

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

DATE: March 9, 2022

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

Christina Downey (BOE)

Megan Galleta

Leslie Moriarty (BET)

### Ex-Officio Members Present:

Craig Amundson (RTM)

Ralph Mayo (GHS Principal)

Will Schwartz (DPW)

Dennis Yeskey (P&Z)

Steven Swidler (BOE Staff)

Tom Bobkowski (BOE - Central Office)

Dan Watson (BOE- Central Office)

### Others Present:

David Stein (Silver Petrucelli)

Timothy Nanzer (Silver Petrucelli)

Chris Cykley

### Not Present:

Lauren Rabin (Board of Selectmen)

Stephanie Cowie

- **Call to Order:** Meeting was called to order by Mr. Walko at 8:01 a.m. Mr. Walko opened the meeting by reviewing ARC requests for more details on the coloring, the corner piece and the size of the facing below the roofline. Mr. Walko noted that after a discussion with the ARC Chairman and one other member of ARC, the remaining detail was eliminating the curtain wall which would result in the glass wall continuing to the roofline. Mr. Walko confirmed that this change was reviewed by Silver Petrucelli from a structural perspective. Mr. Walko added that, today, Silver Petrucelli will present the option previously approved by the committee (Option A) and an option with the removal of the

band/curtain wall at the request of ARC (Option B). Mr. Walko stated that these options will then need to be discussed and voted on by the building committee.

- **Update by Silver Petrucelli:**

- Mr. Stein presented before and after renditions of the design based on the last discussion with ARC. Mr. Stein stated that ARC felt that the design needed further development at the top of the structure. Option A includes a band/metal panel at the top and Option B removes the band and the glass is brought all of the way up to the top. Mr. Stein said that the glass is all blast resistant and the removal of the band will add more cost but is not significant. Mr. Stein added that from the perspective of neighbors, the band helped in bringing everything downward.
- Mr. Stein discussed the inverted corner, which they were able to improve upon. He added that inside the vestibule, the beams on the ceiling cantilever outward to the columns, therefore the columns will be seen from the outside. The lighting remains in the same position.

- **Discussion on Option A and Option B as presented:**

- Mr. Walko asked what the cost implication of the change would be and Mr. Stein responded that he did not have an exact number, but it would likely add approximately \$50K.
- Ms. Downey asked if the removal of the band would compromise the structure and Mr. Stein added that there should not be any structural issues and they were able to address it through the inside. Mr. Stein responded that they evaluated it structurally and determined that the intermediary pieces that were there were superficial. They were able to address the structural support from the inside. Ms. Downey also asked if the light would project out more with Option B, affecting the neighbors. Mr. Stein responded that the lighting will still be downward facing and it bleeds outward at the same angle and any additional lighting impact would be subtle.
- Mr. Contadino stated that he likes the glass going all the way up in front but expressed concern regarding the glass continuing up on the side elevation. He stated that the glass would be close to the beam inside the structure. Mr. Contadino asked if the wall could be moved closer to the main office. Mr. Stein responded that moving the wall would make everything asymmetrical. Mr. Nanzer confirmed that any shift would create issues architecturally.
- As a follow-up to Mr. Contadino's question, Ms. Cole asked if there was space between the glass and the side of the beam on the side view and Mr. Stein stated there was no space and when looking in, the side of the beam is visible through the glass. He then added that a band could be added to the side to fix this issue, but then there would be glass on one side and not on the other.
- Mr. Allen asked if they were able to create uniformity with glass in front and Mr. Stein responded that there is uniformity with the exception of at each beam.
- Mr. Moriarty asked if the ballistic glass was not used at the top portion given there is not the same security risk at the bottom, would there be a cost savings? Mr. Stein explained that the curtain wall should be designed as a system. He noted

the security standards do not give a threshold, however, following best practices, the entire frame should to be consistent from top to bottom. He stated that what they are trying to avoid is if there is some type of explosion outside, the inside of the vestibule is protected. He added that aesthetically, there is no

- Mr. Walko wanted to understand columns in relation to the beams and asked if the beam goes over the column. Mr. Stein responded that the beam is directly centered over the existing column, which is on the outside of the building, which also aligns with a column at the glass corridor.
- Ms. Downey stated that in Option B she doesn't like the white corner piece which seems out of place. Mr. Stein will look into that further.
- Mr. Amundsen commented that as a committee, we have gone out of the way to make changes that ARC has requested. Mr. Amundsen doesn't mind the glass continuing to the top and from his perspective, doesn't mind seeing the beam on the side. He noted that the \$50K incremental cost is significant, and these funds could be used for landscaping. Mr. Amundsen suggested that ARC should absorb the cost.
- Ms. Moriarty thinks glass is awkward against the solid wall and the evenness of the glass panels on the front is equally important.
- Mr. Walko clarified that ARC's role is to make recommendations and we are down to one remaining issue. He noted that we will need to go back to P&Z for approval. The committee can vote to change the design per ARC's recommendation or keep the design as is and have P&Z make the final decision.
- Ms. Cole stated that she likes both designs and doesn't believe seeing the beam on the side is an issue.
- Ms. Bonanno stated that she likes Option B although she expressed concern over the additional cost.
- Ms. Downey asked Mr. Contadino, based on his experience with ARC, if he could share his thoughts on how ARC and P&Z would respond if we decide to keep the existing design. Mr. Contadino thought that they may back off given the added cost. From his perspective, he believes that Option B aesthetically looks nice and he would vote in favor of the change.

- **Motion to Approve Design Change Recommended by ARC:**

**Motion was made by Jake Allen and seconded by Leslie Moriarty to approve Option B, which, as presented, removes the band and has the glass going to the top. The motion was approved. Ms. Cowie was absent.**

*The Motion Passed 5-3-0*

- **Timeline:**

- Mr. Walko gave an update on the status of the state reimbursement process. The RTM committees approved the resolution which will now go to the full RTM on Monday, March 14th. Mr. Cykley stated that once the RTM approves the resolution, they can submit the application in April for the state's review and approval. Mr. Cykley added that the state granted approval to go out to bid prior to receiving the grant approval. Mr. Cykley stated that once we have all of the

necessary documents ready, we can go out to bid. Mr. Stein added that they will schedule a PCR(Plan Completion Review) with the state in April to start bidding in early May and begin construction in June.

- Mr. Stein noted that he sent over a proposal on landscaping which he will review with Mr. Walko and present at the next meeting.
- Ms. Downey confirmed that we are on the BOE March 24th meeting agenda to approve the plans, specifications and cost estimate.

- **Approval of Minutes:**

**Motion was made by Jake Allen and seconded by Christina Downey to approve the minutes of the February 23rd, 2022 meeting. The motion was approved. Ms. Cowie was absent.**

*The Motion Passed 8-0-0*

- **Next Meetings:**

- Mr. Walko suggested that the committee meet on March 16th to discuss the add alternates, the security desk, landscaping and other areas as well as an update on the state reimbursement process.
- A meeting will also be held on March 23rd, prior to the BOE meeting.

- **Adjourn:**

- The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Walko at 8:56 am.

Submitted by Maureen Bonanno on March 14th, 2022