

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

**DATE:** April 14, 2011  
**RE:** Brown Station Elementary School (13272) – Meeting #2  
**ATTENDING:** See Attached List

### REMARKS:

Meeting #2 for the Feasibility Study was held at this date. The following is a record of issues discussed:

1. Craig and Adrienne made a presentation of the process and composition of the committee.
  - a. This school modernization will be designed for a 740 core.
  - b. The students will attend Grosvenor during the modernization.
  - c. The existing gym is air conditioned.
  - d. Construction is slated to begin late 2014 and be complete by August 2016. The construction timeline is dependent on funding.
2. Greg presented the existing plan and program spaces of the school as well as the proposed program to be included in the modernization.
  - a. The difference in the two programs is about 21,000 SF of usable space. This does not include the County day care facility Add Alternate, the 6 master planned classrooms, the corridors, stairs, or toilet rooms, etc.
  - b. The site has 9 acres, only 7 of which are usable.
3. The six proposed options were described as follows:
  - a. Option A – 2 Story Addition - Demolish part of the existing school and add a two story addition to provide the required spaces. The existing gym would remain in this option.
  - b. Option B – New 2 Story School with a Courtyard - Retain only the existing gymnasium and build a new two story school to provide the required spaces. This option includes a courtyard.
  - c. Option C – New 2 Story “L” Shaped School – This option has a 2 story classroom wing at the street.
  - d. Option D – New 2 Story “V” Shaped School – This option has a 1 story classroom wing at the street.
  - e. Option E – New 2 story “L” Shaped School w/ a New Site Plan – This option offers a view of the play fields from the street and new site circulation to separate the buses from the cars.
  - f. Option F – New 3 Story School – This option offers a view of the play fields from the street and new site circulation to separate the buses from the cars.
4. The feedback received from the attendees is as follows:
  - a. Option A
    - i. This option is not preferable because the open space is greatly reduced and the site will not accommodate even the minimum MCPS site requirements.
    - ii. This option does not allow for the media center or music rooms to be high spaces.
    - iii. The PEP and the K will need to be flipped so that the PEP can have direct access to their fields.
    - iv. The control from the admin suite needs to be incorporated into the design.
    - v. This option is difficult to resolve architecturally.
    - vi. Adrienne requested the “nook” by the gym be evaluated as it is a security issue and reevaluate the location of the future classrooms.
  - b. Option B
    - i. Per Adrienne, the unloaded corridor is inefficient and would have to be evaluated and either be loaded or removed. This would create either a “U” shaped building (i.e. the loop to be completed when the future addition is constructed) or a revised design that loads all of the corridors.
    - ii. The one to one and a half story facing the street is a good neighborhood scale.

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

- iii. The field space is adequate.
- iv. The PEP and the K classes would have to be flipped.
- v. The design team should look into new parking designs for this option to see if that could improve this option.
- c. Option C
  - i. The “noisy” / after hours program spaces being grouped together makes sense.
  - ii. The gym at the end of the public corridor is a long walk for the kids at the end of the classroom wing.
  - iii. The two story building on the street is too large for the neighborhood scale.
  - iv. The future addition location looks tight.
  - v. The PEP play areas need to be adjacent to the PEP classrooms.
  - vi. Admin and Health need to be adjacent to each other.
  - vii. The fields should be visible and accessible from the street.
  - viii. Can a 3<sup>rd</sup> level be considered for this option to allow a field view from the street?
  - ix. The teachers like to walk the corridors during their free periods. The “loop” provides this opportunity.
- d. Option D
  - i. The gym is accessible to after hours parking but the kids would need to walk past the kindergarten wing to go to the gym. This is not preferable.
  - ii. The longer drop off lane is good.
  - iii. There is only 1 softball field. That is not preferable.
- e. Option E
  - i. The gym is in a good location for the kids, but it needs to be accessible from the parking lot. A suggestion was made to provide a vestibule to serve the gym and cafeteria.
  - ii. Admin needs to monitor the entire parking lot and drop off.
  - iii. The large field space is preferable.
  - iv. The long drop off lane and the separation of the buses from cars are both good.
  - v. The fields are visible and accessible from the street.
  - vi. It looks like there is sufficient room for the future classrooms.
- f. Option F
  - i. Dr. Baskerville commented that the small footprint and large field area makes this option preferable to the other options.
  - ii. The design team noted this is the only option that accommodates the full MCPS Ed Spec site requirements.
  - iii. The PEP will need to be on the main level with the admin, gym, media, etc. and have direct access to their play areas.
  - iv. The future classroom location should be shifted away from the front.
  - v. The car and bus separation is good.
  - vi. Is it possible to keep the existing gym?
  - vii. The design team should look into the after hours use of the gym location.
  - viii. Dr. Baskerville liked the “statement” that the media center could make on the street.
- g. General comments:
  - i. Craig stated the goal of tonight’s meeting is to discuss pros and cons of each of the 6 options presented and direct the design team regarding which options to continue to develop.
  - ii. It was agreed that Options B, C, D, E and F showed potential because they might be able to accommodate the minimum MCPS site requirements.
  - iii. Currently the parents park and pick up their kids.



## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

- iv. Currently the cars and buses are in conflict often. Parents park between the buses to drop off their children. This is a safety concern of several staff members.
  - v. The existing handicapped parking spaces are not usable when the buses are in the bus loop.
  - vi. The current school has about 70 parking spaces. 100 are required for a reduced class size school. 30 additional parking spaces have been shown on all options.
  - vii. Dr. Baskerville would like the design team to try and look at options that keep the existing gym.
  - viii. It was requested the design team look into the existing gym's mechanical system to see if the system is viable and worthy of saving. The design team will review and discuss with Seth Adams at MCPS and report the findings at Meeting #3 on May 3<sup>rd</sup>.
  - ix. Dr. Baskerville stated that large fields should be a priority since enrollment continues to grow and play area for recess is critical.
  - x. The media center can be on the second floor.
  - xi. The fields should all be drawn at 180° radii so all options can be easily compared.
  - xii. It was requested the design team salvage the memorial plaques and the class photos and place in a prominent location in the new school.
  - xiii. It was requested the design team save as many trees as possible.
5. The following was requested of the design team for the next meeting:
- a. The design team is to further develop the following options: A, B, E, and F as well as any other options that might be the result of the feedback received tonight.
  - b. Options C and D are to be eliminated.
  - c. In addition, the design team is to incorporate the following in the next presentation:
    - i. Show relocatable classrooms-on each option.
    - ii. All options are to show PEP and HS K and PreK with direct access to their play areas.
    - iii. K classrooms do not need direct access to their play areas.
6. Schedule
- |    |                   |   |                       |
|----|-------------------|---|-----------------------|
| a. | Feasibility Study | - | 2011                  |
| b. | Design            | - | June 2012 – June 2014 |
| c. | Construction      | - | late 2014 – June 2016 |
| d. | Move In           | - | August 2016           |

The next meeting will be Thursday, May 3<sup>rd</sup> at 7:00 pm.

The proceeding is the author's interpretation of events that transpired at the above-referenced meeting. Any clarifications, requests for changes, or additional information may be submitted in writing within ten (10) working days from the date of these meeting minutes, for inclusion into the record, otherwise these minutes shall be accepted into the record as written.

Submitted by:

Robin Z. Puttock, AIA, LEED AP  
Project Architect

Attachments: Attendance list, 6 options (A-F)

cc: Shpur, Shuman, Karamihas, Lukmire, File 13272