

MOSELEY ARCHITECTS

03.11.2015

Rosemont Community Meeting 3:30pm

PROJECT MCPS Gaithersburg Capacity Study
Montgomery County Public Schools, MD

ARCHITECT'S PROJECT NO. 546134

DATE AND LOCATION Wednesday, March 11, 2015

PRESENT For Montgomery Co. Public Schools, DOC/LRP

- * Mr. Mike Shpur
- * Mr. Rakesh Bagai
- * Ms. Julie Morris

For Moseley Architects

Mr. Bill Brown
Ms. Olivia Brookman
Ms. Molly Merlo

<u>Capacity Study Participants</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Mr. James Sweeny	Rosemont ES Principal
Mr. Richard Rowe	Rosemont Neighbor
Ms. Jean Rowe	Rosemont Neighbor
Ms. Carrie Bohrer	MCC PTA
Ms. Margarita Serrano	Rosemont PTA
Ms. Maggie Corfield	Rosemont ES
Ms. Allison Barry	Rosemont ES
Ms. Angela Martin	Rosemont ES
Ms. Liz Sasson	Rosemont ES
Ms. Marianne Reif	Rosemont ES
Ms. Carrie Bohrer	MCCPTA
Ms. Paula Walter	Rosemont Neighbor
Ms. Lisa Bixley	Rosemont Parent

DISCUSSIONS AND DECISIONS.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Gaithersburg Capacity Study and what possible additions are being explored for the Rosemont ES site.

1. Ms. Julie Morris performed introductions and began the meeting by giving an overview of the Capacity Study process and how it relates to the Gaithersburg cluster. She mentioned the four school sites that will be analyzed as part of this study; Rosemont ES, Washington Grove ES, Laytonsville ES

MEMORANDUM OF CONFERENCE

Rosemont ES Meeting

Page 2

03.11.2015

and Goshen ES. She explained that both Summit Hall and Strawberry Knoll ES have already had studies performed that will be taken along with this study as information for the Board of Education (BOE) and Superintendent to make recommendations from. Gaithersburg ES is not being considered for any addition or revitalization expansion because it is already at full build out for a 740 core capacity and the site is not conducive to an addition.

2. The enrollment projections at all the schools in the cluster reflect a deficit projected to be over 800 students in the 2020-2021 year. This deficit has triggered the study to help provide relief through additions, a new elementary school and/or a combination of the two.
3. This study will analyze the four schools to figure out the possible sizes and locations for additions on the sites and the costs associated with those additions. The Superintendent will review all the information from the capacity studies and cost estimates before making a recommendation to either build additions at some or all the schools or to build a new elementary school or a combination of both. This is to address the space shortages as part of the FY 2017-2022 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) in the fall of 2015.
4. Sites for a new school and boundary changes will not be explored as part of this study.
5. Moseley Architects will prepare one or more plans for each of the schools in the study and present them at the upcoming community meetings at each school. They will gather feedback from the meetings and present the final plans at the 2nd community wide meeting. Attendees will have the opportunity to provide feedback on the plans at the community wide meeting. Moseley Architects will take the comments and prepare a final Capacity Study brochure which will include the preferred design along with cost estimates for each proposed addition. The meeting dates are:
 - a. Rosemont Elementary School, Media Center – Wednesday, March 11, 2015
(3:30-5:00 p.m. and 7:00-8:30 p.m.) 16400 Alden Avenue, Gaithersburg, MD
 - b. Goshen Elementary School, Media Center – Wednesday, March 25, 2015
(4:00–5:30 and 7:00-8:30 p.m.) 8701 Warfield Road, Gaithersburg, MD
 - c. Laytonsville Elementary School, Media Center – Monday, March 30, 2015
(4:00–5:30 and 7:00-8:30 p.m.) 21401 Laytonsville Road, Gaithersburg, MD
 - d. Washington Grove Elementary School, Media Center – Monday, April 13, 2015
(4:00–5:30 and 7:00-8:30 p.m.) 8712 Oakmont Street, Gaithersburg, MD
 - e. Public Information Meeting (Gaithersburg HS, Cafeteria) – Tuesday, April 28, 2015
(7:00-8:30 p.m.) 101 Education boulevard, Gaithersburg, MD
6. Ms. Morris handed over to Ms. Merlo to present the addition schemes for the Rosemont site.
7. Rosemont's current core capacity is 640. The building's program capacity is 561. The projected program capacity is 640. The current enrollment is 564 with a projected enrollment of 634 in the 2015/2016 school year. There are 2 program spaces in relocatables currently and the need for relocatable classroom space will increase over time based on MCPS's projections. The program calls for a 4 classroom addition and support spaces to bring the buildings program capacity up to match the core capacity of the building at 640.

MEMORANDUM OF CONFERENCE

Rosemont ES Meeting

Page 3

03.11.2015

8. The first scheme locates the addition where the relocatables currently are and connects to the hallway at the end of this side of the building. Parking is located underneath the addition to take advantage of the slope. The parking will have the required turnaround for vehicles and at the same time be a fix for the current erosion problem on the slope between the school and the fields. An accessible walkway from the addition to the fields is provided in this scheme. The plans allow for support spaces in addition to program spaces including; boys and girls toilet rooms, staff toilets, a mechanical room, electric room and space for data.
 - a. The pros for this scheme are: It has a compact footprint. It takes advantage of the slope on site for a lower story parking which helps relieve the parking issue on site. It mostly preserves the play area. It also provides a good opportunity to fix the erosion problem between the upper play areas and the lower fields.
 - b. The cons for the scheme are: The location of the addition does not create a loop in circulation through the building. The lower level parking is isolated from the rest of the building. The current relocatable classrooms will have to be moved for the construction of this addition.

(Additional studies of the parking and building relationship with existing site contours will need to be developed if this scheme is chosen as the preferred scheme.)

9. Scheme 2 locates a 2 story addition in the center of the existing courtyard, dividing it into 2 smaller courtyards. A kindergarten classroom is repurposed in order to create a connecting corridor to the addition on the first floor. On the second floor a standard classroom is also repurposed for a connecting corridor. The repurposed spaces are relocated in the addition. Support spaces provided in addition to program required spaces are a mechanical room, an electrical room, boys and girls toilets, staff toilets and a data closet.
 - a. The pros for this scheme are: It has a compact footprint. It is centrally located and so provides better access and circulation. Current relocatable classrooms do not need to move during construction. Instrumental Music and Dual purpose classrooms are closer to Art and Music. It attaches to the current 2 story portion of the existing building
 - b. The cons for this scheme are: The location of the addition does not create a horizontal loop in circulation through the building. Play areas will have to be relocated. This scheme does not provide the opportunity for the additional parking related to scheme 1 but it could be considered. The current courtyard is reduced to 2 smaller courtyards.
10. The Rosemont ES principal stated that the Music room (as labeled on the existing plans) is now the Linkages to Learning Suite. The Music Teacher stated that she currently uses a regular classroom which changes from year to year and would prefer that a music classroom built per MCPS's ed spec be located in the addition so she can have an actual Music room with sound treatments and per ed specs. This would make the distance between the new Dual purpose room and existing music classroom a non issue. Ms. Morris stated that if this addition becomes a project, we will go through a schematic design process with the staff and community and that time these adjacencies can be addressed.
11. A participant asked why the design team does not explore the possibility of building up in lieu of adding to the footprint of the existing building. The design team stated that the structure of the

existing building is not designed to carry another story. Even though possible to thread columns through the existing to build up, it will be very cost prohibitive for the owner and the school cannot be occupied if such work were to be done.

12. A participant asked why the design team did not consider building the addition in front of the media center. The design team stated that the school would lose some of its parking which is already limited.
13. Some neighbors stated that there is a lot of traffic in the neighborhood due to the school and other church educational programs in the area. There are no sidewalks in the neighborhood and the roads are narrow. In that light, bringing more population and traffic into the neighborhood by enlarging the school will not be a good idea. They feel that the current size of the school fits well in the neighborhood and they would love to have it stay that way. The design team and MCPS stated that hearing and documenting concerns is one reason for the study and all comments and feedback are noted and will help the new superintendant make an informed decision.
14. A participant asked if the study looks at the size of play areas for the school in all schemes. The design team and MCPS stated that all play areas if relocated or impacted shall be evaluated per the Ed spec minimums as part of the decision moving forward.
15. A participant asked about the timeline for when a decision will be made about the study. Ms. Morris stated that the new superintendant will make a decision on recommendations to the BOE in the fall of this year. A boundary discussion will be timed to coincide with the decision and any boundary changes would be timed to occur when additional capacity is made available.
16. Information on all the capacity studies will be posted at the following location as materials become available. <http://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/construction/studies/gccstudy/shtm>
17. Ms. Morris thanked the participants for coming out and she encouraged them to attend the upcoming meetings. The meeting was adjourned.

The above information is the writer's recollection of the discussions and decisions at the meeting. Should there be any additions or corrections, please notify the writer within two weeks of distribution for correction.

NOTES BY:

REVIEWED BY:



Olivia Brookman
Associate

Bill Brown
Vice President

DISTRIBUTION: As indicated by (*) above, also: