

School Building Committee  
Town Hall Room A, 25 Green Street  
November 29, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.

Acronyms used within:

**OPM:** Owner's Project Manager

**SBC:** School Building Committee

**MSBA:** Massachusetts School Building Authority

**Add-Reno:** Addition and Renovation

**SOI:** Statement of Interest

**1. Call to Order**

7:11 p.m.

Attendees: Jeff Anderson, Robin Crosbie, Jonathan Elder, Dr. William Hart, Barry Hopping, Mitchell Lowe, Kevin Murphy, Sarah Player, Steve Solomon, and Chub Whitten

Also Attending: Sheila Conley, Principal of Doyon School. Paul Queeney of PMA Consultants, Owner's Project Manager. Robert Bell and Dan Colli of Perkins Eastman, Project Architect.

Not Attending: Joanne Cuff, Bill Hodge, Richard Howard, Nishan Mootafian, and Sheila McAdams

**2. Review and Approval of 8/23/16, 10/26/16, & 11/15/16 Meeting Minutes**

The School Building Committee (SBC) approved the minutes from the 8/23/16, 10/26/16, & 11/15/16 SBC Meetings.

**3. Perkins Eastman Design Update**

Robert Bell of Perkins Eastman gave a presentation to indicate the development in the design since the prior SBC meeting. The slides that were presented will be posted on the Committee's web site ([www.ipswichsbc.org](http://www.ipswichsbc.org)). The presentation included review of the building layout, site, and floor plans for 3 new-build options and 1 add-reno option. For all building options, configurations and adjacencies of key building elements were reviewed. Also presented were building massing diagrams and shading studies for the building and the site. The relative advantages and disadvantages of each option were discussed and are summarized in the next section and in the attachment to these minutes.

**4. Discussion of Design Alternatives**

Sheila Conley, Principal of the Doyon School, presented review comments from faculty, staff, and community members at the joint council meeting held on 11/28/16 and the community forum held on 11/15/16.

Pros & Cons will be developed for each of the 4 current design alternatives, these pros and cons will be used to rank the options and document the selection of the preferred option

Consideration should be given to how each of the design alternatives addresses the deficiencies outlined in the SOI. The design alternatives that more successfully address the deficiencies should be more highly rated than the alternatives that less successfully address the deficiencies.

**School Building Committee**  
**Town Hall Room A, 25 Green Street**  
**November 29, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.**

Consideration should be given to how each alternative responds to Ipswich's education plan and how the project benefits the community.

Construction Phasing: Some of the building options were influenced by concerns over limiting the impact of phased construction (such as W2A.2 which was influenced by an interest in not interrupting food service). It was noted that consideration of what happens during construction must be balanced with the operation of a building over its 50-year life. It might be worthwhile to trade a 1-year interruption to food service (using bag lunches or delivering hot meals from outside) for preferable configurations of spaces over the 50-year life of the building.

Further design comments are included as an attachment to these minutes.

**5. Public Comments**

Throughout the meeting, citizens were invited to ask questions and provide comments. Committee members assured the public that their concerns are being heard and incorporated into the developing design and that the best interests of the community, the children, and the educational program are guiding the process. Committee members noted that there would be further opportunities for public comment and that the public is encouraged to attend all future meetings. Specific comments expressed by the public are included within the discussion of design alternative section of these minutes and within the design comments that are attached to these minutes.

**6. New Business**

The number and types of meals currently served will be counted so that construction staging decisions can be better informed.

Barry Hopping informed the committee that the School Committee is studying bussing and transportation and is preparing to survey parents about school transportation.

The Committee discussed proposals for additional services that were delivered by the architect and the OPM. The architect's proposal was acted on by the Committee. Action on the OPM's proposal was scheduled for the next Building Committee meeting on 12/8/16.

The following expenditures of funds and architectural services were discussed and unanimously approved by the Committee:

\$46,385 - remaining balance of proposed traffic study

\$10,681 - additional geotech investigation

(\$8,700) - credit for architectural services not performed (eliminated birth-to-3 and school offices options)

\$10,000 - additional services from landscaping subconsultant

\$58,366 - total

School Building Committee  
Town Hall Room A, 25 Green Street  
November 29, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.

**7. Approval of Bills**

No bills were presented for approval; however, the expenditures of funds listed in new business were discussed and unanimously approved by the Committee.

**8. Announcements**

A Joint School Council meeting will be held at the Doyon School on Tuesday 12/6/16 and the public is encouraged to attend this meeting. There will be a tour of the Doyon School at 6:30 p.m. and the meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m. in the library.

**9. Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the School Building Committee was scheduled for 12/8/16 at 7:00 p.m. at the Winthrop Elementary School. The meeting will include a continuation of the communication with abutters to the Winthrop site. Abutters will review the plans for a single town-wide K-5 school for 775 students to be built on the Winthrop site. The meeting will emphasize the placement of the building on the site rather than the configurations of spaces within the building. Abutters will be afforded the opportunity to express their concerns. The traffic engineer will be at the meeting. The traffic engineer will listen to abutters concerns. The traffic engineer will review the work done thus far and outline what will be done next.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Paul Queeney  
PMA Consultants LLC  
Owner's Project Manager

School Building Committee  
Town Hall Room A, 25 Green Street  
November 29, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.

Attachment to 11/29/16 School Building Committee Meeting Minutes (pg. 1 of 2)

Design Comments at 11/29/16 SBC

- Collaborative (“pull-out”) spaces are important to faculty
- W2A.1 Comments:
  - gym over cafeteria is a concern to some faculty,
  - design is boxy, less flow,
  - Pre-K is distant from the rest of the school
  - K classes are too linear/spread out,
  - 3 story building will present challenges in an emergency
  - Nurse’s station is too distant from the classrooms [A Committee member indicated the benefit to having the nurses station in close proximity to classrooms is that some students require a lot of visits to the nurse. Another Committee member disagreed and expressed a preference for the nurse’s station to be near the administration area for ease of parent pick-up of sick children, to allow for faster response to injuries in the gym, and to provide for better short-term coverage of the nurse’s station by administrative personnel.]

Other W2A.1 comments:

- Provides the most consolidated building footprint and therefore maximizes useable outdoor space.
- Gym over cafeteria and 37 foot height zoning restriction results in a suboptimal floor-to-ceiling height, particularly problematic with use of the space as a cafetorium where 1-1/2 stories is preferred.
- Media center distant from classrooms.

W2A.2 comments:

- Music spaces near stage, supports use of stage as added music space.
- KM expressed concern about the proximity of the gym to the property line.
- As a general comment KM advised against using renderings that could imply trees would year-long shielding of the building from view.

W2A.3 comments:

- BH is feels that the Pre-K pod is too distant from the rest of the building and that its proximity to Central Street causes security concerns.
- Dr. Hart indicated that the Pre-K pod looked like a modular add-on.
- Dr. Hart and others suggested eliminating the pre-K pod and integrating the Pre-K space into the rest of the building.
- It was suggested that the rectangular pink admin/nurse area be rotated 90 degrees.

School Building Committee  
Town Hall Room A, 25 Green Street  
November 29, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.

**Attachment to 11/29/16 School Building Committee Meeting Minutes (pg. 2 of 2)**

**Design Comments at 11/29/16 SBC**

Add/Reno comments:

- With add-reno, the desired adjacencies and clustering of classrooms are not achieved.
- 2 long hallways contrast with the community feel that is achieved with the new build options.
- The 2 long hallways inhibit the ability to collaborate that being is sought in other building options.
- The long hallways are isolating, and limit the placement of pull-out spaces.
- Music and art are on second floor in add-reno, yet the preference is for music to be on first floor in proximity to stage.
- Overall, the add-reno option is not a good fit with the educational plan.
- Universal design and accessibility goals are more difficult to achieve in add-reno option and can be more readily accomplished in the new-build options.
- With the 9'-8" floor-to deck height of the renovated portion building, 7'-6" or 8'-0" ceiling heights are likely and this would limit options for lighting and would give the building a more institutional feel. With new construction, 13' floor to ceiling heights are possible providing opportunity for better daylighting into the spaces.
- Much of the add-reno will be oriented 45 degrees off of the optimal solar orientation thereby resulting in a lot of low light entering the building, requiring the use of shades.
- The 9'-8" floor-to deck height of the renovated portion of the building limits available HVAC options to chilled beams and VRF.
- Community access is suboptimal with add/reno.
- In the renovated portion of the building, large amounts of the existing building exterior would need to be either reconstructed or entirely replaced, thereby increasing the cost of the add-reno option.
- The demolition of interior partition and corridor walls as well as the removal and reconstruction of a considerable amount of the exteriors walls of the building add significant costs to the work.
- The add-reno will require seismic upgrades, including shear walls or moment frame connections, adding cost to the work.
- The gym over cafeteria and the 37 foot height zoning restriction results in a suboptimal floor-to-ceiling height, this is particularly problematic with use of the space as a cafetorium, where a 1-1/2 story height would be preferred. (similar comment applies to the W2A.1 option)