

**Cardinal Stadium “Project Big Red” Committee Meeting Minutes
GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

DATE: 12-10-2019

PLACE: Havemeyer Building, 290 Greenwich Avenue, Greenwich, CT 06830
Professional Development Room

ATTENDANCE:

Stephanie Cowie, First Selectman’s Advisory Committee for People with Disabilities
Laura Erickson, BET
Tim Coughlin, Park and Recreation
Joe Siciliano, Park and Recreation
Jim Michel, Department of Public Works
Amy Siebert, Department of Public Works
Jodi Couture, Planning and Zoning
Susan Fahey, RTM
Rob Burton, Greenwich Athletic Foundation

BOE Member

Joe Kelly

BOE Administration:

Toni Jones, Superintendent
Dan Watson, Director of Facilities
Gus Lindine, Athletic Director
Ralph Mayo, Headmaster

Architect

Russ Davidson, KG & D

Call to Order – 5:00 pm

1. Updated Information from Previous Meeting

ROAD DESIGN and PARKING

KG & D looked at the recent traffic study, and the study itself supports the addition of a road for another entrance/exit to the property. The Town of Greenwich held input meetings with the neighbors and it is documented that there is support for a 2nd entrance/exit to the site.

20 spaces is what is believed to be needed to meet the requirement for ADA based on stadium seating and requirements.

The road should be 24’ and KG & D examined several different “tie in” points.

Three proposals were presented. All proposals utilize the same spaces with variations on parking and the placement of the road and tennis courts.

Proposal 1: Navigates outside the existing tennis courts and takes the out drive land to align with the larger parking area. The proposal would likely require a retaining wall next to the wetlands. A raised crosswalk would be utilized to slow traffic and keep pedestrians safe. A ticket book/kiosk is shown at the entrance, and the visitors side building near the entrance.

For all three proposals, the bridge cost was revisited, and the cost is estimated at \$750,000 including the road and lighting necessary.

Proposal 2: Moves four tennis courts and the road runs between the existing court area and the relocated four courts. The relocated courts could be utilized for other uses throughout the year.

Proposal 3: Moves all 8 courts and runs the road closer to the fields. Exit is into the larger parking area.

Proposal Challenges with Wetlands:

Proposal One- closer to the wetlands area from a regulation perspective.

Proposal Two- moves tennis courts currently not in the wetlands to a wetlands placement

Proposal Three- moves courts from wetlands buffer to a wetlands buffer (trade-off, no alleviation)

TENNIS COURTS

How does the tennis court work since it would be split by a road in Proposal Two? Proposal Two does split the courts (4 and 4) with approximately 100 feet in between the two areas. Not too far for visibility or movement from one area to the other.

Athletic Director would want to check with the tennis coaching staff to make sure the distance of 100 feet between the two court areas works well.

TRACK

How does the track get planned for? KG & D replied that design would consider the placement of the visitor bleachers to have room for future development of the track.

COST

Significantly less than the original Plan B while still getting many of the same design elements.

Phase 1 \$7,700,000 Estimate

DESIGN RENDERING OF BUILDINGS

Shows the Visitor Center and Home Bleacher with one Team Room on the Home side of 1,410 square feet. Visitor Team Room shown at 800 square feet plus toilet rooms and storage garage.

Indoor storage is available in both Home and Visitor up to 1,200 square feet.

The budget estimate includes heat and air.

PARKING

More parking on Proposal Three than One or Two. Each design requires discussion with Department of Transportation.

Pedestrian traffic crossing the road would need to be considered for safety features which could help monitor: hours the road is open, gates, security for busy activities... Although, while it's not ideal to have a crosswalk it is much improved over what exists at GHS today.

2. Discussion of Options

Public Works can speak with the remediation team about relocating the fill which is currently sitting where the placement of courts would go. Phase One looks good where the buildings would go, but there is never a guarantee until a shovel goes in the ground.

Is the walking path being updated? Yes, it is budgeted in the scope of the work. There is also rock removal included in the estimated budget.

Ball wall was not included in the budget, but KG & D is estimating the cost at approximately \$75,000.

\$750,000- \$2,400,000 is what the Town of Greenwich estimates the bridge could cost. The KG & D budget is based on estimates of square feet, but 60% design has not been obtained on the bridge and numbers are determined as the process progresses.

3. Group Consensus and Final Discussion

1. How does moving the driveway impact pedestrians? It is an improvement over what is at GHS as of today.

2. Modifications can be made to increase safety. Department of Transportation will be more concerned with the entrance, not the driveway. They do not regulate how the driveway is utilized.

The sidewalk next to the road is an 8' sidewalk.

Group consensus is that excellent options were provided.

The next meeting is set for December 18th, 2019, at 5:00 pm at Havemeyer. However, the group decided that all three options should be presented to the Board of Education and that there was no reason to meet on December 18th unless an issue arises with the design or there is new information which needs to be discussed. A decision to cancel the meeting will be made on or before next Monday, December 16th.

3. Adjournment

Meeting ended at 6:18 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Toni Jones
Approved 12/16/19