

19 May 2015

## MEETING NOTES

**RE: BUILDING LEVEL PLANNING COMMITTEE #2**  
**STRATFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL**  
**ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA**  
**31406600**



2121 WARD PLACE, NW, 4TH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037  
202 298 6700

**Meeting Date & Time:** 04 May, 7:00-9:00 PM  
**Location:** H-B Woodlawn Library

### Attendees:

#### BLPC

Graham McBride – Asst. Principal H-B  
Karen Gerry – Principal, Stratford program (Not Present)  
Renee Harber – Asst. Principal Swanson (Not Present)  
Carol Burger – H-B Staff  
Kathleen Meagher – Director, Secondary Education  
Eve Reed – Cherrydale Representative (Not Present)  
Ray Sendejas – Cherrydale Representative (Not Present)  
Dot Green – Donaldson Run Representative  
Susan Cunningham – Donaldson Run Representative  
Amanda Davis – Maywood Representative  
David Barish – Waverly Hills Representative  
Doug Taylor – Woodmont Civic Association  
Caroline Holt – Lyon Village Representative  
Deb Pearson – PTA Taylor  
Jen Thompson – PTA Glebe (Not Present)  
Rohini Chopra – PTA ASF (Not Present)  
Whytni Kernodle – PTA Key (Not Present)  
Joseph Delogu – PTA WMS  
Michael Henry – PTA SMS  
Laura Saul Edwards – PTA H-B Woodlawn  
Jeff Turner – FAC Representative  
Robert Dudka – HALRB Representative (Not Present)  
Charles Craig – HALRB Representative (Not Present)  
Rebecca Ballo – CPHD staff – Historic Preservation (Not Present)

#### APS Staff

Scott Prisco – Director, Design and Construction  
Ben Burgin – Asst. Director, Design and Construction  
Bill Herring – Project Manager, Design & Construction (Project Point of Contact)

#### County Staff

Diane Probus – DPR  
Jane Kim – DES

#### Other Attendees

Barbara Jazzo – neighborhood  
Vicki Mendelowitz – neighborhood  
Mike Regan – neighborhood  
Brian Smith – neighborhood  
Tegan Holtzman – neighborhood  
Candace Abbey – neighborhood  
Alfred Campot – neighborhood

#### Design Team

Dan Curry – Project Manager, Quinn Evans Architects  
Julia Siple – Project Architect, Quinn Evans Architects

WASHINGTON, DC  
ANN ARBOR, MI  
DETROIT, MI  
MADISON, WI

[WWW.QUINNEVANS.COM](http://WWW.QUINNEVANS.COM)

This was the fourth meeting of the Stratford Middle School Building Level Planning Committee (BLPC). The BLPC is appointed by the Arlington School Board to assist the Facilities and Operations staff and advise the School Board on each major capital / renewal project.

Discussion points are summarized below. This summary presents Quinn Evans Architects' understanding of discussions, decisions, and recommended actions. We request that all attendees review these Meeting Notes and notify APS with recommended revisions or questions.



#### 1. REVIEW OF PROJECT SCHEDULE

- a. Scott Prisco (APS) thanked everyone for coming and reviewed the project schedule and upcoming BLPC meeting objectives.
- b. The focus of this meeting (BLPC 4) is building planning and programming.
- c. The site options are being studied by the traffic and civil engineers so that we can share more concrete data at the next BLPC.
- d. Options will be presented at BLPC 5 and continue to be discussed and refined through BLPC meetings 6 and 7.
- e. The goal is to have final BLPC input on the direction for Concept Design by BLPC 7 on 6/29. This will allow the team to present Concept Info to the School Board in August.
- f. Any concerns about the schedule should be voiced to APS (via Bill Herring). The goal is to stick as closely as possible to the proposed schedule to deliver the school in the anticipated time frame. However, if there are concerns about schedule an additional meeting or review period can be accommodated.
- g. The design team is meeting with HALRB this Wednesday (5/20) for a project worksession.

#### 2. REVIEW OF PFRC #2

- a. Dan Curry (QEA) presented the conversation from the 5/14 PFRC #2.
- b. Additional site planning considerations will be incorporated to the site concept options and analysis. Considerations from the PFRC conversation include:
  - i. Building higher along Old Dominion
  - ii. One-way solution on Vacation Lane and/or 23<sup>rd</sup> St
  - iii. Opportunity for student drop-off outside of the site
  - iv. Challenges of the Five Points intersection; particularly if traffic to the site enters via Old Dominion
  - v. Parent traffic will be more problematic than buses
  - vi. Courtyard scheme is the most difficult from a historic design perspective

#### 3. REVIEW OF GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- a. Julia Siple (QEA) reviewed summary value statements that were generated at BLPC 1. The statements from that meeting have been synthesized into 6 summary statements.
- b. The goal of the guiding principles is to reflect the values and input from BLPC members to provide perspective for the project. These guiding principles will be revisited throughout the project.  
**ACTION:** BLPC member to review draft guiding principles and send revisions and comments to APS (Bill Herring).

#### 4. PROGRAMMING & ED SPEC

- a. Julia Siple (QEA) presented summary of the existing building planning and programming.



- b. The building plans were presented level by level and with description of the entry points, areas below grade, and program areas.
- c. Larger program blocks such as the cafeteria, gym, media center, performing arts, and music area should be considered in relationship to the site since these are areas most typically used by the public during non-school hours.
- d. Analysis of the existing program and building conditions will allow best use of funds for the addition and renovation.
- e. Programming is an ongoing process that will continue throughout schematic design.
- f. QEA and APS staff and educators have met to begin to refine the program goals for 1000 students and considerations for 1300 students. These conversations will continue regularly.
- g. The existing building areas have been charted in comparison to the projected area requirements for 1000 students. The goal of this exercise is to better understand the larger program deficiencies to identify the type of space that will need to be accommodated in the addition.
- h. Education area requirements are not a one size fits all solution. The existing building and evolution of educational trends impact the space needs and opportunities. A comparison of the other Arlington middle schools was provided to demonstrate that range of area per student. Swanson has the lowest gross square feet per student with 137 GSF/Student; Jefferson has the largest with 258 GSF/Student. These areas include relocatables.
- i. Based on initial analysis, areas that will need the largest additional program area are the core classrooms, physical education, building support, and electives.
- j. Arlington currently has an average of 30% of unutilized classroom space. This 30% accounts for two periods per day for teach collaboration and planning. Arlington is looking for opportunities to increase the utilization of the classrooms without being disruptive to the success of the middles school teaching team model.
  - i. Kathleen Meagher spoke to the success of the team model in Arlington Middle Schools and how difficult it can be to ask teachers to share rooms or move to a different space for planning.
  - ii. Multiple BLPC members echoed support of the middles school team model.
- k. The current building does not have any teacher workspace; all of that work is done within each teacher's classroom. Improving a space for teacher collaboration, planning, lounge, and meetings with teachers and students would enhance the collaborative opportunities in the building layout and opportunities for increased utilization of classrooms.
- l. A core middle school academic team includes math, language arts, social studies, science, and special Ed. Analysis was provided of the existing classroom spaces and the number of teams and classrooms anticipated to meet the needs of 1000 students.
- m. Dot Green recommended half teams as a consideration to handle the numbers and address best student needs.
- n. Elective spaces will be further reviewed with APS staff and educators to identify best opportunities to share and right size spaces.
  - i. A question was asked about making the library shared with community. What APS has seen is that the collections needs for the school and community library are so different there is not a great overlap of shared used.
  - ii. Technology, furniture configurations, and optimized digital learning will be considered to make the spaces most flexible for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning environments.

- o. Physical education space is approximately 7500 square feet less than what would be recommended for 1000 students. This would be primarily focused in locker rooms and an Auxiliary Gym.
  - i. The original 1949 building included an Auxiliary Gym and Locker rooms in the area that is now Stratford.
  - ii. Graham McBride indicated locker rooms and less used stairwells have a tendency to be areas that can have greater behavioral issues.
  - iii. Considerations should be made to make these spaces safe and inviting.



## 5. Building Planning

- a. Entry and Circulation: Existing Building
  - i. HB/Stratford currently uses 4 primary entries. The Stratford entry on Level 1, the HB gym/cafeteria entry on Level 2, the historic main entrance on Level 2, and the entry on Level 1 by the Auditorium.
  - ii. HB allows much more porous and fluid use of entries and exits than a traditional middle school.
  - iii. Entries and corridors are not very large and cannot accommodate waiting or gathering.
- b. Most middle schools want to have administrative space right near the entries so that better surveillance can be kept on the entry/exit to the school.
- c. The elevator is located on the west end of the building. When considering circulation patterns, placement of this elevator or the necessity of a new elevator near to primary entry points should be considered.
- d. Heart of School & PlaceMaking:
  - i. The existing building does not have an identifiable area that would be considered the heart of the school.
  - ii. This area can be considered in the circulation areas, entries, or media centers and has benefits of improved social dynamic, pride of place, and better wayfinding and navigating.
  - iii. These are opportunities that we are looking for in the renovation and addition schemes.
- e. Site sections through the existing building were presented. These sections were cut through the existing building in two locations, just east of the main entry and through the core building and field; and through the cafeteria and gym.
  - i. Each of the site sections showed the existing configuration, the buildable area allowing for a full field and some breathing room for the existing building.
    - 1. The distance offset from the existing building is a factor of daylight, fire protection, and preservation of historic facades. The exact distance offset will continue to be studied.
  - ii. The elevation of the site road that would be associated with site Options C and D would be required to sit at Level 1.
  - iii. The group discussed the appeal of getting the road to be closer to the field level.
    - 1. The design team will continue to study the drop off for this road option and the grades.
    - 2. A new site option will be added to the site option considerations. G+ : Similar to the site roads shown in option G plus the connection south of the school to Vacation Lane.
  - iv. The sections show great opportunity for circulation through the different levels, light to penetrate, and heart of school spaces to be created between new and old.

- f. Corridor and classroom efficiency is impacted by the orientation of the classroom and whether there is a classroom on both sides of the corridor (double loaded) or a classroom on just one side (single loaded).
  - i. It is more economical to build double loaded corridors with deeper classrooms.
  - ii. Both double and single loaded corridors both have the potential for good access to daylight.
  - iii. If the addition is placed south of the gym and the site road is included that connects the west site with Vacation Lane, the addition would need to be a single loaded corridor due to space constraints.
- g. Eight building massing concepts were presented.
  - i. Option 1 – Parallel Core
    - 1. This option mimics the building mass of the existing building bar. It is a 60' double loaded corridor.
    - 2. The mass model indicated two light circulation connections to the existing building but it was noted that it may be just one connection point.
  - ii. Option 2 – Terraced
    - 1. This option would step away from the existing building and step down with the existing topography. This would be more challenging to incorporate the road but would have a larger courtyard between the existing and new buildings.
  - iii. Option 3 – East “L”
    - 1. This option is a floor lower in elevation but has a larger footprint.
    - 2. The connection back to the existing building is likely too disruptive to the historic core.
  - iv. Option 4 – West “L”
    - 1. This option is again lower in elevation and has a larger footprint.
    - 2. The building would preclude the ability to have a site road because of the double loaded corridor in front of the gym.
    - 3. Views would be maintained of the historic tower.
  - v. Option 5 – Extension on Gym
    - 1. This option minimizes the area touching the existing building
    - 2. The daylight potential in the new and existing buildings is maximized.
    - 3. The size of the field is constricted and student travel times to class are higher because of the elongated circulation route.
  - vi. Option 6 – Gym Wrap
    - 1. This option maintains a light well at the existing gym façade.
    - 2. There is a “heart of school” space created at the knuckle with the gym and existing building.
    - 3. The building would preclude the ability to have a site road because of the double loaded corridor in front of the gym.
  - vii. Option 7 – Plaza
    - 1. This option shows a single loaded corridor in front of the gym, allowing for the site road.
    - 2. Program is added below grade with a plaza or terrace above which provides view of the historic building, improved entrance at field level and/or Level 1, and an improved site amenity in the courtyard.
    - 3. There are opportunities to step down or provide skylights to activate the courtyard and provide daylight below.
  - viii. Option 8 – Satellite Building
    - 1. This option originated out of a conversation in the PFRC meeting.



2. During conversation at this BLPC meeting it was better understood that this would option was intended to include structured parking that would connect to the addition and the existing building.

6. **NEXT STEPS**

- a. The next BLPC meeting is Monday, June 1, 7pm-9pm, in the H-B Woodlawn Library.

END OF MEETING NOTES



QUINN EVANS  
ARCHITECTS