

# MOSELEY ARCHITECTS

03.30.2015

Laytonsville Community Meeting 7:00pm

PROJECT MCPS Gaithersburg Capacity Study  
Montgomery County Public Schools, MD

ARCHITECT'S PROJECT NO. 546134

DATE AND LOCATION Monday, March 30, 2015

PRESENT For Montgomery Co. Public Schools, DOC/LRP  
\* Mr. Rakesh Bagai  
\* Ms. Julie Morris  
\* Mr. Mike Shpur

For Moseley Architects  
Mr. Bill Brown  
Mr. Conno O'Neill

<u>Capacity Study Participants</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Ms. Donna Sagona	Laytonsville ES Principal
Ms. Shannon Hockey	LES PTA
Ms. Ann Denyberry	LES PTA
Ms. Caroline Scare	LES Parent
Ms. Laurie Augustino	Gaithersburg Cluster
Steve Augustino	Gaithersburg Cluster
Ms. Kathy Coffman	LES Parent
Ms. Tiki Lamberton	LES Parent
Ms. Pat Hill	LES Grandparent
Ms. Kari Primozic	LES 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 Laytonsville 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 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.

## MEMORANDUM OF CONFERENCE

Laytonsville ES Meeting

Page 2

03.30.2015

---

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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Mr. Brown to present the addition schemes for the Laytonsville site.
7. Laytonsville's current core capacity is 640. The building's program capacity is 448. The projected program capacity is 640. The current enrollment is 433 with a projected enrollment of 416 in the 2015/2016 school year. There is 1 program space in a relocatable currently. The program calls for a 8 classroom addition and support spaces to bring the buildings program capacity up to match the core capacity of the building at 640. There is an alternate design that would increase the Multi-purpose Room by approximately 1,300 square feet and four additional classrooms to bring the projected program capacity to 740.
8. The scheme locates a two story classroom addition in the rear of the building on the black top and connects to the existing hallway by reconfiguration of an existing classroom that would need to be relocated to the new addition. Included are support spaces and separate toilet facilities for students and staff. It was noted that the existing classroom that would be reconfigured is the current Band Room and that would be relocated in the addition and adjacencies to the Instrumental Music Room

## MEMORANDUM OF CONFERENCE

Laytonsville ES Meeting

Page 3

03.30.2015

---

and the Dual Purpose Room would need to be considered in the final design. It was also noted that it may be more desirable to locate the two School Community Based classrooms and shared Grooming Room closer to the main entry and administration suite. While it is typical to consider new programs only in new additions and not to reconfigure the existing building there are situations that are recognized that may warrant repurposing existing spaces in the building and relocated some existing spaces to the addition and it was noted that if this project goes forward to design that the planners would work with the school to review the merits of such.

- a. The pros for this scheme are: It has a compact two story footprint. Centrally located and good access to the existing building. Existing portable will be able to stay during construction. Provides natural daylight to all new and existing classrooms. And the addition is away from fields. Stays away from existing septic field.
  - b. The cons for the scheme are: Requires relocation of play areas and will create two areas that will require supervision. SCB classrooms are far away from the main entry. Circulation does not loop. Requires two stairs and an elevator for a relatively small amount of the overall school.
9. The Alternate Scheme expands the existing Multi-purpose Room and would reconfigure the new addition to include two more classrooms on each floor for a total of four more classrooms.
- a. The pros for this scheme are: Same as above with the ability to increase the core and program capacity to 740.
  - b. The cons for this scheme are: Much more disturbance to play areas.
10. A participant commented that Gaithersburg ES is already approximately 200 students over capacity and as such this process culminates in having to move them from their school to another school elsewhere. Furthermore, it is understood that there is no meeting planned with the Gaithersburg ES community. MCPS stated that the entire cluster had been invited to the first Public Information Meeting (Gaithersburg HS, Cafeteria) on February 24, 2015. Julie Morris offered to meet informally with the school but a presentation of options for the four schools (and recap of the two schools with previous feasibility studies) would be shared at the final Public Information Meeting (Gaithersburg HS, Cafeteria) – Tuesday, April 28, 2015.
11. A participant asked how many students are we over capacity and need to be placed. MCPS stated that approximately 700+ would need to be placed and it was observed by the group that could be a whole new school and possibly additions as well.
12. While it was stated by MCPS that site selection and boundary changes are not part of this study a discussion concerning what sites might be available and what are the criteria for site size. MCPS stated that there is a FAARA policy that defines what a preferred site size is and that is published in the long range planning master plan. Furthermore, MCPS will not just look at sites that the BOE owns if the process of site selection proceeds.
13. A participant asked what the largest capacity school that MCPS will build is. MCPS stated it was a program capacity of 740 which is a combination of the size of the Multi-purpose Room and contributing factors of site size and required program site amenities including play areas, parking and bus loop.

## MEMORANDUM OF CONFERENCE

Laytonsville ES Meeting

Page 4

03.30.2015

---

14. A participant asked what the timeframe for the project might be. It was stated that the total anticipated project could be 4 to 5 years and that the construction would last approximately 18 months.
  - a. Study brochure will be completed in the fall for the Superintendent to present his recommendations to the BOE.
  - b. Public hearings would be held in November.
  - c. County council will consider funding in Spring of 2016
  - d. Projects would be included in the CIP cycle in the fall of 2016.
  - e. Would be 4 to 5 years out for a construction date depended on funding availability.
15. A participant asked how development in the Laytonsville area being tracked by MCPS. MCPS stated that contact with the Mayor's office is being made to update tracking of proposed development. A discussion covered what development is included and when and MCPS encouraged and welcomed the community to offer information on known development that could inform the MCPS projection process.
16. The community members attending expressed great concern about the appropriateness of additions to schools that are not where the enrollment increases are being experienced that will generate long bus travel times for students and longer travel times for parents that will have to travel to the school or require extended day care.
17. A participant asked if the playground area that is taken away for the new addition will be relocated, and commented that the playground area is currently used by the school and community. They don't want it taken away. Mr. Brown stated that yes, the same area taken away would be relocated somewhere else on the site. The location shall be determined during the design phase.
18. A participant commented that the pickup area is not adequate. Mr. Brown suggested that the pickup area be relocated toward the back of the parking lot and have the students exit thru the new addition area.
19. A participant commented that the distance students would have to travel to get to Laytonsville ES is too far if the boundaries are extended to include student that now go to the other schools. They also commented that a new school should be built where the most people are.
20. A participant commented that they feel that expansion at Laytonsville ES is not necessary.
21. A participant asked what the maximum number of students allowed is to still be considered safe. Ms. Morris stated that MCPS policy is to cap program capacity at 740.
22. A participant asked if the addition could be flipped on the axis of the corridor (toward the gym). Mr. Brown stated no, there are too many utilities in the way.
23. A participant asked if part of the existing school could be demolished and rebuilt as part of the addition. Ms. Morris stated that that is not the intent of the scope of work.
24. A participant asked if the addition could be built on top of the existing school. Mr. Brown stated no, the existing foundations are not adequate and not designed for the additional weight of an addition.
25. 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>

26. 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:



Conno O'Neill  
Associate

REVIEWED BY:



Bill Brown  
Vice President

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