

MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: Queen Anne Elementary School
Seattle Public Schools

PROJECT NO: 2015917.00

DATE: 27 May 2016

FILE NAME: 16527 (SDAT 06 mins) - DRAFT.docx

SUBJECT: School Design Advisory Team (SDAT) Meeting 06 – Finalize

MEETING DATE: 5 May 2016

TIME: 4:30-6:30

LOCATION: Queen Anne Elementary

ATTENDEES:

- X Joe Bailey-Fogarty QAES, 4th grade
- X Nancy Buran QAES, Nutrition
- X Jenny Brailey Parent
- X Gloria Chambers Neighbor
- Julie Colando QAES, 4th grade
- X Elena Damm Parent
- X John Leary Parent
- X Jenny Lee Parent
- X Patty Maxfield Neighbor
- X Amy McCue Jessee QAES, Principal
- Megan Palumbo QAES, 3rd grade
- Ted Panton Parent
- X Geness Reichert Neighbor
- X Jeffrey Riley QAES, Library
- X Jeff Rothenberg QAES, PE
- X Mark Stewart Parent

- X Vince Gonzales (VG) SPS
- X David Mount (DM) Mahlum
- X JoAnn Wilcox (JW) Mahlum
- X Forest Payne (FP) Mahlum

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

CORRECTIONS TO PREVIOUS MEETING

:: n/a

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION BY
5.1	JW presented the agenda	
5.2	<p data-bbox="381 575 854 594">Site analysis, site values & vehicular access</p> <p data-bbox="381 611 1224 667">JW presented discussion items recapping discussions in the previous SDAT meetings, and recent correspondence with parks regarding their property along Bigelow Ave</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="381 678 1170 735">:: JW summarized the significance of the Crown of the Hill Greenway, which includes Bigelow Ave and the street trees along it <li data-bbox="381 745 1159 802">:: JW presented a diagram showing the primary site values that are highest priority for the SDAT group <li data-bbox="381 812 1211 898">:: Parks owns the property between the curb and the school property, as well as the opposite side of Bigelow, but the street itself is owned and maintained by the City Engineer's office. <li data-bbox="381 909 1211 1058">:: In VG's correspondence with Parks, it was clear that Parks felt left out of the school's decision to begin utilizing Bigelow for dropoff when QAE opened in 2010. Parks would prefer dropoff be accommodated in another location, and the design team will explore alternatives after the initial traffic study is completed. <li data-bbox="381 1068 1224 1155">:: JW presented a series of diagrams showing primary considerations in developing site design schemes, including tree coverage, setbacks, views to the main historic facades, and site access. <li data-bbox="381 1165 1224 1285">:: JW presented a diagram showing the existing vehicular access to the school, including offsite bus and parent dropoff and onsite staff parking, followed by a series of diagrams illustrating alternative locations and the natural place for main entry to the buildings associated with each scheme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="430 1295 1224 1352">:: Schemes showing dropoff on Boston St are in conflict with existing Metro stop <li data-bbox="430 1362 1175 1419">:: Schemes showing dropoff on 4th Ave are challenging due to the narrowness of this street. Bus dropoff could work with a pullout lane <li data-bbox="430 1430 1211 1486">:: Curb cuts shown for staff parking and on-site dropoff access would need variance from SDOT standards for clearance to intersections <li data-bbox="430 1497 1175 1554">:: A neighbor expressed strong reservations over how 4th Ave would be impacted by locating dropoff/pickup along this street 	
5.3	<p data-bbox="381 1572 591 1591">Mission Statement</p> <p data-bbox="381 1608 1182 1692">JW presented summaries of the four mission statements that were developed in SDAT 05 and asked for volunteers to work with Amy to draft a final version compiling ideas expressed in each statement.</p>	
5.4	<p data-bbox="381 1715 656 1734">Functional Programming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="381 1745 1187 1801">:: JW presented qualities and principals related to effective collaborative work environments. <li data-bbox="381 1812 1203 1898">:: JW recapped the exercise from SDAT 02, which diagrammed individual and group learning activities and how these activities are utilized by the faculty to teach various subjects. - <li data-bbox="381 1908 951 1932">:: JW presented analysis of the results of the exercise - 	

- :: - 11% of the activities portrayed in the exercise by the SDAT members were shown to bring 2 or more classes together (>25 students). The learning activities and ideal tools chosen for each the activities are listed in the presentation.
- :: - 17% of the activities portrayed in the exercise by the SDAT members were shown to utilize groups of a full class (~25 students). The learning activities and ideal tools chosen for each the activities are listed in the presentation.
- :: - JW presented images and descriptions of spaces for large group learning: Forum/Lecture, Workshop/Creator Space, Community/Gathering Space
- :: - 11% of the activities portrayed in the exercise by the SDAT members were shown to utilize groups of around 10-15 students (Large Flex). The learning activities and ideal tools chosen for each the activities are listed in the presentation.
- :: - JW presented images and descriptions of spaces for medium group learning.
- :: - 30% of the activities portrayed in the exercise by the SDAT members were shown to utilize groups of around 4-6 students (Small Group). The learning activities and ideal tools chosen for each the activities are listed in the presentation.
- :: - JW presented images and descriptions of spaces for small group learning, whether in shared spaces for multiple groups or in small spaces physically separating individual groups.
- :: - 31% of the activities portrayed in the exercise by the SDAT members were shown to utilize individual or paired learning. The learning activities and ideal tools chosen for each the activities are listed in the presentation.
- :: - JW presented images and descriptions of spaces for 1 or 2 students to study on their own, whether with others or in breakout spaces.
- :: - In summary, 28% of the activities portrayed in the exercise by the SDAT members were shown to need space for large group learning, and 72% were shown to need accommodations for small to medium groups.

5.5 **Virtual Tour: Northwood Elementary**

JW presented all the various types of shared learning areas developed for this school on Mercer Island, and described their programmed function.

5.5 **Concept Development**

JW presented four schemes updated with input from SDAT 05 and meetings with the school district.

- :: Scheme 01 – Gym replaces existing covered play, utilizing existing dining as a stage. Administration expands within the brick building. Classrooms and library are located in a two-story wing attached to the brick building.

Pros: -

- :: Field in front of wood building (treehouse) -
- :: 4th & 5th grade in treehouse, sense of “graduation” -
- :: Amount of parking and location on site (south end) -
- :: Play areas -

- :: Location of library at the heart of the campus
- Cons:
 - :: Covered walkway cuts off façade of treehouse (Faculty felt it wasn't necessary to connect covered walk to front door of treehouse building)
 - :: Administration does not have supervision over site or dropoff
- Suggestions:
 - :: Look at Hay school for dropoff layout
 - :: Accommodate dropoff/pickup both for parents wanting to park and walk onto campus and those that do not want to get out of the car
 - :: Raise library to second floor
 - :: Use terraced field and entry in front of treehouse from Scheme 02
- :: Scheme 02 – Gym attached to treehouse. Administration and new classrooms located in one-story wing attached to the brick building. Library replaces existing dining; new dining/stage replaces existing covered play.
 - Pros: -
 - :: Like the terraced field, connection with gym. Steps good for viewing the - playfield.
 - :: Kindergarten closed to library, admin and commons
 - Cons:
 - :: Gym blocks view to the treehouse
 - :: Seems like three separate buildings
 - :: Pinch between admin wing and treehouse, separates play areas too much
 - :: Gym is far from youngest students, feels separated from rest of the campus
 - :: Concern with main entry on 4th Ave, too narrow and congested as-is
 - :: No parking on site, difficult for neighbors to accept
 - :: Library without direct views to exterior, library connected to dining
- :: Scheme 03 – Gym/stage attached to treehouse. Administration in treehouse. New classrooms located on second floor above library, which replaces the existing covered play. Dining stays in existing location with some renovation.
 - Pros:
 - :: Like lowering the grade for dropoff/parking along east edge of site
 - :: Entry sequence, plaza/garden, new trees on site
 - :: Covered walkway as threshold to the campus
 - :: Library with direct access to outdoors, access to natural light
 - :: Preservation of openness between the buildings
 - Cons:
 - :: Use of SE corner
 - :: Administration far from center of instruction
 - :: Distance between buildings
 - :: Gym feels separated from rest of the campus, distant from most of the students
 - :: Concern about ability to attach to the wood building in a respectful way
 - :: Too much site area dedicated to parking

- :: Concern about traffic on 4th Ave
- :: Scheme 04 – Gym located in new wing attached to the brick building. Administration expands within the brick building. Two-story classroom block replaces existing covered play. Dining/stage located in addition to treehouse.
Pros:
 - :: Gym addition attached to brick building works well
 - :: Plaza and new trees
 - :: Parking dropoff on siteCons:
 - :: Entry sequence
 - :: Administration does not have supervision over site or dropoff

Scheme 01 seemed to be the preferred scheme among the four presented

mahlum