



Meeting Minutes BSD – Parkview Elementary Advisory Committee Meeting No. 3 December 16, 2014

Parkview principal Mylo Allen opened the meeting at 3:32 pm and introduced the committee to the staff of Parkview who joined the meeting for the first half hour.

Mylo highlighted the purpose of the advisory group: to provide input and recommendations for the design of a new gym or cafeteria; identify other building and/or site improvements to be completed if funds allow; take into consideration that a future bond issue may provide funds for the complete renovation or rebuilding of Parkview Elementary; and help communicate and gather input from stakeholders including staff, neighbors, parents, etc.

He drew attention to the Facts, Needs, Goals handout (see December 9 minutes) and reviewed items listed. He asked staff to jot down additional thoughts. Staff was encouraged to keep the lists and add to over the next couple of days, if necessary before returning to Mylo. See Addendum 1, attached.

Questions Mylo posed to staff:

Do you think Parkview should build a gym or a cafeteria? Please explain why.

- depends on the future expansion; whatever is going to make it all pull together in a sensible way later
- a gym would be good choice in order to utilize the stage more often
- Staff question: will the existing gym/cafeteria remain heated by the boiler? If so, advocate for a new gym since there is 7 hours of instruction in there per day. Answer: the new space should have new air-handling and heat source and if the existing space is kept, it could possibly be modified to improve those aspects
- Staff question: If we build a new gym, would we also at least build a kitchen to the existing cafeteria? Answer: likely, the need to renovate or improve the current kitchen will need to be considered as stated in the original advisory group template

If funds allow, what other improvements to the building or site should be considered? Please explain why.

- extra space for small group instruction
- concur about extra space for small group instruction
- student bathrooms in the intermediate wing
- the two doors in the intermediate wing that lead outside are a safety concern
- designated space for PTA
- revisit air quality
- heating and cooling
- soundproofing to the calming room (room 8 - special ed)
- eliminate or change 'freezeway' because of traffic congestion and climate
- staff room/work room modification
- extra storage in classrooms
- playground surface improvements (under play structure)
- parking and traffic loop
- covered play area - line of sight, flat surface, more light
- Staff question: will safety improvements be paid by another fund or will they be part of our budget? Answer: there are other bond funds and a safety grant that will pay for safety improvements

Mylo excused the Parkview staff at 4:02 and told staff he'd collect their written feedback now or in the coming days.

Handouts were distributed. Minutes will be reviewed electronically and comments/edits can be submitted to Mylo/Ron Cowan in order to approve.



Zervas Group architect Terry Brown indicated that the 9 schemes from last week's gaming exercise were distilled down to the 3 concepts.

Terry reviewed all 3 concepts (site plan, floor plan, massing model - see attached) and encouraged members to jot down notes about pros and cons.

Questions about each floor plan were asked and answered. Some answers were identified and shown on the floor plan and for others, floor plans will have to be refined as issues are identified and the process ensues.

Other thoughts identified by group members not already listed on the material:

Concept A -

- the only site plan that impacts the school garden
- this seems to be the least impactful on the operation of the school in terms of construction during the school year
- there appears to be no way to join west wing to the cafeteria without creating a cross current of students

Concept B -

- the PE storage location is fine but does not seem to be large enough
- challenges with supervision with this plan because of the corridor between gym and east wing
- circulation to the music area continues to be a challenge
- seems less flexible in terms of compatibility with future design
- this still keeps all the kids mostly entering and exiting the same area for lunch and recess (although staging of lunches and hand washing would be contained in the cafeteria and not done in the hallway any longer)
- could the covered play area come off of the other side of the gym instead to improve visibility and future building compatibility? (yes)

Concept C -

- no other additional comments

General questions:

- if we remodel spaces now and a new building is created in a few years, will the remodeled spaces remain or would they be redone? Answer: depending on the concept, remodeled spaces may or may not be incorporated into new design later. The intent is to either keep costs minimal on those spaces now so the loss is lessened if taken down in the future, or to create a space that is embedded and at a level that would incorporate well into the new design
- is the cost of new cafeteria tables included in these cost estimates? Answer: no, the construction budget and the project budget is separate and there is a budget for new tables
- please discuss construction phasing - it appears Concept B and Concept C would be more difficult than concept A? Answer: yes, some concepts have more difficult phasing and sequencing than others
- in the concepts with new gym construction, will the gym be comparable in size to the new Birchwood Elementary gym? Answer: yes, that is a standard elementary school gym and that would be the plan for Parkview, too
- on Concept A, even with a renovation, we wouldn't be raising the roof, correct? Answer: correct. But size-wise the renovated gym will be comparable. In some cases, the roof might be higher or lower than other current gyms but will be up to standard.

Terry pointed out that the difference in cost between the concepts is only about \$150,000 because the ratio of new versus renovated spaces is similar in all three concepts.



Terry also mentioned that the 'massing' drawings are not architectural renderings they are simply 'big blocks' showing relative size of the new spaces and don't include any design elements.

Assistant Superintendent Ron Cowan asked for some feedback from the group - do these three concepts accurately reflect the ideas in the 9 schemes from last week or are there other things that need to be addressed? Terry also identified that there is room for movement within any of the chosen concepts; things can be tweaked.

- One member commented that it feels like there is no graceful movement of students in any of these concepts - the halls and corridors feel like an afterthought. Another member commented that it may be the sacrifice of choosing to keep students at Parkview rather than disburse to other schools during a renovation. Terry said there could be ways to move spaces around. The proposed halls are designed as 10 foot corridors which is generous compared to some other schools.

More general discussion and questions and answers ensued. Ron then asked for a sense from the group - are members ready to declare a favorite or is more time necessary?

- One member asked, with all the feedback given, would the architects have come up with another idea or have they been limited by the members' designs? Terry said that he had an idea for a concept and the group came up with it as well. Ron clarified that the purpose of the group is to have the people who are closest to the project and living in the space be the ones who have the greatest voice in determining what the design should be.
- One member said she would be very comfortable eliminating one and then would like to have a table discussion about the other two.
- One member asked, what is better when taking a preferred plan to the community? Is it better to have one preferred concept or better to have a couple that are floated for more opinion? Ron answered that it has been done both ways in the past and it really depends on what the group wants to do. One member suggested that taking one preferred option to the community is the best idea and then pose that there are opportunities for input.
- One member asked if there could be an open discussion to hear what opinions are.
- Ron encouraged members to share their thoughts about the concepts.
- One member suggested that voting now could reveal a lot and give the group something to springboard from.
- Some members indicated that B is least favorite and others indicated C is least favorite. Most of the reasons are because of the impact on the school and opportunities for future compatibility. Some indicated that C is a favorite floor plan except for the limitations presented by impact and compressed space.
- One member favors B's floor plan. Another member also indicated B of a favorite but acknowledged that is not a member who works in the space.
- After more discussion the committee agreed they had reached consensus that Concept A was the preferred plan, with the understanding that there are refinements to be made.



The committee agreed on January 7, 2015 at 7 pm for a parent/neighbor meeting to share their initial work and the preferred design concept and provide opportunity for feedback and questions. Advisory group members are encouraged to attend to hear feedback first hand.

The meeting adjourned at 5:34 pm.