

MEETING MINUTES

May 18, 2011

DATE

PROJECT : Wayside Elementary School
Facility Advisory Committee Meeting #4
PROJECT NO. : 11001.000

CC : Matt Willems
Jim Leeuwrik
Phill Brummett
FILE
☐ ATTACHMENTS

<u>ATTENDEES</u>	<u>COMPANY/TITLE</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>EMAIL</u>
Yong-Mi Kim	WES - Principal	301-279-8484	Yong_M_Kim@mcpsmd.org
Ioanna Chase	WES - Admin. Secretary	301-279-8484	Ioanna_Chase@mcpsmd.org
Dennis Cross	MCPS DOC	240-314-1000	Dennis_F_Cross@mcpsmd.org
Julie Morris	MCPS DOC - Planning	240-314-4713	Julie_a_morris@mcpsmd.org
Debbie Szyfer	MCPS DOC - Planning	240-314-1000	Debroah_szyfer@mcpsmd.org
Jillian Storms	MSDE	410-767-0615	jstorms@msde.state.md.us
Kathy Grosso	WES - Media Specialist	301-279-8484	Katherine_T_Grosso@mcpsmd.org
Anne Price	Neighbor	301-294-8157	APrice500@msn.com
Whit Kidwell	Neighbor	301-424-1725	wwkidwell@comcast.net
Tim Fennell	BeeryRio	703-249-7668	tpfennell@beeryrio.com
Amanda Witkowski	BeeryRio	703-249-7637	awitkowski@beeryrio.com

These meeting minutes reflect the notes and memory of the writer and constitute the basis on which the project is proceeding. Any clarifications, corrections, or additions should be submitted to BeeryRio in writing within seven days of receipt of this document.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>ACTION BY</u>
1.	Introductions were made and the committee was called to order at 7:00 pm.	-- --

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>ACTION</u> <u>BY</u>
		-- --

2. The existing site constraints and previous concepts were reviewed by the committee. The two concepts from the last FAC meeting are very similar to each other. Both schemes have the primary circulation loop around a large central courtyard with 4 breakout spaces between classrooms along the main corridors. The major difference between the two schemes is the location of the gymnasium. The committee at the previous FAC meeting had a great deal of concern for this layout because it was felt that teachers would be unable to see the students in the breakout spaces from the classrooms, and thus would not use the breakout spaces.



3. Mr. Fennel then discussed the new schemes based on comments received from the last FAC meeting. -- --

ITEM DESCRIPTION

**ACTION
BY**

The first scheme, Scheme A presented has most of the public spaces on the left side of the site and the academic spaces primarily to the back and right of the site. The media center is located in the middle of the building close to the academic wing. The dumpster in each of the schemes proposed will be well screened. This scheme is further away from the property line at the right side than the existing building. The existing basketball court and large soft play area remain in the same location as they are now. Nothing is further back on the site than what is there now.

4. This layout helps to provide good sightlines from the street and administration area on the left of the site while extending the parking and the drop off loop. One concern that MCPS staff has with this scheme is that it has very circuitous circulation. The lockers would be hard to fit in the pods and the corridors are not long enough to accommodate all of the lockers. -- --



5. Mr. Fennel then moved on to present Scheme B. This scheme is for a 3 story school. The public -- --

ITEM **DESCRIPTION**

ACTION
BY

spaces are located in a similar location to than shown in Scheme A except for the Media Center, which is located on the second floor in order to be closer to the classrooms. The PEP classrooms are closer to the bus loop in this scheme than in Scheme A and C.

- | | | |
|----|--|-------|
| 6. | The major concern with this scheme is that the classrooms on the third floor would be isolated from the rest of the school, and that is undesirable. One benefit of this scheme is that it has a smaller footprint than the other schemes presented. | -- -- |
|----|--|-------|



- | | | |
|----|--|-------|
| 7. | Mr. Fennel then moved on to present Scheme C. Scheme C is similar to the master plan for the | -- -- |
|----|--|-------|

ITEM **DESCRIPTION**

ACTION
BY

modernization and to the concepts presented at the last FAC meeting except that this scheme does not have any additional breakout spaces. PEP classrooms are located on the right side of the school and Kindergarten classrooms are located on the left. The layout is focused around a large central courtyard with circulation looping around it. The purpose of the courtyard is to provide daylight to the classrooms. The courtyard does not add to the building footprint. This scheme is 15 feet closer to the property line on the right side than the existing building.

8. The circulation in this scheme does make it easier to access administrative support spaces than the circulation in the existing building. Ms. Szyfer also mentioned that this scheme allows for easy access to shared spaces like the gym for after hours use. A con for this scheme is the east/west exposure of the classrooms. Another con is that there are no common areas in this scheme. -- --



9. Scheme D is a 2 story U-shape scheme which has a similar layout to Scheme B. Public spaces are on -- --

ITEM DESCRIPTION

**ACTION
BY**

the left side of the site. The academic spaces are up front and in the back. On the second floor the two wings would be connected by a corridor.



10. In Schemes A, B and D the students would be dropped off near the administration area. In Scheme C the students would be dropped off at the back by the gymnasium, similar to how they are dropped off now. Scheme C deals best with the student drop off according to the school staff. The school staff would like to see the back made into a destination spot with an architectural feature, like a canopy. -- --
11. MCPS staff mentioned that the kindergarten play areas are to be adjacent to the Multi-purpose room, but still be fenced. The fence will be 4 feet high. The purpose of the fence is to keep the students separate. --
12. MCPS's standard is to provide for small group instruction rooms. MCPS has certain standards that must be maintained. Additional small group rooms may be provided in the school by taking 25 to 30 square feet maximum out of each classroom. This would provide for 2 additional small group rooms. The school staff mentioned that their instructional support spaces currently located in the addition are not being used as they were intended. Small group instruction is taking place in the existing pods instead. The school staff would prefer breakout spaces located along a long corridor as opposed to -- --

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>ACTION BY</u>
	not having any at all. MCPS mentioned that a similar design exists at Matsunaga Elementary School where there is a small breakout space between every 2 classrooms located along a corridor. Each of these classrooms also has a window looking into the breakout space. Any of the schemes presented at this meeting could have breakout spaces added to them.	
13.	Ms. Kim feels frustrated that the options presented at this meeting do not reflect the feedback that has been provided by the school staff. The only other concern that the school staff has for Schemes A, B and D are that they feel that the location of the building services would hamper the traffic flow in the parking drop off loop if a truck should ever need to drop off or pick something up during the student pick up and drop off time. The school staff likes Scheme A presented at the first FAC meeting without the alleyways which was revised and presented at the second FAC meeting, but has since been dropped. MCPS is concerned about having pods in schools as shown in Scheme A or as the existing school has because they are concerned with having areas where kids can't be supervised from the classroom. MCPS acknowledged that the new modernization for Wayside will be a culture change for the school staff. MCPS staff also mentioned that the Fire Marshall has a concern with kids in open spaces. The school staff is willing to give up administrative support spaces in order to get breakout spaces.	-- --
14.	The goal for these concepts is to have an efficiency ratio of 67%. The schemes presented have a gross square footage of : Scheme A – 68,000 sqft. Scheme B – 70,000 sqft. Scheme C – 63,000 sqft. Scheme D – 63,700 sqft.	-- --
15.	Other ways to add support spaces would be to locate them into the corners of a layout similar to Scheme C. This would allow for the support spaces to be more spread out, and would activate the corners of the loop. Little Bennet and Great Seneca elementary schools have their support spaces located in this manner. Wayfinding in the school could be done by giving each wing its own theme or color. The school staff would prefer that the classroom entrances be grouped along the corridor.	-- --
	For the next meeting BeeryRio will present the following schemes:	BR
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reincorporate breakout spaces along the corridor with windows. There will be 1 breakout space per grade. The school layout will be around a central courtyard. 2. Provide breakout spaces between every 2 classrooms. The school layout will also be around a central courtyard. 3. Show Scheme B has a 2 story school with breakout spaces. 4. An enlarged diagram showing the layout of a grouping of classrooms around a breakout space. 	
16.	The next Facility Advisory Committee meeting is to be determined. Please check the school website for meeting dates.	All

Amanda A Witkowski, LEED AP