



**MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2020, EASTERN GREENWICH
CIVIC CENTER COMMITTEE PUBLIC MEETING**

Mazza Conference Room
Greenwich Town Hall 4:00 p.m.

Committee Attendees:

Scott Johnson, Co-Chairman/BPR
Gary Dell'Abate, Co-Chairman/BPR
Kirk Schubert, Committee Member/BRP
Karen Fassuliotis, Committee Member/BET
Liz Peldunas, Committee Member/RA *
Susan Snyder, Committee Member/DPR
Alan Monelli, Committee Member/DPW
Joseph Siciliano, Committee Member/DPR

Members of the Public in Attendance

Andy Duus, BET
Nancy Cooper, RTM (D-5)
Susan Foster, RA *
Erf Porter, Citizen
Peter Uhry, RA *
Sydney Uhry, RA *
Ted Larrabee, Neighbor
Janet Stone McGuigan, RTM (D-6)
Leander Krueger, RTM (D-6)

***Riverside Association**

Architect Representation

Randall Luther, TKSP
Jesse Saylor, TKSP
Jeannette O'Connell, TKSP
Jeffrey Brown, TKSP

Meeting commenced at 4:00 p.m. and ended at approximately 6:00 p.m. A brief interdiction was made by Scott Johnson, Co-Chairman of the Eastern Greenwich Civic Center ("EGCC") Committee describing that this was the first meeting after the selection of and contract signing of TKSP Architects from the competitive selection process which occurred last fall. Work was commenced by TKSP based on Replacement Goals as previously identified by the Committee after public meetings and public input outlining desired project characteristics.

During the presentation by TKSP Project Architects at this meeting, questions were asked by both the Committee and encouraged from general public.

The presenters included Jeffrey Brown on elevations and floor plans; Jeannette O'Connell on interiors; Jesse Saylor on project materials and Randall Luther on project overview.

Presentation started with Mr. Saylor describing potential flooring products. These products will be used in the multi event and recreational spaces presently proposed to consist of two 8,000± separate spaces. Many samples were reviewed and circulated. Pluses and minuses of each product was discussed but clear preferences occurred for traditional wood for the primary basketball court area and synthetic multi-purpose rubberized/synthetic type surfaces for the other large multi-purpose area. It was explained that the rubberized material was extremely popular and was appropriate for many athletic activities and also could accommodate exhibitions and large non-athletic gatherings which would use tables and chairs. No particular vendor was specified but these products are readily available. There is, however, difference price points based on product characteristics. Charts were displayed indicating the durability, pricing, impact absorption, etc. Characteristic differences for the various products were explained. Site visitations of examples were recommended. Committee Members indicated that proper surfacing was of significant concern. No final decision was made and further investigation will continue.

Presentation continued with a description of potential exterior surfacing materials, many of which were stone derivatives, including circulation of samples and various color descriptions. References were given for examples of the products at other locations to be viewed separately. Most products described as extremely durable, good for insulation capabilities and weather resistance and were reasonably priced and with price points between the various samples pointed out. Committee Members indicated that exterior surfacing was of significant concern since many products appeared too cheap, boring and institutional. No final decision was made and further investigation will continue.

Presentations then shifted to various ceiling components, both from an aesthetic standpoint as well as insulation, sound absorption, light effects, and functionality. Descriptions were given of other facilities with photographs. Comments were given relevant to the amount of opaque coverage vs. roof monitors. Glass was discussed as a roofing material as well as siding, and included considerations of safety, impact resistance and protective barrier applications, particularly areas adjacent to recreational impact areas.

The next topic focused on 3-D visual and plan presentations of exterior elevations and floor plans. Exterior discussions covered visual impacts as well as application of potential surfacing materials and colors. This also included ingress and egress elements for the north elevation adjacent to the existing outdoor playing fields.

Floor plan descriptions included relative sizes of different spaces, including multi-purpose non-recreational rooms, such as OGRCC Office, civic center administration offices, storage areas, common areas, corridors, mechanical areas, interior and exterior bathrooms, parent and child gathering areas (with limited furniture layout), catering/kitchen facilities, potential concession space, exercise space, quiet space, low impact activity space, such as yoga and dance, general meeting areas, such as scout troops, senior citizens, support groups and the like. Square footages were demonstrated with general rooms larger than the present open plan rooms but with descriptions of potential dividers. Questions occurred regarding potential for a coffee and pastry concession area adjacent to the public assembly area, but in general, there is no vendor interest in this type of operation but that food trucks might be an attractive alternative which should merit further discussion.

Attention was also given to the potential catering/kitchen area and including potential inclusions, such as walk-in refrigerator, freezer, cooktop preparation spaces, food storage areas, food warming equipment, preparation areas and serving areas and exterior access for the potential kitchen. Discussions included questions on code requirements for exhaust and fire suppression system and potential non-use of cooking facilities versus electric warming facilities. Cost implications were apparent. Staff indicated that full kitchen facilities are quite popular and have been utilized by multiple user groups historically. [It should be noted that this kitchen might be helpful in emergency shelter situations.]

Presentation also included a brief discussion/analysis of energy savings strategies, such as radiant heating and cooling, daylight harvesting, green roof, solar panels, geothermal and the like. This discussion was prompted by the potential for the Town of Greenwich initiating a carbon neutral policy. Architects will include elements of this topic at subsequent presentations and will attempt to include extra cost analysis.

Questions were asked as to the relative size of the project, indicating that the current plan was only slightly larger than the existing square footage, perhaps by only 2,500± square feet, but that was appropriate to accommodate functionality considerations, mechanicals and storage.

Discussions intentionally did not include presentations of traffic and site plans, but Mr. Monelli did include discussion on the recognized need for compliance with wetlands requirements, architectural review considerations, town stormwater drainage requirements, parking, traffic patterns and the like, but this will occur in subsequent plans. It was also acknowledged that the existing poor drainage issues on the parking areas and Harding Road, and other culverts, need and must be addressed in coordination with the site plan development for the project in general. This included removal of debris and improvement of existing storm drain and conduit facilities. Those expenses are in a separate DPW budget.

During the discussion of public restrooms, it was confirmed that showers, locker rooms and public changing areas are no longer appropriate and not in high demand by facility users.

Mr. Monelli mentioned that the new facility was not intended to be used as a town emergency shelter in the event of a natural or other disaster particularly because such facility requires additional equipment, such as generators, and that during, for example, periods of high rainfall, due to the adjacent low lying areas, the facility may be difficult to access. Eastern Middle School is the existing emergency facility and was reported as adequate.

Project architects indicated that since no major objections or adverse comments occurred with respect to the displayed plans and specifications, and that the current proposal received uniform positive responses, the next meeting can entail review of a more progressed set of project plans and specifications, including site plan.

Mr. Monelli then described the anticipated next procedural steps, including further plan development and then followed by the commencement of the Municipal Improvements procedure and application and its required review by the Board of Selectmen and Planning and Zoning and then, upon further plan development, and subject to approvals, there will be other land use agency reviews, including Architectural Review Board, Engineering Department, Wetlands, further Planning and Zoning and then, at the appropriate point, RTM. Budgets can be more accurately developed pending further plan development and approvals.

Since there were no further questions, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:00 p.m.