
Happy Valley Educational Specifications Advisory Committee

Workshop 4 Meeting Minutes

PROJECT: Happy Valley Elementary

PROJECT NUMBER: 121-14011

MEETING DATE: May 19, 2014

MEETING LOCATION: Happy Valley Elementary

Members Present:

Anderson, Mike	Haberman, Mike
Angell, Dennis	Howard, Gretchen
Aperule, Tara	Lawyer, Curtis
Brawley, Jackie	Lin, Ming
Caldwell, Thomas	Love, Brian
Cowan, Ron	Moss-Owen, Jamine
D'Hondt, Mike	Prichard, Tony
DeJong, Jill	Rumbaugh, Matt
Flanagan, Kevin	Scherrer, Wendy
Gazow, Kurt	Sterling-Chue, LaVonne
	Tolliver, Karen

Members Absent:

Dalton, Mark
Dominguez, Kristi
Holland, Melissa
Morse, Steve

A. Comments on Workshop 3 Meeting Minutes

No comments or corrections noted.

B. Area Tabulation Spreadsheet

1. Kevin reviewed the Area Tabulation with the group. The general consensus from the Ed Spec committee was that the priority on space is for classroom size and shared area space.
 - a. There was some discussion regarding classroom groupings with shared areas. Assuming 3 classrooms per pod, there are 6 shared areas; if the pods were larger (4-5 classrooms), there would be fewer pods and fewer shared areas so the shared area could be larger and/or the classrooms could be larger. The committee will continue to consider this.
 - b. Ron indicated that 2 portables could remain on site. With this, the art program could be in a portable rather than a designated space in the school. With this, the computer lab space could be a full size classroom. It is anticipated that the computer labs will not be used in the future and this room should be planned to

become an idea lab/project room (science, STEM, art). The lab could be plumbed for future large sinks to accommodate flexibility in future use.

- c. LaVonne noted that art in the portable can work for student use and could be used as an after-hours community art room.
 - d. It was noted that a space like the resource room could possibly be smaller if there were more 'push in' programs in the future, however, by keeping it the classroom size it will accommodate the current needs and allow flexibility for the room to be used as a classroom space in the future. As a classroom, space consideration should be given to relate this space with other classrooms.
 - e. Moving art to the portable allows for larger classrooms and larger shared areas. To meet the area target of 53,000 SF, the PTA office was removed to allow them to use the conference room in the school. The committee agreed that these adjustments provided a good balance of space to keep classrooms large, have good shared areas and a future project room.
2. Attached is the revised Area Tabulation sheet that reflects the balancing made by the committee.

C. Happy Valley Design Thinking

1. The architects discussed the design process and focus on responding to the goals identified by the committee as well as the student books.
2. The architects prepared 3 different design options for building lay including conceptual site plans and floor plans. The committee was instructed that the intent is NOT to select a preferred design but to discuss the relative merit of each. The discussion around these schemes is intended to inform the architects what responds best to the needs and preferences of the school.

D. Discussion for each Design Concept

The following are pros, cons and comments for each of the 3 concepts presented (see attached for drawings of each concept).

1. Concept 1 – Reaching Out
 - a. Pros
 - + Like entry – nice, open, welcoming
 - + Connects well to street
 - + Good access and supervision from gym/commons to play
 - + Like art/STEM/lab up front – visible
 - b. Cons
 - Garden on north would be in shade
-

- Garden by parking is a concern
- Don't like fields adjacent to north property/apartment parking lot
- Long hallway – want closer connection for gym to classrooms
- Hallway along shared areas could be disruptive

c. Comments

- Bus drop-off separate from cars is good for traffic flow but separate loading areas will require added supervision

2. Concept 2 – Big Tent

a. Pros

- + PK and K are close to playground
- + Drop-off close to entry
- + Good garden location for sun (though far from commons)
- + Classrooms get good exposure and light
- + Good transition of land use from north apartments to parking to play
- + Good internal connections – sense of community
- + Feels well connected

b. Cons

- Question the access from the gym to the playground
- Bus access from 27th may be an issue – need to confirm with City (applied to all schemes)
- Don't like fields adjacent to north property/apartment parking lot
- Concern that line of classrooms along south are too linear
- Hallway along shared areas could be disruptive
- Concern that line of classrooms along south are too linear
- Art is very internal rather than visible

c. Comments

- Courtyard in middle of school was discussed, concern expressed that it could become a more cold, unused space. Other opinion that courtyards have been successful in schools

3. Concept 3 – Green Link

a. Pros

- + Like L shaped pods
- + Classrooms get good exposure and light
- + Like that gym is behind classrooms – allows good light for both
- + Like that lunchroom can open to courtyard on nice days

b. Cons

- Don't like admin separated from classrooms; security/management issue
 - Don't like odd shaped classrooms
 - Angled walls in commons could be wasted space
-

- Music would be somewhat isolated
- Covered play too far away
- Concern that courtyard would be cold

c. Comments

- Question if walkways between would be covered or not. Open connections would be considered undesirable (too much like Sehome)
- Should flip PK and K to have K closer to classroom

E. Other General Comments

1. Noted that a cluster of 4 classrooms works well for shared space in middle.
2. Considering that 'art' is not specifically part of the listed areas in the revised tabulation, the space should be referred to differently to reflect use for computer lab, STEM or projects.
3. Like to be welcoming (with safe path) for walkers from 24th and 27th.

F. Next Steps

1. Next meeting will be 5/27 at 1:00 at Happy Valley Portable F. The meeting will review new concepts developed based on today's input.
-