

**Town of Swampscott
School Building Committee
Hadley Elementary School Project
Tuesday, January 19, 2021
6:33 p.m. – 8:24 p.m.
Meeting Held via Zoom**

M I N U T E S

Committee Members Present: Suzanne Wright, Martha Sybert, Pamela Angelakis, Max Kasper, Ilana Bebchick, Martha Raymond, Michael McClung, Kevin Breen, A.Randall Hughes, David Zucker, Lytania Mackey Knowles, Scott Burke, Kathleen Huntley, Matt Kirschner, Christina Collela, Sean Fitzgerald

Committee Members Absent: Jose Alvarado, Robert Bell, Tim Cooper, Catie Porter-Roberts, Eric Stewart

Others Present: Paul Kalous (OPM, Hill International), Vivian Varbedian (OPM, Hill International), David Harris (Architect, Lavallee Brensinger Architects), Leigh Sherwood (Architect, Lavallee Brensinger Architects)

Call to Order: Suzanne Wright made a motion to call the meeting in order, seconded by Catie Porter Roberts. The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m.

1. Minutes from prior meeting:
No minutes to approve.

2. Schedule Update

Project Schedule

D. Harris gave an update on the project schedule and indicated it is still on time.

Recent Activity

D. Harris gave an update on recent activity including; community engagement, design process, sustainable design, and existing conditions. Community engagement included scheduling community conversation meetings and creating community conversations flyer for neighborhoods. The design process included holding a building code meeting, advancing the building floor plan and façade design, and scheduling faculty/staff design meetings. The sustainable design included executing MOU for the Path-I incentive

program and coordinating ZNE services with National Grid/Slipstream. Existing conditions included coordinating proposals for site survey, geotechnical, and traffic.

Two-Week Look-Ahead

D. Harris gave a two-week look-ahead on items including; community engagement, building and site design, and sustainable design. Community engagement includes community conversations preparation in February and a connection-meeting week of January 25 with the UU church. building and site design include; faculty and staff design meetings, design team meetings on UU church connection (landscape, civil, structure, MEPFP, acoustics, food service), schedule security review meeting with the district, fire, and police, start site survey for Stanley and UU church, and schedule geotechnical investigations. Sustainable design includes; schedule an integrated design meeting Slipstream energy modeling input

Three-month overview

David Harris gave a three-month overview. February includes community conversations on February 2, February 4, and February 9 (02/02/2021, 02/04/2021, and 02/09/2021). A schematic design update on February 16 (02/16/2021). Another schematic design update is scheduled for February 26 (02/26/2021) to review drawings, specifications, and narratives to cost estimators. March includes SBC meetings on March 2 and March 16 (03/02/2021, 03/16/2021) for an SD update. A community update meeting is scheduled for March 23 (03/23/2021). Another SBC meeting is scheduled for March 30 to review the total project budget and SD submittal approval. Review/reconcile cost estimates and finalize DESE and SD submittals is also set to occur in March. April consists of an MSBA project scope and budget conference, MSBA SD review comments and response, and DESE and SD submittals to MSBA on April 7 (04/07/2021)

S. Wright asked about the faculty meetings.

D. Harris indicated a school faculty representative from each department to discuss spaces and needs.

S. Wright asked about the planning of the spaces.

D. Harris indicated welcoming ideas.

L. Sherwood indicated an open discussion on that topic and gave an example of how a discussion/interaction would go.

The SPB indicated problems in the past school turn over with technology.

Sherwood indicated wanting to support the educational vision without giving direction.

Breaking people away from what they have now and what they can see in the future.

For example: splitting the gym into thirds may or may not work. An explanation of how the allowance coincides with the project as it goes from SD to DD. You cannot design based on the ideas of one person. Ideas will be reviewed repeatedly. Bring people together in a holistic way.

P. Angelakis indicated strength in a smaller community is the teachers' united thought process and decision-making.

3. Design Update

Proposed Site Plan

L. Sherwood displays the site-plan from the last meeting with improvements. Improvements including; entry views, least imposing, neighbor distance, buffers, most efficient footprint, maximum open/play space, on-site queuing, traffic, community use, access, solar orientation, PV's, geothermal system, rain garden/native plants, protect natural resources. The scale of the site keeps changing and some preliminary site plans can come together however, the overall site-plan will not change. Martha Raymond indicated a section of playground designated for toddlers. Sherwood indicated this is a developmental step in playground design.

Floor Plans – First Floor

Sherwood shows how each school has its entrance leading to the “shell”, or common area. There are additional entrances for services and community. The cafeteria and media center present room for discussion on “stepping”.

Floor Plans – Second Floor

“Daylighting” and a connecting “flex space” were discussed. The “flex space” is located at the landing of the right stairwell (32'x32')

Floor Plans – Third Floor

Openings in the ceiling provide daylighting in the stairwell. The gymnasium functionality was reviewed. Stepping

Neighborhood Conversations

D. Harris indicated working with the communication subcommittee to create a flyer inviting community members to a neighbor-focused meeting on February 2. The meeting will focus on the traffic impact the new school will have on the surrounding neighborhood. A site design meeting is scheduled for February 4, to discuss landscape, civil, play, and outdoor learning spaces. A community use meeting is scheduled for February 9, to discuss the shared community spaces. Posting will be updated plans before meetings.

S. Wright indicated she distributed the flyer to residents surrounding Stanley.

4. Potential Site Acquisition

S. Wright indicated she wants to present a formal proposal to the town selection board to acquire the property.

Current Site Plan – Stanley School Site

The current on-site queue length is about 950 ft. All cars fit on-site in the a.m. In the p.m. (85) cars can fit on-site. In fair weather conditions, 15 available spaces in the p.m. In inclement weather conditions, the extension to Nason provides (46) spaces off-site. The current plan has 65 of 120 needed. The current site has open space including;

Playfields (33,000 sf), play area/outdoor learning (32,360 sf), and undecided space (66,710 sf).

Expanded Site Plan – with Adjacent Parcel

The acquisition of the adjacent parcel land would provide an increase of 37,480 sf bringing the total site area to 301,980 sf. The potential site is located at 49 Forest Ave. with an existing house and driveway that spans 100 ft. wide, by the length of the site. The land slopes with the existing Stanley site and contains no wetlands. The expansion would increase the queue length by 620 ft. allowing all a.m. cars to fit on-site. An additional (33) cars could fit in the p.m., bringing the total to 118 spaces. In fair weather conditions in the p.m, off-site parking would reduce by (15). In inclement weather conditions in the p.m., off-site parking would reduce by (33), keeping all cars off Nason Road. Parking spaces could be consolidated and increased by 49 spaces. This would allow 114 of the 120 spaces needed with 16 being overflow. The new space relocates parking away from playfields for a larger field area. The land provides a connection to Forest Ave. that is shifted away from Ewing woods and the wetlands. Additional options for bus access and circulation to consider. Open space would increase by adding a larger playfield area (+6,325 sf), learning area (+3,805 sf), and buffers (+13,675 sf). In total, this is an additional 23,805 sf of open space with the school 100 ft. further away from the east abutters.

Site Development Cost Comparison

L. Sherwood displays the current site plan next to the expanded site plan. The current site plan has a total site area of 264,500 sf. The estimated site development cost (includes fields, play areas, site utilities) cost of \$8.65 M. This brings the estimated \$/sf to \$32.70/sf. The current site plan also shows the existing Stanley school with 38,400 sf and an estimated Stanley demolition cost of \$1.23M.

The expanded site plan shows an additional area of 37,480 sf, with an estimated site development cost between \$425 – 475K bringing the \$/sf between \$11.34/sf – \$12.67/sf. The additional sf of 49 Forest Ave. is 4,300 +/- sf in addition to the current project budget. The increases would include building demolition cost (\$25 – 30K), added demolition cost (\$25 – 30K), parcel acquisition cost, increased survey, and increased Geotech costs. The total estimated added construction costs are between \$450 – 505K.

1:02:58 – M. McClung asked if this will relieve any of the construction connectivity concerns.

P. Kalous indicated this space will most come into play during construction is when contractors are looking at the additional lay-down space as a benefit.

Vivian indicated the MSBA enjoys seeing additional growth as overall growth to the project as extra space for the future, which is a positive contingency element.

A discussion over the potential site acquisition land being used for blacktop

Catie Porter Roberts Indicated the way this acquisition appears to regular people is just blacktop but needs to highlight benefits and numbers.

M. Raymond indicated the site plan to show more of the color green and not blend the hardscape and greenspace. Martha indicated she supports the land acquisition when weighing the benefits.

M. Sybert indicated the playfield was possibly used for a soccer field.

L. Sherwood indicated different uses of the playfield.

K. Breene indicated in a past project trying to acquire land and not going through with it and it ultimately being a problem in the end.

S. Wright questioned when the demolition of the house would happen on the project schedule.

L. Sherwood indicated a funding percentage granted by the MSBA would be based on the amount of money being spent on the site. It would be a cost advantage to acquire this land before that funding.

M. Kirschner asked about the funding and types of transactions that would take place.

J. Epstein questioned why the land on Cedar Street and the Wetlands have not been acquired. M. Epstein asked about the queuing and traffic involved in the decision-making.

L. Sherwood indicated the project's history. Sherwood indicated the reasoning that leads up to the ultimate decision to reject

M. Epstein indicated where their house is located related to the project site.

S. Fitzgerald indicated the process of the site acquisition would take all the proper measures.

N. Duffy indicated a question on MSBA cost coverage before versus after Schematic Design.

P. Kalous indicated MSBA's reimbursable to site-cost is limited to 8% of total building cost, which has most likely already been exceeded.

M. McClung made a motion that the committee recommends to the select board instruct the town administrator to perform feasibility and financial analysis regarding the site acquisition at 49 Forest Ave.

V. Varbedian took role call: unanimous yes.

5. Communications Subcommittee Update

S. Wright indicated distributing 180 flyers to surrounding neighbors to Stanly schools. A virtual flyer is forthcoming.

Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn by Suzanne Wright and seconded by Martha Raymond. The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.