Shutesbury Library Building Committee: Design Subcommittee Minutes

Wednesday, March 15, 2023, 2 pm, on Zoom

SLBC Design Subcommittee Members Present: Jeff Quackenbush, Stephen Dallmus and Mary Anne Antonellis, Lauren Stara

Guests: Andrea Bono-Bunker, MBLC, from OEA Matt Oudens, Dominik Wit, and Porpla Kittisapkajon, from CMS Roger Hoyt and Neil Joyce and members of the public Joyce Braunhut and Mike Vinskey.

The LBC Design Committee will not take public comment and will focus on the design. Public comment will be reserved for the regular Library Building Committee meetings.

There was a brief conversation about open meeting law and design meetings.

There was brief discussion about taking minutes.

A new designer from OEA, Porpla Kittisapkajon has joined the design team.

OEA is trying to get a handle on site issues and building planning in conjunction with Landscape architect and Civil Engineer. Three options to share.

Plan 1: Parallel to Leverett Road. Organizing elements on site, mindful of wetlands and wetland buffers.

The 100-foot buffer zones from the wetland on the East side of the property and the wetland parallel to Leverett Road overlap.

Preliminary feedback from Miriam DeFant, Chair of Conservation Commission, suggests the Con Com will entertain encroachment in the buffer up to the 50-foot buffer.

The septic field needs to a raised system, a higher grade than the Library and its grounds. The septic will be placed in the Northeast corner, next to the road. There are some choices about the grade and the berm will be feathered out to nestle in to natural grade. Placing it in this corner simplifies the placement of the Library, its grounds and parking at the South end of the open/disturbed area.

The 100-foot buffer zones from the wetland on the East side of the property and the wetland parallel to Leverett Road overlap. Driveway/parking will go through this area which is already a disturbed area. It also encapsulates the area where the garage was previously, encapsulating the soils there. There may need to be a loop turn around at the end of the driveway or space for a K-turn. The soil can be reinforced so it has weight bearing capacity. There will have to be some clearing of trees at the end of the parking area. The trees may be outside of the buffer zone but we will be mindful of the impact of tree removal. We are also mindful of the need for remediation elsewhere in the site if we remove vegetation in the buffer. We will need to have a conversation with the Fire Department.

One the west end of the building in scheme one, some work will have to happen in the 50-foot buffer, which we would then repair and restore but we'll need to gauge the Con Coms opinion regarding work in the buffer.

Orientated east-west, entire roof will be south facing and available and needed for PV. PV system is estimated to be 5,600 to 6,000 square feet plus a four-foot border around the edge of the PV.

Reading garden would be nestled in between the long building and the tree line with existing pockets.

Between the building and the road is a clump of evergreens that are dense and out of place. That clump interferes with the visibility of building from road.

Preliminary Floor Plan – scheme 1. Meeting getting pushed further away from lobby than we would like. Adding in elements that were previously missing – fire pump room, electrical room, etc. Not all required spaces are incorporated in the floor plan yet.

In all three plans, the lobbies are bigger than in the program. Oudens suggests that the larger lobby is needed to provide a main circulation hub. They are a place for people to orientate themselves and provide clear access to various program areas.

The proportion of open space to small rooms is less than they anticipated, making the plan feel denser.

Circ Desk has good sight lines. Teens in a closed room next to study room. Mechanical equipment can go in attic space about staff work area, teen room.

Oudens shared a conceptual street view of the front of the building to give a sense of scale, location and visibility. The cluster of evergreens blocks the view from the road and we will want to have conversations with Con Com.

This plan assumes Heavy Timber construction with a single pitch roof facing south to maximize PV potential.

Dallmus asks about distance from road. It is roughly 340 feet from the road. 50-foot wetland buffer prevents us from being closer to the road.

Scheme two rotates the building 90 degrees, orientating north to south with a single pitch roof that slopes north to south along the long dimension to maximize PV potential. Parallel to parking, with parking on one side of building and reading garden on the other side, creates a nice separation between garden and parking.

Garden will have distinct character from front of building. Septic in lower right corner. Parking consolidated into single corridor.

This floor plan has circ desk closer to lobby/entrance. From lobby you either go left into meeting room area or right into body of the library. More of the required components are incorporated in this plan making this plan a little bit bigger than the others.

This plan needs some windows with views added and for the roof line to be extended out over outdoor cover space. Reading rooms orientated out toward views of the landscape.

Diagrammatic view of the road shows the high end facing the road. In the center of the building the roof is still high enough to accommodate mechanical equipment in the attic above circulation and staff workspaces.

More dynamic view than the first scheme with OEA likes.

Scheme three is an L-shape. Septic in same location. Parking extends a little further back. L-shape shields garden from parking. Long elevation to the road. More defined garden. Meeting room wing to the left, Library proper space strait ahead of the entrance. Need to add covered entrance. Adults program in middle, teens between adults and children who are at the far end. Children spaces far from entrance.

Dedicated staff restroom may be required by code. It is not in the program. Matt asked what our position on family restroom is. Lauren said they are not necessarily required in a building this size but restrooms should be positioned so that they are easily accessible to children. Mary Anne asked why a staff restroom is required. Lauren doesn't feel that a staff restroom is required in a building this size. Code rules regarding bathrooms have changed and more research is being conducted.

Restrooms and meeting room are collocated and children's room is on the other end. It will be difficult to get the children's room near a restroom. Lauren will send Matt the new code requirements regarding gender. We hope the new requirement are more progressive.

Discussion about proximity of restrooms to meeting rooms, children's room, off hours' access and security continued. Matt commented that the building won't be a big building. Mary Anne thinks proximity of the children's room to restrooms is not a defining factor.

Preliminary view from the road is to give a sense of scale, distance from road, etc. Matt shared a slide that compared the Building Program to the sizes in each of the schemes.

All three schemes are bigger than the Building Program which is typical at this stage. It is early schematic design and they are in a tight range of about 250 feet but they are all bigger than the Program. Several new elements, such as the fire pump room and automatic transfer switch (ATS) add program space. Some mechanical equipment can be stored in attic space.

OEA separate unassigned space and grossing factor. They have calculated 6% grossing factor for walls, columns, circulation. Lauren asked what percentage is the unassignable plus the grossing? Is it more or less than30%? We are in early stages and these numbers will change and improve as we move forward with plans. We need to get answers on code requirements, and make sure all elements are included and then compare apples to apples with the plans.

OEA wants to continue to explore the three versions as they continue to work with their consultants and review code.

Andrea: Third plan allows for the most separation between children and adult programming. There may be desire in the future to put a wall between the adult and children's area and it would be good to keep future desires in mind.

Lauren suggested we have a conversation with the director of the Monterey Library – they don't have a separation between the children's and adult's area and they might be wishing they had designed things differently.

Mary Anne asked if the meeting room could be between the children's and adult's areas. Andrea suggested there might be issues with locking things off in that case. Matt said the small size of the building is our challenge.

An L-shaped building will be more complicated and therefore more expensive, though not dramatically so.

Stephen: Separation between adults and children in scheme three is appealing. Would it be possible to achieve a similar separation in schemes one and two? Matt: We can look at it and continue to develop schemes and keep possible separation between children and adults in mind.

Dominik asked questions about shelving numbers, shelving height, shelving efficiency. There is room to increase shelving. Right now there is more seating shown than is needed. More fine tuning is needed.

Matt suggested high shelving in the perimeters and lower shelving in the open areas. Some libraries have a stack room which removes the collection somewhat. Lauren suggested reducing floor to ceiling windows increasing wall space for shelving.

More discussion about an element that might create some separation between adult's and children's space ensued. There was also more discussion about proximity of children's area to the entrance and also about how children will run past the adult area to get to the children's area. Questions about the safety of children in close proximity to the entrance were raised. These concerns will all be considered as we move forward with the design process.

Dominik asked if a work bench in the staff room instead of a free standing table would be acceptable. Mary Anne said yes.

There was discussion about sightlines.

Discussion about upcoming informal meeting with Con Com. Matt will share site plans. The hope is to get a general sense of what the Con Com will support.

Mary Anne shared that the Commission share general thoughts that know we are building a library, they know it is an important project, that work will have to occur in the buffer zone. The guidance is to avoid wetlands and resource areas and propose remediation where appropriate. They generally seemed supportive.

Stephen contributed positive comments about scheme two and the conceptual view from the road. It is a dynamic and more interesting view from the road.

OEA proposes that this will be a heavy timber building. It is better for carbon sequestration. It is manufactured off site and assembled on site. The framing would go up in a week. We don't have to conceal the underside if the structure. They may use cross laminated panels or wood decking for the ceiling.

<u>Schedule Moving Forward</u>

Next meeting, Thursday, March 16, 2023, 2 pm. Hybrid, with Con Com, Board of Health, Selectboard.

Goal to start to have a scheme we are comfortable with by the end of March.

April – OEA works with consultant team to put together documents to provide to a cost estimator to get a more realistic cost estimate. At that point we can make decisions based on budget, resources, and needs.

Next regular LBC meeting – Tuesday, March 21, 2023. OEA will present more developed floor plans.

The LBC design subcommittee will meet on alternating Wednesdays, meeting next on March 29th at noon on Zoom.

Following subcommittee meetings will be April 12th, April 26th, at noon. These can be in-person.

Discussion about a public forum. We had discussed April 11th. Mary Anne questions if Passover will effect that meeting date. We will discuss this with the larger committee on March 21st.

OEA will give an update once a month to the full committee.

Lauren offered to use a program to transcribe the transcript of the meeting for the minutes.

Matt asked how the committee felt about Glulam beams. Jeff said it is a good product and the appropriate way to proceed. Jeff also commented that he likes scheme two.

Stephen made positive comments about the siting of the septic system. OEA is waiting for more information from the civil engineer about the proposed size of the leach field. Jeff commented that septic systems don't last forever. OEA can have a conversation with the civil engineer about that.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Anne Antonellis