and facilities that serve to educate children over the life cycles of neighbourhoods and in the face of the City's dynamic growth and change. It is recommended as a model that other public sector stakeholders, including the Province of Ontario, could adopt to assess interests in public infrastructure such as schools.

The Community Asset Evaluation Framework builds on and operationalizes the principles expressed in the School Lands Acquisition Framework approved by Council in 2010. The 2010 Framework provided direction to prioritize school properties that advance multiple or cross-cutting City interests over properties that are relevant to the mandate of only a single or a few City divisions or service interests. It has been a generally useful guide over the years for considering a small number surplus school property circulations. To prepare Council to consider up to twenty-three different school property circulations within a twenty-four month time frame (an unprecedented challenge for any municipality or school board in Ontario), a more systematic and comprehensive approach has been taken that:

- Gives equal consideration to each of the City's four defined interests in schools;
- Prioritizes school properties that meet multiple City interests;
- Is evidence-based and utilizes divisional planning measures and data;
- Has been informed by consultations with the community-based non-profit sector and provides a foundation for developing a "community use of schools" measure as requested by City Council and the City-School Boards Advisory Committee;
- Is the result of a dramatically strengthened information-sharing relationship between the City and TDSB planning staff that has emerged over the last twelve months (see below).

## **Results Summary**

Results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 (attached).

- Altogether, the City has identified six out of twenty-three TDSB school properties as "priority community assets". The total investment to retain all six properties in the public domain could range from \$48 million to \$168 million, based on Toronto Lands Corporation ballpark estimates.
- Only one property, Thistletown Multi-Service Centre, is recommended as a City of Toronto acquisition priority. Thistletown stands out as the highest rated community asset for the City among all the properties reviewed. Thistletown was the only property to be rated as a strong interest by three out of four City divisions. This facility has been leased by the City for recreation programming for close to thirty years and is a core access point for child care services, green space and community programming in a Neighbourhood Improvement Area. Staff recommend taking immediate steps to negotiate to acquire Thistletown Multi-Service Centre to ensure continued access to this community asset. The lot size of this property is 4.5 acres. An appraisal of the property has not yet been conducted. Toronto Lands Corporation reports that TDSB properties have ranged in value from \$2 million/acre to \$7 million/acre.
- Five additional sites (DB Hood, Champlain, Whitfield, Vaughan Road Academy and Sir Sanford Fleming) have been identified as "priority community assets" through this analysis.
  - Three of these schools are located within Ward 15 (DB Hood, Vaughan Road Academy, and Sir Sanford Fleming) and will need to undergo a local comparative assessment. TDSB is requested to report on the anticipated impact of multiple school dispositions in a small area.
  - Two are located in Neighbourhood Improvement Areas (Thistletown and Whitfield)
  - Five have active or strong community capacity to plan for future community uses of the sites.
  - Two have been postponed/removed from the disposition process. TDSB has recently indicated that Sir Sanford Fleming has been removed from the disposition process. Vaughan Road Academy will be considered for closure through a Pupil Accommodation Review process.

- City Staff recommend the following steps in relation to these five properties, should they be declared surplus:
  - Request that TDSB further assess the impact of new transit/future growth prior to disposition (see below for further discussion);
  - Explore partnership opportunities to ensure community access to these sites, including active engagement of local agencies and the Province; and
  - Explore options for replenishment of the School Lands Acquisition Reserve Fund to invest toward these sites.
  
- In a number of cases, properties were identified as "lower priority community assets" and the City accepts that if no other public sector investor emerges, then future redevelopment should be undertaken thoughtfully and in alignment with principles described in Recommendation #3 in this report.
  
- Most (74% or 17 out of 23) of the properties that TDSB has scheduled for disposition over the next few years were not rated as priority community assets for the City, although there may be other significant public interests or individual City divisions that may have strong interests in the sites. For example,
  - Silver Creek and McNicoll have been identified by the Ministry of Children and Youth Services as important sites for the delivery of children's developmental services and programming;
  - Toronto Catholic District School Board may have interests in acquiring up to ten of the sites. This is a very positive news, as the ideal outcome for the City is for a public school to remain a public school, after disposition;
  - A significant number of the sites (43% or 10 out of 23) represent a strong City interest for green space and recreation. Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PF&R) provides registered Recreation programs at three surplus school locations (Thistletown, Vaughan Road and Nelson Boylen) that are being considered for disposal. PF&R staff are assessing the impact to the delivery of current Recreation programs, including whether the Recreation programming can be relocated to other locations;
  - At many sites, the school yard and the local City-owned park are adjacent to each other and function as an integrated green space. The property boundary may not be distinguishable. At Thistletown, Champlain, Whitfield and Bridgeport sites, there are PF&R-operated outdoor recreation facilities constructed on TDSB property. In these cases the potential disposal of a surplus school property may negatively impact the access to and functionality of local parks;
  - Most of the properties (82% or 19 out of 23) are located in neighbourhoods that have inequitably low access to community spaces for meeting. Five of the sites (22%) are located in Neighbourhood Improvement Areas (Thistletown, Whitfield, Nelson Boylen, McCowan, and Sir Robert Borden). This is a higher proportion of

NIA-located properties than was anticipated in 2015 when the City reviewed TDSB's preliminary plan for schools disposition. At that time only 13% of the sites planned for review were in NIAs. Loss of schools in areas with minimal access to community space is of significant concern. In many of these areas, schools have been one of the few types of facilities where community services can be provided locally to residents. Under the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy it will be a priority of the City to work with partners to preserve and grow community spaces in NIAs, including, where appropriate, in schools. Exacerbating inequities by further reducing service and space availability should be avoided. The City encourages the TDSB to ensure no net loss of community space through redevelopment of school properties;

- Altogether, the City has identified 7 school properties as strong interests for the delivery of local community programming: Sir Robert Borden, Thistletown, Nelson Boylen, Sir Sanford Fleming, Vaughan Road Academy and Whitfield.
  - This set includes all of the NIA-based school properties.
  - All of these sites have active local community planning tables or strong potential for local community planning.
  - Four of these sites are also rated as strong interests for green space.
  - Two of these sites are also strong child care interests.
  - None of these sites overlap with growth interests.

There are some natural tensions across the four city interests represented in the Community Asset Evaluation Framework, reflecting the breadth of city-building considerations addressed. For example, the growth lens calls attention to the importance of retaining school lands to accommodate new and changing population needs. The community programming lens focuses on the value of school facilities for underserved and vulnerable communities, including those in NIAs; however NIAs are often outside of the City's areas for high growth consideration.

- Most of the sites reviewed (87% or 20 out of 23) under review are located within the City's *Neighbourhoods* designation, which are stable areas where significant growth is not anticipated, and which will see little physical change. At the same time, a significant number of sites (65% or 15 out of 23) are located in close proximity to growth areas which either have approved plans, have studies underway or will be the subject of future studies which may lead to future population growth.
- Recent decisions on new rapid transit plans for the City should inform the TDSB's consideration around the disposition of school facilities. Several sites (7 out of 23 or 30%) are adjacent to or within close proximity to newly funded and/or planned transit: Thistletown, McCowan, Sir Robert Borden, DB Hood, Vaughan Road Academy, Buttonwood Hill and Silver Creek. The City and TDSB should work together to assess the impact of new transit and pressures on community infrastructure. TDSB should consider retaining some of their school sites as *Core Holdings* to provide them with the flexibility to address future growth and change.

- To date, the TDSB has shared detailed analyses related to utilization rates and future capacity to accommodate future growth for Thistleton, Silver Creek, McNicoll, Buttonwood, Sir Robert Borden, Nelson Boylen and Vaughan Road Academy. For these sites, TDSB has satisfied City staff that local schools can accommodate growth. TDSB will need to continue to have conversations with City staff to ensure a plan is in place to accommodate future growth for all other schools as identified in this report. City Planning staff will continue to engage the school boards as stakeholders in planning studies and future growth to inform current and future PAR processes.

## **Strengthened Information-Sharing with School Boards and the Province**

**New Ministry Guidelines:** In March 2015 the Ministry of Education released new guidelines on Pupil Accommodation Reviews (PARs) and Community Planning and Partnerships (previously known as the Facility Partnerships Guideline) and required school boards to revise their policies within the year. According to the Ministry, revisions were made to provide more clarity on community expectations of the public consultation process for the PARs, create a less contentious process and introduce more flexibility to address local circumstances. Importantly, the new guidelines on PARs require school boards to consult with municipal governments and other community partners on underutilized space before and during the review process. School boards are required to request technical information from the local municipality where a planned pupil accommodation review will occur. This technical information can include, but is not limited to, population and future development projections in the area. The school boards must document their engagement and information obtained from local municipal governments and must include any relevant information from the local municipalities and other community partners as part of the initial staff report. Under the new Community Partnerships and Planning guideline, at minimum, school boards must hold an annual public meeting with other public organizations and share planning information on: locations of unused space in schools; emerging capital projects; and potential Pupil Accommodation Reviews. In addition to the annual meeting, school boards are expected to continue communication with affected municipalities and other public organizations to explore options about underutilized space issues in schools within specific areas of their school board.

School boards' implementation of these guidelines have supported enhanced information-sharing relationships with City staff over the past year and represent an important positive change in the quality and frequency of communication and engagement. Strong information-sharing relationships between the City and the school boards will be essential for generating a multilateral "Made in Toronto" response to school funding pressures that are faced in Toronto and for achieving the shared interests in community schools, as envisioned by City Council and the new City-School Boards Advisory Committee. This new level of communication and cooperation has enabled the City staff to work more proactively to assess potential community impacts of school closures or property dispositions, to consult with community stakeholders, and to provide stronger advice to

City Council. For example, the development of this report would not have been possible without school board cooperation.

**Toronto District School Board:** City staff and TDSB staff initiated a series of information-sharing workshops during 2015 focused on approximately 60 TDSB schools and non-operating school sites that were identified in the Board's ten year capital plan. In 2016 information-sharing between the City and TDSB continued, with a focus on the smaller basket of twenty-three sites that have been scheduled for potential disposition over the next couple of years. TDSB requested that City staff provide technical input into their analysis of individual school facilities including recent and relevant area studies or surveys of local residents/users, planned area studies or surveys, and other relevant intelligence. TDSB staff provided information to City staff concerning the board's growth planning projections and accommodation plans for the communities affected by potential school closures, facilities conditions and program planning considerations for the sites, and have kept staff apprised of the TDSB public consultation processes. These valuable discussions have marked the first time City of Toronto staff had the opportunity to provide formal input into the TDSB's planning process in advance of the Board launching public consultations related to potential school closures or dispositions.

**Toronto Catholic District School Board:** Recently a similar information-sharing process has begun between the City and the planning and facilities staff from Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB), in response to the Ministry of Education's new guidelines for community partnerships and planning. Discussion has focused on the Board's long term facilities planning strategy. Under O. Reg. 444/98 of the Education Act, coterminous school boards have priority opportunity to purchase a surplus school property, before other public entities, including the City. To ensure that access to catholic education remains equitable across the City, TCDSB is exploring interests in a number of the TDSB properties that may be declared surplus over the next few years. The Toronto Catholic District School Board is seeking to right-size its property portfolio over the long term, which may include: (i) securing new sites in emerging new communities, (ii) building new or replacing facilities on existing sites, and (iii) 'trading up' small facilities/sites to larger facilities/sites.

TCDSB has indicated that it has funding to pursue interests in TDSB properties including: Nelson Boylen; Burnett; Buttonwood or Silver Creek; McCowan; Earls court; Gooderham; Brookbanks and Whitfield.

This is positive news for the City and for neighbourhoods that may be fearing the loss of a local school or school playfield. From the City's perspective, the ideal outcome of a school property disposition is for a school to remain a school, and to be acquired by another publicly-funded board. This underlines the need for an improved pre-Regulation 444/98 coordination process between the various Toronto school boards, the City and the Ministry of Education. The current process triggers a somewhat disjointed public discussion around disposition, raising concerns from the community and local agencies. Some of these concerns could be more easily addressed if the public was also made aware that another school board had funding and was interested in using the property as a school. This would

also assist the City in working with both school boards to ensure that the municipal interests are addressed. The recent changes to O.Reg 444/98 have captured the need to broaden the circulation notice to other public agencies and stakeholders.

**Province of Ontario:** On June 3, 2016 City staff met with the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Ministry of Children and Youth Services, and Community Hubs Secretariat to discuss the City's and the province's respective processes for identifying interests in TDSB surplus properties.

The Ministry of Children and Youth Services (MCYS) reported that it is working actively to define its interests in relation to two properties, Silver Creek and McNicoll. Both of these properties are occupied by licensed child care services and MCYS-funded service organizations that deliver significant children's mental health and developmental programming, including Autism programming and child care for children with developmental needs. Both sites serve children and families who travel from across the City to access services and both have been subject to significant capital investment in order to adapt indoor and outdoor facilities for the developmental services that are delivered.

The Province is working internally to develop a cross-government policy framework for identifying interests in surplus school properties and some active communication across ministries has been initiated. The Province acknowledged the City's leadership in preparing a systematic approach for evaluating school properties as community assets.

### **Principles for Redeveloping School Properties for Strong Communities**

The City of Toronto recognizes that schools are often an integral part of communities and neighbourhoods, and changes to these physical assets can have an effect on local neighbourhoods and city-wide service strategies. Where keeping surplus schools for community service purposes is not feasible, the alternate uses of the space should be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. With these priorities in mind, the interdivisional City staff team developed a set of eight principles for "Redeveloping School Properties for Strong Communities" (see Appendix 2 for further discussion), to be shared with the school boards operating in Toronto, the Toronto Lands Corporation, the Ministry of Education, the Community Hubs Secretariat of Ontario and other relevant entities.

The principles are consistent with the City's Official Plan for meeting the needs of today without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs, and with the City's equity and social policy agenda priorities, including TO Prosperity: Toronto Poverty Reduction Strategy, the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy, the City's Open Door Program to fast track affordable housing, and the Mayor's Task Force on Report on Toronto Community Housing. These principles are also consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement for building strong, liveable and healthy communities and planning for public service facilities and the recent provincial report, Community Hubs in Ontario: A Strategic Framework and Action Plan. The eight principles are summarized below:



1. New development or additions to existing school facilities and lands must be consistent with the City's Official Plan and Council approved design guidelines.
2. School boards must ensure that they accommodate long-term growth projections prior to disposing of school sites and coordinate with the local municipality on growth planning.
3. Schools boards should accommodate any child care program that would be impacted by the disposition of a school within other school facilities in their portfolio to ensure that there is no net loss of child care space in the local community.
4. Redevelopment of school sites should accommodate community facility space that will be displaced as a result of the disposition of a school facility to ensure no net loss of community space in the local area.
5. Redevelopment of school sites should maximize both the onsite provision of public parkland and the provision of privately owned but publicly accessible open space.
6. The provision of a full range of housing, including affordable housing, should be secured as part of any site generally greater than 5 ha. Affordable housing will be encouraged on all sites that can support multi-unit redevelopment.
7. Built heritage resources will be evaluated prior to the disposition of a school site.
8. Where appropriate, provision of joint facilities, either with the school board, the City, a private developer, or any combination thereof, for community service purposes, is encouraged.

## **Conclusion**

The City of Toronto and many of the other public sector entities operating within Toronto share significant capital infrastructure funding pressures as the city grows, changes, and ages. Responding effectively to these challenges will require thoughtful, intersectoral public policy-making that takes into account both the current and future needs of residents and looks for ways to cooperate across sectors and levels of government to maximize the value and use of public infrastructure for long-term public benefit.

With a focus on surplus TDSB schools, this report has provided a framework for defining and prioritizing the City's cross-cutting interests in public infrastructure, as well as principles to guide redevelopment of public lands in such a way that maximizes the public interest. The policy tools and advice presented to Council in this report have been strengthened through tangibly increased communication and cooperation between the City, school boards and the Province. Positive outcomes for Torontonians during the upcoming period of school dispositions and beyond will depend upon sustained communication among the parties and a shared willingness to plan the future of public infrastructure responsibly, constructively, and creatively.

**Table 1: 23 TDSB Properties Rated by Four City Interests, June 2016**

Child Care		Green Space and Recreation		Growth		Community Programming	
School	Score/25	School	Score/25	School	Score/25	School	Score/15
Thistleton	25	Thistleton	21	DB Hood	18	Sir Robert Borden	14
McNicoll	23	Vaughan Road	21	Champlain	15	Thistleton	13
Buttonwood Hill	21	DB Hood	19	C B Parsons	15	Nelson Boylen	13
Silver Creek	21	Nelson Boylen	19	Queen's Court	15	Sir Sanford Fleming	10
Whitfield	21	Sir Sanford Fleming	18	Sir Robert Borden	13	McCowan	12
Sir Robert Borden	18	Queen's Court	17	Sir Sanford Fleming	13	Vaughan Road	10
Champlain	18	Champlain	16	Bridgeport	13	Whitfield	10
Glen Rush	18	Bridgeport	15	Cartwright	10	C B Parsons	9
Vaughan Road	16	Sir Robert Borden	15	Burnett	10	Cartwright	9
Gooderham	16	Silver Creek	14	Greenwood	10	Gooderham	8
Nelson Boylen	15	Gooderham	14	Silver Creek	8	DB Hood	8
DB Hood	15	Whitfield	14	Buttonwood Hill	8	Bridgeport	7
C B Parsons	15	C B Parsons	13	Vaughan Road	8	McNicoll	7
Cartwright	15	Greenwood	12	Gooderham	8	Old Orchard	7
Sir Sanford Fleming	15	Brookbanks	11	Thistleton	8	Buttonwood Hill	7
Bridgeport	14	McCowan	11	Whitfield	5	Queen's Court	7
Earlscourt	12	Buttonwood Hill	10	Earlscourt	5	Champlain	6
Queen's Court	7	Cartwright	9	McCowan Road	5	Glen Rush	6
McCowan	5	Burnett	9	McNicoll	2	Earlscourt	6
Burnett	4	Earlscourt	9	Old Orchard	2	Greenwood	6
Brookbanks	3	Old Orchard	9	Brookbanks	2	Burnett	5
Old Orchard	2	Glen Rush	7	Glen Rush	0	Silver Creek	5
Greenwood	2	McNicoll	4	Nelson Boylen	0	Brookbanks	3

Strong Interest:  Moderate Interest:  Lower/No Interest:

**Table 2: 23 TDSB Properties Ranked as Community Assets, June 2016**

TDSB Property	Score (/90)	Strong City Interests	Moderate City Interests	Low/ No City Interests	Anticipated Circulation Date	Community Asset Evaluation Result	Opportunities
<b>Thistleton</b> 925 Albion Rd. Ward 1	67	3	1	0	Fall 2016	Highest Priority Community Asset	Negotiate to Acquire
<b>DB Hood</b> 2327 Dufferin St. Ward 15	60	2	2	0	2018/19	Priority Community Asset	Explore Partnership Opportunities. Request TDSB to further assess impact of new transit/future growth. Ward 15 considerations required.
<b>Champlain</b> 44 Champlain Blvd. Ward 10	55	2	2	0	Late 2016	Priority Community Asset	Explore Partnership Opportunities.
<b>Whitfield</b> 123 Whitfield Ave. Ward 7	50	2	2	0	2018/19	Priority Community Asset	Potential TCDSB Parkland Interest. Request TDSB to further assess impact of new transit/future growth.
<b>*Vaughan Road</b> 529 Vaughan Road Ward 15	55	2	2	0	*N/A	Priority Community Asset	*Pupil Accommodation Review Ward 15 considerations required.
<b>*Sir Sanford Fleming</b> 50 Ameer Ave. Ward 15	56	2	2	0	*N/A	Priority Community Asset	*Postponed for Disposition Process Ward 15 considerations required.
<b>Sir Robert Borden</b> 200 Poplar Rd. Ward 43	60	1	3	0	Fall 2016	(High) Potential Community Asset	Potential Provincial/NGO Interests.
<b>C B Parsons</b> 2999 Dufferin St. Ward 15	52	1	3	0	2017/8	(High) Potential Community Asset	Explore Partnership Opportunities. Request TDSB to further assess impact of new transit/future growth. Ward 15 considerations required.

<b>TDSB Property</b>	<b>Score (/90)</b>	<b>Strong City Interests</b>	<b>Moderate City Interests</b>	<b>Low/ No City Interests</b>	<b>Anticipated Circulation Date</b>	<b>Community Asset Evaluation Result</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>
<b>Queen's Court</b> 35 Ourland Ave. Ward 6	46	2	2	0	Late 2016	Potential Community Asset	Request TDSB to further assess impact of new transit/future growth.
<b>Bridgeport</b> 51 Bridgeport Dr. Ward 44	49	1	3	0	Late 2016	Potential Community Asset.	Request TDSB to further assess impact of new transit/future growth.
<b>Buttonwood Hill</b> 100 Allanhurst Dr. Ward 4	46	1	3	0	Fall 2016	Potential Community Asset.	TCDSB interest.
<b>Nelson Boylen</b> 155 Falstaff Ave. Ward 12	47	2	1	1	TBD (PAR)	Potential Community Asset.	TCDSB Interest.
<b>Silver Creek</b> 65 Hartsdale Dr. Ward 4	48	1	2	1	Fall 2016	Potential Community Asset.	Provincial Interest. TCDSB Interest.
<b>McCowan</b> 425 McCowan Rd. Ward 38	33	1	1	2	2017/18	Low Priority	TCDSB Interest. Request TDSB to further assess impact of new transit/future growth.
<b>McNicoll</b> 155 McNicoll Ave. Ward 24	36	1	1	2	Fall 2016	Low Priority	Provincial Interest. TCDSB Interest.
<b>Gooderham Learning Centre</b> 62 Gooderham Dr. Ward 37	46	0	4	0	Late 2016	Low Priority	TCDSB Interest. Request TDSB to further assess impact of new growth.
<b>Earlscourt</b> 21 Ascot Ave. Ward 17	32	0	4	0	2017/18	Low Priority	TCDSB Interest.

<b>TDSB Property</b>	<b>Score (/90)</b>	<b>Strong City Interests</b>	<b>Moderate City Interests</b>	<b>Low/ No City Interests</b>	<b>Anticipated Circulation Date</b>	<b>Community Asset Evaluation Result</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>
<b>Greenwood</b> 24 Mountjoy Ave. Ward 30	30	0	3	1	TBD (PAR)	Low Priority	Potential Conseil Scolaire Viamonde Interest. Request TDSB to further assess impact of new growth.
<b>Glen Rush</b> 77 Glen Rush Blvd. Ward 16	31	0	2	2	Late 2016	Low Priority	
<b>Burnett</b> 21 Eddifield Ave. Ward 23	28	0	2	2	2018/19	Low Priority	TCDSB Interest. Request TDSB to further assess impact of future growth.
<b>Old Orchard</b> 375 Dovercourt Rd. Ward 19	20	0	2	2	Late 2016	Low Priority	
<b>Brookbanks</b> 217 Brookbanks Dr. Ward 34	19	0	1	3	2018/19	Low Priority	Request TDSB to further assess impact of future growth.
<b>Cartwright</b> 99 Cartwright Ave. Ward 15	43	0	4	0	TBD (PAR)	Low Priority	

## CONTACT

Elaine Baxter-Trahair  
General Manager  
Children's Services  
416-392-8134  
[ebaxter@toronto.ca](mailto:ebaxter@toronto.ca)

Joe Casali  
Director  
Real Estate Services  
416-392-7202  
[jacasali@toronto.ca](mailto:jacasali@toronto.ca)

Josie La Vita  
Executive Director, Financial Planning  
416-397-4229  
[jlavita@toronto.ca](mailto:jlavita@toronto.ca)

Janie Romoff  
General Manager  
Parks, Forestry, and Recreation  
416-392-8182  
[jromoff@toronto.ca](mailto:jromoff@toronto.ca)

Jennifer Keesmaat  
Chief Planner & Executive Director  
City Planning  
416-392-8772  
[jkeesma@toronto.ca](mailto:jkeesma@toronto.ca)

Denise Andrea Campbell  
Director, Social Policy Analysis &  
Research  
416-392-8606  
[dcampbe6@toronto.ca](mailto:dcampbe6@toronto.ca)

## SIGNATURES

---

Chris Brillinger  
Executive Director  
Social Development, Finance &  
Administration

---

Roberto Rossini  
Deputy City Manager & Chief Financial  
Officer

## ATTACHMENTS

- Appendix 1: Community Asset Evaluation Framework
- Appendix 2: Principles for Redeveloping School Properties for Strong Communities
- Appendix 3: Map (23 TDSB Properties, by Circulation Date and Ward Boundaries)
- Appendix 4: 23 School Property Profiles
- Appendix 5: Correspondence: Ministry of Children and Youth Services

# Appendix 1

## Community Asset Evaluation Framework

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Working in coordination, Social Development, Finance and Administration, Children's Services, Parks, Forestry and Recreation, and City Planning have developed a Community Asset Evaluation Framework for reviewing the City of Toronto's four interests in the school properties.

The Community Asset Evaluation Framework advances the consideration of the value of schools from the broadest city-building perspective. It captures the multi-dimensional role of schools as community gathering and program spaces, child care space, green, open and active recreational play space, and facilities that serve to educate children over the lifecycles of neighbourhoods and in the face of the City's dynamic growth and change. It is recommended as a model that other public sector stakeholders, including the Province of Ontario, could adopt to assess interests in public infrastructure such as schools.

The Community Asset Evaluation Framework builds on and operationalizes the principles expressed in the School Lands Acquisition Framework that was approved by Council in 2010. The 2010 Framework provided direction to prioritize school properties that advance multiple or cross-cutting City interests over properties that are relevant to the mandate of only a single or a few City divisions or service interests. It has been a generally useful guide over the years for considering a small number surplus school property circulations. To prepare Council to consider up to twenty-three different school property circulations within a twenty-four month time frame (an unprecedented challenge for any municipality or school board in Ontario), a more systematic and comprehensive approach has been taken that:

- Gives equal consideration to each of the City's four defined interests in schools;
- Prioritizes school properties that meet multiple City interests;
- Is evidence-based and utilizes divisional planning measures and data;
- Has been informed by consultations with the community-based non-profit sector and provides a foundation for developing a "community use of schools" measure as requested by City Council and the City-School Boards Advisory Committee;
- Is the result of a strengthened City/school board information-sharing relationship.

There are some natural tensions across the four city interests represented in the Community Asset Evaluation Framework, reflecting the breadth of city-building considerations addressed. For example, the growth lens calls attention to the importance of retaining school lands to accommodate new and changing population needs. The community programming lens focuses on the value of school facilities for underserved and vulnerable communities, including those in NIAs; however NIAs are often outside of the City's areas for high growth consideration.

## 2. Objectives

The Community Asset Evaluation Framework has been applied to review TDSB properties that may be soon be declared for disposition in order to:

- Document the attributes of each school property across all four of the City's interests in schools as community assets;
- Identify "priority community assets" (defined as properties that advance multiple City interests). These properties should be retained for community use by the appropriate public sector investors, including but not limited to City of Toronto;
- Identify properties that represent a lower priority community asset value, in terms of City interests. If no other public sector investor emerges for these school sites, the City would recommend that the potential future redevelopment of these sites should be carried out thoughtfully and should address the community-building principles for school lands redevelopment described in Recommendation 3 of this report.
- Identify properties of potential strategic value to one or a few City interests. Appropriate investors, including but not limited to City of Toronto divisions, may be engaged to consider retaining these properties for public use.
- Identify properties that may experience future growth and change, including areas that may be impacted by recently proposed transit investment and ensure that sufficient school accommodation is provided prior to considering disposition of the site.

## 3. Method

**Step 1:** School properties were first assessed against each of the city's four interests, using twenty-five criteria listed in Table 1 below. Divisional planning data, demographic data and TDSB planning information were collected to inform the evaluations, which included quantitative scoring and qualitative commentary. Divisions assigned scoring thresholds to rate properties overall as strong, moderate, or low/non-interests. This purpose of this step was to document the community asset attributes of the properties, per Objective 1. The results of this review reflect current conditions and information as of June 2016. See sections below for criteria and comments from divisions; see Appendix 2 for individual school profiles, including qualitative comments.



**Table 1: Community Evaluation Framework: Assessment Criteria**

<p><b>Child Care Interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Child Care Onsite</li> <li>- Priority Ward for Capital Investment</li> <li>- Child Care in Vicinity</li> <li>- Approved Child Care Capital Project(s) in Vicinity</li> </ul>	<p><b>Green Space and Recreation Interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adjacent to a Park</li> <li>- Existing City Recreation Programming or License</li> <li>- Potential for New/Enhanced Recreation Services Onsite</li> <li>- Feasibility Fit for New Recreation Facility</li> <li>- Local Tree Canopy Coverage</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community Programming Interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Designated Neighbourhood Improvement Area</li> <li>- Neighbourhood Social Marginalization</li> <li>- Neighbourhood Access to Community Spaces for Gathering</li> <li>- Impact of Loss of Current Community Use</li> <li>- Local Capacity to Plan Future Community Use</li> </ul>	<p><b>Growth Interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Growth Area</li> <li>- Land Use Designation</li> <li>- Future Residential Growth Identified</li> <li>- Planning Studies Completed/In Progress</li> <li>- Activity Development within walking distance</li> <li>- Existing Transit or Funded new Transit/Hub</li> <li>- Planned Transit Expansion             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identified Need for Community Services and Facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Identified Need for New Schools to Serve Projected Population</li> </ul>

**Step 2:** The second step was to combine four divisional assessments in order to designate the properties as either Priority, Potential, or Low Priority Community Assets. In alignment with the principles of the School Lands Acquisition Framework, this process prioritized schools that can best advance multiple City interests. Thresholds for prioritizing the properties are shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Community Asset Evaluation Framework: Priority Thresholds**

<p><b>Priority Asset</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 2 "Strong" City Interests; <i>and</i></li> <li>- No "Low/No Interests" ; <i>and</i></li> <li>- A Combined Score of 50 Points out of 90.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Potential Asset</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rated Below "Priority" and Above "Lower Priority"</li> </ul>
<p><b>Lower Priority Asset</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 2 "Low/No" City Interests; <i>or</i></li> <li>- No "Strong" City Interest</li> </ul>

## 4. Divisional Scoring Criteria and Comments

To conduct this review, City divisions prepared qualitative comments and quantitative scores to rate each school property as a strong, moderate, or low/non interest site for child care, green space and recreation, community programming, and responding to future growth, respectively. Details on divisions' scoring criteria are provided below.

### 4.1 Child Care and Early Learning Interest (Children's Services)

Children's Services' Capital Strategy acknowledges that there is not enough licensed child care capacity in the city to meet the needs of families. City wards are prioritized for capital investment if they do not have enough licensed child care spaces to support families with a fee subsidy. School sites with child care have a further impact on a ward's priority as they represent a loss of child care capacity in a community if they close. Additional criteria include whether or not the child care has an agreement for fee subsidy with the City of Toronto; the site's proximity to other child care centres; and any new child care capital projects that are approved in the ward and their proximity to the site.

Children's Services will work with the TDSB to relocate child care centres in disposed schools to other school sites in the community where possible. This process may result in the priority of some school sites changing as child care centres are accommodated off-site and existing service levels maintained.

<b>Child Care Interest Criteria</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<b>Child Care Onsite</b>	Provides child care capacity to the local community and contributes to overall capacity in the ward
<b>Fee Subsidy Contract: the onsite child care provider has a service contract for fee subsidy with the City of Toronto</b>	Child care fee subsidy provides access to families who could otherwise not afford care for their children and is allocated to a family's ward of residence
<b>Ward Priority for Capital Investment, as defined by Children's Services Capital Strategy (updated March 2016)</b>	Wards are considered a high priority for capital investment if they do not have enough child care spaces to meet the number of fee subsidies allocated to the ward
<b>Child Care in the Vicinity: is one or more child care centres located in close proximity to the site that offer infant and/or toddler care</b>	Child care is provided in the vicinity of the site. This gives an indication of whether there is any child care capacity available in the local community.
<b>New child care capital project located in or planned for the vicinity</b>	Adds child care capacity in the vicinity of the site, which makes the site less desirable for child care expansion

## 4.2. Green Space and Recreation (Parks, Forestry and Recreation)

The City of Toronto has an interest in ensuring that select school properties are retained for public use. School buildings and school yards are important community assets that complement the parks and recreation facilities managed by the Parks, Forestry & Recreation Division. The loss of school building and greenspace may reduce community access green space and community facilities, and increase service pressure on nearby Parks, Forestry & Recreation-operated recreation facilities and parks.

School sites were evaluated based on the following six criteria for a total score out of 35 points and then adjusted for a Final Score out of 25 Points:

Green Space and recreation Criteria	Discussion
<b>Local Park Provision</b>	Parkland provision is quantified using Local Parkland Assessment Cells (LPACs) which is a calculation of hectares of local parkland per 1,000 residents. There are five LPAC quintiles representing the Highest, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Highest, Middle, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Lowest, and Lowest Parkland Provision levels. The Local Parkland Provision quintile score was given twice the weight if the location was within an area anticipated to experience growth.
<b>Is the site adjacent to a Park?</b>	Identified if the school is adjacent to or part of an existing park. Parks that are co-located with school properties may be impacted by the loss of the connected green space. Schools adjacent to parks were given 5 points. School sites that were across the street from a park were given 3 points as there are potential co-location benefits.
<b>Existing PFR Recreation Programming or Licence</b>	Did PF&R provide Recreation programming or maintain/manage a facility/amenity at this location in 2015? 5 points were given if PF&R operated the whole facility. 4 points were given if PF&R operated recreation program within a TDSB school. 3 points were given if PF&R operated an outdoor asset on TDSB land.
<b>Potential for New or Enhanced Recreation Services</b>	Assessed the existing recreation services level within the neighbourhood and the need / opportunities to expand or enhance location recreation service delivery.
<b>Feasibility Fit for New Recreation Facility</b>	Is the property the appropriate size and shape to accommodate a major or minor recreation facility? 5 points were given if the site could accommodate a major indoor or outdoor recreation facility. 3 points if the site could accommodate a minor outdoor recreation facility. 1 point if the site will expand and enhance the park space.
<b>Forestry Tree Canopy Coverage</b>	Indicates the existing Tree Canopy Coverage in the ward based on the Every Tree Count study. Tree Canopy Coverage is measured in five quintiles representing the Highest, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Highest, Middle, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Lowest, and Lowest Tree Canopy Coverage. Tree Canopy Coverage is strongly related to health indicators such as Heat Vulnerability.

## **Notable Findings:**

- Out of the twenty-three sites reviewed, ten surplus scored over the 15 Point threshold meaning, a high priority interest for green space and recreation. Parks, Forestry & Recreation provides registered Recreation programs at three of surplus school locations (Thistletown, Vaughan Road and Nelson Boylen) that are being considered for disposal. Parks, Forestry & Recreation staff are assessing the impact to the delivery of current Recreation programs, including whether the Recreation programming can be relocated to other locations.
- In many neighbourhoods, the local school and park were co-located adjacent together so that the school yard and park could function as an integrated green space. The property boundary separating the park and the school grounds may not be distinguishable. At Thistletown, Champlain, Whitfield and Bridgeport sites, there are PFR-operated outdoor recreation facilities constructed on TDSB property. The potential disposal of a surplus school property may negatively impact the access to and functionality of local parks.

### **4.3. Community Programming (Social Development, Finance & Administration)**

To prepare this section of the framework and analysis, City staff consulted with external agencies from the community-based sector and Toronto Neighbourhoods Funders Network who bring a Toronto-wide equity lens to community and neighbourhood services planning and funding. Agencies provided advice on criteria to use assess schools as sites for community programming and validated the results of the analysis that was conducted. The following organizations participated in the consultation:

- United Way Toronto
- Boys and Girls of Greater Toronto
- Hispanic Development Council
- Metcalf Foundation

The City depends on the community-based sector to achieve its service and strategic goals. Consequently, the City has a significant interest in ensuring that community service organizations have access to appropriate, affordable, and accessible space that is proximate and convenient for residents. School buildings and school lands can represent affordable, neighbourhood-centered access points for non-profit and volunteer-based community services and programming.

The City's interest in school properties as sites for community programming is to advance equitable access to community services and programs that promote strong, safe neighbourhoods and social inclusion for newcomers, youth, seniors and equity-seeking groups. Socially and economically deprived communities have highest level of need for locally-tailored services in local facilities which can serve as a first point of contact to connect residents to other supports and opportunities.

Community programming in schools can range from a one-time event to a fully operating community hub. The level of community programming available through a school facility will depend on a range of factors including the geographical location, amenities and accessibility features of the facility, how much space is available at the school and when, complementarity of the services with other uses of the school, and the level of need for services. Neighbourhoods that are better-resourced in terms of community spaces and services and neighbourhoods where residents have higher levels of social, economic and geographical mobility are likely to be less reliant on the local school for services.

School sites were evaluated based on the following five criteria, which include a mix of social demographic indicators and community intelligence information gathered by the City's Community Resources Unit in the Social Development, Finance and Administration Division. The social demographic indicators used here were generated by the Centre for Research on Inner City Health at St. Michael's Hospital as part of the Urban HEART@Toronto project and were previously used to guide selection of Neighbourhood Improvement Areas under Council's Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy 2020. The Urban Health Equity Assessment and Response Tool (Urban HEART) is an evidence-based standard for measuring the well-being of Toronto's neighbourhoods. An accessible database of community-based tenants in TDSB schools is not available. This report urges the Ministry of Education, with the Community Hubs Secretariat, to work with school boards to establish a public inventory of community agency tenants and services provided in publicly-funded schools.

For more information on the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy visit:  
[www.torontohealthprofiles.ca/urbanheartatortonto/UrbanHeart\\_ExecutiveReport.pdf](http://www.torontohealthprofiles.ca/urbanheartatortonto/UrbanHeart_ExecutiveReport.pdf)

For more information about Urban HEART@Toronto visit:  
[www.stmichaelshospital.com/crich/projects/urbanheart](http://www.stmichaelshospital.com/crich/projects/urbanheart)

<b>Community Programming Criteria</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<b>Is the Neighbourhood Designated for Community Development Investments?</b>	<p>Under the Toronto Strong Neighbourhood Strategy 2020, thirty-one Neighbourhood Improvement Areas and eight Emerging Neighbourhoods were identified for investment in new community infrastructure, services and supports for local community partnerships and networks.</p> <p>School sites were scored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Located in NIA: 3 points</li> <li>- Located in Emerging Neighbourhood: 2 points</li> <li>- Not located in NIA: 1 point</li> </ul>
<b>Neighbourhood Social Marginalization Rate</b>  <b>Source: Urban HEART@Toronto</b>	<p>“Marginalization” is the process through which individuals and groups are prevented from fully participating in society: finding appropriate employment, continuing with education, accessing health/social services and having good health. Data from the Ontario Marginalization Index was used to measure</p>

Community Programming Criteria	Discussion
	<p>marginalization against Toronto target levels and benchmarks.</p> <p>School sites were scored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Below equity benchmark: 3 points</li> <li>- Above benchmark &amp; below target: 2 points</li> <li>- At/above equity target: 1 point</li> </ul>
<p><b>Neighbourhood Access to Community Spaces for Meeting</b></p> <p><b>Source: Urban HEART@Toronto</b></p>	<p>Given the high price of real estate in Toronto and a growing and diverse population, access to affordable community spaces is lacking in the City to meet the needs of all residents. A standard measure of affordable community space required per Ward has not been established for Toronto. For Urban HEART@Toronto, a proxy measure for access to community space was developed that includes the quantity of libraries, recreation and community facilities and places of worship within walking distance.</p> <p>School sites were scored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Below equity benchmark: 3 points</li> <li>-Above benchmark &amp; below target: 2 points</li> <li>-At/above equity target: 1 point</li> </ul>
<p><b>What is the Anticipated Impact of Losing the Current Community Use of the Site?</b></p> <p><b>Source: Community Resources Unit Assessments</b></p>	<p>The impact of losing a school as a site for current programming will depend on a range of factors including the relative importance of the current services (if any), opportunities for relocation, and the vulnerability or resilience of the community in the face of change.</p> <p>Based on staff knowledge and experience with the local communities, school sites were scored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant Loss for Community = 3 points</li> <li>- Moderate Loss for Community = 2 points</li> <li>- Minimal Loss for Community= 1 point</li> </ul>
<p><b>What is the Local Capacity to Plan Future Community Use of Site?</b></p> <p><b>Source: Community Resources Unit Assessments</b></p>	<p>Community engagement and community leadership are core principles in all of the City's social development strategies. A critical factor in assessing the value of a school as a community asset is the surrounding community's capacity to plan and prepare for longer-term use of the site. Residents, elected officials, community-based agencies, local businesses and other stakeholders are all relevant partners in this work.</p> <p>School sites were scored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Community partners are actively engaged in planning: 3 points</li> <li>-Strong potential for community planning: 2 points</li> <li>-Limited potential for community planning: 1 point</li> </ul>

## **Notable Findings:**

- Most of the properties (82% or 19 out of 23) are located in neighbourhoods that have inequitably low access to community spaces for meeting. Five of the sites (22%) are located in Neighbourhood Improvement Areas (Thistletown, Whitfield, Nelson Boylen, McCowan, and Sir Robert Borden). This is a higher proportion of NIA-located properties than was anticipated in 2015 when the City reviewed TDSB's preliminary plan for schools disposition. At that time only 13% of the sites planned for review were in NIAs. Loss of schools in areas with minimal access to community space is of significant concern. In many of these areas, schools have been one of the few types of facilities where community services can be provided locally to residents. Under the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy it will be a priority of the City to work with partners to preserve and grow community spaces in NIAs, including, where appropriate, in schools. Exacerbating inequities by further reducing service and space availability should be avoided. The City encourages the TDSB to ensure no net loss of community space through redevelopment of school properties.
- Out of 23 sites, 9 or 39% are located in communities where there is active or strong potential for local communities to plan a future use of the site. Local capacity to lead a visioning and planning process for community use of a school is a critical precondition for community programming onsite
- Altogether, the City has identified 7 school properties as strong interests for the delivery of local community programming: Sir Robert Borden, Thistletown, Nelson Boylen, Sir Sanford Fleming, Vaughan Road Academy and Whitfield.
  - This set includes all of the NIA-based school properties.
  - All of these sites have active local community planning tables or strong potential for local community planning.
  - Four of these sites are also rated as strong interests for green space.
  - Two of these sites are also strong child care interests.
  - None of these sites overlap with growth interests.

## **4.4. Responding to Future Growth (City Planning)**

Growth trends in a mature and diverse urban area like Toronto are very complex. There are two basic types of growth and change that the School Board needs to consider. First, the City has had significant growth in the Downtown and its Centres as well as along the Sheppard Corridor. That growth attracts different households in each of these areas. For example, Yonge and Eglinton and the Sheppard Corridor attract a significant number of families with children. As a result, both of these areas will be seeing new school investment in the next few years. The City is working to meet the needs of growing families and of all age groups to make living in growing vertical communities attractive in the long term.

Second, the City's "stable" low rise *Neighbourhoods* and *Apartment Neighbourhoods* have repeating demographic patterns that, over time, see the decline and rise of households with school age children. These *Neighbourhoods* and *Apartment Neighbourhoods* make up 48% of the overall area of Toronto. A good example of neighbourhood life cycle changes is the Davisville area, which faced significant decreasing enrolment and is now an area with a growing child population triggering the need for a larger school facility.

City Planning evaluated the future growth potential for the twenty-three school sites under the umbrella categories of 'Policy Direction', 'Pipeline/High Order Transit', and 'Community Services and Facilities'.

**Policy Direction:** Under the lens of 'Policy Direction,' the school sites were reviewed against the Official Plan's Urban Structure and Land Use policies and the presence of an approved or planned policy framework (Secondary Plan, Site and Area Specific Policies). The location of a school within one of the Urban Structure's growth areas, indicated a stronger possibility for future growth and change.

The school sites were also assessed and evaluated based on its land use designation and whether the designation anticipated future growth, or if the designation reinforced neighbourhood character and stability. While most (20) of the 23 school sites are within stable residential *Neighbourhoods*, and therefore not within a designated growth area, sites such as DB Hood and Champlain were in *Mixed Use* and *Regeneration Areas* where the Official Plan anticipates growth. Planning staff also evaluated the school sites based on their location within, or proximity to, an approved or planned framework (Secondary Plan, Site and Area Specific Policy, Avenue Study, Revitalization Area) and examined whether there was direction for future growth and redevelopment. While many of these growth studies and planning frameworks are approved, the TDSB will need to continue to factor in the impact of potential future residential growth in the surrounding areas prior to considering the disposition of the sites and coordinate appropriate discussions with City staff.

**Pipeline:** In determining active growth pressure, City Planning relied on feedback from the Divisions and any information available on the City's Development Application mapping webpage. The 800m 'zone of influence' was borrowed from the Province's Mobility Hub guidelines, which is considered a comfortable walking distance. The extent of the area of influence for active residential development outside of the 800m radius was determined on a site by site basis, using the area context, physical characteristics, land use designation, and school ward. Development applications that were considered 'active development' are typically complex applications for multiple buildings/ units or multiple dwellings.

**High Order Transit:** New rapid transit has the potential to stimulate growth and change. The intersection of two or more transit lines can result in transformative change, and is often the focus of planning for future growth. Local and regional transit can impact accessibility and mobility, and can potentially stimulate growth and change, and investment in transit can help contribute to new development interest. As such, community services



and facilities may seek to be located near existing or planned rapid transit to increase accessibility to people in need of services. The presence or absence of existing, funded or planned rapid transit was assessed when reviewing the school sites. The TDSB will need to factor in the impact of rapid transit and residential growth prior to considering the disposition of the sites in these areas. The TDSB should consider a *Core Holdings* strategy for sites near planned rapid transit. The long term growth and change that this investment can stimulate is something that will only be clear over time.

**Community Services and Facilities:** Finally, the school sites were evaluated on the basis of existing Planning studies that identified the need for local Community Services and Facilities (CS&F) based on a local area needs assessment, the existence of a social infrastructure implementation plans to support future growth, and an identified need for new schools to accommodate future growth. Through the City's community services and facilities planning process, the TDSB has and will continue to be engaged in developing strategies to ensure that there are sufficient school facilities to support future growth and change.

#### **Notable Findings:**

- Recent decisions on new rapid transit plans for the City should inform the TDSB's consideration around the disposition of school facilities. Several sites (7 out of 23 or 30%) are adjacent to or within close proximity to newly funded and/or planned transit these include: Thistleton, McCowan, Sir Robert Bordon, DB Hood, Vaughan Rd., Buttonwood and Silver Creek. The City and the TDSB should work together to assess the impact of new transit, and pressures on community infrastructure. The TDSB should give serious consideration to retaining some of their school sites as *Core Holdings* to provide them with the flexibility to address future growth and change.
- A majority (20) of the twenty-three school sites under review are located within the City's *Neighbourhoods* designation, which are stable areas where significant growth is not anticipated, and which will see little physical change. Some of these sites are located in close proximity to growth areas which either have approved plans, have studies underway or will be the subject of future studies:
  - Out of the twenty-three school sites, three sites have been identified as currently meeting the City's criteria for 'growth' (DB Hood; Champlain and Queen's Court);
  - Two sites, have been identified as having the lowest growth potential (Nelson Boylen CI and Glen Rush Public School).
  - There are recently approved, or planning studies underway adjacent to the following schools: DB Hood, Champlain, Queens Court, CB Parsons; McCowan Road Jr. PS; Sir Robert Borden; Greenwood; and Cartwright.
  - There are also schools that may be impacted by the City's existing planning frameworks that support future growth, which include: CB Parsons, Burnett, Brookbanks, Bridgeport; Gooderham; Sir Sanford Fleming; Earls court Jr. PS.

- To date, the TDSB has shared detailed analyses related to utilization rates and future capacity to accommodate future growth for the Thistleton, Silver Creek, McNicoll, Buttonwood, Sir Robert Borden BTI, Nelson Boylen and Vaughan Road Academy. For these sites, the TDSB has satisfied City staff that local schools can accommodate growth. The TDSB will need to continue to have conversations with City staff to ensure a plan is in place to accommodate future growth for all other schools as identified in this report. City Planning staff will continue to engage the school boards as stakeholders in planning studies and future growth to inform current and future PAR processes.
- Community services and facilities, and affordable housing priorities are typically required to respond to significant demographic or social change within an identified area. Additionally, on school sites generally larger than 5 hectares, which propose residential or mixed use, a community services strategy will be required to inform the range of facilities needed to support new development. The disposition of a public school asset should prioritize the provision of broader public objectives such as affordable housing while also ensuring that future development does not further burden/impact the existing community facilities in an area.
- Twenty out of the twenty-three school sites have heritage potential. The TDSB should include an assessment of Heritage Potential for all facilities over 40-years old prior to any disposition or change of use so that schools of landmark or architectural significance can be assessed and if required, preserved. A Statement of Significance should be completed for each property deemed to have heritage significance before a property is recommended for change of use or disposal.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Principles for Redeveloping School Properties for Strong Communities**

The City of Toronto recognizes that schools are often an integral part of communities and neighbourhoods, and changes to these physical assets can have an effect on local neighbourhoods and city-wide service strategies. Where keeping surplus schools for community service purposes is not feasible, the alternate uses of the space should be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood.

The following principles are consistent with the City's Official Plan for meeting the needs of today without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs, and with the City's equity and social policy agenda priorities, including Poverty Reduction Strategy (TO Prosperity), the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy, the City's Open Door Program to fast track affordable housing, and the Mayor's Task Force on Report on Toronto Community Housing. These principles are also consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement for building strong, liveable and healthy communities and planning for public service facilities and the recent provincial report 'Community Hubs in Ontario: A Strategic Framework and Action Plan' authored by the Premier's Special Advisor on Community Hubs:

- 1. New development or additions to existing school facilities and lands will be consistent with the City's Official Plan and Council approved design guidelines.**

The majority (20) of the twenty-three sites under review in 2016-2019 are located in *Neighbourhoods*. City Planning staff will expect any development application on a former school site in a *Neighbourhood* to respect and reinforce the existing character of the area. Where surplus schools are located in growth areas and where development is anticipated, new development will be expected to consistent with Official Plan policies and Council approved design guidelines.

- 2. School boards must ensure that they accommodate long-term growth projections prior to disposing of school sites and coordinate with the local municipality on growth planning.**

The Official Plan also encourages preserving and improving access to schools and the timely provision of new schools to meet the demand of new residential development. The TDSB has demonstrated that the need for a 'net-new' school facility is generally only triggered when population growth is 500 pupils and 1,000 pupils in excess of what can be accommodated by, respectively, existing local elementary and high schools. City Planning informs school boards of new residential development through the circulation of development applications where the school boards are provided the opportunity to include their feedback. City Planning also informs school boards of potentially significant new planned growth related to upcoming transit investment and potential future growth. The TDSB will

need to factor in the impact of upcoming transit investment and potential future residential growth prior to considering the disposition of this site and coordinate this review with City staff.

- 3. School boards should accommodate any child care program that would be impacted by the disposition of a school within other school facilities to ensure that there is no net loss of child care space in the local community.**

If services/programs for children and families are operating in school board owned buildings that are then sold, those programs should be relocated into neighbouring school board owned space. This principle is meant to ensure that there is no net loss of service and to minimize community impact. If the sale of a school board property results in the redevelopment of the lands any child care spaces that were not appropriately relocated in the neighbouring community should be replaced, ideally on site. Ensuring community services and facilities and local institutions are not lost due to redevelopment is an important tenet of the Provincial Policy Statement and the City's Official Plan. The child care needs of a growing population should be secured as part of any redevelopment. Ensuring that an appropriate range of community services and facilities and local institutions is provided in areas of major or incremental physical growth is an important tenant of the Provincial Policy Statement and the City's Official Plan. The incremental need for services for children and families as a result of population growth must be provided for when considering the redevelopment of school lands.

- 4. Redevelopment of school sites should accommodate non-profit community facility space that would be displaced as a result of the disposition of a school facility.**

The School Board should actively engage the developer to find suitable alternative locations for operating non-profit community facility space onsite or within future development. A no-net loss approach to community services and facilities, especially in wards that are underserved, is consistent with the City's Official Plan policies to improve and/or ensure that an appropriate range of community services and facilities and local institutions are provided in areas of major or incremental physical growth.

- 5. Redevelopment of school sites should maximize both the onsite provision of public parkland and the provisions of privately owned and publicly accessible open space.**

The City's Official Plan encourages the City to consider acquiring publicly owned school sites for parks and open space purposes should they no longer be needed as learning institutions. Where this is not feasible, on-site parkland provision should be pursued, where possible, in order to expand and improve the City's existing system of parks and open spaces, and open space linkages, and meet the City's Official plan policies to add new parks and amenities, particularly in growth areas. Access to

existing parkland and privately owned and publicly accessible open space should be protected.

- 6. Provision of a full range of housing, including affordable housing, should be secured as part of any site generally greater than 5 hectares. Affordable housing will be encouraged on all sites that can support multi-unit redevelopment.**

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides direction to municipalities on affordable housing policy. Municipalities are required to consider and implement the objectives of the PPS through their Official Plan policies and zoning regulations and as part of all planning and land-use decisions. The recently updated housing policies of the PPS require planning authorities to provide for an appropriate range of housing, including affordable housing, to meet the needs of current and future residents.

Creating and maintaining affordable housing is one of the City of Toronto's key priorities. The City secures affordable housing provisions in new development through the mechanisms of the Official Plan and Council's Open Door Program for fast tracking affordable housing. A provision of a full range of housing, including affordable housing, should be secured as part of any surplus school site generally greater than 5 hectares that is subject to a development application. Affordable housing will be encouraged on all surplus school sites that can support multi-unit as part of development.

- 7. Built heritage resources will be evaluated and conserved. Development on lands adjacent to protected heritage properties will be evaluated to ensure heritage attributes are conserved.**

The PPS directs that significant built heritage resources will be conserved and development on lands adjacent to protected heritage property will be evaluated to ensure that the heritage attributes of the heritage property will be conserved. A majority of school sites are over 40 years old. Due to the overall age of the school facilities being considered by the TDSB under the PAR or TLC process, there is also potential for heritage value. For schools with heritage potential, the school boards should assess the building's heritage value and adjacent lands with a heritage consultant and in consultation with the City's Heritage Preservation Services, before disposing of a facility. A Statement of Significance should be completed for each property deemed to have heritage significance before a property is recommended for change of use or disposal. Where alterations are proposed to existing schools, or development is proposed adjacent to a property on a Heritage Register, the proposed alterations will ensure the integrity of the heritage property's cultural heritage value and attributes will be retained prior to work commencing (and to the satisfaction of the City) and meet the appropriate standards and guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, and Official Plan policies. Adaptive use of heritage buildings is encouraged.

8. **Where appropriate, provision of joint facilities, either with the school board City, a private developer, or any combination thereof, for community service purposes, is encouraged.**

The PPS encourages co-location of public service facilities in community hubs, where appropriate, to promote cost-effectiveness and facilitate service integration, access to transit and active transportation. Preserving and improving access to facilities in established neighbourhoods, and providing for a full range of community services and facilities in areas experiencing major or incremental physical growth, is a responsibility to be shared by the City, public agencies and the development community. The Official Plan encourages adequate and equitable access to community services and local institutions and directs that local institutions are provided and preserved, and local community service facilities are improved and expanded, especially in established neighbourhoods that are under or poorly served. The Official Plan also directs that with new development in areas of major or incremental growth, an appropriate range of services and institutions are provided. The Official Plan promotes the shared use of schools, parks and public open space when appropriate for this purpose. Shared use of school facilities make the best use of publicly owned land, provides an opportunity for strategic investment in social infrastructure and helps promote greater equity, equality and access to neighbourhoods that may be underserved in existing community service facilities and programs.