

BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
URBAN DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES

Date: June 27, 2019

Meeting #20

Project: 21st Century Schools Imitative – Robert Coleman

Phase: Discussion #2

Location:

CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

Greg Lukemire began the discussion with an introduction of the existing building:

Built in the 1960s; team was originally hired to renovate existing 45,000 SF building, but ~ 6,000 SF addition was identified as a need – site is shared with Fredrick Douglas H.S. but two schools are totally separate; new stadium being built on site will be shared.

Existing structure is essentially a two-story box on a sloped site; most students come from the southwest side. Currently cars park everywhere – need +/- 30 spots for teachers. Need to identify bus drop (currently 3 busses, but there may be more), automobile / parent drop, teacher parking, etc. Neighborhood is primarily walking / parent drop.

School is divorced from neighborhood because of steep site at southwest corner. Main entrance is recessed in the building. Site is pretty constrained – topo from front door to Windsor is a drop of 11' – 15' and to Warwick is nearly 20'

Comments from last time focused on reducing impervious surface area and paving, reconsidering the need for secondary bus loop, minimizing the times children have to cross paths with cars.

- Bus lane moved to front will utilize single curb cut for in / out traffic
 - Create two public spaces – one associate with the front door (south), one associated with dining (east), to integrate drop off, entry, recess area, and cafeteria, etc.
 - Focus on the southeast corner of the site
- Path around school connected to two playground areas (grades 3-5 on north, pre-K – 2 on south side)
- Feedback on the canopy – can it relate better to bus loop? Triangular shape (p.15) vs. rectangular shape (p.14); also looking curved option (p. 18-19) – both options will feature more punched opening with more transparency
- Introduced more vegetation to soften edge of the school

- Vast majority of the school will note change, but glazing will be replaced with new anodized windows to brighten the look and feel.

DISCUSSION:

The Panel voiced appreciation for how the team addressed previous comments. Clarification needed about whether play areas are fenced – Yes, ornamental fences; hard play area will not be fenced (not needed).

Site:

- Landscape will guide circulation and remove the need for retaining wall
- Busses need to be on site – kids need to be assisted as they exit the busses / monitored by administrative area (west side of interior entry); Could busses be moved closer to Windsor to compress parent drop area, reinforce the axis, and minimize asphalt? Principal has expressed a desire to keep kids on site – tentative answer is no
 - Bus needs 35' radius – Panel suggested a bus drop-off area at the street edge; streamline with additional circulation – study how the area can be compressed further
 - Problem is bus alignment, and the co-mingling of the cars and busses, basic geometry, signage, and timing (drop schedule)
 - Is the earlier version parking a little more successful as concentrated in one zone (push parking into one area vs. making the north side be simply a drive isle) – also is there an opportunity to push closer to the building. However, this turning radius is based on fire access requirements
- Walkway loop is nice, but perimeter is episodic due to fencing, but should use landscape to support the edge of the grounds along the topographic edge to contain site - continuous and coherent markers of the nodes – could be lower vegetation (not necessarily trees)
- Very successful development of the east plaza and its connection to the main entry, internally and through the exterior arrival zone. Design team should use 3-D model to evaluate how plaza space will be used (opportunity for additional planting to screen from parking lot and driveway)

Building:

- Entry plaza is a bit awkward because of conflicting geometries – can it be squared off at 90 degrees, and align plaza at orthogonal or generate off the radius of the curve – rotate the plaza area
- Geometries are clashing and could be reconciled by aligning the loop. Bite was taken out of the paving to allow for landscape / greening at window space in the community space – no longer a perfect square therefore further development of the geometry is needed

to integrate better with surrounding elements. However, accomplished its purpose as an arrival / “mixing” bowl of functions

- Doesn’t need the rigid geometry
- Curve vs. no curve on the canopy? No curve will be better (less self-conscious); absolutely needs a tapered column; canopy should touch the building more lightly. Consider a light colored entry wall that engages with the canopy as one element.
- Arrival area is nice, but the corner can tie the two plaza areas together – could be united through glazing in the auditorium / cafeteria area; rear of the stage will have glazing but with a blackout curtain for performances (space must do double duty)

Next Steps:

Discussion only.

Attending:

Greg Lukemire, Omari Davis – RRMM Lukmire Architects

Tom Henderson – CSP / MSA P.M.

Micheal McBride – No affiliation listed

Mr. Anthony, Mses. O’Neill, Ilieva – UDAAP Panel

Laurie Feinberg, Renata Southard*, Chad Hayes, Jennifer Leonard – Planning