



Smolen ■ Emr ■ Ilkovitch Architects

1355 PICCARD DRIVE, SUITE 200
Rockville, Maryland 20850
(301) 770-0177
FAX (301) 330-3224

Meeting Minutes		
Project: (Name, Address)	Longfellow Elementary School 5470 Hesperus Drive Columbia, MD 21044	
Meeting Location:	Longfellow Elementary School Art Room	Meeting Date: November 19, 2012 Time: 4:00 p.m.
Owner:	Howard County Public School System 10910 Route 108 Ellicott City, MD 21042	
Architect:	Smolen ■ Emr ■ Ilkovitch Architects, Inc. 1355 Piccard Drive, Suite 200 Rockville, Maryland 20850	Architect's Project Number: 12022.00

Attendees

Laurel Marsh	Principal, LOES	410-313-6879	laurel_marshall@hcpss.org
Dan Notari	Assistant Principal, LOES	410-313-6879	dnotari@hcpss.org
Michelle Baker	LOES	410-313-6879	michelle_baker@hcpss.org
Laurie Buckland	LOES	410-313-6879	laurie_buckland@hcpss.org
Susan McHale	LOES / Parent	410-313-6882	susan_mchale@hcpss.org
Lauren Dolinger Few	Parent	410-988-4635	lauren.dolinger.few@gmail.com
Lucas Webster	Parent	443-538-5214	webster@constructionlaw.com
Steve Horuath	Parent	443-518-4939	shoruath@howardcc.edu
Ken Roey	HCPSS	410-313-1527	ken_roey@hcpss.org
Bruce Gist	HCPSS	410-313-6798	bruce_gist@hcpss.org
Scott Washington	HCPSS	410-313-6807	scott_washington@hcpss.org
Ron Miller	HCPSS	410-313-6739	ronald_miller@hcpss.org
James W Emr	Smolen ■ Emr ■ Ilkovitch (SEI)	301-770-0177	jemr@seearch.com
Dan Lubeley	Smolen ■ Emr ■ Ilkovitch (SEI)	301-770-0177	dlubeley@seearch.com
Dave Fischer	Smolen ■ Emr ■ Ilkovitch (SEI)	301-770-0177	dfischer@seearch.com
Jonathan Dickinson	Lend Lease	301-354-3121	jonathan.dickinson@lendlease.com

Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Item	Minutes	Action
1.	Mr. Washington opened the meeting, explaining the two objectives of the session. The first objective was to go over issues with the design of the school, the second to review moving the school against performing an occupied renovation.	
2.	Mr. Lubeley took the floor to discuss the changes the design team had made to address the comments from the first committee meeting.	

3.	<p>Revisions to the site plan included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising the crosswalk and sidewalk locations to allow pedestrian access to the school without having to cross the car entrance/exit lanes at Hesperus. Pedestrians will need to cross traffic once on site. • Adding an extra lane at the parent drop off and parking lot exit. In total the revised design has three lanes: entrance, left turn exit, and right turn exit. This was accomplished by widening the entrance, not by narrowing the existing drive lanes. 	
4.	<p>The committee asked the following questions regarding the site plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently the school has several dumpster pads in the parking lot, will these be accommodated in the renovation? Mr. Lubeley answered that yes, these will be located, but not until after the schematic design phase when the broader design issues have been resolved. • Will adding a third lane at the Hesperus Drive entrance require widening the curb cut? Mr. Lubeley answered that it would required widening. He also noted that adding this lane required the removal of 3 parking spaces from the previous site design. The design team will attempt to relocate these 3 spaces as the design moves forward. • What is the reasoning for HCPSS' directive to separate the bus loop and parent drop off/parking lot? Mr. Roey answered that pedestrian safety is the motivation behind this directive. 	
5.	<p>Mr. Lubeley explained the revisions to the floor plan. Revisions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing and proposed plans were color coded to clearly define spaces make comparison easier. • Grade levels have been grouped into clusters, but not pods. • Infilling the front courtyard (between gymnasium and early education classrooms) to gain additional space. • Ensuring adequate number of classroom, office, special program, and pull-out spaces. • Providing direct interior access from the main entrance to the early education classrooms. • Providing a second music classroom off the public corridor across from the cafetorium. • Relocating art to the central courtyard to take advantage of the natural light. • Relocating the computer lab to be closer to the media center. • Eliminating the oversized ELRs in favor of a greater number of smaller breakout spaces. • The addition of mechanical spaces to accommodate the heating/cooling renovation. • Locating student bathrooms by the cafetorium. 	

6.	<p>The committee asked the below questions regarding the floor plan. Unless otherwise noted. The design team will look into incorporating these comments into the next iteration of the floor plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can handicap accessibility be added to the back entrance of the music classroom to help provide a second accessible exit out of the rooms? • Can an exit to the exterior be added to the corridor by the 5th grade classrooms, similar to the exit at the Pre-K classroom on the opposite side of the school? • Can a G&T classroom be relocated to be proximate to the 4th and 5th grade clusters? This relationship is more important than clustering the two G&T classrooms. • Are the ELRs large enough to be used for a whole team/grade meeting (as the current Pod Commons are used)? Mr. Washington noted that this is a common concern as the county moves away from Pods to enclosed teaching spaces. He answered that the ELRs were not large enough for this function and that it is very difficult to find large enough spaces for this function in enclosed classroom schools. • With the music rooms located by classrooms, will there be any sound issues? Mr. Lubeley answered that the design places the music rooms off in their own corner, and that storage rooms between music classrooms and other teaching spaces. In addition acoustical walls will be utilized to ensure the sound is contained. Mr. Washington noted that this will be a LEED project, and as such acoustical considerations are specifically measured and certified. • With the new corridor to the early education areas, would there be enough space to stage these students outside by the main entrance? The committee noted that currently there are gardens flanking the main entrance, and that these could be removed to provide staging space. It was also suggested that a third set of doors could be added to the main entrance to further ease the flow of students at opening/dismissal. • Will there be a visitor bathroom for adults to use without going into the administrative suite? Mr. Lubeley noted that there was a toilet room located at the lobby that could be utilized for this purpose. • Will there be a canopy provided at the front entrance? 	
7.	<p>After the questions/comments were wrapped up, Mr. Washington asked that any further concerns be sent to Principal Marsh. As with the last meeting, Principal Marsh will forward these onto Mr. Washington and Mr. Lubeley. This is to be sent by email on 11/28/12.</p>	
8.	<p>Principal Marsh will go over the floor plan provide her thoughts on 11/28/12. This review will include assigning the offices and breakout spaces shown on the plan.</p>	
9.	<p>Mr. Roey opened the floor for a discussion of the issue of moving versus occupied construction.</p>	
10.	<p>Mr. Washington noted that the feedback provided through Principal Marsh has been supporting occupied construction and against relocating the school.</p>	
11.	<p>Principal Marsh explained that the Longfellow community as not been provided with enough information on school relocation to make an educated decision. She outlined questions that are unanswered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would teachers, students, administration, special programs, after-care programs be split up? • Would splitting up the school affect its status with special programs such as Title I? 	

12.	Mr. Roey explained that HCPSS would come up with a detailed plan for how moving the school would work within the next few weeks.	
13.	Mr. Roey noted that at this point HCPSS is attempting to gauge the community's level of comfort with moving the school population during construction, as well as compile the questions and concerns. These factors will be presented to the Board of Education, in conjunction with HCPSS's study of the physical feasibility of this strategy. The plan is to provide information to the BOE at the Schematic Design presentation on Jan. 10, 2013.	
14.	Mr. Dickinson was asked to give more detail on the schedule of a phased occupation. He presented a potential phasing plan, showing locations and schedule of what spaces would be taken away for construction purposes. He noted that this plan was preliminary, and any final phasing plan would be devised after meeting with the principal and coordinated with the needs of the school.	

This concludes the minutes of the meeting as recorded by Smolen ■ Emr ■ Ilkovitch Architects. If there are any errors or omissions, please notify our office at once.

The next scheduled Planning Advisory Committee Meeting will be held on December 3, 2012 at 4:00 pm at Longfellow Elementary.

Prepared by: Dave Fischer

Reviewed by: Dan Lubeley

N:_2012 Projects\12022.00 Longfellow ES\MGMT\MeetingMinutes\PAC mtgs\MM 2012.11.19 - PAC 2.doc