



Working Group Meeting #3: July 23, 2014 Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendees

Working Group Members: Steve Cole, Chairman; Abby Raphael, Jay Fiset, Ginger Brown, Tom Ikeler, Dennis Gerrity, Erik Gutshall, Paul Holland, Stan Karson, Gerry Laporte, Carmen Romero, Paul Rothenberg, Alex Sanders, Jennifer Zeien, Denny Truesdale, Heather Obora, Kelly King. **Other participants:** Mark McLachlan, Stuart Stein, Stephen Powell, Katherine Elmore, Paul Mulligan, Anne Spiesman, Nancy Ianedes, Mike Aziz, James Gartner, Lionel White, Mary-Claire Bunck, Marjorie Green, Jennifer Zu, Barbara Kanninen, and Josh Bowden. **Staff:** Richard Tucker, Jennifer Smith, Leon Vignes, Sarah Pizzo, Lida Ajibar, Andrew Wilson, Kelly Cornell, Chief Joseph Reshetar, Claude Williamson, John Chadwick (APS), and Scott Prisco (APS).

Summary

The third Western Rosslyn Area Planning Study (WRAPS) Working Group meeting was held July 23, 2014 with the purpose reviewing staff's preliminary site analysis and APS' staff's site considerations for a new secondary school.

Richard Tucker gave general remarks on the feedback obtained from the Working Group meeting #1 and #2. He also indicated that presentations and notes would be posted on the project web page, including staff's responses to questions posed at Meeting #1.

The Site Analysis presentation included a review of the following elements:

1. Transportation Network: proximity to transit (Metro and bus); bicycle connections, sidewalk and other pedestrian connections and an assessment of condition; and parking;
2. Natural Realm: existing and planned open spaces within 1 mile of the WRAPS area; hydrology; existing open space conditions and tree coverage within the WRAPS area; and topography;
3. Built Environment: age of buildings in the neighborhood; identification of historic buildings; building use and retail frontages; and building heights.
4. APS Staff gave a presentation on its considerations for siting a new school.

Working Group members raised questions and provided comments on the site analysis, including suggestions for additional information to be provided at future meetings (see Working Group comments below).

One of the next steps of the Working Group process will be to prepare a set of guiding principles which will be used to guide planning discussions, including those held with the broader public during the Workshop. The Chair and staff described the sample guiding principles prepared for other studies and mentioned that a survey would be used to generate ideas by the Working Group. It is anticipated that the survey would be released by August 1.

WRAPS | Working Group Meeting #3 July 23, 2014: Working Group Discussion Questions/Comments

A. Transportation Network

1. Bicycle Parking: How do you decide how much bicycle parking is needed? Are there national Standards? What are schools requirements for bicycle parking?
2. Additional pedestrian connections exist in this block and should be shown:
 - Adjacent to the Penzance Building – walking tour took this route
 - 1025 Wilson
 - 1525 _____Are these connections public or private? Provide display with easements for public access.
3. Sidewalks along Key Boulevard at Queens Court are the worst sidewalks; narrow and obstructions
4. Cabi bike share: what is the minimum age of users? What is possibility of a bike share station on the school property? Due to helmet requirements, Cabi has a minimum age requirement of 16.
5. Rosslyn Sector Plan has discussion about wider sidewalks on Wilson; will these be incorporated into this study area?
6. Lighting: Is lighting along streets sufficient today?

B. Natural Realm

1. Building Height should also be shown in relationship to average sea level and topo, to provide a more accurate portrayal of heights.

C. Land Use/Development

1. When you say this is an edge condition, that should not limit opportunities; Rosslyn is an edge and building heights/massing is not limited. This is going to be a center point between Rosslyn and Courthouse.

D. General

1. There are thousands of residents in this area who use the existing open space; including many residents in the FMHN area to the south.
2. With the addition of Central Place etc. the population is broader and growing rapidly, there is a need for more active recreation.
3. What is potential maximum height for a building at the Penzance site? The site is within the area eligible for redevelopment with the CO-Rosslyn zoning which allows building heights up to 300'.

E. School Site

1. What is APS' preferred choice of the 4 siting options? A school at back of site with a field along Wilson Boulevard; south facing solar exposure is critical. Shading of lower floors is okay; classrooms can have indirect light, as they would on the north facing rooms.
2. What uses are planned for the field? The school building could shade the field.
3. Southern exposure is critical and the school could act as a buffer from the noise of the field to residents to the north.
4. Solar shading – is this an emerging trend in designing new schools? Yes, orientation of school building is critical.
5. Can you change teacher behavior and avoid having shades drawn during much of the daytime hours? Through use of automated shades? Are there other options/solutions? Yes, but it is a simple concept – raw data shows that direct access to light will increase student learning performance. Optimal orientation provides classroom window walls on south and north sides of the building.
6. School demographics: what are the generation rates of multifamily buildings versus single family residents? APS prepares survey every year to show generation by housing type. Currently more students come from single family housing but APS expects more from multifamily housing in the future.
7. In the last 6 years no condominium site plans have been approved by the County Board. Proposed development is targeted towards apartments for younger singles.
8. There are many low income residents in the area.
9. The County's Community Energy Plan indicates solar energy. It is good to see that APS is incorporating solar power; this will be the next wave of design and will provide a teaching lab for future citizens.
10. Realize Rosslyn Framework calls for open spaces along 18th street. Having the field on 18th street would be consistent with those plans.
11. Are there examples of high-rise schools? How does the proposed school height of up to 175' compare to adjacent buildings?
12. Provide literature/case examples on high-rise, urban schools and how those schools offer/use shared spaces. Provide more information on the standard requirements for schools? What spaces are required; how many classrooms and typical classroom size? The Arlington Public Schools Educations Specifications are used by APS, but each project is evaluated and may build upon or optimize beyond the base specifications.

APS School Board adopted maximum sizes for each type of school as follows:

- Elementary School – 700 student maximum

- Middle School – 1,300 student maximum
 - High School – 2,200 student maximum
13. APS expects a secondary school at this site (either Middle or High or both) but does not expect to build a new Elementary School. Other planned locations would serve that need.
 14. Is there a difference between the terms “seats” vs. “students” when planning for a new school?
No, APS indicates the terms are interchangeable.
 15. Are there conflicts with fire station near drop off zones? Bus access? Recreation fields?
 16. Is district energy considered for the school? New school should be eligible to connect to community energy facilities

F. Multi-Purpose Field @ School

1. Why is underground parking shown under the field rather than the school building? APS has only undertaken preliminary analysis and would continue to evaluate parking during this time period with assistance from APS consultants. Preliminarily, there are cost considerations for building under the school; impacts of school’s structure penetrating through to the parking area. Parking under the field offers opportunity to add natural light into the lower level of the school building and one of the core function areas could be located below ground.
2. Artificial turf versus grass? Artificial turf can be used with more regularity, virtually 24/7; and will better meet demand and operational needs of APS; grass fields cannot handle heavy use.
3. Will having underground parking beneath the field just create a plaza over parking? Not necessarily. There could be significant areas around the perimeter of the field for trees and other softscape/landscape; the space could be a vibrant urban green space.
4. If parking is partially below grade it could allow extra light and increase sense of security, as well as possibly allow space to be utilized for assembly space.
5. What is size of the field? What will it be used for? The sketch shown in the presentation indicates a smaller space than a standard middle school size field; the ultimate size would depend on building arrangement and whether property at the corner could be consolidated; space could be somewhat larger but not likely to achieve a regulation-sized soccer field. The Charge says “up to 60,000 sf field.”
6. Would a fence be used around the field to contain loose balls? Would need to address this to maintain “openness” to neighborhood.
7. What about providing some/all school parking at future Penzance building? Timing of construction would have to be considered; would the parking be available when the school would be ready to open.

8. The current field size is 43,000 so there would be a net loss based on the current Charge.

G. Guiding Principles

1. Send link with examples

H. Charge

1. Are we constrained by Arlington Public Schools and its decision to move forward with a new building and without preservation of the existing structure? The School Board and County Board spent significant time preparing the Charge and both bodies are on the same page that protection of this building is not a priority. The Charge indicates that the feasibility of preserving and/or memorializing the existing school would be evaluated during this planning process.

I. Information Requests

1. Provide exhibit showing public access easements for walking connections through the block
2. Shadow studies with existing structures, for multiple times during the year
3. Provide demographics on who is living within a 5-10 minute walk of study area (include recently approved site plans and planned construction)
4. Affordable housing located in the area – Statistics
5. Exhibit with an integration of topo and building heights – above sea level analysis