Meeting Agenda

- Project Overview
- Summary of Meeting #1
  - Building History, Evolution and Existing Historic Conditions
  - Existing Site and Building Conditions
  - Program Goals
  - Potential Scope Options
- Public Comment Results
- Proposed Scope
- Questions and Comments
GOALS

- To develop unique solution to serve the Towson Community
- Design for next generation learning
  - Collaborative
  - Adaptable
  - Career Technology Education
  - Career and College readiness for next generation workforce
- Increasing student capacity / eliminating portables
  - Existing Student Capacity – 1,260 State Rated Capacity (SRC)
  - Ed Spec Design – 1,728 SRC
  - Core Capacity - 1,860 SRC

CHALLENGES

- Building Impact
  - Existing Area – 205,313 GSF
  - Ed Spec Area – 320,785 GSF
- Building’s structural layout
- Limited Site
- Students must remain on site during construction
Design Goals

• Achieve Next Generation Learning Program and Objectives
• Maximize Impact of Tax Dollars
• Respect Historic Legacy
   Green Globes, 2 Globes Rating
• Design a Bespoke Project that Symbolizes the Towson Community

DEVELOP A MASTERPIECE DESIGN THAT THE ENTIRE TOWSON COMMUNITY CAN BE PROUD OF!
Building History

- **Timeline**
  - Construction: 1947
  - Addition: 1953
  - Addition: 1967
  - Alteration: 1998
- **Baltimore County Landmark and MIHP Listed**
- **Proposed Period of Significance 1947 -1953**

IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH MD HISTORICAL TRUST ACT OF 1985, AS AMENDED, SECTIONS 5A-325 AND 5A-326, THE PROJECT WILL FOLLOW THE NHPA SECTION 106 PROCESS.
• **Mid-Century Modern Design**
  - Linear plan
  - Horizontal emphasis and window bands
  - Vertical accents
  - Flat roof
  - Projecting entrance canopy

• **Landscape and Siting**

• **Materials**
  - Fieldstone walls
  - Cut stone sills and quoining
  - Glass block
  - Tile
  - Terrazzo flooring

• **Spaces**
  - Lobbies and corridors
  - Auditorium
  - Gymnasium
**Interior Historic Elements**

- **Intact Historic Interiors**
  - Main Lobby
  - Auditorium Lobby
  - All other spaces significantly altered since 1953

- **Historic Materials**
  - Volume of Space/Columns
  - Terrazzo Flooring
  - Terra Cotta Wall Tiles
  - Plaques
MINIMIZING BUILDING FOOTPRINT WILL MAXIMIZE SITE PROGRAM
Traditional vs. Next Generation Learning

Existing classroom layout

Upper Marion Area HS, Shrader Group

Traditional Mid-Century Classroom

Pathways Innovation Center in Casper WY, Cunningham Group Arch + MOA
### Structural Layout Challenges

- **CONSTRUCTION TRADES**
- **CARPENTRY**
- **FOOD SCIENCE**
- **CAFETERIA**
- **AUDITORIUM**
- **TYP. LAB**
- **LEARNING COMMONS**
- **GYMNASIUM**
- **AUX GYM**

### EXISTING VS ED SPEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>ED SPEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GYMNASIUM</td>
<td>9,066 SF</td>
<td>14,960 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX GYM</td>
<td>3,115 SF</td>
<td>6,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFETERIA</td>
<td>4,485 SF</td>
<td>9,300 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING COMMONS</td>
<td>7,505 SF</td>
<td>7,450 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDITORIUM</td>
<td>13,659 SF</td>
<td>15,675 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD SCIENCE</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPENTRY</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>5,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION TRADES</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYP. LAB</td>
<td>1265 SF</td>
<td>1880 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYP. CLASSROOM</td>
<td>620 SF</td>
<td>750 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING PROCESS

- Information Gathering
  - Existing Conditions
  - Program Goals
  - Stakeholder Input
- Analysis
  - Scope Definition
  - Document Findings

SCHEMATIC DESIGN PROCESS

- Concept Development
- Engineering / Technical Input
- Cost Estimating
- Submit to BOE, State / IAC

Explored full range of potential scope options through a series of diagrams and metrics

Concept design will begin following determination of project scope
# Meeting #1 - Scope Options

## Proposed

## Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Comparison</th>
<th>OPTION A</th>
<th>OPTION B</th>
<th>OPTION C</th>
<th>OPTION D*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>9,471</td>
<td>82,050</td>
<td>160,665</td>
<td>205,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>195,842</td>
<td>124,980</td>
<td>44,648</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>207,804</td>
<td>216,835</td>
<td>283,826</td>
<td>321,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403,446</td>
<td>341,815</td>
<td>328,474</td>
<td>321,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net to Gross Efficiency**
- 55%
- 65%
- 67.6%
- 70%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed Spec Deficiencies</th>
<th>OPTION A</th>
<th>OPTION B</th>
<th>OPTION C</th>
<th>OPTION D*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux Gym</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Commons</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Areas for Site Programs
- Next Generation Learning Capacity
- Minimizes Construction Impact on Learning

*LPC has noted that this concept will likely not receive permit approval.*
Website Comments

135 comments received as of October 30
- All comments are public on project website

Consensus
- Significant work needed at Towson
- Need is urgent!

Comment Summary
- Some preference for full replacement (+/- 50%)
- Some preference for maintaining historic building (+/- 50%)
  - Maintaining Historic building split between Option B & C

Other Design Comments
- Track (timeline)
- Auditorium

"Option D. Towson deserves a world class school. Constantly trying to repurpose an old building that doesn’t meet the needs of the students or staff is a waste of money."

"I prefer option B, option C would be my second choice, option A seems inefficient and option D has no appeal at all."

"I'm a fan of something between options B and C. I would love to preserve the historic character of the building."

"I believe the option presented in which an entirely new school is built is the best option. It is less expensive than the others and meets all of the needs. Surely the historic wall can be moved or it can be incorporated into a gateway or some other decorative structure."

"Thank you for presenting options and seeking input. Option A seems like a waste since it does not accomplish very many goals. Options B & C seem comparable to me. My biggest concern would be getting this done as expeditiously as possible to positively impact as many students as possible."

"The faster a new Towson High School is built, the better. THS students need it quickly!"

"I think rebuilding Towson high to turn it into a state of the art learning institution is the best option (D). But if permits aren’t possible than C."

"C seems to be the only plan that balances historic preservation with forward looking improvements."

"I'm a fan of something between options B and C. I would love to preserve the historic character of the building."
Historic Agency Comments

- Baltimore County Department of Planning
  - 10/18/2022 Letter
  - Options A & B comply with Hist. Preservation Design Guidelines
  - Option C subjugates historic building to new construction
  - Option D “is not permissible”

Options C and D do not follow our guidelines or Article 32, Title 7, of the Baltimore County Code. The complete demolition in Option D is not permissible. The selective demolition in Option C removes too much of the original structure and creates a large disconnect from the main entrance and the theater portions. They are become two separate entities -- to the point that the school will no longer have enough integrity or architectural significance to meet the criteria for which the school was originally landmarked for. The 1947 portions become subordinate to and overpowered by, the new addition. At this point, it no longer feels like an addition; it’s a new school that is incorporating portions of the old.
Scope Decision

- Community believes Option A did not meet the educational needs.
- Community was equally split between Modernization (B & C) and Replacement (D).
- Department of Planning reiterated that Option D Replacement is not permissible.
- Department of Planning will most likely support a variant of Option B.

PROCESS DETERMINED A MODERNIZATION SCOPE BETWEEN OPTIONS B & C.
PROJECT SCOPE

Hybrid of Option B&C

• 1967 & 1998 Volumes
  ▪ Acceptable to demolish

• 1947 Gym & Cafeteria
  ▪ Acceptable to demolish

• 1947 Main Entry Volume
  ▪ Maintain facades, volume and historic finishes within lobby
  ▪ Gut remaining spaces to shell condition and renovate

• 1947 & 1953 Classroom Bars
  ▪ Maintain public facing Façade
  ▪ Maintain front classroom bay
  ▪ Maintain corridor bay
  ▪ Replace rear classroom bays to address structural & spatial concerns and facilitate next generation spaces

• 1947 Auditorium Volume
  ▪ Maintain facades, volume and historic finishes within lobby
  ▪ Gut remaining spaces to shell condition and renovate
• Scope Outline
  ▪ Maintain Historic presence within community
  ▪ Address structural layout challenges within existing classroom bays by selective replacement at back of building  
    ○ Retains visible historic fabric
  ▪ New construction adjacent historic areas permits ideal educational adjacencies
  ▪ Promotes next generation learning environments
  ▪ Maximizes site program by condensing footprint
### Project Scope

**Hybrid of Option B&C continued**

#### Proposed

#### Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Comparison</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Hybrid Option</th>
<th>Option C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>82,050</td>
<td>119,268</td>
<td>160,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>124,980</td>
<td>86,136</td>
<td>44,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>216,835</td>
<td>247,962</td>
<td>283,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341,815</td>
<td>334,098</td>
<td>328,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net to Gross Efficiency</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ed Spec Deficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Hybrid Option</th>
<th>Option C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux Gym</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Commons</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Visual Comparisons

- **Option B**
- **Hybrid Option**
- **Option C**

#### Key Features

- **Areas for Site Programs**
- **Next Generation Learning Capacity**
- **Minimizes Construction Impact on Learning**
What does that mean?

**Limited Renovation**
- Minimal Approach
  - Upgrade of at least 5 major systems (i.e. roof, mechanical, electrical, lighting, flooring etc.)
  - Educational Enhancements to refresh the existing environments

**Modernization**
- Aggressive Approach
  - Full gut
  - Like a new school
  - Walls are moved to meet ed spec sizes and achieve next generation learning
  - Often includes significant demolition and new construction

**Hammond HS - HCPSS**

**Forest Park HS – City Schools**

**Gustavus Brown ES - CharlesCPS**
MODERNIZATION

What does that mean?

• Entire school will be like new upon completion of the project

• All spaces will be touched

• What will be new?
  ▪ All Finishes & Furnishings
  ▪ All Mechanical systems
  ▪ All Plumbing systems
  ▪ All Electrical systems
  ▪ All Classroom technology
  ▪ All Roofing

• What will be kept?
  ▪ Critical historic fabric
  ▪ Structural elements: floor slabs, columns, beams, joists, etc.
  ▪ Kept items will not be visible at the end of project
MODERNIZATION

What does that mean, continued

• Money saved on reusing structure can be invested into learning environments

• Time saved on reusing structure can reduce construction durations

• Reuse of existing structure lowers embedded carbon

Forest Park HS
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Historic Exterior: Annapolis ES Site
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Historic Exterior: Annapolis ES Pictures

before

historic rhythms
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Historic Exterior: B-CC High School Pictures

historic facade

historic rhythms

addition rhythms
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Transition Spaces: Forest Park HS Spaces

Vertical Circulation  Public Spaces  Academic Clusters  Levels of Impact
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Circulation: Forest Park HS Pictures
Gathering Areas: Mary Rodman ES

before
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

General Classrooms: Forest Park HS

before
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

General Classrooms: B-CC HS
Science Lab: Forest Park HS

before
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

CTE Spaces: Forest Park HS

- JROTC
- law & leadership
- automotive
- food & beverage
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Next Gen Spaces: Meade HS

before
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Next Gen Spaces: Meade HS 2

before

under construction
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Cafeteria: Forest Park HS

before
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Physical Education
SEI MODERNIZATION EXAMPLES

Dance / Black Box: B-CC HS
THANK YOU!

Next Steps

- **Winter 22/23**: Prepare Schematic Plan with school and curriculum staff
- **May 2023**: Present Schematic Design plan to BOE for approval
- **June 2023**: Community Stakeholder Meeting 3
- **Summer/Fall 23**: Fit out all spaces with school and curriculum staff
- **Nov. 2023**: Present Design Development Plan to BOE for approval
- **Fall of 2024**: Submit Permit documents including LPC review
- **Dec. 2024**: Community Stakeholder Meeting 4
- **Feb. 2025**: Present Construction Contract to BOE for approval
- **March 2025**: Community Stakeholder Meeting 5