

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

**Attendees**

<b><i>PFRC Members (√ = present):</i></b>	<b><i>Arlington Public Schools (APS):</i></b>
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	
√ Eric Harold, E2C2	<b><i>County Staff:</i></b>
Jana Lynott, Transportation Commission	Matt Pfeiffer, DCPHD
√ Inta Malis, Planning Commission	Robert Gibson, DES
√ John Miller, At-Large	Robin Leonard, DPR
√ Heather Obora, Schools	Freida Wray, DCPHD
Steve Sockwell, Planning Commission	<b><i>Observers:</i></b>
Jason Widstrom, Fiscal Affairs Adv. Comm.	Charles Trabandt, Resident
	Gail Harrison, Rock Spring CA
<b><i><u>New ES#1 Project-Specific PFRC Members (√ = present):</u></i></b>	
	Michael Marean, Resident
√ Lynn Pollock, Rock Spring CA	Jennifer Musser, Resident
Moe Kabiri, Rock Spring CA	Sharon Lewis, Resident
Paul Cullen, Williamsburg CA	Kevin Scott, Resident
√ Jim Lunson, Williamsburg CA	
David Friedman, Yorktown CA	<b><i><u>Ashlawn Project-Specific PFRC Members (√ = present):</u></i></b>
√ 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

**Process Updates**

Committee member Inta Malis chaired the meeting in Chair Monfort's absence.

The committee reviewed the public review schedule leading to the Planning Commission and County Board hearings in September. Future PFRC dates must be confirmed, including the scheduled June 19, 2013 meeting. The committee asked what the next phase of review – Final Design – would consist of. Chair Monfort had previously indicated that staff will present the draft use permit conditions and transportation matrix of recommended improvements at future meetings of the PFRC.

The PFRC requested that the PFRC Chair communicate to the School Board the status of their discussions prior to the May 2, 2013 meeting of the School Board to review the New ES#1 schematic design as an informational item. If this is not possible due to Chair Monfort's absence John Chadwick offered to provide a summary to the School Board. Further, the PFRC requested that the PFRC Chair prepare a letter to the Chair of the

County Board, with copies to the School Board, outlining the PFRC's discussion and comments on the schematic design of the New ES#1 prior to the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the School Board to decide on the New ES#1 schematic design.

### **Updates to Schematic Site Design**

#### **Tree Planting**

W. Knox, architect on contract with APS, provided an update on the design. As a part of his presentation, he reviewed the plan for new tree plantings. Based on the tree replacement standards, a total of 135 new replacement trees are required to be planted. APS proposes to plant 245 new trees. The BLPC had previously recommended that the number of new trees on the site be reduced, expressing concern for shaded play fields, impacts on the vista through the site, and creation of a barrier between the school and community. During the PFRC discussion, while one member commented that early in the process a desire was expressed to preserve the vista (views of the sky over the fields) through the entire site, other members expressed that the proposed number of trees would not adversely impact the vista, given that the viewshed would be impacted by tree trunks as opposed to the canopy. It was noted that the PFRC generally recommends additional tree plantings where possible. It was suggested that appropriate tree species be identified, such as river birch or other understory trees, which would allow the vista to be preserved. Another PFRC member commented that the provision of a double row of trees adjacent to the parking lot would mitigate the heat island effect.

#### **Play Fields and Construction Staging**

The play fields will be used for construction staging. One PFRC member asked about the potential to phase construction to allow continued use of the play fields. J. Chadwick responded that APS will attempt to allow as much use of the fields as possible, but given their tight construction time frame and the scheduled school opening in Fall 2015, it may not be possible.

#### **Sustainable Elements**

Locations of proposed photovoltaic solar panels (PV panels) were presented and shown on the roof of the gym and at the south end of the play fields. The PFRC expressed concerns for the aesthetic and child safety impacts of PV panels on the fields. J. Chadwick (APS) confirmed that the PV panels shown adjacent to the play fields will not be installed at that location. APS will continue to explore other locations on the building for installation of the PV panels. Mr. Chadwick also expressed that PV panels are not included in the school budget, and that APS is working on alternate sources of funding to secure the PV panels.

The PFRC raised questions regarding the inclusion of geothermal wells beneath the play fields, which is being proposed, and whether there would be conflicts with potential artificial turf fields. J. Chadwick explained that the wells would not be visible from the surface. He will also be exploring the costs for construction of wells beneath turf fields.

### **Updates to Schematic Building Design**

The appearance of the retaining wall will be reduced in height by replacing the upper portion with some type of open fencing material. New designs for screening the loading dock from the view of Harrison Street residents have not yet been developed. W. Knox also presented samples of the various materials and colors that will be used on the building façade. A warm color palette of tan brick, stone, and white cedar will be used to contrast the existing middle school building. The building design includes the provision of colorful bump-out windows that can also be used as cubby-holes internal to the classrooms. Several PFRC members expressed concerns that the design of the bump-out windows may result in children injuring themselves on the corners of the protruding windows and underneath window boxes, and suggested that the windows be lowered to preclude any safety issues. W. Knox agreed to reconsider their design.

### **Update on the NC Plan for improvements to the Williamsburg Boulevard and Kensington Street intersection**

R. Gibson, DES staff, presented planned intersection improvements for the Neighborhood Conservation project, which includes construction of nubs at each of the four corners, expansion of the median on the east side of Williamsburg Boulevard, installation of new pavement markings including a high-visibility ladder crosswalk, and the potential for flash-beacon pedestrian signals. While both TDG (APS transportation consultant) and County staff do not support a traffic signal at this intersection because it is not warranted by the traffic analysis, the NC project would not preclude a signal if it is determined that one is necessary. Staff will provide a detailed presentation and solicit citizen comments at the NC Project Design Review Meeting scheduled for May 13, 2013, from 7:00 – 9:00 pm, at the Williamsburg Middle School Auditorium.

There was discussion as to whether the NC Plan is appropriate for discussion with the PFRC. Commissioner Malis suggested it was relevant to the extent that this intersection is within the scope of the work done by Toole in its review of off-site transportation improvements and recommendations. On the one hand, Toole was not aware of the project when it conducted its analysis and the NC Project was not informed by the proposed ES#1. Since this intersection has gained a good deal of interest, updating the community on the specifics of the project seems reasonable.

### **PFRC Comments**

The following wrap-up comments were expressed by PFRC members in attendance:

- The project has come a long way and has made good advances on design; would like to see solutions to screening the service area.
- Appreciate how the architect has accommodated all the conflicting goals for the project.
- The E2C2 is pleased with the direction that the project is going for a much more sustainable, water- and energy-efficient building. It sets the tone for future school designs.
- The Franklin Area Civic Association has no comment; the representative's personal opinion is that the building design is lovely. It does oppose the field lighting.

- The building design works well for the site; only concern is the vista through the site.
- Pleased that initial resistance to building on the corner was overcome. Excited about the overall design and looks forward to reviewing more detailed plans of the building at future meetings. Concerned about the retaining wall outside the pre-K and K area and safety issues it may present. Looking forward to results of the safety and security review.
- Agree with all previous comments, but also concerned with the design of the south face of the building where the pre-K and K building elements are located – concerned about safety issues regarding the wall and the boxy architectural design of the pre-K and K elements.
- A beautiful campus with good design and sustainable elements; concerned about how much the bump-out windows extend out from the exterior wall and the safety concerns.
- Agree with all previous comments; the design has evolved and the architect has been very responsive. The wall outside the pre-K and K area is a concern; while it is an important design feature, aesthetics has to be balanced with child safety.
- Appreciate the work of the architect to bring together a wide range of views. Looking forward to seeing a solution for screening the loading docks and the type of fencing to be used above the stone wall.

### **Public Comments**

The following comments were expressed by the general public in attendance:

- First, it was requested that the PFRC formalize their position regarding no lighting on the play fields, recognizing that at the last meeting on April 17, 2013, the PFRC Chair stated that he sensed that the PFRC may support provision of artificial turf field(s) but not lighting of field(s). Second, the wall at the pre-K and K area has safety issues and the community is looking forward to the promised safety and security review. Third, believes the Toole report concluded that a traffic signal at Williamsburg Boulevard/Kensington Street was warranted.
- A number of issues and questions were raised regarding safety and technical issues with the Williamsburg Boulevard/Kensington Street intersection, and the desire for a signal at that location. Concern was expressed for the lack of involvement of the total community in earlier discussions of the NC plan. Only a small number of residents were involved in the planning the NC Project. Expressed disappointment by the format of the upcoming community meeting on the NC Plan. Not enough time is being allowed for community input. Does not believe the proposed design allows for two lanes of traffic in each direction on Williamsburg through the intersection.
- A resident who lives directly across from the Williamsburg Boulevard/Kensington Street intersection supports the incremental approach staff is taking to analyze the need for a traffic signal at this intersection. He feels the solution should be in proportion to the problem. He expressed concern for potential adverse traffic impacts at the intersection in front of his property and does not support signalization at this intersection.

- A resident who lives across from the Williamsburg Boulevard/Kensington Street intersection also expressed support for the staff position and no traffic signal at the intersection. The need is only for a few hours a day and there is no need for a 24/7 device.
- A resident indicated that he was an initiator of the NC Project. He identified the problem and NC staff developed the solution. He noted that he was among the residents who collected the necessary petition signatures in order to advance the project. The pragmatic approach of staff to the intersection improvements and signalization is needed; he does not support a traffic signal at this time. He looks forward to the new school and all of the benefits it would provide to the neighborhood.

### **Next Steps**

The next steps in the process include:

- May 2, 2013 – School Board Informational Item
- May 13, 2013 – NC Project Design Review Meeting
- May 16, 2013 – School Board Action Item
- May 20, 2013 – E2C2 Action Item
- June 19, 2013 – PFRC (tentative - scheduling of future PFRC meetings will be confirmed)
- July 15, 2013 – Filing Deadline for Use Permit Application
- July 23, 2013 – Parks & Recreation Commission
- July 25, 2013 – Urban Forestry Commission (tentative)
- ? – Sports Commission
- September 5, 2013 – Transportation Commission
- September 9, 2013 – Planning Commission
- September 21, 2013 – County Board

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.