

Marymount University – Facilitated Meeting #2
Tuesday, March 27, 2007

Agenda:

- 7 – 7:10 Guest process and directions
7:10 – 7:30 Small Group – Question 1: “What is your vision of a healthy co-existence between the community and Marymount?”
7:35 – 7:55 Small Group – Question 1
8:00 – 8:20 Small Group – Question 2: “What will it take to achieve this vision?”
8:25 – 8:45 Regroup & Share
8:45 – 9 Next Steps

Attendees:

Ellen Anthony	Peter Fallon	Ned Rhodes
Will Anthony	Michael Foster	Loretta Siegley
James Bundschuh	Robert Gibson	Ernest Ulibarri
Chris Champagne	Pam Gillen	Art Walsh
Rosemary Ciotti	Jill Griffin	Ted Weihe
Abby Denham	David Haring	Anne Wilson
Chris Domes	Alice Harrington	
Shelley Dutton	Rob Kohler	

Group Notes (Main Themes have been highlighted and italicized)

Host: Chris Domes

- Marymount to digest some of these suggestions
- Placement and uses
- Site – Ballston site
- VISION – Residential campus that can become
- Small residential campus
- Internship – Organizing Principles
 - Redevelopment plan
 - Sensitive to St. Mary’s but not the neighbors
- Creative design
- Open up
- Wider sidewalks/Pedestrian/Vehicle Drop-off
- Impacts – Achieve vision to neighborhood
- Architecture – Broken
 - Too much density
 - Low to high
- Neighbors don’t want to have campus impact them
- Oriented toward campus
- Material use/institutional compatibility
- Residential feel
- Rethink design – how can it fit on site
- *Master Plan – Accomplish Marymount University goals*
 - *Goals – Metrics*
 - *Commitment to the Master Plan: Community Objectives & Compatibility*
- Theater
 - Concerns about size
 - Performing arts theater?
 - Should this be located somewhere else on the campus?
 - What part could go?

Marymount University – Facilitated Meeting #2
Tuesday, March 27, 2007

- Marymount – maybe should hold back & wait
- Theater is an excellent point
- Generates traffic
- Classroom space
- *Well conceived master plan*
- Visioning – How to make Marymount better
- *25-Year Plan – important*
- Not against auditorium – but is it in the right location?
- Classrooms
- Add more parking
- *Master Plans*
- *Visioning – County Resources*
 - *Lots of Asphalt*
 - *Master Planning for County*
- Parking
- Gateway – Community Gateway
- What & how
- *Vision*
 - *Parking*
 - *Dorms*
 - *Classrooms*
- *Less Uses*
- Solving parking
- Auditorium
- Add no more parking

Host: Ned Rhodes

Question #1

- Core activities on campus – more dorm/parking -4-5 dorm floors
- Ballston site is underutilized – as many classes filled there
- Noise from students – too concentrated
- University should be hidden
- Not adversely affect neighbors
- *Regular community meetings*
- Community benefit of what is built
- Advertise education functions
- Break up façade – step back – no wall – scale of building on the neighborhood side
- University needs to solve three needs – can't build 2+ buildings at the same time
- 20% academic growth/25% increased beds. Growth to Reston
- Only 80% solve parking problem – better to solve that one problem
- Need to look at traffic management to manage campus parking

Question #2

- Regular meetings continued
- *Softening of positions/needs – Prioritization*
- Consider stepback
- Cooperative design – work sessions
- *Update and revise mater plan – long term road map*
- Solve 26th / Yorktown intersection – minimize impact on neighbors

Marymount University – Facilitated Meeting #2
Tuesday, March 27, 2007

- No surprises or last minute changes
- Maximize community benefits – more park on site
- *If residential campus – focus & prioritize based on that premise. Sort & consolidate to other buildings*
- If elements are moved into the new building – what would be opened up and how would it be used?
- Use of swing space

Host: Robert Gibson

Question #1

- Marymount needs to incorporate the development of the Ballston Campus with the Main Campus Master Plan
- The site is part of the Main Campus not an isolated piece of property.
- Marymount see it self as an important park of the community.
- The underground parking is seen positive element of the project.
- The design of the new project on the site needs to be inviting.
- Any project on the site will be first part of overall Marymount redevelopment and will allow uses to be shifted from aging building in to new facility allowing for renovation.
- General acceptance that Marymount needs to do work to maintain its facilities.
- Community does on feel maintenance should not be done all at once but gradually over time.
- The Old Master Plan was not a viable or realistic plan.
- How does the present plan impact the long term plans of the University?
- Maybe the project should be oriented around the pedestrian walkway over Yorktown Boulevard.
- The project needs to be low then what was proposed.
- Marymount needs to make sure that any future proposals are economically feasible before presenting them to the public.

Question #2

- The University needs a New Master Plan.
- The community needs to be involved to a limited extent in the development of the New Master Plan.
- University is in a crisis crunch when considering the current state of the existing facilities, with many of them at capacity or well beyond there projected lives.
- Any new plan should include metric that can be used by the community and the University to judge impacts on the neighborhood and community benefits.
- Need clear idea of neighbor hood goals with respect the University?

Wrap-Up

Issue for Next Meeting:

Prioritization from Marymount – including the Master Plan...a “measured metrics”

Further Discussion:

Traffic/Parking Management Plan – Presentation

Commitment to Discussion

Impacts to Community (discussed among the neighborhoods during the interim)

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 24, 2007 – 7 p.m. – 10 p.m.