

**Public Facilities Review Committee
New ES#1 (Williamsburg MS Campus)
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, January 23, 2013**

Attendees

<u>PFRC Members (√ = present):</u>	<u>Arlington Public Schools (APS):</u>
√ Charles Monfort, Chair	John Chadwick, APS
√ Lander Allin, Schools	Steve Stricker, APS
Jeff Certosimo, Housing Commission	Wyck Knox, VMDO Architects
√ Elizabeth Gearin, Parks & Rec. Commission	Diane Lambert, TDG
Brian Harner, Planning Commission	Eric Mongelli, TDG
Eric Harold, E2C2	Tina Fink, TDG
√ Jana Lynott, Transportation Commission	
√ Inta Malis, Planning Commission	<u>County Staff:</u>
√ John Miller, At-Large	Matt Pfeiffer, DCPHD
√ Heather Obora, Schools	Freida Wray, DCPHD
Betty Siegel, At-Large	Robert Gibson, DES
Jason Widstrom, Fiscal Affairs Adv. Comm.	
	<u>Observers:</u>
<u>New ES#1 Project-Specific PFRC Members (√ = present):</u>	Tony Trabant, Rock Spring CA
√ Lynn Pollock, Rock Spring CA	Gail Harrison, Rock Spring CA
√ Moe Kabiri, Rock Spring CA	Judy Hadden, Resident
√ Paul Cullen, Williamsburg CA	Richard Sheehy, Resident
Jim Lunson, Williamsburg CA	
√ David Friedman, Yorktown CA	<u>Ashlawn Project-Specific PFRC Members (√ = present):</u>
√ David Haring, Yorktown CA	Josh Handler, Boulevard Manor CA
√ Ann Hafer, Franklin Area CA	Tamela Gelboin, Boulevard Manor CA
Craig Esherick, Sports Commission	Matt Robarge, Dominion Hills CA
√ Ed Hilz, Urban Forestry Commission	Scott Christensen, Dominion Hills CA
	Craig Esherick, Sports Commission
	Ed Hilz, Urban Forestry Commission

Concept Design 1.5

VMDO presented Concept Design 1.5, which is the option located in the southeast quadrant of the site. Wyck Knox highlighted several elements of the concept design, including the relocated gym, reduced building height from 2 to 3 stories, comparable setbacks from the curb, covered outdoor spaces, elements of the pre-K/K area adjacent to North Harrison Street including the vegetated roof and outdoor play area, building footprint (43,349 sf for main level), and overall GFA (approximately 94,000 sf). The BLPC approved this concept at its meeting on January 17, 2013. The concept design was discussed at the joint County Board/School Board Work Session held on January 17, 2013. At the work session the County Board identified three issues regarding the concept design: 1) the footprint is too large and sprawling; 2) the location of the building entrances are inconvenient and too far from the direction that some children will be walking to the school; and, 3) the building should have a public face, or civic presence, adjacent to 36th Street. In addition, the County Board stated its desire for an energy

efficient building. The concept design will be discussed at the School Board meeting as an informational item on January 24, 2013, and as an action item on February 7, 2013.

There was discussion among the PFRC about the design of the pre-K/K area and its relationship to 36th Street, adequacy of pathways through the site from various directions to access school entrances, the location of primary and secondary school entrances, and the building's civic presence adjacent to 36th Street. Several PFRC members, representing the community and surrounding civic associations expressed desire for the building to be partially screened from 36th Street N.

PFRC members were asked whether Concept 1.5 should be used as the basis for further site and architectural development in the schematic design phase of the project. The overwhelming consensus of the PFRC toward Concept 1.5 was very positive, with 13 out of 14 members present supporting the concept. Some comments included: concept is a nice campus model that provides a good transition from elementary to middle school; moving the pre-K/K area back from 36th Street might reveal the front door and make more of a presence, and have less impact on adjacent residences; consolidating the bus loop and pedestrian access on the west may allow creation of larger play areas; impervious surface areas should be minimized; native plant materials should be used in landscaping; step up of building allows for clear sight lines to 36th Street; good use of underutilized areas of property; concept needs a more dignified approach for pedestrians; more of the parking should be achieved on the street; and, the North Harrison Street side should be treated as sensitively as the 36th Street side.

Transportation

There was significant discussion about transportation and traffic issues, using a 37-page report from the Toole Design Group that answered 81 questions submitted by PFRC members since the last meeting. While many details remain to be resolved about the infrastructure improvements recommended by the report, at the end of the meeting there were no outstanding issues or questions by the PFRC. The County will need to continue to monitor traffic in the area as the school is built and once it opens. It was the consensus of the PFRC that no additional meetings focused specifically on traffic would need to be scheduled and the process should move on to the schematic design phase.

Next Steps

If the School Board approves Concept Design 1.5, then the next step is development of the schematic design. In order to allow sufficient time to develop site and building designs, PFRC probably will not meet on New ES#1 on February 27, as previously scheduled; the next two meetings would be on March 20 and April 17, 2013. At that time the PFRC will review the building architecture, façade design, site design, open space, and landscaping. Later meetings would address use permit conditions.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 pm.