

Shutesbury Library Building Committee: Design Subcommittee Minutes

Wednesday, March 29, 2023, 12 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, Lily from Stimson Associates, Fire Chief Lenny Czerwonka, and Police Chief Kristin Burgess.

Minutes from previous meeting tabled until next meeting.

Mary Anne asked Matt to provide specific needs for additional survey work. Matt will provide it by the end of the week.

Discussion with Fire Chief regarding fire safety concerns to address in site design.

Fire department concerns regarding emergency vehicle access.

Building will be approximately 350 feet from the road, driveway will be as long as 700 feet – too long to back out.

Possible solutions

K-turn area or hammerhead shaped area with reinforced turf at end of drive with concerns about winter maintenance were discussed.

Chief Czerwonka: Wants a fire lane, a place for a truck to pull off the road next to building so a second truck can drive past it and turn around to exit the drive.

Drive will be 24 feet wide.

Chief Burgess: Space for multiple fire trucks to maneuver around each other in the drive is important factor.

Various ideas including creating reinforced areas adjacent to the building for a fire truck to pull into to allow a second truck to pull past it and turn around and exit easily.

Matt asked how long the trucks are. Lenny will measure the trucks and get back to us.

Mary Anne: Placing the turnaround area on the east side of the end of the driveway would avoid wetlands.

Matt: A paved loop drive in the location could be created with a bio retention area in the center.

Matt asked Lily from Stimson Associates for her thoughts regarding paved turn around areas and a fire lane with reinforced turf.

Lily: The space to the east of the end of the drive makes sense and Lily will include that in future renderings.

Mary Anne and Lenny – in scheme two, a fire truck parking area can be created between the first and second parking areas on the west side of the drive.

Matt – this area could be paved and be incorporated as a drop off area for the library and a fire lane.

We'll need to talk to the highway department about plowing.

Matt asked if getting a fire truck on one side of the building is sufficient. Lenny said yes.

Following the discussion with Fire Chief Czerwonka, a discussion with Police Chief Kristin Burgess about safety concerns began.

Kristin: Panic buttons, multiple egresses, exterior cameras are important in public buildings.

Matt: Typically, they provide cameras that record rather than a live feed.

Matt asked if we were anticipating cameras inside the building. We are not.

Discussion about building mounted vs. pole mounted cameras in parking lot.

Discussion about best placement of panic buttons.

Kristin suggested a need for measures to prevent someone from being able to drive through the double glass doors in the entryway.

Discussion about procurement of security system.

Discussion about possible but unlikely need for a Bidirectional antenna. The fire department can do a test once the building is fully enclosed.

Discussion about maximum occupancy – 100 -150 people. The architects are looking at code occupancy regarding egress and a different calculation is used to determine compliance with plumbing code.

Kristin asked is there will be a sprinkler system, a basement or crawlspace, and how the roof will be structured?

Fire protection will be automatic sprinkler system with underground water storage for fire suppression with a fire pump room. Backup generator will provide power for fire pump.

Currently we are planning a low, single pitched roof, sloped north to south to accommodate solar panels.

There is no crawlspace planned. The architects are beginning to explore a small basement area for mechanical areas.

There will be an attic space above staff offices, and other spaces to accommodate mechanical equipment.

Following the discussion with our public safety team we moved on to review of the three developing schemes.

Scheme one

Scheme one sites a rectangular building parallel to Leverett Road. Entry through a narrow covered porch on the north side of the building. Meeting room to the left of the entry, library proper to the right. A lot of mechanical services are located on the east end of the building.

There is glazing (windows) on both north and south sides of the building with views to the reading garden area in the north and the meadow to the north.

According to the code consultant, a third restroom is required if we anticipate 100 patrons. The third restroom can serve as a staff/family restroom. Mary Anne expressed concern about the suggestion that we would have 100 people in the building at one time on a regular basis. Mary Anne is concerned about construction cost and maintenance cost. Matt's opinion is that the building inspector would have to have sign off on having only two bathrooms. The fixture count for restrooms is based on seating occupancy.

Matt said an advantage to having it is a restroom in closer proximity to the children's area.

Restrooms will be gender neutral.

OEA showed some preliminary views of how the building in each scheme would look on the site. The porches/entries would be at grade.

OEA is looking into the possibility of a basement for mechanical needs which would shorten the length of the building.

The outdoor covered program area is not included in scheme one yet. It could be created by tabbing out the roof on the south east end of the building. It has to be attached to the building to be an eligible cost. There was more discussion about possible options for providing outdoor covered space.

Stephen likes the lobby in scheme one which could provide seating space. Stephen doesn't like the long hallway to access the meeting room.

Stephen asked if general storage, which is indicated on the lower right corner of the slide is interior storage yet to be incorporated into the plan. OEA answered yes.

Lauren asked why the plan calls for a long, narrow building. Proportions are influenced by the size of Glulam structural beams, the program elements and adjacencies.

Scheme one feels too long.

Scheme two

This scheme is perpendicular to the road but slightly pivoted. Meeting room has potential spill out space. Restrooms have space between them which could accommodate a drinking fountain.

A centralized spine of stacks between the adult's and children's areas provides some acoustic separation.

An exterior door at the west end of the building could lead to a small porch area.

A second scheme two plan was presented which has a small basement accessible by a single run stair. Some of the mechanical rooms could be placed in the basement. This reduces the number of small rooms needed and the overall footprint.

Lauren and Andrea both commented that the wall between the adult's and children's rooms needs to be a full wall to provide effective acoustic separation between the two areas.

OEA showed renderings of the exterior of the building on the site. The building will be 18 feet high on the high end which faces Leverett Road.

Scheme three

This is an L-shaped building. The meeting room has entrances at both ends, making it hard to imagine program set up. The children's room is at the end of the long L, on the west end.

Mary Anne and OEA will need to have a follow-up meeting to discuss collections. Currently there is not enough shelving to accommodate the full collection size. Lauren said we can reduce the number of windows to accommodate more bays of shelving.

We are trying to balance creating a nice building, with connections to the outside, with collection needs and space needs.

Square footage is ranging from 6,000 to 7,000 square feet but it is still in flux. Matt thinks the building needs to be about 6,000 square feet.

Mary Anne asked about the basement and the high-water table. Matt said there are ways to manage that such as perimeter drains and water proofing techniques. They have just began exploring this idea and are just thinking about it as a way to free up room in the floor plan. They do prefer a single story, slab on grade building.

Mary Anne asked if the L-shaped building is more expensive to build. OEA said there is more exterior envelope, a more complicated foundation, and there is a little bit more structural complexity which might make it more expensive to build but Matt can't quantify the difference now.

The L-shaped building shapes outdoor space and Matt likes the meeting room/lobby configuration in this plan. The relationship of children's to adult's space is somewhat awkward.

Oudens Ello would like us to determine a preference soon so it can be fully developed and we can keep to the timeline.

Matt prefers scheme two. While there is still work to do, it nice to see through the building to the garden space as the rear of the building, entry is quickly at the lobby with choices of going into the meeting room area or the Library proper. Matt likes the dynamic view fro

Lauren and Andrea said about scheme two that the spaces are better defined and adjacencies work the best.

There was discussion about the relationship to the meeting room and the lobby and our desire to expand the opening to allow for natural spill out space.

Orientation of building is slightly altered in response to wetlands and buffers and grading. It also provides a more dynamic view from Leverett Road.

The site plans are still diagrams.

We want the reading garden to feel separate from the larger, more public landscape and we want the building to be visible. We'll have to manage existing tree cover. We may be able to move the building/grounds a little bit further east.

Lauren asked how the raised septic system will impact views from Leverett Road and the abutter's views. The system will be thoughtfully designed and landscaped. It creates a barrier to traffic for the abutter. It might also block the view of the Library for cars travelling west.

Jeff prefers schemes one and two. He likes that the orientation of two has been shifted a bit and he likes entrance through the center of the building.

Mary Anne said she would like the building to be closer to 5,500 square feet. She likes scheme two the best but is starting to like scheme three. Mary Anne likes the lobby to meeting room to outdoor program area in scheme three. She would like the bar with the Library programming areas to be wider and shorter to accommodate having the adult's and children's area next to each other, separated by a wall, like in scheme two. Mary Anne is concerned that scheme three will be more expensive to build and price is a very important factor.

Lauren thinks scheme two has most of what we want. She is concerned about acoustics between children's and adult's but in a small building, it is hard to separate the two.

Stephen biggest problem with scheme three is the visual presence from the road. Stephen likes the elegant look of scheme two. Scheme two has a nice buffer between the parking area and reading garden.

Next meeting will be the full building committee on Tuesday, April 4th on Zoom.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Anne Antonellis

