

# 29 responses

[Publish analytics](#)

## Summary

**Legat Architects** [Please rank order the three design, with '1' being the concept you liked the best, '2' being in the middle, and '3' being the concept you liked the least. ]



1 - Most Favorite	<b>0</b>	0%
2	<b>10</b>	34.5%
3 - Least Favorite	<b>19</b>	65.5%

**Cordogan, Clark, and Associates** [Please rank order the three design, with '1' being the concept you liked the best, '2' being in the middle, and '3' being the concept you liked the least. ]



1 - Most Favorite	<b>27</b>	93.1%
2	<b>2</b>	6.9%
3 - Least Favorite	<b>0</b>	0%

**Wight & Company** [Please rank order the three design, with '1' being the concept you liked the best, '2' being in the middle, and '3' being the concept you liked the least. ]



1 - Most Favorite	<b>2</b>	6.9%
2	<b>17</b>	58.6%
3 - Least Favorite	<b>10</b>	34.5%

**Please briefly explain why the design you chose as '1' was your favorite. Please use the name of the firm you are speaking about in your comments.**

While I truly appreciated the design and size and consistency of the classroom, I marked Cordogan, Clark, and Associates as my favorite because I felt they presented the most knowledge on the current education climate and where it may be headed in the future. I felt that their design reflected the latest in best practices and really focused on what would work best for our students and staff.

Forward thinking. Designed to please community and school. Features that could be changed (ie planetarium) to better meet school and community needs. I like how they thought about interior design/furniture needs as well as architecture of the walls.

It's the most traditional designed building. It fit into the community better than the other two.

Cordogan, Clark was my favorite. It had adequate class size. Traditional yet creative educational layouts, designated auditorium space and ample gym size.

I liked the look of the building and the facilities that they explained. I believe they addressed space for special educational delivery. I thought that the team of people were very professional and seemed to be in tune with what's needed. Legat Architects seemed less interested in the project. Since they had worked on Hubble Middle, one of the models we would like to work towards, I would have thought they would want to be included in our vision. I believe this was the model that used underground space to provide more room.

Cordogan, Clark and Associates' plan was well thought out with a realistic construction timeline. They also spoke of the assistance they can offer with passing a referendum. In addition, the high use areas were very functional and designed to meet the needs of middle school students. The design would be appealing to the community as it is traditional and offers much gym and theatre space that the community could utilize. The footprint allowed for a good amount of parking and green space. The layout had a very efficient flow as well.

I felt the CCA group had the most space for classrooms & had the best mix of traditional with forward looking. The WC company I liked, but did not like the separation of the grade levels mainly because so many teachers & students are cross leveled. That could possibly be altered? I thought the Legat was futuristic which is possible what got us here in the first place.

Too much away from traditional and not practical. MY biggest concern with all 3 - NOT ENOUGH OUTDOOR SPACE> My second biggest concern was for all 3 plans AND was expressed at the meeting. WHY include the district admin in this plan when we are so short of space as it is.?!>

Cordogan, Clark and Associates provided rooms, facilities and thoughtfulness in all areas of current programming and curriculum.

Most practical, addresses the most expressed needs and concerns.

Cordogan et al seemed to have the best grasp on the needs of a school.

#1 Cordogan with green space at a minimum already this made the most sense in terms of overall space. We will need a gym/track/fitness lab to accommodate the number of students safely.

Cordogan firm: I liked the flexibility that was put into place for large and small classrooms!

I chose Cordogan as my first choice-- The design of the building seemed to be the best out of the three. I liked the 900 seat auditorium, the Sunday street concept, and the overall layout of the building.

Cordogan, Clark and Associates was my number 1 choice. I feel that this space can be best used according to the current set up of our school. The fact that the gym and auditorium would be readily available was what put this choice over number 1 for me.

Bow tie and houses are a waste of space.

Cordogan gives the PE department the largest gym, a fitness lab, and indoor running track.. Considering the PE department is losing a lot of outdoor green space, these additions are a must. Also, the size of the gym is crucial is accommodating classes that can be as large as 140 students between 4 sections.

I feel like Cordogan, Clark and Associates has a great music department set up. Its the only design that has flexibility with classrooms, practice rooms, storage rooms and a music lesson room. I also feel that if we choose a design with an auditorium, we should have a large enough one for the community to use and for our whole school to fit in. A 400 person auditorium is nice but should be at least 500 for all district school concerts and the musical. Thirdly, I like how this floor plan separates different departments so our noise doesn't bleed into other areas of learning.

Cordogan, Clark, and Associates incorporated modern educational concepts with a traditional exterior. In addition, they had contacted the community in their plans while allowing "public" use of new areas (gym, auditorium, and common outdoor areas). They had a grasp of the need for community support in order to pass a referendum.

Although I think Cordogan has a few flaws including making a "Sunday Street", it seemed to do the best including classrooms, which is what we are sorely missing!

Cordogan, Clark, and Associates: Like the large spaces for meeting with entire school. Large classrooms.

Wight & Company - Best fits the needs of our students, staff, and community. Innovative

without being overly "trendy" or "flashy" just for the sake of being trendy/flashy. Great shared use spaces.

Most thorough and bigger classrooms.

Cordogan, Clark & Associates seems like the most practical design.

Cordogan was the most traditional, I like the closing off of Washington, good parking

I liked the traditional look and the flow of the building Cordogan created. I also liked the large auditorium and ideas for outdoor space that the whole community could use. They seemed to provide us with enough parking (without district offices). And I like that grade levels will be separated by floors.

CC&A was my favorite. I liked the concept, it seemed to address our needs the best.

I felt that Cordogan, Clark, and Associates really paid attention to important details that the other firms missed quite frankly. They demonstrated a better understanding of our district in their design, grouping grade level classrooms in the same area of the school, but not in isolation. They recognized that a loss of green space necessitated a gym large enough to house four teaching "stations" or "areas" for our PE teachers, including a gym, track, and fitness center that could be used for the community, as well as our students. They also took into consideration the neighborhood, moving traffic and parking to the north side of the school, minimizing traffic on Third Street for the residential neighbors. They provided ample classrooms and labs, as well as flexible learning spaces. Best of all, they created an auditorium that can seat the entire student body. Amazing.

I chose Cordogan, Clark, and Associates because it best fit our needs.

Cordogan, Clark, and Associates was my favorite because I think their focus was clearly on a realistic classroom size, as well as spaces that fit the entire school. Our number one issue has been useable space, and they really focused their design on that.

**If the firm that created the design you chose as '1' was selected, are there any questions, concerns, ideas, or suggestions you would want to share? Please use the name of the firm you are speaking about in your comments.**

CC&A was the most realistic and factual with their presentation. They spent time making sure our concerns were implemented in the building design.

Obviously, I would want to make sure there were enough classrooms with Cordogan design. Also, there needs to be 1-2 smaller rooms per grade level for small group instruction and testing centers. Again, this needs to occur on all floors.

C,C& A I thought was the best design because of the use of space.

If the administrative center were moved, would that allow us to remove the two rows of parking that ate up a portion of Washington field? Other than that, I was really excited about this design.

Having only glanced at the plans, vs. studying them, I would want to make sure all of our desired spaces were in place.

No additional questions yet.

I have concerns of a "green roof" Is it necessary? Why would we want students up on a roof. Where will all the mechanics of the building be? What happened to a building like CHMS. That is a traditional building that works.

my concerns would be to have enough classrooms, special ed space for instruction delivery and parking.

I also went to the night presentations at both HMS & CHMS. Cordogan, Clark & Associates also had a concept for a renovated HMS along with the the new building. On the renovated design they had showing, the library was mislabeled as a locker room, which happened to be on the opposite side of the building from the gym. Plus, it wasn't an "off by one" mistake (like 25 vs. 26), but a totally different number (I believe it was marked as 35, but should have been 27). If the design company can make this kind of silly mistake, what other mistakes can they make on the finished design? Also, when I asked one of the people with Cordogan, Clark & Associates about the mistake, she said that since the gym (and auditorium) were in a "public" section of the school, they did not want student lorckerrooms to be near where the public can see them. While understandable, but to have it on the opposite side of the school is very impractical considering the amount of time each class period has. While I realize the mislabeling was a mistake, the person with the firm did not know this, and gave me a very problematic answer. I have concerns about their judgment in designing a practical school if this kind of thinking and mistakes can happen.

See concerns above. PARKING PARKING PARKING! This is really a question to be directed to our district admin. THEY DO NOT LIVE IT so they don't realize it. And if we end up sharing a space with them, they better not say NO PARKING in certain spots reserved for them because they come to work later than us.

More than "just enough" classroom space. We've tried movable walls and flexible classrooms and they are not a benefit for most instruction.

The major drawback with the Cordogan et al plan seems to be the "Sunday Street." It appears that the outdoor PE area would be significantly reduced and I don't believe that the community will back the design.

Cordovan, Still need more classrooms, cafeteria should be closed, need to make sure there is space for pull out, reading classes, teacher lounge, copy rooms, conference room, etc. The day to day necessities are missing.

Cordogan needs to make sure there are enough classrooms, be realistic about what the village will approve. Flexible learning spaces will not be used as such unless we are given enough classrooms.

Only idea would be to create/carve out smaller classrooms that could be used by the resource teachers and/or specialists. A teacher's lounge, a large conference room (or two), work rooms, etc. are all needed to make our building run smoothly in the future.

I would ask Cordogan, Clark, and Associates if there was any way to expand Washington park to be bigger to allow for more green space.

I chose Cordogan as my first choice-- Due to the size of our instrumental music program, it would be ideal to have two separate rooms for band and orchestra instead of one shared room. We would also need storage rooms/instrument locker space.

Personally, I would like to see both a band room and an orchestra room in addition to a choir room. Sharing one room with 3 teachers is really tough. In all designs, it only had one room for all three teachers to share. No matter which architect we go with, this is a need for our growing music department.

For the Cordovan/Clark plan, I absolutely love the idea of having a big auditorium that seats 900, but if it becomes too costly we could get by with about 600 as we generally have up to 500 people at our concerts plus the students. Also, at any given time we need classrooms for 4 music staff plus a rehearsal/sectional room. I don't believe there were 4 full music rooms in their plan. Also, the idea of having a 'contained' lunchroom would be great.

The only concern I can think of of the Wight & Company design is that we do currently have teachers teaching more than one grade and some classes with mix-grade students. I'm not sure how that would work with the grade level "houses".

For all three firms, I don't remember hearing much about placement of lockers, number of bathrooms (student and staff), etc in their design, so I would urge that there be consideration for those areas. For Cordogan and Clark, I think the green space could be increased by a little bit. Even though there is a great deal of gym space, I think classroom space it utilized by all members of staff. Additionally, I would like to know what green design elements the firm would use. I feel strongly that it is incredibly important to be as green as possible in the design.

How is safety for the building addressed. Sending students to where they need to go in a bigger building.

Cordovan firm: Please check on the amount of parking we would have without the administration building being there. Also, check to see if another (smaller) gym could be placed where the administration building would have been.

**If a different firm was selected (your '2' or '3' ranked design), are there any questions, concerns, ideas, or suggestions you would want to share? Please use the name/s of the firm/s you are speaking about in your comments.**

The Legal Architects design seemed very modern. Because of the modern design, angels, and all the open spaces I feel we have some wasted space that could have been used for classrooms or small teaching spaces. Wright and Company seems that the houses look nice but its also wasting some space and will take students quite a bit of time to move from one area to the next. I also don't like the idea that PE and Music are displaced for 6-12 months. I know we are flexible but I feel that should be a part of the decision process.

Wright firm- We are moving towards integrated all students but yet these "houses" separate what we are trying to put together. Please build a building which helps us integrate students into their appropriate classes. Please find a way that the gym and the others rooms attached are completed when school opens in August. Legal firm - We need more rooms! Please find a

way to build regular sized classrooms as well as small sized classrooms for all grades and subjects.

With Legat and Associates, it's probably the "coolest" school, but I wonder how "cool" it'll be in 10-20 years. When the current HMS was built in the 1970's, "open concept" style schools was "cool," but is no longer the case. Also, they had the student services offices under the stair learning area seems a bit small. There doesn't seem to be enough room for everything. With Wight & Company, I appreciate the time they took to look at the community, and designing a school with a more urban look towards downtown Hinsdale and a more "house" like look facing the residential side of Hinsdale. While looks are important, this concept seems impractical. For teachers who teach across grade levels, as well as people who work school-wide (IT, custodians, etc.), having separate "houses" for each grade level means a lot of walking. This is exasperated should said people should need to move large objects (book cases, desks, laptop carts, etc.) from one "house" to another. With Legat as well as Cordogan/Clark, I do like how it's basically one long hallway with classrooms on either side. I like the idea of having a gym and auditorium open to the public. I would hope that they're only open outside school hours as well as have a secure entrance between them and the rest of the school. With all three designs, they all lacked behind-the-scenes areas, such as a staff long & restrooms, copy/work rooms, custodial work areas and server room(s). While these are not the "main" areas of a school, or any other kind of building, they are very necessary parts. While their designs are only samples at this point and can change, the fact that NONE of these rooms were included in any of the firms' designs is greatly disturbing.

As a taxpayer I would oppose the referendum for the firm who designed an open concept space age building. We built one 40 years ago and it didn't work. Why would we spend that much money on a concept that didn't work.

Make the bow tie straight!!!! Waste of space.

Wight's houses are a cool idea in theory, but seem pretty much impossible for students who take classes across grade level and teachers who teach cross-grade. I do like that it brings our school back to a middle school, as opposed to a junior high.

No other firm met the said needs of the school.

Wight and co doesn't seem to have adequate classrooms in each house.

For the other designs, I had concerns with the "building" style for each grade level. While there is something to be said for having our own designated areas, I'd like to see it with less of an abrupt divide. With the Legat design, I had major concerns with the number of rooms, their size, and the potential irregular shape. I'd really like to see more of a focus on maximizing classroom and meeting space.

The same three things as above.

Legat's bowtie shaped design seemed to create a major "clog" in the middle. Overall the Legat design had too little space and too much of what is wrong with HMS - open concept and unusable, odd shaped spaces, not enough classrooms.... The Wight plan with the "houses" would not seem functional with all the cross graded students and teachers. The

open Esplanade is what we want to avoid. The offices on either end did not seem practical.

See comments in first box.

I greatly disliked the general feel of the Legat architects design because I don't think it fit any of our class size needs. I think there would still be issues with the open lunch room with close proximity to classrooms. Most importantly, there were not enough classrooms at all. While I appreciate that the design was middle school pedagogy focused, that is not our reality. Wright and Company would be my second choice. I liked the overall feel and I think it was a creative approach, but again, the classroom space was not enough and needs great improvement. I did like the overall layout and thought behind the decisions and design, better than Legat.

Legat - thought of students but not the teachers, not feasible Wight - no need for a telescope, need more classrooms, classrooms shouldn't have glass walls to the hallway, need lockers for all grades, need rooms for support, not the hallway, not an efficient use of space.

Legat - wasted space with the bow tie look. Need large spaces for meetings. Wight - liked the houses, but too spread out. Phases would not work.

#2 - Wight Is there any possible way to have the whole building completed earlier? Phase 2 was presented as being done not until well after building opened. The following question is more for HMS leadership. This design creates separate "houses" for each grade level. Perfect for a middle school set up possibly. At this point we operate more like a junior high. I think we need to decide what type of school we want to be before a choice is made on design.

Regarding the Legat design - this design has some of the same problems that the current HMS has (too many open spaces, no conference rooms, not enough classrooms, hallway areas where student traffic would be jammed, no auditorium, etc....).

Not a fan of building in stages over multiple years. Can this be prevented?(Wight) Who is maintaining all of the green space that is part of your plan? (Legat)

I chose Cordogan as my first choice. My concerns about the other two firms/designs... Legat seemed too modern and the design didn't seem to fit the needs of our building. The Wight building had some nice features, but I was concerned about the academic houses since many teachers/kids cross grade levels. I also felt like the green space in between the academic houses (while nice) did not make the best use of the land. And in regards to the auditorium-- it seems like if they're going to build an auditorium it should be able to fit the whole school... so the 900-seat Cordogan design would be better.

Wight and Company - While I understand the desire to create a building pleasing to the neighbors, the instructional "houses" were way too small for our student body and unfortunately, isolate one grade level from the others. I don't think our staff or students would benefit from a phase-in plan. We need a building/design that can be done and opened at the same time. The disruption to PE, activities/extra-curricular sports, music, hot lunch, etc. for an entire year just won't work for our staff. We have to do better. The size of the gym, the size of the auditorium, and the sheer number of classrooms were all inadequate for a building that can houses 850-900 students. Legat- While the design is creative and innovative, the most unique of the three, I am concerned about the sheer size of learning spaces, the number of

irregular-shaped classrooms and labs, the size of the gym, etc. It just seemed too small and too modern for the community.

I would only be concerned about my third ranked design. It was very corporate and strange and didn't seem to consider that these are middle school and not high school students.

For Wight and Co. - I liked the design, but I felt it took up way too much of a footprint and building in 2 phases would not work. I don't believe that the planetarium was necessary and the theatre would need to be expanded to 600 seats. Also, the lunchroom might be better if it were more contained. For Legat - Not a workable design. It did not fit with the community and had too much wasted space. Too many bells and whistles and not enough basics!! No theatre and a wide open free-form cafeteria. yikes. Also many blind spots in concourse. With the Legat design, people 20 years from now would be talking about us, just like we do about those who conceived our current building. I also questioned their use of students to promote the design.

## Number of daily responses

