



## MEETING MINUTES FOR PROGRAMMING WORKSHOP – A5

Held Wednesday, April 28, 2010

2:45 PM – 4:45 PM

Vashon Island High School Library



### Attendees:

Michael Soltman, VISD

Eric Gill, VISD

Dave Wilke, VISD

Susan Hanson, VHS

Colleen Carlson, VHS

Jim Coulson, Community

John(Oz)Osborne, Community

Molly Reed, Community

Greg Nespor, Community

Cynthia Pringle, Community

Brian Carter, INTEGRUS

David Van Galen, INTEGRUS

Jim Petrich, INTEGRUS

Jeff Middleton, INTEGRUS

Loretta Sachs, INTEGRUS

*The following is a record of the author's understanding of comments made and direction given. Written clarifications or corrections should be directed to INTEGRUS Architecture within seven days of the date of publication of this memo.*

### **I. REVIEW OF STUDENT EXERCISE: “(RE)IMAGINE VASHON HIGH SCHOOL”**

A. Brian Carter reviewed the Student Exercise conducted earlier in the day with the ASB group. This exercise, titled “(Re)Imagine Vashon High School,” uses a private group page on Facebook for communicating with the students about different aspects of school design and their high school experience. Since the meeting took place during the lunch period, the students were asked to go out in small groups and take pictures about “Lunch Time.” The pictures should address questions about Lunch Time, such as:

- What do you do at Lunch Time?
- Where do you like to spend this time? Why?
- What things work really well?
- What things are not-so-great?



- B. When the students returned from taking photos, they were introduced to the Facebook group page and shown nine photos of Lunch Time spaces from schools around the world. After some brief discussion, the students were given access to Facebook, asked to upload the photos they just took, and provide comments on those photos as well as the other nine.
- C. Through the Facebook page, the students will be asked to again provide photos and comments about “Study Time” (starting 5/5/10) and “Between Time” (starting 5/12/10). Then, on 5/26/10, we will meet with the students again to help each small group create a digital story from the Facebook content about the high school experience.

**II. REVIEW OF STUDENT EXERCISE: “BLINK”**

- A. The students participated in the same “Blink” exercise at the end of the meeting as the Design Committee did at the beginning of its first meeting. The student and Design Committee results have been compared, and some items of note below are:



This image of the Gleneagles Community Centre in West Vancouver, BC by Patkau Architects ranked No. 1 for both the students and the Design Committee. The students liked the image slightly more:

- 1.19 Ave. score by ASB students
- 1.44 Ave. score by Design Committee



The biggest difference in results was of this image, the athletic fields and Gym building at Eastside Catholic High School by Integrus Architecture:

- ASB students: Ranked No. 6  
1.57 Ave. score
- Design Committee: Ranked No. 27  
2.56 Ave. score



Pictures of the existing high school ranked lowest for both the students and the Design Committee:

- Existing Lockers: Ranked last by ASB students
- Existing A Building: Ranked last by Design Committee



### III. UPDATE: PROGRAM SPACE LIST

---

- A. Brian Carter gave an update on the development of the Program Space List. The space list compares the spaces of the existing school campus with those in the District Master Plan. Integrus is continuing to analyze the space list data with the District, including which spaces are and are not included in the final program, square footages of existing and planned spaces, and the utilization rates of both individual spaces and the overall campus.

### IV. REVIEW OF DRAFT PROJECT GOAL BOARDS

---

- A. Integrus presented six draft project goal boards created from the two previous Design Committee meetings. The boards incorporated language used by the Committee both during the goal creation exercises and the Hopes & Fears exercise. The group reviewed, discussed and edited the contents and language of each board. Some highlights from those discussion include:
- Create a separate project goal board focused on the goal “Welcoming to the Community”
  - Provide clearer language regarding what “well-conceived serviceability” and an “ethically-responsible campus” mean
  - The “Enduring Materials, Enduring Design” board should include a description pertaining to designing to an “appropriate aesthetic”
- B. Integrus will incorporate the comments and re-present the boards at the next Design Committee meeting.



### V. GROUP EXERCISE: EXPLORING THE SITE

---

- A. The goal of this exercise is to have the Design Committee consider three different scenarios of how the campus could accommodate the Master Plan program. The three scenarios are:
1. Minor Renovation: Buildings B & C are still demolished and a new building provided per the Master Plan. Renovation work to Buildings A, F & K should keep existing structure and exterior walls, but interior walls can be relocated to accommodate different programs.
  2. Major Renovation: Same constraints as “Minor Renovation” except existing structural elements and exterior walls at Buildings A, F & K can be altered.
  3. Other Ideas: This category allows the group to explore other ideas that come up that may not fit within the other two scenario constraints.



- B. The Committee divided into three groups of 3 to 4 people and each group explored all three scenarios, resulting in nine schemes to review and discuss. The schemes were created by placing pre-made program pieces on a print out of the site. Once finished, each group was asked to present one of their schemes that most intrigued them.

**Group 1: Major Renovation**



- Main feature of this scheme is the relationship of three major elements: Admin (red), Commons (orange) and Library (purple)
- Entrance plaza placed near Admin, Commons and Library
- Scheme moves spaces that are currently at the center of the “donut” to against outdoor space
- Library is placed near classrooms and Admin is more stand alone
- Commons & Theater stay at current locations
- Shop spaces moved to Building F to isolate their noise



**Group 2: Other Ideas**



- Main features of this scheme are the grouping of Music, Theater & Art and the relationship of the Library to the classrooms
- Commons remains at its current location and could be used as a casual theater space
- Considered stacking Commons & Library
- Classroom arrangement allows connections between departments
- Admin is placed towards a courtyard



### **Group 3: Other Ideas**



- Main features of this scheme are connecting the “Tech” with the “Tactile” and the relationship of the Commons, Admin & Library
- Shops are moved to the existing theater space, Theater is moved to the existing library space, and the Library is moved to the new building
- Admin is at the main entry so you can still see students when they are not seen by teachers
- Combine Maintenance and Grounds in old Admin building
- Buildings F & K would be demolished

## **VI. NEXT STEPS**

- A. At the next Design Committee meeting, the nine schemes will be diagrammed with the main ideas pulled out of each scheme. We will also look at the schemes by asking the question: What are we not able to accomplish in these schemes?

**End of Minutes**