

**School Building Committee – DRAFT Minutes**  
**April 4, 2019**  
**Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall**

**Present:** Chair Sharon Gray, Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder, Jane Andrews, Virginia Ferko, Marjorie Freiman, Steve Gagosian, Joubin Hassanein, Ryan Hutchins, Meghan Jop, Matt Kelley, Matt King, David Lussier, Ellen Quirk, Heather Sawitsky, FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; FMD Project Manager Dick Elliot. Alex Pitkin of SMMA; Kristen Olsen of SMMA, Jeff D’Amico of Compass Project Management. **Absent:** Jose Soliva

Ms. Gray opened the meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m. She announced that the meeting was being aired live by Wellesley Media and is being recorded for later viewing.

**Citizen Speak**

Catherine Johnson, Chair of the Planning Board said that the Planning Board expects to adopt the Town Unified Plan in their next few meetings. The Cultural and Natural Resources chapter of the Plan contains a statement that expresses what Ms. Johnson describes as a goal or directive, perhaps aspirational, that residents wish to preserve, as much as possible, the Hardy and Hunnewell facades. She said that the Planning Board is charged with implementing the Unified Plan. She requests that SBC fold this information into its decision making process.

Ellie Perkins, a resident of Chestnut Street, spoke in support of a building option that preserves the large Hunnewell tree. She said that the tree is in the heart of Wellesley and Wellesley is a "Tree City". She said there is an opportunity to use this tree as a way to explain the importance of trees to the environment.

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the minutes of January 31, 2019 and February 27, 2019. Mr. Kelley seconded. The motion carried. Mr. King, Ms. Jop and Mr. Hutchins abstained.

**Report from Tripp Sheehan and John Brown on Town gym space considerations**

Ms. Gray introduced Playing Fields Task Force vice-chair Tripp Sheehan and WHS Athletic Director John Brown.

Mr. Sheehan presented information concerning indoor athletic space needs in town. He recognized the constraints of the Hunnewell site and provided what he described as aspirational recommendations for meeting some of those needs in this or other school facility projects.

Mr. Sheehan described some impacts on athletics of the transition to the new Wellesley High School. The old high school had a main gym and a second building with upper and lower gyms.

The upper and lower gyms in old high school were utilized for the following:

- Basketball practice and games for freshmen and JV
  - Currently utilize Sprague and Bates gyms
  - Limited or no seating for spectators
  - Bates gym 3 point line is so close to out of bounds line on baseline that a 3-point shot puts the player out of bounds

- Volleyball practice and games for freshmen boys and girls
  - Currently utilize main gym for practice and games
- Wrestling
  - Currently utilize main gym for meets and cafeteria for practice
  - No wrestling room at WHS due to need to repurpose the designated space to expand the reduced fitness center design to adequately accommodate needs
- Cheerleading
  - Currently utilize cafeteria for practice
- Gymnastics
  - Currently utilize facility and equipment in Newton
- Indoor track workouts and Indoor baseball and softball workouts in inclement weather
  - Currently no dedicated comparable indoor space available

Limitations with the current WHS Gym configuration:

- Full court and side court cannot be used simultaneously due to main court placement and curtain locations

Mr. Sheehan then described community needs for additional indoor gym space including:

- Additional indoor gym space capacity for the WHS displaced sports he just identified.
- Additional capacity to meet community needs for additional indoor gym space
  - Wellesley Youth Basketball Program: WYBA sponsors multiple programs for Wellesley community members
  - Wellesley Hoops – 675 participants from 4th thru 9th grade
  - 3rd Grade League – 150 participants
  - 2nd Grade League – 90 participants
  - Wellesley High School Recreation League – 100 participants from 9th thru 12th grade
  - Metrowest – 200 participants
  - TOPS – 40 participants

WYBA utilizes all currently available school gym space and has to rent space at Meadowbrook, Dana Hall and Rivers to meet the facility needs. Mr. Sheehan noted that other community sports organizations would like to use town facilities but none are available.

Mr. Sheehan provided statistics related to High School and Middle School sports. He said there are 99 athletic teams for 7th grade through 12th grade with more 1,300 discrete individual participants out of the roughly 2,300 students from 7th grade through 12th grade. He presented a detailed chart containing details about each school- or town-owned gym facility and said that other than WHS, WMS and Sprague, the indoor gym space is not very serviceable for indoor sports. He said the location of Hunnewell, with easy access from WHS via the Brook Path and without crossing Washington Street would make it a good location to accommodate another facility for high school athletics, although he again acknowledged the challenges with space at the Hunnewell site.

Mr. Sheehan presented a request for facilities at Hunnewell or other facility:

- Include 50' x 84' basketball court with 6 adjustable baskets, recessed volleyball sleeves and sockets, telescopic bleacher seating for 300 spectators, equipment storage closet and ideally, in priority order:
  1. Elevated Indoor Track
  2. Retractable Batting Cage
  3. Wrestling Mat Lifter

He estimated that 9,000 square foot gym would be needed to accommodate the foregoing and said adding such a gym to the Hunnewell Elementary School would:

- help address the shortage of available indoor gym space
- increase practice/game scheduling flexibility and efficiency
- place gym in close proximity to the high school to allow for ease of access and reduced foot and automobile traffic across Washington Street, as opposed to the Hardy or Upham locations

Mr. Sheehan added that he believes this is an opportune and relatively cost-efficient time to add additional gym space (including the fact that this would not be MSBA funded, constrained gym space) to a planned construction project as there are likely to be few suitable opportunities to add additional gym space in the near or intermediate term future.

Mr. Brown also acknowledged the issues with the Hunnewell site but said this request reflects gym space needs and a hope that gyms similar to Sprague in size could be built.

Mr. Ulfelder said that he appreciated that Mr. Sheehan acknowledged site constraint but also that he did not tailor his presentation to those, but clearly presented the needs.

In response to a question by Ms. Andrews, Mr. Pitkin said the gym in current options is programmed to match the MSBA standard of 6000 sq. ft, just under the Sprague gym size. It would not have the bleacher set or the full sized cross courts. He said that it would accommodate a regulation 50' x 84' court.

Ms. Gray asked about the timing required to add some of the described additional elements. Mr. Pitkin said during the feasibility study the size is most important to know. Other elements can be worked out later.

Mr. Hassanein asked what the request for bleachers for 300 spectators was designed to accommodate. Mr. Sheehan said that would be JV or freshman games rather than varsity for most sports. He said the Sprague gym has bleachers for 200.

Ms. Jop asked Mr. Pitkin how parking requirements are impacted by the number of spectator seats provided. He said there would need to be analysis as to how many cars would be generated. Ms. Jop said parking availability could be limited for spectators if the town does not go forward with structured parking.

Ms. Gray asked Mr. D'Amico what would be involved if in the Hardy or Upham project the town wanted to build a gym larger than MSBA standards. He said it would involve a negotiation with the MSBA and the Town would pay incremental cost. In his experience MSBA will not consider community gym needs but only educational needs. Mr. Pitkin noted a recent example of MSBA limiting a town to a gym sized to their standards.

## Review updated Hunnewell design and parking options

Mr. Pitkin said that he has spent time since the last meeting working on the challenge of putting a large addition on the 1938 structure that still respect the quality of that building. The building is sculptural and not easy to add onto. He suspects that the previous additions to the building pushed back from the original for this reason, not just because of the tree. But he acknowledged that the resulting travel distances within the current building and with this courtyard scheme are educationally challenging.

Mr. Pitkin reviewed the following considerations for adding onto the older building:

1. Dual Context –1938 portion responds to its village environment *and*...Larger addition should respond to the site's natural features: a building on the edge of a park
2. Addition would respect the building's form not just "façade" He noted that the structure is three dimensional with the cupola and hip roof, so hard to tuck in, and needs the addition to stay behind.
3. The addition might utilize a matching brick in size and color/range
4. Crafted and materially rich yet technological and sustainable – "of its time"
5. The upper story might utilize a textured rainscreen system in the context of reaching a NZE building envelope
6. Fenestration patterns and sizes more reflective of its natural setting

Mr. Pitkin presented the site, floor and program diagrams for the Addition/Renovation Option A. He said he worked to move the addition massing closer on the site to the 1938 structure to minimize travel distances, but the result is not as compact as the new construction option. The floor plan features a more open front entrance and clear south/north and east/west circulation pattern. Concerning the educational program plan, Mr. Pitkin said he has continued to pull the learning commons closer to the centralized programs. Music, art and STEAM are located in a cul de sac in the 1938 building, taking advantage of the ceiling height there and near the cafetorium. The concern of educators remains the distance between the learning commons and the special and administrative spaces. He said the second floor has opportunities for overlooks onto the beautiful parts of the site.

Mr. Pitkin reviewed considerations for Hunnewell parking, which include:

- Larger Hunnewell School requires additional parking spaces (+21 spaces)
- Open Space requirements reduce Hunnewell site parking (-21 spaces)
- These additional parking needs will reduce available spaces at Cameron Street Lot
- Existing Traffic and Parking Report indicates additional parking need for library use during peak period –overlaps with Hunnewell peak needs
- Anticipating net loss of 42 spaces on Cameron Street Lot with status quo

Mr. Pitkin then showed diagrams of existing Hunnewell parking and future parking scenarios for Addition/Renovation Option A.

Scenario One includes 15 spaces on site with loading and service areas and a car queue line no less than it is today. Estimated lot coverage for that scenario is +/-24.8%.

Scenario Two includes 57 +/- spaces on site, at the front of the building, not utilizing additional spaces in the Cameron lot in the event it is not decked. Estimated lot coverage for that scenario is +/- 29.3%.

Mr. Pitkin showed some images of older buildings with new additions and noted that most successful options are like the Sprague school that terrace down a hill and create separation between old and new.

Mr. Pitkin presented images to illustrate massing, scale and street views of the Addition/Renovation Option A and some depicting how different materials on an addition might look.

Mr. Hassanein asked how this addition would tie into the other civic buildings in the area. Mr. Pitkin said in schematic design things like materials and roof pitch could be considered as they relate to existing buildings.

Ms Gray noted that the footprint of Option A extends beyond the disturbed area line. Mr. Pitkin said for this option he does not see a way to move the whole structure within that line if 2 stories. In response to a question by Ms. Jop, Mr. Pitkin said that this option does not extend into the flood plain.

Mr. Ulfelder noted that this building is being designed for an increased number of students than presently attending but the available outdoor space for play or learning would be decreased with this option.

Mr. Pitkin then reviewed New Construction Option C site and floor plans. This update shows a service area near the cafetorium for limited food and trash related activity, over which the school administration has a great deal of control. Other deliveries and mechanical functions would be at a front service area.

Parking scenarios for the New Construction option C were reviewed.

- Scenario One includes 15 spaces on site. Estimated lot coverage is +/-24%.
- Scenario Two includes 28 spaces on site. Estimated lot coverage is +/-25%
- Scenario Three includes 57 spaces on site. Estimated lot coverage is +/-30.7%

Mr. Lussier inquired about the curved porch that was shown on previous images of Option C. Mr. Pitkin said moving the gym forward in this version resulted in that changing but there may be opportunity to include it again as design progresses.

### **Discussion: Wellesley Historical Commission**

Ms. Gray introduced Grant Brown, Jan Gleysteen, members of the Wellesley Historical Commission, and Josh Dorin, who is serving as the Historical Commission's liaison to the project. Ms. Gray noted that although this is the WHC's first formal presentation to the SBC they have been involved in the process throughout. She noted that the Historical Commission discussed the Hunnewell project extensively at their March 11, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Brown said that the Historical Commission has audited the process since 2013 and in 2014 voted that the 1938 portion of the Hunnewell building is historic. Mr. Brown acknowledged that the primary goal of the school building is to enhance the learning experience of students and the related needs of teachers and administrators. He said that the Historical Commission encourages that the 1938 portion of the building be saved. He noted that the Town's 2007 Comprehensive Plan says the town must act to preserve our character. He said that the current Unified Plan states as that it is a town goal to maintain the character of its historic buildings and

to preserve iconic town owned buildings and structures and to promote renovations and retrofits to maintain historic character. Mr. Brown said that the Unified Plan specifically states that we should preserve as much as possible of Hardy and Hunnewell.

Mr. Brown said that the Historic Commission has approached the Hunnewell project with a goal of collaborating with the SBC in order to accommodate the school's programming needs and site challenges. He encourages thinking of the school from a child's perspective. He said the current school is approachable, inviting and presents on a small scale. The Addition/Renovation option preserves the 1938 entry. The new construction is opposite, with students met with a fairly massive front facade. Mr. Brown encourages full 3D renderings of both new and renovation option exteriors to understand the experience of each from children's point of view.

Mr. Gleysteen said he is a member of the architectural advisory group for the project and he previously served on the WHS Facilities Advisory Committee. Mr. Gleysteen said he is impressed by the Addition/Renovation Option A that was shown, describing it as using the existing structure as a head house with the learning pods and functional spaces behind. He said that whatever option is chosen, this is a good diagram of a school. The question is, what will be the character and legacy of the school.

Mr. Gleysteen noted that open space can be used to pull together different architectural styles on one campus. Whether the oak tree stays or not, he said that he finds the front open space in this option to be very inviting. Mr. Gleysteen acknowledged that new construction is more efficient and compact and allows more solutions to problems of parking and delivery and that this is a very complex site with many variables that affect play space and educational program. He reiterated that the Wellesley Historical Commission strongly advises SBC to preserve the 1938 Hunnewell building.

Mr. Brown said that the Hunnewell School has been a part of the Town's fabric for 81 years. Many other historic assets in Wellesley Square have been lost. Mr. Brown said that this is a time to be thoughtful about the history we have a chance to preserve for future generations.

Mr. Brown said it appears that the Addition/Renovation and the New Construction options are feasible. He encouraged the SBC to look at each option with the tree and without the tree rather than to narrow in on an Addition/Renovation with the tree that is less compact with more impact on setbacks as a result.

Mr. King wondered if putting a new structure immediately against an old structure makes sense architecturally. Mr. Gleysteen replied that connection could be made with a buffer of glass. Mr. Brown said that having contrasting new and old elements could be effective.

Ms. Gray asked Mr. D'Amico to clarify the goal of the feasibility study. He said it is to whittle down options and get to one specific recommended option. Mr. Brown reiterated that he hoped the SBC would evaluate the Addition/Renovation option and the New Construction option with the same approach to the tree, either with it or without it.

Mr. Hassanein said that he understood other factors than the tree led to the decision to push the new construction back from the old structure. Mr. Pitkin said that the location of the gymnasium and cafeteria were a factor. He said if the tree is removed the building could be pulled forward from the blue line from the east but with this plan it is not likely he could move it much more to the north.

Mr. Gagosian said the charge of the committee is to engage the architect to create the optimal architectural solution. He does not see moving the mass of new construction up against the old building would be as visually pleasing and architecturally sophisticated as the Option A shown today.

Mr. Brown reiterated that the Unified Plan says that the town wishes to preserve as much as possible of Hunnewell and there is an option to do that. Mr. Kelley said some members of the community who attended a workshop expressed that point of view, and it is one data point, but to him it is not a conclusive statement of what the town wants.

### **Review Updated Swing Space Options**

Mr. D'Amico reviewed swing space options currently under consideration, and provided preliminary cost estimates. Options include:

### **Modular School/Classrooms at Sprague Site: \$7M *Hunnewell opens 2023*** **Modular half schools at Sprague & Schofield: \$8M+ *Hunnewell opens 2023***

Considerations include:

- Cost
- Loss of fields (at Schofield and on the grass field at Sprague) for multiple seasons
- Permitting time and challenges
- AUL below fields at Sprague
- Adjacent 40B Housing project to Sprague
- 2 schools, 1 site (Traffic)
- Variability of Mods
- Supporting lunches
- Busing and Transportation
- Socializing and gaining acceptance (Schools, Neighborhood, Town)

### **Waiting until Hardy/Upham opens: \$10M Two schools on one site: Hunnewell moving into old Hardy or old Upham on same campus as new school. *Hunnewell opens 2026***

*Considerations include:*

- Escalation Costs
- Permitting time and challenges
- 2 schools, 1 site (Traffic)
- Variability of Mods
- Supporting lunches with larger school population
- Busing and Transportation
- Expected maintenance cost of existing Hunnewell
- Shared fields scheduling

Ms. Andrews asked if the 5% escalation used was appropriate. Mr. Hassanein said 5% escalation or even more is seen in the current market in this area, much related to shortage of labor. Ms. Gray said a detailed report on costs would be available at the next meeting.

There is a question about whether MSBA would agree to wait to close out this project and how reimbursement would be impacted under this scenario.

**Waiting until Hardy/Upham opens: \$12M. Redistrict plus mods on closed Hardy or Upham site: *Hunnewell opens 2026.***

Mr. D'Amico said this option has many of the same considerations as the other late Hunnewell option including escalation costs. Modularity would be needed, and accommodations for the larger population would be required as would busing and transportation.

Ms. Ferko asked that operational savings related to reducing to six schools under this scenario be included in the calculation of cost for this option.

**Internal Swing Space: Exploring "cohort/internal" swing space options, including the possible use of existing spaces in all 6 elementary schools, to determine whether the Hunnewell students can be accommodated.**

Mr. D'Amico said more on this option would be presented at the next meeting.

Ms. Freiman asked if there would be an opportunity for parents with children in multiple grades to have children at one school and Dr. Lussier said that would probably not be possible under this scenario. Ms. Jop noted that busing could allow this to work effectively. Dr. Lussier said the school department is still looking at the details.

Ms. Sawitsky asked that cost information be shared with the committee before the forum.

**Review Schedule and Milestone Deadlines**

Mr. D'Amico reviewed the current schedule and meeting focus as follows:

April 25 - Swing Space, Sustainability, Costs, preparation for public forum

May 2 - tentative preferred building solution and understanding of parking, which includes an alternate approach if a parking deck is not successful.

May 16 - Swing Space

May 23 or 30: Joint BOS/SC meeting- finalize preferred solution

Ms. Ferko asked if a public forum would be possible before a final preferred option is selected if more information is developed after the April 30 Forum and there appears to be a need for more community feedback. Mr. D'Amico said that typically a forum in June would present to the community the solution that will be presented to Town Meeting in the fall.

**Discussion/Vote: Review and Approve March invoices for SMMA (\$56,940) and Compass Project Management (\$15,530)**

Mr. Kennedy distributed a project invoice from Compass Project Management for work in March 2019 and a project invoice from SMMA for work from February 23, 2019 - March 22, 2019.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve SMMA invoice #50495 in the amount of \$56,940. Mr. Kelley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve invoice #CPM 69-09 in the amount of \$15,530. Mr. Kelley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### **Discussion: Proposal #3, Cameron Street Parking**

Ms. Olsen said that the Existing Conditions Report measured peaks, ebbs and flows of parking on the lots around Hunnewell. The study showed the Cameron lot exceeding capacity at peak time in the afternoon. She asked if SBC was interested in an 11 hour one-day face-to-face parking survey with questions for users to determine destination, frequency of use and duration.

Ms. Jop suggested waiting for data analysis being done by Traffic and Parking Operations to better inform the survey questions. Mr. Ulfelder and Ms. Freiman agreed.

Mr. D'Amico said should more Cameron lot spaces be needed for the Hunnewell project than currently assigned, it would be useful to have data detailing which users would be displaced. Mr. D'Amico said the cost of the described study, data analysis and presentation at a meeting would be approximately \$11,000.

Mr. Ulfelder said he thought the likelihood of success of this survey does not justify the expense at this time. There was a consensus not to go forward at this time.

### **Hardy/Upham Project**

#### **Designer selection process overview**

Mr. D'Amico said the Designer RFS was approved by the MSBA and published on April 3. Proposals are due on May 1. Mr. D'Amico said that about 10 proposals would be typical for a project such as this.

Mr. D'Amico distributed and reviewed a synopsis of MSBA Designer Selection Procedures. The MSBA Designer Selection Panel is comprised of 13 appointed members plus 3 members representing the district.: A School Committee representative, the School Superintendent or representative and the CEO of the Town or representative. At the Designer Selection Panel meeting the designer submissions are reviewed and ranked and 3 finalists selected. Interviews are then scheduled unless one designer is overwhelmingly preferred. For the interviews, project-specific questions are developed. After the interviews designers are ranked and the town negotiates a contract with the first ranked designer or if not successful, moves to negotiate with the second ranked firm. By the end of June a contract should be awarded.

#### **Adjournment**

At approximately 8:15 p.m., upon a motion by Ms. Andrews and a second by Ms. Sawitsky, the Committee unanimously voted to adjourn.

#### **Documents and Exhibits Used**

- *Facilities Project Gymnasium Recommendation* Power Point presentation by Tripp Sheehan, Wellesley Playing Fields Task Force and John Brown, Athletic Director, Wellesley High School
- Compass Project Management and SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC 4/4/2019
- Wellesley Historical Commission Power Point Presentation 4/4/2019
- Compass Project Management Invoice # CPM 69-09 and related Invoice Review Memo from Kevin Kennedy
- SMMA Project Invoice: # 50495 (\$56,940) and related Invoice Review memo from Compass Project Management
- Synopsis of MSBA Designer Selection Procedures