Library Facility Needs Assessment Committee  
(LFNAC)  
January 20, 2010  
6:00PM  
Town Hall  
Meeting Minutes

LFNAC Members Present:  Karen Traub, Mary Anne Antonellis, Martha Field, Dale Houle, Weezie Houle, Michele Regan-Ladd, Lori Tuominen

Absent:  None

Guests:  Mark Sullivan, D.A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc.  
Matthew Oudens, Oudens Ello Architecture  
Conrad Ello, Oudens Ello Architecture  
Rob Bowen, Co-President of Library Friends  
Jane Urban, Member of the Library Friends  
Paul Jacobs, Co-President of Library Friends  
Becky Torres

Meeting called to order at 6:12 PM

1. Minutes - approved December 14, 2009 minutes

2. Conservation Committee visit to Lot O32  
Discussed the trees on the lot, especially the spruce tree which is 70 years old and part of Shutesbury heritage. There is concern that the tree could fall onto the new building if not taken down. We decided to discuss the keeping of the tree later in the process.

3. Next stage of design and planning – OEA presentation and discussion

OEA presented a project option summary. Based on our December meeting discussion, OEA continued to develop options #2 and #3 and developed some new options. All of the schemes have taken account for the buffer zone for the wet areas of the lot. After the presentations and discussion we identified the preferred options for continued development and listed pros and cons of each.

The preferred options are 2b, 2c and 5.

Option 2b – T-shaped configuration with community room at rear of building  
There are three wings: children’s wing and adult wing housed under a single gable roof and community wing under it’s own gable roof perpendicular to the main roof at the south side of the building. The porch is at the east end of the main gable roof facing the parking area and wraps around the corner along the south side of the main gable roof with entry at the intersection of the wings. One concern is that although a portion of the porch can be seen from Leverett Road, the entry is located on the back side of the building and is only visible from the parking lot. This layout is similar to the Wendell Library except that the community room is adjacent to and accessible from the lobby area rather than the adult area. Circulation desk is centrally located at the intersection of the three wings with the children’s room and adult room flanking each side. A work sink and toilet is easily accessible to the children’s room and to the staff room. The locations of the Young Adult room (YA) and the History room could be exchanged. The entry way has two sets of doors. One goes to the library proper and the other goes to the community room for direct after-hours access. The entry way includes a glass wall for visibility from the circulation desk to the entry porch. The entry ways are under the gabled section of the roof so snow and ice falling on someone is not a problem. The roofs have a simple gable design. Clerestory windows or other light amenities could be added as the design develops.
PROS: Best sightlines of all the options; good flexibility of community room location for day access; good acoustic separation between the community room and the rest of the library; well defined outdoor program area defined by adult and community wings; community room visible from Leverett Road.

CONS – location of entry at rear of building has poor visibility from Leverett Road and is not inviting for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The History room is not accessible after hours. The entry and lobby areas are smaller than in other options (less transition space for meeting people upon entry/exit). The toilets located in entry vestibule require patrons to leave the library to access them and switching toilet access to other side of the hallway directly off the lobby complicates security of off-hours space. Sightlines to toilets from circulation desk are not ideal.

Option 2c – T-shaped configuration with community room at front of building
Layout is very similar to Option 2b with children’s wing and adult wing housed under a single gable roof and community wing under it’s own gable roof perpendicular to the main roof. In this option the Community room or wing is flipped and extends off the front of the building towards Leverett Road with a large window facing Leverett Road. One of the negatives is that the building mass does not shape the outdoor space in the back.

In all of the options, building width is in the 30 to 40 foot range and overall building length is approximately between 120 and 140 feet. Community room interior is typically about 25 by 40 ft.

With this design, the community room on the front encroaches into the 100-foot wet area buffer if the main building remains in the same location; this would put the building into Conservation Committee review. Pushing the building back beyond the 100-foot buffer would push the entrance well back from the road. In this option, the entry wing and the community wing frame the spruce tree visually.

PROS - excellent sightlines, especially for young adults and into the community room. The larger porch area and the entry facing Leverett Road are both positives. The Community room will also have good visibility from Leverett Road and for evening events. The circulation desk and staff room’s central location at the intersection of the three wings is ideal. With the community room on the north side of the building, there is more roof area facing south.

CONS – the outdoor space at the rear of the building is less defined by the building massing than Option 2b. There was a concern stated that back yard access doors from the children’s room and adult room may be problematic for heat loss. (OEA believes that a strong physical and visual connection from library space to outdoor space is something that will distinguish this library from other local libraries and that the impact of doors on overall energy performance is minimal.) There is concern about the impact of building location on the wet area buffer. Perhaps the shape of the community room could change to make it squarer and less rectangular so the building would not need to move too far south to avoid the buffer. History room does not have off-hours access. The entry way is a little small.

Option 5a – Parallel gable roofs with community room at front of building
This is a new scheme which attempts to simplify the massing; it is a two gable-roofed design. The Children’s and Adult room and Circulation are under one east-west oriented gable roof with another parallel gable roof over a porch, lobby and community room. The porch located at the east end of the gabled wing closest to Leverett Road is visible from the parking lot and from Leverett Road. Good flow to the outdoor program area to the rear of the building. The circulation desk cannot see into the community room, but there is visual supervision of the entrances to that room. There is good entryway for off-hours use of the community room and the history room. A low roof unites the two program areas. There is a lot of south facing roof for Photovoltaic panels.
PROS - conceptually this design is very clear. The entry/lobby is large enough for interactions among people and chairs, etc. The separation of children’s and adult rooms is good. Off-hours access to the community room and history room is good. We like the overall massing of the building as it is architecturally different and maximizes the PV potential. The roofs have more south-facing perimeter area than 2c. The community room and building entry would be visible at night from Leverett Road. The community wing and the library wing are clearly organized and identifiable.

CONS – The sightlines to community room need to be improved. The entry/lobby is too generous or has too much depth compared to other rooms. The connection between the adult room and the community room may need to be stronger with more flow between these two areas during normal library hours when the community room does not have an event; there needs to be a focus in the lobby toward the library and not orienting completely toward to the community room. YA room adjacent to staff workroom is not ideal. Perhaps there could be a switch of the history room, the young adult room and the mechanical room. The roof design is of some concern for handling snow in the area between the two gable roofs.

Option 5b – Parallel gable roofs with garden separation between adult and children rooms
This is a modification of 5a. By pushing the adult room west, separated from children’s room by an outdoor garden space, the design allows greater exposure of the community room to natural light as well as direct access from community room to outdoor program space. Connection of the adult room to the lobby is by way of a corridor along the south side of the community room which could double as a gallery. The gable roof orientation and south-facing surface area would be the same as option 5a. Sightlines from the circulation desk to the adult room are reduced by virtue of the glass partitions that separate them. There would be a 40 foot wide yard between the circulation desk and the adult room. MBLC approval of the yard format is questionable. All the community services are in the same location as 5a.

Both 5a and 5b get the most south facing roof space.

Other Options – these are no longer under consideration.
Option 3b – Changed from U-shape to L-shaped with a focus of the outdoor program area. There is a corner porch and entry with good visibility from parking and Leverett Road. Improved sightlines from the circulation desk. Locations of children’s room and adult room switched to provide better circulation and visual supervision.

Option 6 – A hybrid of several of the schemes. This scheme attempts to define outdoor space with the legs of the building similar to Option 2b and tries to locate the circulation desk central to the building which is laid out in a cross plan. Building layout is similar to Southampton Library. Porch and entrance are located at the east end of the east-west gabled wing clearly visible from the parking lot. Circulation desk at the intersection of the two wings offers diagonal views throughout the building. This option crosses the 100 foot buffer by approximately 20 feet. Trying to get fully back behind the 100 foot buffer would push the building possibly too far from Leverett Road.

PROS - good sightlines; good visibility for community room from Leverett Road; well-defined outdoor program area at rear.

CONS - swap young adult with adult stacks to improve sightlines from circulation desk; less south-facing roof for PV; lobby is in front of circulation desk away from building entry; not very architecturally inspiring.

General Discussion:
Sightlines - It is important for supervision of young adult room and toilets. All of the libraries visited during the benchmarking trips have some imperfections. Achieving 100% visual
supervision throughout the library is extremely difficult if not impossible, but every effort will be made to achieve as much visual control as possible within the limitations of any given design.

Community Room - Discussed the use of the community room when an event or activity is not occurring and the desire that it serve as an extension of the library during library hours. Wendell Library is a good example. In many of the libraries visited, the community room was adjacent to the children’s room to facilitate children’s programming, especially craft related activities. Does the community room need to be seen from the circulation room? Some sight but 100% not needed.

Café - Discussed how a seating area/café might fit into the library; this arrangement had very positive response in the town survey. It makes sense to have the lobby play that role to some degree and locate the kitchen in a way that supports that use.

History room – Discussed use of history room as an intimate extension of the adult reading room versus as a conference or study room available for off-hours use. LFNAC decided that there was a preference for its use as an extension of the adult reading room.

Solar potential: 5a and 5b greater than 2c greater than 2b

4. Amherst Rotary Community Grant Application – discussed improving the site, such as refining the front wall and grounds; due Feb 28th. The town could submit the grant with ideas form LFNAC. Send ideas to Karen.

5. Next Steps – OEA will continue to develop/refine options 2b, 2c and 5a and prepare bullet points of pros and cons for each.

Send Mark Sullivan name, address, phone, email of all LFNAC members

6. Updates and Announcements
   Mary Anne will be meeting Rosemary Waltos on Feb 11, 2010

7. Next meeting date – Monday, February 8, 2010, 6:45 PM

Meeting adjourned 8:57PM
Respectfully submitted,
Martha Field