

**Library Facility Needs Assessment Committee, (LFNAC)**  
**June 16, 2010, 7:00PM, Town Hall**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**LFNAC Members Present:** Dale Houle, Weezie Houle, Lori Tuominen, Martha Field,  
Michele Regan-Ladd  
**LFNAC Members Absent:** None  
**Guests:** Mary Anne Antonellis, Becky Torres,

Meeting called to order 7:05PM

1. Minutes – June 2, 2010 meeting, approved as amended
2. Nominate and elect LFNAC chair – tabled from June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting  
Nomination of Lori Tuominen to chair LFNAC, seconded, passed unanimously  
Thank you, Lori!
3. Updates
  - a. Budget update of the planning grant – discussed at previous meeting
  - b. Perc test – rescheduled for June 28, 2010
  - c. Geo-tech survey – scheduled, date not known
  - d. Hazardous Materials testing – tested on June 14, 2010. The test was looking for evidence of prior hazardous dumping and checking the records of the old gas and oil tanks on the property. A report of results will be sent to the town next week.
  - e. Building Program – clarification and updating of tables based on a review by Roe Waltos and a close review by Mary Anne to give clarity. Mary Anne focused on projections for the collection and the seating. Mary Anne distributed copies of revised tables for these two topics. Mary Anne will send an electronic copy of the updated tables and Weezie will format them as an addendum to the Library Building Program.
  - f. Mary Anne will identify inconsistencies and typos in the Library Building Program and write explanations of inconsistencies in an addendum. Mary Anne will pass along the document to Michelle to review, too. Weezie will handle the formatting of the addendum.
  - g. 2005 Construction Application Round –Mary Anne distributed copies to use as a sample application. Using this document as a guide was suggested by Roe Waltos at the last LFNAC meeting.
4. Discuss comments and suggestions for exterior of proposed library design  
Message to OEA: the general consensus of comments from town residents is that the exterior does not fit well with the town and we would like OEA to develop alternatives to the current exterior design. To help accomplish that, we will send the compiled list of concerns and comments to OEA along with some general ideas.  
(The list of comments is attached at the end of these minutes.)

Roof:

- a. Explore design concept with a single peak

- b. Was the current roof pitch designed for optimal PV performance?
- c. Could height of side walls be lower so pitch could be lower?
- d. Would a modified salt box shape work?
- e. There are concerns about the double peak:
  - i. The look doesn't fit Shutesbury (fits Hadley but not Shutesbury)
  - ii. Valley construction might cause leaking
  - iii. Snow sliding off roof
  - iv. Could the double roof have a lower pitch? the very steep proposed design does not appeal aesthetically

Porch:

- f. Feels very open due to the very high roof of the porch; could the porch roof have a lower pitch or have a ceiling put added?
- g. Looks too commercial
- h. Close in the gable and put a face over the open end of the ceiling and add a flat ceiling
- i. Porch needs to be more protected from the weather
- j. Could wrapping the porch around partially on two sides be a possibility?

View from road:

- k. Change the look of the building from the road. How could the side along the road be broken up more than currently?

However, we want to protect the integrity of the inside for the Library Building Program.

5. Next steps

- a. Mary Anne will identify inconsistencies and typos in the Library Building Program and write explanations of inconsistencies in an addendum. Mary Anne will pass along the document to Michelle to review, too. Weezie will handle the formatting of the addendum.
- b. Lori will update Meeting Wizard for August meeting dates.
- c. Send OEA the draft minutes and list of comments and invite OEA to next meeting at which OEA would bring some choices for the exterior.

6. Next Meeting Dates

- a. Wednesday, July 21, 2010, 7PM
- b. Wednesday, September 8, 2010, 7PM, tentative

LFNAC, June 16, 2010 – amended

**List of various Comments and Suggestions for Exterior of the Proposed Library:**

*(Note: these comments and suggestions were gathered randomly and are a compilation of unsolicited feedback to LFNAC members. If Shutesbury is awarded a Library Construction grant, there will be opportunities for input from town residents.)*

1. Recommend something that looks less like a tobacco barn; regarding the long shape and the exterior siding, because it was brown.
2. It seemed too contemporary.
3. Felt it should be more in keeping with the other town buildings' designs in the town center.
4. Some felt the roof design seemed too steep, until I explained the purpose - solar & PVs.
5. Did not like the big window with the shed dormer on the road side.
6. Liked the porch idea, wondered if it was too small for allowing many people to sit and chat, feels there should be more of a wraparound - didn't say in what direction in order to offer more seating space.
7. Entry porch
  - a. portico too large and commercial looking (roof too tall and opening too wide open). Looks like the entrance to a hotel. Not conducive to feeling cozy.
  - b. Not cozy enough.
  - c. Would be nice if it wrapped around to the front and/or back. Though it wouldn't be advantageous to wrap around front in winter as it is the north side.
  - d. Need weather protection so when it is raining or snowing you can sit, read or compute and be protected. With such a high ceiling, you won't be protected from the elements.
  - e. Maybe we need a U shaped porch, South side for being protected from elements (wall on north & west side and lower roof), North side for looking nice from road and East side as the entrance.
8. Roof Style
  - a. Double Roof Option
    - i. Should not have a crotched roof with snow accumulation in this town.
    - ii. Should not have a crotched roof over the bulk of the adult collection – the most likely place to leak.
    - iii. Should have a single gabled roof
  - b. Steepness
    - i. Too steep to fit in our town's architectural motif
    - ii. PVs can be mounted at the appropriate angle as needed. Roof line doesn't have to be the exact angle.
9. Exterior "look"
  - a. Looks too much like 2 tobacco barns
  - b. Should be styled more toward a Cape or Greek Revival style - like the Old Town Hall, The Shutesbury Church or The Wendell Library

- c. Should look more cozy - like Wendell's
10. Front window in Meeting Room
    - a. Should have a gable roof not a shed roof
  11. Other openings
    - a. All need to be viewed more carefully and weather protection (roofs) discussed.
  12. Ceiling Height
    - a. Cathedral ceiling too tall, creating heat loss.
    - b. Fans can't make up for all that space and then you are using electricity to push the heat back down.
  13. "Barns and agricultural buildings help tell the Massachusetts story over the last several hundred years. From carriage barns in city or town centers, tobacco barns in the Connecticut River valley, cranberry screen houses on the Cape, to dairy barns across the state, they help us read the landscape and connect us to the life and work of our communities through the generations. Most barns, especially those of timber frame construction, are well-built and have open floor plans that make them useful today for farming or for a wide variety of new uses. Yet, barns are disappearing at a rapid rate from the landscape. With some planning, patience, and creativity, older and historic barns can continue to serve their original function or be put back to use.  
<http://preservationmass.org/programs/mass-barns/>
  14. It is my hope that natural materials such as slate, brick, granite and stone (especially local) will be considered for the exterior because they are natural, long lasting, and have low maintenance costs.
  15. Green roofing is growing in popularity and I hope it will be explored as an option in conjunction with photovoltaic to offset carbon footprint. There's lot of good info out there such as: *www.igra-world.com/links\_and.../IGRA\_Green\_Roof\_News\_1\_09.pdf* and [http://www.gruendach-mv.de/en/research\\_topics.htm#8](http://www.gruendach-mv.de/en/research_topics.htm#8)
  16. Does the limit of the pitch of the southern facing roof limit the solar gain?
  17. Will there be shadowing from the southern-most roof onto the southern-facing northern-most roof?