

10 December 2015

MEETING NOTES

RE: BUILDING LEVEL PLANNING COMMITTEE #15
STRATFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA
31406600



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

Meeting Date & Time: 07 December, 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
Carol Burger – H-B Staff (Not Present)
Kathleen Meagher – Director, Secondary Education
Eve Reed – Cherrydale Representative
Ray Sendejas – Cherrydale Representative
Dot Green – Donaldson Run Representative
Susan Cunningham – Donaldson Run Representative – BLPC Chair
Amanda Davis – Maywood Representative (Not Present)
David Barish – Waverly Hills Representative
Doug Taylor – Woodmont Civic Association (Not Present)
Caroline Holt – Lyon Village Representative
Deb Pearson – PTA Taylor
Jen Thompson – PTA Glebe
Rohini Chopra – PTA ASF
Whytni Kernodle – PTA Key (Not Present)
Courtney Hill – PTA WMS
Michael Henry – PTA SMS
Laura Saul Edwards – PTA H-B Woodlawn
Jeff Turner – FAC Representative
Robert Dudka – HALRB Representative
Charles Craig – HALRB Representative (Not Present)
Rebecca Ballo – CPHD staff – Historic Preservation (Not Present)

APS Staff

John Chadwick – Assistant Superintendent
Ben Burgin – Acting Director, Design & Construction
Bill Herring – Project Manager, Design & Construction (Project Point of Contact)
Debi DeFranco – Division of Instruction, Physical Education

County Staff

Diane Probus - DPR

Design Team

Dan Curry – Quinn Evans Architects
Atara Margolies – Quinn Evans Architects

CMaR Team

Jim Lears – Principal
Joe Swanson – Project Executive
Ty Pate – Pre-Construction and Estimating Manager
Adriana Nino – Senior Project Manager

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

WWW.QUINNEVANS.COM

This was the sixteenth 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.

Before the meeting began, at 6:30 pm, several members of the BLPC and the Turner pre-construction team joined APS and QEA on a walk-through through the existing building. The group walked through all floors and saw the cafeteria, gym, weight room, auditorium lobby, the Stratford Program space, and a few classrooms throughout.



1. INTRODUCTION

- a. Susan Cunningham (chair) opened the meeting with roundtable introductions due to new attendees.

2. REVIEW OF SCHEDULE AND MEETINGS

- a. Atara Margolies (QEA) reviews the SD meeting schedule, and recent or upcoming meetings in the next week or so.
 - i. VDOT pre-scoping meeting on 12/1
 - ii. RPA meeting with Arlington County 12/9
 - iii. Meeting with APS instructional on 12/10
 - iv. PFRC 12/16
- b. Review of overall SD schedule. School Board to meet on historic designation of Stratford site on 12/8.

3. INTRODUCTION OF TURNER CONSTRUCTION (CM-AT-RISK)

- a. Joe Swanson from Turner introduced the company and reviewed Turner's experience in K-12 construction, particularly with multiple phases while buildings are occupied. Turner also demonstrated their experience with historic buildings.
- b. Each team member present introduced themselves to the BLPC and explained their role.
- c. In summary, Mr. Swanson defined the role of the CM at Risk in the preconstruction phase of the project and Turner's role in helping to maximize the project design while keeping the project within the budget and the schedule.

4. SCHOOL BOARD

- a. Emma Viola-Sanchez, Arlington School Board chair, stopped in to the meeting to talk about the School Board approval of the West Option concept plan and to answer any questions BLPC members might have.
- b. February 2, 2016 there will be a commemoration of the integration of Stratford Junior High.
- c. Local historic district designation will not happen until the Use Permit is being approved – likely in July 2016.
- d. BLPC asked if the School Board was specifically asking for a scheme that was between the minimum and maximum values of the range approved. Ms. Viola-Sanchez stressed that the School Board wants to see the project come in on time and on budget; and it may not go over the maximum dollar value approved.
- e. John Chadwick (APS) asserted that by the end of SD we will know what program pieces are in, and where they are placed. Sacrifices needed to be

made will be apparent by that point. May come to the School Board with some optional items above a base scheme, but all within the approved budget range.

- f. Viola-Sanchez said the School Board is aware that not everything is worked out in Schematic Design, and some things will be discovered during this phase that were not known during concept design.
- g. She also stated that the Board trusts the APS staff to manage and execute the projects. The Board is committed to “celebrating the history of this building.” She stressed that there are lots of expectations for this project, but also lots of support from the Board.

5. ARCHITECTURAL PRECEDENTS

- a. Dan Curry (QEA) opens the architectural portion of the presentation with a discussion of the different ways of building an addition that connects to a historic building.
- b. The Draft Historic District Design Guidelines provide some input on building massing and materials.
- c. Regardless of designation, APS is committed to respecting the intent of the guidelines in designing the addition.
- d. Several precedent images are shown that cover the spectrum of approaches of adding a new addition to an existing historic structure.
 - i. Similar building elements, with a clear design element that separates old from new. New addition could have materials and details that recall or relate to those on the existing building.
 - ii. Complete departure. Modern addition to a historic building where there is little relationship between the two other than the stark differentiation.
 - iii. Approach that is between the two already mentioned; combination of similar materials and more modern materials. Modern massing, but with some elements (fenestration, for example) that relate to the existing building.
- e. Examples of precedent building materials. Dan showed examples where the base/ground floor of the building was clad with a different material than the upper floors and indicated that as this is a pattern seen on the south façade of the existing building at the gym façade, this may be something to consider on the new addition.

6. MASSING AND FLOOR PLANS

- a. Dan Curry presented two massing strategies
 - i. Option 1: Ground floor rotated 90 degrees so auxiliary gym space is double height at the west end of the addition. Upper two floors are long in the north-south direction and the massing extends south of the existing south façade by approximately 80’.
 - ii. Option 2: All three floors stack; auxiliary gym is on ground floor and is not a double height space. Massing is more of a square form where the first option was more rectangular. It does not extend as far south, but extends farther west on the upper 2 floors
 - iii. Both options show a glazed “hyphen” space along the west face of the existing building where the connection with the new addition occurs.
 - iv. Both options show a new stair central to the addition that serves as the main vertical circulation for the addition.
- b. Dan Curry reviewed the building stacking.
- c. Dot Green asks about classrooms along the north side on the first floor: what are they used for as there is no natural light in those rooms? Dan responds that if lightwells can be created to bring light down to those rooms there are greater possibilities for programming; otherwise the goal is to not use them for core or science but rather for electives that may be possible without daylight.





- d. Renee Harber mentions that she would prefer 6th grade to share the 3rd floor with 7th grade rather than be on the 1st floor and have electives and other shared classrooms on that floor.
- e. Robert Dudka asked that massing views be shared from the north (from DPR property) as well.
- f. Discussion about how decisions are made when a material that may be historically appropriate but is not environmentally appropriate. Dan Curry explained how there are many options on the market these days so that conflict is not something to be concerned about. John explained that what is inside the wall to contribute to performance often does not have much to do with the choice of exterior material, so that is how that conflict can be handled.
- g. Debi DeFranco provided comments on the size/height of the auxiliary gym and the size of health classrooms.
- h. Discussion about locker rooms and how many students need to be accommodated at one time. Ms. DeFranco mentions up to 200 students could need to change at the same time.
- i. Several comments made on specific instructional space requirements for the project. John Chadwick states that the program and space requirements for the school are determined by APS instructional staff. After the upcoming meeting with APS instruction, QEA will discuss with the BLPC what sacrifices or trade-offs may need to happen.

7. OPTIONS FOR THE NEW ELEVATOR AT THE EAST END

- a. Dan Curry reviews two options for locating a new elevator that travels from basement to third floor at the east end of the existing building to improve the accessible path between those floors.
 - i. Option 1: Using shaft for existing elevator that is from B to 1. Elevator would extend through to 2 and 3 with a new corridor constructed over the roof that would connect at 2 and 3 at the east end of the central classroom bar.
 - ii. Option 2: Create a new elevator shaft towards that end of the classroom bar but in a space currently occupied by classrooms on each level. Three classrooms would be affected, requiring replacement somewhere else, likely in the new addition. Furthermore, excavation at the basement level would be needed for the elevator and a corridor to connect to the basement as there is no existing basement in that location.
- b. QEA will continue to develop these two schemes and work with Turner on feasibility; will update BLPC.
- c. John Chadwick raises the possibility of doing Option 2, but only from floors 1-3, thus eliminating the costly basement piece. A person who needs to use an elevator to travel from floor to floor would need to change elevators at the 1st floor, although the two elevators would be quite near each other.
 - i. Some BLPC members thought this was a compromise position worth pursuing; some felt it did not solve the problem completely.
- d. Question about building security: what is the security plan with an increase in entrances? Will the existing Vacation Lane bus loop entrance remain the "main entrance?"
 - i. Discussion about how existing main entry will remain the main entry for students arriving via bus, and all visitors.
 - ii. John Chadwick mentions that there will be new security measures at the new neighborhood middle school, and that APS will work to design the building so that portions can be closed off during off hours, and no entrance that is open will be without supervision.
- e. Discussion about the driveway and the possibility for it to be open for parking or drop-off for after hours uses, or for summer camp. It will be something for APS to determine in the future.

- f. Question raised about the possibility of moving to auxiliary gym to the 2nd floor so all of the spaces that are potentially shared with the community would be on a single floor.

8. NEXT STEPS

- a. Next BLPC is 12/21; will be an update on site design.
- b. PFRC meeting on 12/16 will include a preview of site design.

END OF MEETING NOTES

