



MEETING MINUTES

**PROJECT:** Viewlands Elementary **PROJECT NO:** 2019908.00  
**DATE:** 10 December 2019 **FILE NAME:** 191120 MA\_VES  
(SDAT 03 Meeting Minutes)  
**SUBJECT:** School Design Advisory Team 03

---

**MEETING DATE:** 20 November 2019 **TIME:** 4:00pm – 6:00pm  
**LOCATION:** Viewlands Library

---

**ATTENDEES:**

Amy Klainer (AK)	Viewlands Elementary
Carrie Wheeler (CW)	Viewlands Elementary
Kirsten Erickson (KE)	Viewlands Elementary
Kristen Beers (KB)	Viewlands Elementary
Signe Roscoe (SR)	Viewlands Elementary
Kyle Gray (KG)	Viewlands Elementary
Katie Laws (KL)	Viewlands Elementary
Marilyn McVay (MM)	Viewlands Elementary
Breanne Kutch (BKu)	Viewlands Elementary
Beth Kelley (BKe)	Parent
Sohail Abrahams (SA)	Parent
Josh McGaffey (JM)	Parent
Cheri Hendricks (CHe)	Community
Eric Becker (EB)	Seattle Public Schools
Brian Fabella (BF)	Seattle Public Schools
David Mount (DM)	Mahlum
Corrie Rosen (CR)	Mahlum
JoAnn Wilcox (JW)	Mahlum
Stacey Crumbaker (SC)	Mahlum
David Dahl (DD)	Mahlum
Jessica Lapano (JL)	Mahlum

**COPY TO:**

Christine Hatcher (CHa)	Parent
Denise Joines (DJ)	Community
Grace Alams (GA)	Community
Deborah Northern (DN)	Seattle Public Schools
Kristi Jones (KJ)	Seattle Public Schools
Sara Mirabueno (SM)	Seattle Public Schools

---

**ATTACHMENTS:**     ::   SDAT 03 Presentation  
                           ::   SDAT 03 Sign-in Sheet

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.

---

**ACTION ITEMS**

::   None this session.

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION BY
11.20-01	<p><b>SPS Strategic Plan Presentation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Racial Equity Advancement Coordinator Deborah Northern was unable to attend, and the scheduled presentation was postponed.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Committee reviewed the SPS Strategic Plan. Mahlum asked the Committee to keep the Strategic Plan in mind while reviewing the goals that were set in the previous SDAT 02.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
11.20-02	<p><b>Goal Review &amp; Aligning Your Headlines</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Top "10" Shareback            In SDAT 02, the Committee created a Top "10" list of goals. In this exercise, the Committee was asked to review the Top "10" Goals created during SDAT 02. The Committee identified the following opportunities and challenges with each goal:           <p><i>"1: Viewlands will be infused with nature, outdoor learning, and natural light."</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Opportunities:</u> Nature supports intrinsic learning opportunities. Natural light helps with sensory sensitivities. Transparency throughout the school feels more welcoming and inviting.</li> <li>b. <u>Challenges:</u> None identified by the Committee.</li> </ol> <p><i>"2: Viewlands welcomes ALL! The design will be accessible to all students, staff, community, and culture."</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Opportunities:</u> Opportunities for a Community Board as a way to create two-way communication with the surrounding community. Signage can explain the significance of the surrounding Viewlands environment.</li> <li>b. <u>Challenges:</u> Ensuring physical accessibility. How can all cultures be represented authentically in the space? How can we make sure students see themselves and their culture in the design and flow of the building, but not superficially?</li> </ol> <p><i>"3: Viewlands will have collaborative, flexible spaces throughout (that are not vanilla)."</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Opportunities:</u> Flexible spaces create opportunities for multiple classes and grades to gather, such as the Reading Buddies program. Fluid connections</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

to spaces would allow easy movement among groups. The interaction between students would help maintain the small school feel.

- b. Challenges: How can we create a flexible indoor space for 50-75 students? How can we maintain privacy while not stigmatizing those using collaborative or small group spaces for additional support? How can we keep an intimate community feel with a larger school population?

*"4: Viewlands has a big Heart: a large, welcoming space for celebrations with a soft feel."*

- a. Opportunities: The gathering space can be responsive to the community and a place to work in partnership with families of at-risk students. It can provide opportunity for students and parents to gather together, such as during V-CATS performances.
- b. Challenges: How do we make a large, durable gathering place feel warm and welcoming?

*"4.5: Viewlands has many gathering spaces that foster relationships with community partners."*

- a. Opportunities: It is an opportunity to provide gathering spaces at multiple scales for different types of gathering and relationship-fostering activities.
- b. Challenges: How do we group grades together but also provide flexibility from year to year? How do we create a space for the community and a space for school gatherings? Are these the same space?

*"5: We are connected to the history of place."*

- a. Opportunities: Displays and learning opportunities can be embedded into the design. Gathering and community spaces could be named for the first peoples of this land or incorporate the language that describes the topography of the area. Connection to the history of place supports the goal of Viewlands being a welcoming environment.
- b. Challenges: How do we create **authentic** connection, without misappropriation of culture? How do we create a timeless design that continues to be relevant as the school changes?

*"6: Our building hugs the children!"*

- a. Opportunities: We can create a sense of stewardship for the site.
- b. Challenges: How do we create a balance of spaces? How do we create a building that is both welcoming and secure?

## 11.20-03 Educational Planning

1. District Wide Elementary Ed Spec
  - a. Mahlum shared a graphic program diagram representing the program square footages determined by the SPS elementary educational specification.
2. Designing for Collaboration
  - a. Mahlum shared example images and diagrams of collaborative spatial models. Collaborative spatial categories included:
    - i. Community/Gathering (50-150 students)
    - ii. Forum/Lecture (50-60 students)

- iii. Workshop/Create (28-35 students)
  - iv. Project/Activity (15-20 students)
  - v. Large Group (12-20 students)
  - vi. Small Group (4-6 students)
  - vii. Individual Study (1 student)
3. Designing for Multiple Intelligences
- a. Mahlum reviewed the theory of multiple intelligences and identified examples of spaces that could support each intelligence. The multiple intelligences explored included:
    - i. Verbal | Linguistic Intelligence
    - ii. Mathematical | Logical Intelligence
    - iii. Spatial Intelligence
    - iv. Bodily | Kinesthetic Intelligence
    - v. Musical | Auditory Intelligence
    - vi. Interpersonal Intelligence
    - vii. Intrapersonal Intelligence
    - viii. Naturalist Intelligence
4. Organizational Models
- a. Mahlum shared examples of different spatial Organizational Models with the Committee. The Organizational Models explored different ways of organizing the classroom and shared learning spaces. The examples were taken both from the schools the Committee had toured during SDAT 02 and various other elementary schools. For each organizational model, the Committee discussed what elements worked well and what elements did not.
    - i. *Organizational Model: Cascadia Elementary School (SPS)*  
What Worked: The Committee appreciated the low casework that separated the shared learning space from the path of travel. There was some discussion about challenges with the shared learning along the circulation, but the committee appreciated that it was not along the main path of travel for the whole school and, instead, the circulation was limited to the students within that pod. Transparency between the classroom and shared learning allowed teachers to supervise the space. The area rug was an effective way to differentiate between activities. Closed storage kept the area tidy and materials secure.  
What Didn't: The shared learning was open to circulation. The smaller space limited the capability to bring the "pod" community together. Shared learning spaces will often need to be used by multiple specialists at the same time.
    - ii. *Organizational Model: Hazel Wolf K-8 (SPS)*  
What Worked: The large shared learning space allowed for variation in activities.  
What Didn't: The shared learning was too open and distracting. Because it was so big, it was also used as overflow storage. Classes needed to circulate through the shared learning space in order to reach their classroom.
    - iii. *Organizational Model: Maple Elementary School (Springfield SD)*  
What Worked: The exterior access could be used as an outdoor learning space.

- What Didn't: The shared learning space felt too small and much of the space felt like it would be used for circulation to the classrooms. Some Committee members noted concern about a shared learning space with access to an exterior door.
- iv. *Organizational Model: Thornton Creek Elementary School (SPS)*  
What Worked: The Committee appreciated that the shared learning space was located in between two classrooms, and not in front of them. They appreciated a visual, but not auditory, connection to the space. The connection provided an opportunity to connect the two adjacent classrooms.  
What Didn't: The shared learning space would not be able to fit two classes. This model would be preferable if they were able to move directly between the classrooms and shared space.
  - v. *Organizational Model: Northwood Elementary School (MISD)*  
What Worked: There was a variety of types of shared learning – both in terms of the different sizes and amount of enclosure to provide different levels of acoustic separation.  
What Didn't: The Committee did not comment on this section.
  - vi. *Organizational Model: Queen Anne Elementary School (SPS)*  
What Worked: Using all the shared learning square footage in one area allowed for a large makerspace to be created.  
What Didn't: A large makerspace would need to be scheduled. It would not be accessible for smaller meetings per classroom.
  - vii. *Organizational Model: Lynndale Elementary School (ESD)*  
What Worked: Some models of Lynndale's shared learning spaces were directly adjacent to two classrooms and felt like an extension of the classroom.  
What Didn't: Some models of Lynndale's shared learning were across the hall from the classrooms they served and felt like too much separation.

## 11.07-04 Site :: Analysis, Character and Possibilities

1. Site Analysis
  - a. Mahlum shared diagrams of the Viewlands site explaining the various site constraints including setbacks, habitat and riparian buffer zones, steep slope and potential slide areas, drainage and sewer locations, and exceptional trees.  
 These diagrams help us to understand the "buildable" areas on the site.
2. Site Response Possibilities
  - a. After identifying the buildable area of the site, Mahlum introduced various responses to the site and asked the Committee for their feedback.
    - i. *Build East & Enter East*  
Committee Response: Outdoor learning opening to 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue instead of Carkeek Park seems contrary and not connected to nature. The location of the entry is helpful in that it is close to the crosswalk and will encourage pedestrians to use sidewalks. The view of buses at the front entrance is good for its direct connection and access to the entry, but it may not create a welcoming entrance.
    - ii. *Build North & Enter North*

Committee Response: The southeast corner does not feel well utilized. It dedicates a lot of site area for vehicular and bus use, but it creates an opportunity for cars of parents to queue on the street. It creates an opportunity to locate staff parking at the southeast corner. It seems like a suburban scheme that prioritizes parking. The Committee expressed a desire for more outdoor learning space.

iii. *Build North & Enter South*

Committee Response: This possibility seems more integrated with the natural environment. Some concern was noted about bringing vehicular traffic to access the site on a dead-end street (105<sup>th</sup>). This possibility would allow bus drop off to be closer to the building and front door.

iv. *Build Central & Enter South*

Committee Response: This possibility appears to have less views and access to nature. The Committee noted a concern about a potential bottleneck at 105<sup>th</sup> street, and that turning onto 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue from any cross street is difficult.

v. *Build South & Enter Central*

Committee Response: The Committee appreciated the idea of a public plaza adjacent to the entrance, which would create connection to the community as well as provide security and space between the school and the street. The Committee made note that the distance between ends of the building may be long. The Committee appreciated the integration of the outdoor learning though noted that more southern exposure would be preferred. The Committee appreciated the opportunity for covered play space and lots of views from the building. This was the preferred option.

vi. *Build South & Enter North*

Committee Response: This possibility locates the parking adjacent to the entrance, which the Committee did not feel was an ideal location. They felt the site dedicated too much area to vehicles. The Committee asked why none of the possibilities suggested an orientation similar to the one currently used at Viewlands. Mahlum responded that the North-South orientation is not ideal as it gets a lot of glare from the west sun angle. The possibilities are oriented on an East-West axis in order to take advantage of the daylighting from the north and south.