

**Library Facility Needs Assessment Committee  
(LFNAC)  
December 14, 2009  
7:00 PM  
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 of D.A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc.  
Becky Torres  
Phil Kinder  
Paul Jacobs  
Matthew Oudens, Oudens Ello Architecture  
Conrad Ello, Oudens Ello Architecture

Meeting called to order at 7:08 PM

1. Minutes
  - a. November 11, 2009 – approved
  - b. November 17, 2009 – approved as amended as meeting notes
  - c. December 2, 2009, community discussion meeting notes - approved
2. Contract signatures – OEA signed their contact; Karen signed for the Library Trustees.
3. Library Creed –Karen distributed *Library Creed*, a document from Anne Larson, former MBLC Director.
4. Discuss community meeting –
  - a. Everyone thought the discussion was positive.
  - b. Conservation Commission follow-up – The town Conservation Commission requested LFNAC to submit for a determination. So far, there has been a conservative approach to any design regarding the wetlands. The Conservation Commission would like to walk the property with OEA. A time will be arranged. Karen distributed a list of the abutters which will be necessary for submitting a request for determination to the Conservation Committee.
  - c. Three people talked with Mary Anne after the community meeting with interest for their involvement with building the new library. One person wanted to be on the LFNAC building committee, someone else wanted to be involved but was not sure how yet, and the third person wanted to help with the capital campaign. Mary Anne will be speaking with these people again.
5. Confirm site decision – Trustees approved the selection of Lot O32. LFNAC unanimously approved the selection of Lot O32.
6. Next stage of design and planning – We are now in the design stage. Tonight's discussion is mostly about planning and the larger issues regarding juxtaposition of parts of the library program, general location of outdoor access, functionality of spaces, adjacencies of amenities and site lines. **Refinements** to square footage and **preliminary cost estimating** will occur at a later point in time. This is the first phase of design proposals and brainstorming is encouraged. For today, we need to discuss big issues.

OEA reviewed the floor plans of the libraries visited this fall and revisited the positive attributes of these libraries.

OEA shared thumbnail sketches of rough building outlines that might have some potential. We looked at four draft options in detail.

**Option 1:** straight plan with community room in “el”; long east-west orientation. Aligns the children’s room, circulation desk and adult’s room; single gable roof. Community room located on the north/street-side of the building; in this way the community room takes on its own identity yet it is adjacent to the adult reading room.

Option 1 with the Community Room toward the street would give a lot of exposure.

History room: what is its greater meaning or secondary purpose? Could it be a second reading room? In Option 1, it is pulled out into the garden in the back so that it provides a **small contemplative reading room directly adjacent to the Adult Room**. Perhaps there could be a fireplace in the history room.

There is good visibility to the outside porch from the staff work area and circulation; there are good site lines to see people coming and going from the library.

Talked about the distance from the parking lot to the front door.

The porch in front gives visibility facing Leverett Road;  
The parking lot needs to be on the east side of the lot although it can be closer to Leverett Road.

For Option #1, the young adults need to be in a more central location.

Option #1:

- Pros: Corral in the Children’s Room  
Community Room upfront  
Book drop in good location
- Cons: Walk around the mechanical room to reach the entry  
Entry way a bit small  
Site line to Community & Young Adult is limited  
Do not see circulation desk when entering the library

**Option 2:** The key feature of this option is three wings (**Adult, Children, and Community**) with the circulation desk in the middle. Each wing has its own gable roof **with a low roof over entry and lobby serving to connect the three wings**. Community Room is not connected to the adult room. The History Room is **adjacent to the adult book stacks under the main Adult Room roof**.

Option #2

- Pros: Two yards  
Basic foot print **and overall building massing**  
Community Room with access to **dedicated** outdoor space  
Proximity of kitchenette to lobby and Community Room
- Cons: Site lines are challenging  
Must walk through the library with kitchen supplies  
**Complexity of rooflines**

**Option 3:** A U-shaped plan under one roof. The outdoor program area is more defined. The Community Room forms one wing and does not connect the adult room. **Adult Room and Children’s Room are in adjacent wings in an “L” configuration with Young Adult at the corner**. Porch on the **northeastern** corner of the building with the porch roof part of the main roof. This has the potential for **clerestory lighting (windows located high in a room above eye level)**.

There is good visibility from the road. The roof would be high in the front and has a lower slope in the rear to create a more intimate scale in the garden area.

Entrance for option #3 is closest to the driveway.

#### Option #3

Pros: Corner, two-sided porch

Closest entrance to parking lot

Most sustainable design

Cons: Children can “race” right from the entryway to the children’s room

Does the design of the roof with clerestory windows fit Shutesbury?

Children and adult room are adjacent

U-shape seems to cut off some of the view to woods at the west side of garden

**Option 4:** All program located under single gable roof with the exception of front porch and entry under low-pitch roof. Community room is adjacent to the adult reading room. Clear site lines for all areas. Includes long entry way. The History Room could have off-hours access and also be used as meeting space.

Having the bulk of the library program under one roof without wings will be easier to build and to heat. All these plans are within 10% of the original size; sizes are approximate for now.

The entry way can have more of a function with some community activity occurring there. The square footage of 150 is limited to give more space to the lobby. The larger lobby will be a trade-off.

Staff workroom and circulation desk have two means of egress (true in all options).

Proportion of windows can be altered.

Option #4 has great welcoming features of the circulation desk with it being in front when you enter the library.

#### Option #4

Pros: Alcove in the Children’s area

Great views from all rooms (except restrooms and entry) in this floor plan

History room could also be used for a small meeting room and have off-hours use

Young Adult location okay if there’s some glass

Cons: Large entry with glass may be more like a hallway than an entryway

Poor site lines to the restrooms

Lobby in front of circulation desk is congested

Concern for security of History Room during off-hours use.

#### General comments:

- Discussed roof design; try to design away from a crotched roof.
- Community Room
  - Positive thoughts about the Community Room being on the front
  - Having the Community Room opening to outdoor back area could give increase access and overflow in good weather.
  - Discussed the day time use of the Community Room. If it is not being used during the day or other times then it could appear empty and underused.
  - Discussed an irregular shape to the Community Room.

- Our program calls for a larger sized community room than other area libraries so maybe there would be less need for overflow like other libraries, so we may not need to have that overflow connection to the adult area.
- Need a place in the building for interaction
- Young adults area needs to be away from adult stacks.
- Discussed the possibility of building angles being other than 90 degree angles.
- Site lines need to be stronger from the circulation desk for all options. Must be able to see restrooms from the circulation desk.
- Sharing all the amenities (restrooms & kitchen) with the Community Rooms and off-hours access is a challenge.
- Liked the Circulation Desk faces the lobby entrance.
- Having the lobby near the kitchen is positive.
- If the History Room could be used as a meeting room that would be beneficial.
- General preference for L-shaped rather than U-shaped building.
- Positive thoughts about a corner front porch.
- Continue with exploration of a very sustainable building design as an option.
- Outdoor space
  - Discussed the timing of finishing an outdoor space because it will not be paid for by a library grant and money to complete outdoor spaces may not be available right away.
  - Discussed outdoor space; we want to have a door and the ability to see what is going on outside while someone is in the library.
  - Outdoor space for children would need to be away from the parking lot.
  - Options #2 and #3 give the best outdoor space for children.

7. Other -

- a. Mary Anne will be on vacation from Jan 22<sup>nd</sup> to Feb 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- b. Capital Campaign: Karen reported that the Trustees are looking for help with the capital campaign for the new library. January 17<sup>th</sup> has been set by the Trustees to have an event to discuss fundraising for the new library. A location or home is still being identified. If anyone would like to step forward to host this event, please contact Karen.

8. Next steps

- a. Mary Anne will be meeting with Rosemary Waltos of MBLC on Feb 11<sup>th</sup>. Rosemary Waltos would like to see a copy of draft plans completed to that date or when she meets with OEA at a later date in the spring.
- b. OEA will take all our comments and refine the options.
- c. OEA will email the four options to LFNAC members.

9. Next meeting dates:

**Wednesday, January 20, 2010, 7PM, Town Hall**

Meeting adjourned: 10:03PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Martha Field