

**Town of Swampscott
School Building Committee
Hadley Elementary School Project
Thursday, October 15, 2020
8:07 p.m. – 10:00 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, Tim Cooper, Kevin Breen, Eric Stewart, A.Randall Hughes, David Zucker, Lytania Mackey Knowles, Scott Burke, Catie Porter-Roberts, Kathleen Huntley, Matt Kirschner, Christina Collela, Sean Fitzgerald

Committee Members Absent: Robert Bell and Jose Alvarado

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

Call to Order: Suzanne Wright made a motion to call the meeting in order, seconded by Michael McClung. The meeting was called to order at 8:07 p.m.

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

2. Review and Discuss District K-4 Options

Option 1: New 3-story school at Stanley. (Grades k-4, 900 students)

Stanley site, k-4 (900 students), 3 stories, \$97-\$114m (based on PDP phase estimates)
It was indicated this option has 90 of 120 parking spaces and 62,000 SF plus Ewing Woods as a play area (68 SF/ student).

Advantages include; a 3-story school along the woods, good distance from neighbors, good side entry, good views and fit, loop road exit at Whitman to UU parking lot, safe play, safe pedestrian paths, good educational layout, good solar orientation. Limitations included; limited on-site queuing adds to street traffic, demolition of Hadley would cause disruption resulting in temporary classroom costs.

Option 2: New 3-story school at Stanley. (Grades k-4, 900 students)

Stanley site, k-4, (900 students), 3 stories, \$97-\$114m (based on PDP phase estimates).

It was indicated this option has 90 of 120 parking spaces and 62,000 SF plus Ewing Woods as a play area (68 SF/ student).

Advantages included; 1-2 story entry side with 3-story classroom wings behind, better on-site queening length, steps away from neighbors with good tree buffer, side entry, views and fit, loop road exit at Whitman to UU parking lot, safe play and pedestrian paths, educational layout, solar orientation, and maintains the use of Stanley throughout construction. One limitation identified was on-site queuing adding to the street traffic. Another limitation was the temporary classroom costs for students during the demolition of Stanley. A rendering displayed the height of the building in 3D.

3. Questions from SBC answered by LBA

Question 1

Q) Does one option encroach on neighboring houses more than the other?

A) Option 1 is closer to the Northside abutters at Cedar Road and Whitman Road. Option 2 is closer to the Forest Avenue extension but a lesser degree, and with less impact.

Question 2

Q) Is there a way to determine which option will be more imposing than the other?

A) Although option 1 has a 2-story front stepping to 3- stories, its proximity to the Whitman entry and its location on the site will likely make it feel its occupying more space and will feel more imposing. Option 2, by having space between the building and the entry and having 2-stories in the middle front section, gives a sense of more openness and breathing room. Being against the tall trees at Ewing woods also provides a mediated scale making it less imposing

Question 3

Q) What option could best suit a playing field?

A) Playing field areas for 10 year-olds to 12-year-olds, range from (120'x180') to (150'x240').

L. Sherwood marks up a site plan showing possible footprints of various fields on both options

Question 4

Q) Which option leaves more open space? Does one option offer increase play space or increased parking than the other? Are there any outstanding programmatic size differences between the two?

A) Option 2 has 13,600 +/- more total open space than option 1.

L. Sherwood broke down both options by square footage to show approximate space comparison

Question 5

Q) Which option is likely to involve less blasting during construction? Which one is less invasive/ disruptive?

A) It's not about the blasting, as both options have building area within a ledge zone, it's more about having to remove unsuitable fill at the north side of the site and the need to replace it with structural fill for the option 1 building area. With option 2, the north side area playing field could be leveled with new topsoil and would likely not require soil replacement. Soil and ledge are not determining factors as we can overcome those items for each option. Ledge extents should be similar for both. Unsuitable soil removal and replacement carry significant costs and will be minimized as much as possible for both options

Question 6

Q) Is it necessary to do some site testing to understand the groundwork that would be needed for each design, or should that not be a driving factor in the decision?

A) We have referenced existing test pit results done previously and were using that information, which indicated the probable areas of Ledge, the type of ledge, and soils that may need to be remediated. More investigation will be done during the schematic design phase to better define those areas.

Question 7

Q) Which allows more cars to queue on-site? What is the queuing impact of each design?

A) Option 1 has more on-site queuing length than option 2. With some bussing, both options keep ques on site. Without bussing, option 1 queue length fits on the site, but option 2 pickup queue length could backup onto Orchard and to the intersection with Nason Road.

Question 8

Q) Is either better for bussing?

A) Either option can be made for bussing

Question 9

Q) How much is budgeted for the construction and operation of temporary facilities, including returning to the site to usable condition past post-construction?

A) The budget established for temporary classrooms and setup is \$2.5M +/- . This line item is under the soft costs.

Question 10

Q) Where will the temporary classrooms be located?

A) temporary classrooms would be located at the existing Hadley school and the middle school-grades k-1 at Hadley (front of the school) and grades 2-4 at the MS lower parking lot

Question 11

Q) Is there a plan for the drop-off and pick-up traffic impact wherever the portables are located?

A) Hadley and the MS would continue to drop-off as they do now. We have not reviewed the impact of additional cars.

Question 12

Q) Is there an anticipated cost increase in the general conditions to build on the site of an operating school?

A) Yes. Costs for temporary barriers, walkways, access, safety protocols, etc. would add to the general conditions with the Stanley school kept in operation. Then a question presents itself, where to locate faculty parking?

Question 13

Q) How many parking spaces could you get in the 6,000 s.f. 3-4play space in the NE corner of 7D?

A) A few spaces only.

Question 14

Q) How many parking spaces could you get in the green space directly in front of 7C? Could this be accomplished and still have green space in the front of the building?

A) We could develop a few parallel parking spaces, but both of these areas should be maintained as play areas.

Question 15

Q) Can you provide an outline overlay of the building footprint of each option on the existing site?

A) Yes. Option 1 alone, option 2 alone, or option 1 and 2 combined.

Question 16

Q) Which option is less likely to be perceived as a threat to the Ewing woods? Does having the building so close to the conservation area create any environmental or safety issues?

A) Both options will be a similar distance from Ewing woods. We need to maintain a respectful distance. We will rebuild the East-West pathway along the North edge of Ewing woods. One difference is that option 2 runs along most of Ewing.

Question 17

Q) Is one of the options optimal for educators.

A) No, they both meet MSBA standards

Question 18

Q) Do we have approved access through the Unitarian church? How will the dropoff work if we don't use that area?

A) The simple approach is for the UU exit to be used only during drop-off and pickup times and be gated otherwise. During other hours, we should allow Whitman Road to serve as the site entrance and exit.

Question 19

Q) Do we have approved access from forest ave through Ewing woods? Do we have a chance? How does traffic work?

A) There is a “paper road” that connects forest ave ext. to the southeast corner of the site. This will be only for emergency vehicle access. We’re avoiding the wetland area.

Question 20

Q) Does one of the options respod better access points? What is the queue time for each, with 1, 2, or 3 entry/exit points?

A) Option 1 has a longer onsite queue but requires a road around the building to access the UU exit. Option 2 has a simple connection from Whitman to the UU exit.

Question 21

Q) What is the footprint (GSF ground floor) of each version? Greatest height? Total GSF and NSF each?

A) Option 1 footprint is 72,210 GSF, and its greatest height is 42’ at the 3-story wing. The 2-story front is 28’ high. Option 2 footprint is 62,080 GSF, and its greatest height is 56’ in the back at the gymnasium. The classroom wings are the same 42’ at 3-stories. The entry and center are 2-stories at 28’. The total program is the same for both options at 155,205 GSF. Refer to the 3D building height drawings attached to the 3rd-floor plans for each option.

Question 22

Q) Is there a way to move the gym to a lower floor in option 2?

A) There is always a way and one approach would be to locate the gym on the 2nd floor above the administration areas. This would make the whole building 3-stories at the front versus 2-stories.

Question 23

Q) Is TLT the elevators?

A) No, TLT is a toilet room. We will plan for 2 elevators in both options one for the lower school and one for the upper school

Question 24

Q) is there another option to put the core of the building into the corner like illustrated. Perhaps even an underpass that leads to UU exit? A hybrid site location for the two options?

A) We looked at this option illustrated because it had merit. There are two big concerns- the north classroom wing is not properly orientated to the sun and would have

undesirable east-west light. We don't recommend a vehicular pass-through at an elementary school that would also cut off access, then becomes a safety concern.

Additional Question 1

Q) What would a 4 or 5 story building do to the play areas, open space, impact the neighbors?

A) Having a 4-5 story building would increase the amount of play and open space areas, but we do not recommend more than 3-stories for this site location and scale a 4-5 story building would be out of scale and character in this neighborhood. Oth educationally, for smaller children, and the internal layout of the lower and upper schools, a 4-5 story school doesn't work well

Additional Question 2

Q) Are the architects/ builder willing to meet Stanley neighborhood resident to alleviate concerns around blasting and impacts to stone foundations

A) Of course, along with the OPM, we will meet with the neighborhood residents to discuss their concerns

4. Vote/Selection

Superintendent Pam Angelakis made a motion to select Option 2: New 3-story school at Stanley. (Grades k-4, 900 students) to submit for the PSR. The motion was seconded by Catie Porter-Roberts. Role Call vote illustrated that all were in favor of Option 2 as preferred selection for the Consolidated District Wide K-4 at the Stanley Site.

A second motion was requested by the OPM team to submit Option 2: New 3-story school at Stanley (Grades k-4, 900 students) to the MSBA. The motion was made by Superintendent Pamela Angelakis and seconded by Kevin Breen. Roll call vote produced a unanimous vote to move forward for the submission to the MSBA for the Preferred Selection Report.

Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn by Eric Stewart and seconded by A.Randall Hughes. Meeting was adjourned at 9:52 pm.