



Your Voice Matters

FACILITIES MASTER PLANNING: PHASE TWO

Hastings Building Team Meeting #2 Feedback

February 5, 2025

What do you like or dislike about each of the options? Why?

Thompson Park - like the fact that construction would not impact student learning - blank slate allowing us to be creative in design - don't like the increased cost. Rebuild B - don't like the design of the school - don't like the parking so far away - COULD move building and field to the East, to allow the ability for traffic to move around the building and have staff lot on the West side of the building - like the lack of land swap. Rebuild A - don't like the land swap - the frontage against the neighborhood would be a sticking point - like the parking in front of the building. Renovate B - like the lack of land swap - don't like the idea of teaching in a building while renovation is going on. Renovation A - like the reorientation of the track.

Moving the building to the track footprint makes the site/parking more efficient. Do not like the main entry off road. Moving the school to Thompson is worth further exploration. Parking could benefit the park activities but infrastructure costs could affect it. Not sure rotating the track is worth the effort in either design.

Repair: It's not enough for what we need.

Renovate A: My favorite of the renovation.

Renovate B: I really worry about the location of parking. We already get complaints about it.

Rebuild A: Second favorite.

Rebuild B: Least favorite. Rebuild C: My favorite of all the options.

Repair: Very skeptical of the practicality of the Repair option. Too many constraints with high potential for unforeseen problems that will continue into the repaired structure. Poor return on investment. Renovate: Both seem decent. Prefer Option A over Option B for long term logistics. Rebuild: Absolutely prefer C, the Thompson Park option. The clean slate allows for constructing the ideal school and site. Neutral between A & B. I see a lot of multi-year logistical pain and safety concerns for the middle school community if Jones ends up being housed in the Old Hastings. Parking and traffic is already bad and at times dangerous.

I like the rebuild A and B options. I don't see the value to renovating the existing structure

Rebuild A-I like the parking lot being between the field and the building and just feels more spacious. With Renovate B and Rebuild B - it seems like having the parking lot access on Reed Rd. will cause more traffic issues than if the parking lot access is on Hastings Lane. Rebuild C gives more options on layouts since the space options would be less restrictive.

Not interested in renovating. Rebuild A would be my choice with the parking between the field and building as it is now. Rebuild B is not ideal with parking behind the field. We get older people coming to watch grandkids games. That walk to the gym or auditorium is hard for them as it is now with the current location. Rebuild C is an option but not my favorite.

Thompson park will make people revolt!

Do NOT like the repair or renovate options. Rebuild A and Rebuild C are the strongest options. Parking and Circulation critical to any of the schemes.

Loved rebuild C. Its unique, innovative and it solves a lot of problems.I like any rebuild options but I like C the best.

In my opinion, moving Hastings to Thompson Park is a very bad idea. Taking space away from the park, adding traffic, parking, noise, and congestion to that neighborhood when families purchased their homes anticipating that the park would always be there, is wrong. Including space for projected student population increases is a great idea. I believe the options that include the parking lot between the football field and the school are optimal for staff and visitors to the campus. This will be particularly true during inclement weather including weather that produces icy conditions.

Renovate B is my vote for best option. In terms of rebuild, I really like Thompson park option!! It's A fresh start with various flows into the school. The other rebuild option with the entrance at the curb of Hastings and Romney would be a nightmare. No where to go being so landlocked.

Moving the building where the field is puts it much closer to the back of the houses along Mountview. I like the idea of moving Hastings to Thompson because students won't be learning in the middle of a construction zone but worry about community buy in and the community thinking they have access to school grounds during school hours.

Of the renovation options, I thought option B was better. I didn't see a strong enough benefit to justify the cost of relocating the track and field in option A. For option B- I would want special consideration regarding the design of the parking lot adjacent to the Turkey Run stream to ensure the pollutants do not worsen the tributary's water quality. Of the new build options, I thought options B and C were better. I felt option A was an inconsiderate move to the adjacent neighbors on the current site. I was impressed with the creativity and openness of the design/owner team to consider the option C at Thompson Park. Definitely an idea worth considering! I liked the e/w orientation of Option B.

Repair: In this day and age, I feel like we'd be doing the kids and the district a disservice if we simply got the building back to good standing. If you fast-forward to 10 years from now, the school will be even that further removed from educational building standards. Not sure why we'd sync money into what will ultimately be a sinking ship. It feels more efficient to apply to new building or to renovate options.

Renovate A & B: I like the fact that it maintains the existing school and builds upon it. I don't see the value in swapping land with the city in option A just to turn the football field and allow for a similar parking flow. The renovated building would presumably allow for some much needed upgrades but you'd still be somewhat limited in constraints of previous building structure. One big pro to both of these options is that it doesn't change much of the existing footprint, thus keeping neighbors happy while upgrading the facilities as best as possible. Of course, this would need to be weighed heavily vs the new build options from a price standpoint.

Rebuild A & B: For the rebuild options located at current property, I'd stick with the option B that doesn't require swapping land. I don't see a lot benefits from swapping the land that make it worth the hassle, on top of the added cost to re-do park land. Plus the centralized parking isn't so beneficial to out sway the need to swap land. One callout for both options is that you're going to be impacting neighbors who didn't ever expect the school to pop up in their backyard. I think you'll get some pushback and some legitimate concerns. Of the 2 options, option B impacts less neighbors, which is a positive. Another extremely critical aspect could hinge on how/when Jones is updated. If Hastings rebuild option is chosen, there could be an opportunity to house Jones students in the old Hastings building. This would likely be a lot less stressful than putting them in pods and some other option. They could leverage an existing/useable school while theirs is updated.

Rebuild C: I think you're going to get quite bit of pushback if Thompson Park option is selected, just because the neighborhood is so established and this would definitely ruffle some feathers. I say that as someone who lives directly on Thompson Park on Woodbridge Rd at the northwest corner. I do think it's an interesting option given it truly allows for a blank slate. It would just totally change the flow of day-to-day life in the neighborhood though. Add the fact that it would also cost even more to turn the current Hastings area into more park area. I'm guessing this will be the most cost-prohibitive option, but I'm open to the discussion.

Repair option is not going to suffice

Renovate A does not seem to be worth what will probably be added cost for the land swap.

Renovate B is better than A but avoiding the logistics of working through partial renovation makes me think the rebuild options would be worth the added cost.

That being said rebuild B seems to be best choice. Doesn't seem like the land swap in A will add enough value and I like the parking drive through in B

I do like the idea of option C but just seems a little unreasonable.

Are there any other thoughts or options we should be considering?

Traffic flow for drop off and pick up - additional parking if Jones is housed here while their renovation is going on

Pickup/Drop off, while it may seem silly, is a HUGE deal for parents :)

Safety, Parking & Traffic Considerations:

- Hastings has a large population of students that ride bicycles & electric scooters; several hundred when it is nice out.
- Many parents park and pick-up on the side streets across from Hastings. Crossing the road especially while buses pick up can be very dangerous. Lots of close calls.
- I hope a good deal of thought is put into safety with regards to vehicular traffic and children if both schools end up being housed at one site.

Specifics related to Technology & Engineering / STEM Classrooms:

- 3500+ sq ft of flexible space: 2 classrooms, processing lab (shop), storage.
- Exterior dust collection system for shop that does not impact the sound within our own classrooms or neighboring classrooms. An exterior dust collection system is likely the best option but an interior system could be explored.
- External ventilation for VOC removal, laser cutting, welding, 3D printing or other yet to be developed technologies.
- Drive Up / Service Entry to Technology & Engineering Classroom(s) - Material and equipment delivery
- Exterior access for STEM / agricultural projects.

* Our existing space is currently 2500+ sq ft counting storage and it is too small! Class sizes are now much larger than when the current classrooms were re-designed. In the past several years we have had class sizes up to 30 and probably an average of 25. When the current shop was created, class sizes were a maximum of 20 and averaged less than 18.

*Many professional STEM organizations call for classroom space of 50-75 sq ft per student (NSTA & ITEEA)

It is clear that answers for traffic flow and drop off need to be a part of all the models for presentation to the community

Having drop off/pick up access completely separate from the parking lot would be much safer. Having athletic fields & track right next to the building can cause distractions if classrooms are looking out and hearing gym classes or other events out there. Another consideration is safety if there is an evacuation due to bomb threat/shooting (where will everyone go)

Rebuild b is a clear top choice to me

Is there an option where the rebuild option is placed where the existing building is currently so we can hold the building along the street and then land swap and rotate the field for the North and South orientation?

Sell the Thompson Park option by swinging Hastings for the Jones students, it will save money that way.

The final option should include traffic congestion mitigation solutions.

The traffic at Hastings place.... Currently parents pick/drop off using the streets of Hastings place and neighborhood across the street from Reed (Grace, Rita Marie etc)..... if you move the entrances to the corner of Hastings and Romney.... Where can parents park to pick up?? Just Hastings place? Where will they park when there are concerts, musicals, sporting events? Like every other school in the district, there should be other options/directions for traffic in/out of the school. I also don't like the classrooms facing into people's homes.

If Hastings is rebuilt on the same site and Jones has to utilize the old building it will be a mess if the new building is on the same site and 2 middle schools are going to the same area as well as Wellington across the street.

Pick up/drop off considerations if moved to Thompson with St Andrew's also utilizing McCoy at the same time.

Has any thought been put into moving/eliminating the tennis courts?

A few specific items discussed with the design team to consider with all options shown:

1. With higher energy prices and long term cost considerations, it would be beneficial to consider a geothermal system for heating and cooling.
2. Maximize passive solar design given the program and site constraints- maximize southern exposure, utilize shading devices and thermal mass.
3. Reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and create an all-electric building/systems package.
4. Consider and track sustainable strategies and goals alongside costs starting as early as now.

Is the proposed rebuild option building 100% the footprint it has to be? Is there an option that reconfigures the land swap where you build new school over current gym, extra land, and baseball field? The design would need to differ based on land profile and stream, but wasn't sure if that was explored as only rebuild options were using current football field space.

Think you've considered all options - thank you nice work!