

Greenwich Board of Education Minutes of the GHS Front Entry Committee Meeting

DATE: August 11, 2021

LOCATION: Virtual via Google Meet

TIME: 8:00 am

Committee Members Present:

Stephen Walko - Chairman

Jake Allen- Vice Chairman

Maureen Bonanno-Secretary

Ashley Cole

Louis Contadino

Stephanie Cowie

Christina Downey (BOE)

Megan Galleta

Leslie Moriarty (BET)

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Steven Swidler (BOE Staff)

Craig Amundson (RTM)

Dennis Yeskey (P&Z)

Tom Bobkowski (BOE - Central Office)

Dan Watson (BOE- Central Office)

Lauren Rabin (Board of Selectmen)

Ralph Mayo (GHS Principal)

Others Present:

David Stein (Silver Petrucelli)

Dean Petrucelli (Silver Petrucelli)

Humza Afzal

Not Present:

Will Schwartz (DPW)

1. Meeting was called to order by Mr. Walko at 8:09 a.m
2. Silver Petrucelli & Associates Presentation:
 - Mr. Stein noted that today's presentation was created within a 3 dimensional model. The presentation reflects revisions to Scheme 1 and Scheme 4 based on suggestions discussed at the August 4th meeting. The focus of the presentation includes:
 - The scope of the security desk, with and without protective glass and, the height of the high portion of the desk and where it should be and how it impacts visibility,

- The exterior overhang for weather protection on both schemes and the removal of the side waterfall in Scheme 1.
 - Views inside the lobby and the interplay of the ramp and the main office and lobby.
 - Scheme 1 Revision:
 - The design concept eliminates the waterfall feature on the exterior and simplifies the structure. This design shows a 20 ft overhang 4ft overhang on the right side. Removal of the waterfall eliminates the circular cutout.
 - Inside the vestibule, the 10 inch ramp up to the main lobby is nondescript but has handrails which are required by code.
 - 7 sets of doors including one visitor set on the left.
 - The security desk has low and high portions. The purpose of the high side is to house security technology.
 - The design is ADA compliant with an ADA compliant desk in a separate location on the high side of the ramp..
 - The glass option would have a frameless glass protection with a pass through for transactions..
 - Scheme 4 Revision
 - The security desk takes a slightly different shape than in Scheme 1. A glass wall on the side provides a better view from the security desk out to the plaza vs. the solid wall in Scheme 1.
 - A high counter is placed closer to the front glass which opens the back side of the glass toward the ramp.
 - The sloped roof was changed to a flatter roof to accommodate an 18ft extended overhang for weather protection with 4ft overhang on the side.
 - The entrance to the main office is similar to Scheme 1.
3. Questions and Comments from Committee:
- Ms. Moriarty asked about the GHS logo detail (which sits on the interior roof in both designs). Mr. Petrucelli noted that the roof is the current roof which can be used as a shelf for features such as logos or school mottos. By integrating the current roof into the design, there is a cost savings.
 - Ms Downey inquired whether flat vs. sloped roofs are cost comparable and Mr. Petrucelli responded that the cost of materials are essentially the same, however, there is more volume with a sloped roof and with more volume, there are additional costs in heating, cooling and lighting.
 - Ms. Downey also asked if, the removal of the waterfall feature makes the design , more costly from a structural perspective Mr. Petrucelli indicated that without the waterfall, there would be significantly less material, however, since the waterfall added support, additional support would be needed. So, by removing the waterfall, there is approximately an 80-90% cost savings.
 - Ms. Downey asked if they considered a design with a smaller waterfall as the design loses its luster without the waterfall. Silver Petrucelli agreed with Ms.

Downey and stated that they did not consider a smaller waterfall. They felt that their charge was to create a design without the waterfall feature.

- Mr. Contadino indicated Scheme 4 ties into the existing school better than Scheme 1. He also indicated that the side access for the ADA requirement in Scheme 1 is less desirable and he would prefer the ADA access not in a separate location. Silver Petrucelli responded that they can take that into consideration. Mr. Contadino also prefers the location of the security desk in Scheme 4 which is more out in the open vs. forced into a corner and prefers the security desk without the protective glass feature. Mr. Petrucelli pointed out either scheme could have the security desk in that configuration.
- Ms. Cole agrees that the GHS logo should be somewhere and having it on the inside roof makes sense. She also thinks that without the waterfall feature, Scheme 1 has lost its allure. She would also like to see a design of Scheme 4 without the V-shaped columns.
- Ms. Cole also noted that a design should have a place for art in the future. Mr. Petrucelli responded that there is enough volume in either design to accommodate art.
- Ms. Cowie noted that from an ADA perspective, she appreciates the security desk design in Scheme 4, with an equal opening and not in a separate area.
- Ms. Cowie also commented that she does not like the V-shaped columns in Scheme 4 and misses the waterfall feature in Scheme 1.
- Ms. Galleta requested that the presentation be more interactive as details are discussed.
- Ms. Bonanno noted that she prefers the glass next to the security desk vs. the wall. She also asked if the V-shaped columns could be replaced with a different column. Mr. Petrucelli responded that the glass next to the security desk could be in either scheme and that the columns could be made any shape.
- Mr. Contadino noted that he likes the V-shaped columns as it makes the design interesting and dynamic.
- Ms. Downey does not prefer the V-shaped columns but would like to see more options. She asked if the columns would be required and Mr. Petrucelli noted that they are necessary. Ms. Downey would like to see a more open entrance and anything that can be done to increase visibility for the security guards.
- Ms. Rabin prefers Scheme 4 and its consistency with the current building.
- Ms. Moriarty thinks that the V-shaped columns block the entrance and asks if lighting can be incorporated into Scheme 4 similar to Scheme 1. Mr. Petrucelli noted that it is more difficult to imbed the lighting in Scheme 4 due to the wood structure, but they can install surface mount lighting vs. pendants.
- Mr. Walko agrees that the columns in Scheme 4 could block the entranceway. He asked if the right side could be a solid wall, or something else, which would provide structural stability when the waterfall feature is removed. Mr. Petrucelli indicated that they can look into that, however, any solution there may impede visibility. The waterfall feature did still allow visibility.

- Ms. Moriarty expressed concern over the high monitors blocking the security guards' view. Mr. Petrucelli noted that they would work closely with the security team to determine the positioning of the equipment that will be installed on the walls and desk.
 - Mr. Bobkowski noted that some of the monitors can be recessed into the security desk top and much of the equipment cannot be put on the outer wall where there would be public access.
 - Ms. Cole asked if Scheme 6 was still an option. Mr. Walko noted that there is concern over the additional costs of maintenance and energy associated with Scheme 6 and Ms. Downey noted that any design that would be more costly to the BOE is not preferred. Ms. Galetta added that she did not like the triangle in front of the glass structure on Scheme 6.
4. Moving Forward:
- Mr. Walko asked Silver Petrucelli to revise Scheme 1 and Scheme 4 for the next meeting, prior to a vote:
 - Scheme 1 with a modified waterfall and the removal or adjustment of the solid wall by the security desk.
 - Scheme 4 with different shaped columns or without columns in the front of the structure.
 - For both schemes, utilizing the design in Scheme 4 for the design of the security desk.
 - Committee will meet again, virtually, on August 18th to vote on a scheme.
5. Approval of Minutes:

Motion was made by Jake Allen and seconded by Leslie Moriarty to approve the minutes of the August 4th, 2021 meeting. The motion was approved.

The Motion Passed 9-0

6. Adjourn
- The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Walko at 10:00 am.

Submitted by Maureen Bonanno August 17th, 2021