



## Meeting Minutes – Design Review Committee #3

**Project:** Central Middle School  
Greenwich, CT

**Issue Date:** March 9, 2023  
r. June 23, 2023

**Meeting Date:** February 8, 2023

**Project No.:** 22367.00

**Meeting Time:** 4:00 pm

**Present:** Design Team: Amy Christmas, Jim Hoagland, Kemp Morhardt, Amy Samuelson, Henry Withers  
Owner's Project Manager: Chris Cykley  
Building Committee: Tony Turner, Nisha Arora, Steph Cowie, Clare Kilgallen, Laura Kostin, Christina Poccia, Dennis Yeskey  
School Administration/BOE: Tom Healy, Joe Kelly  
Construction Manager: Tim Klepps  
Public: Dan Ozizmir and (2) unidentified guests.

---

**Distribution:** Building Committee                      Project Google Drive  
GPS and CMS Administration

---

1. Jim reviewed slides to be presented at the Community meeting tonight.
  - Quick review of project goals and site analysis slides. Will go into more detail tonight.
  - Review of 2 site plans being presented tonight
    - Provide discussion of parking lots and use.
    - State the number of cars that can be cued along parent drop-off driveway on site.
2. SLAM to provide proposal for 2 additional intersections for traffic count, as was requested just after the last DRC meeting. Traffic study proposed dates (to avoid private school break in March and public school spring break): March 27 – April 6. To be discussed at the next building committee meeting (March 14).
3. Jim reviewed site sections and how we are utilizing them to help inform the design. These will also be instrumental for cut/fill analysis and to help with budgeting. And visually, these will be helpful throughout the P&Z submissions. We'll continue to develop drawings like this as the building design progresses.
  - Shows how the first floor is sitting into the earth
  - Shows how the grade hits the building in the back at the mid-level.
  - Shows how an amphitheater can be built into the hill to the north.
4. (Slide 14) Jim reviewed building diagrams and compared the plans from our last meeting (115,795 GSF, but unacceptable educationally), the first-pass building plans developed using the Ed Spec but before Visioning Sessions and Program Focus Group meetings (140,852 GSF), and a new version today called Option 2 (134,433 GSF), further described below:
  - This is a first pass to provide an educationally viable, student-centered design, with the best net-to-gross factor possible.

- Compressed footprint to minimize circulation and maximize efficiency.
  - This represents all program areas as listed in the approved CMS Ed Spec (column 1 of the SLAM issued "Program Comparison" document).
    - Lower Level: Main entrance, Administration, Nurse, Cafeteria, Storage/custodial, Performing Arts, PE, and wide stair for students to comfortably access the academic areas. (slide 18)
    - Mid-Level: Exploratory classes (Media Center, Family Consumer Science, Art) at west side of central stair, and grade 6 (2 teams) to the east. In the center there is a double height area for clerestory windows over the lobby of the first floor and the central stair. This is flanked by 2 of the world language classes. (slide 19)
    - Upper Level: 7<sup>th</sup> grade (2 teams) on the west side and 8<sup>th</sup> grade (2 teams) on the east side. Both have stairs at the end of the corridor for more direct access to the exploratory classes and large assembly spaces. (slide 20)
  - This preliminary diagram may not represent all code, ADA, and mechanical system requirements which will be refined as the project design moves forward.
5. Jim reviewed an enlarged plan of a typical grade level neighborhood (slide 21):
- This version shows some open break out spaces within the team corridors, utilizing area borrowed from the overall Media Center program area. This is a result of multiple requests and conversations during programming verification meetings.
  - SLAM confirmed to Laura that this plan matches the Ed Spec and does not include any additional spaces identified during program verification. It may need to be modified to accommodate all ADA requirements, mechanical/electrical/data rooms, and code required plumbing fixture counts, but as of right now, it matches the first set/column of numbers in the Program Comparison document.
6. Reaction from Tom:
- This (Option 2) is closer to what we've been talking about as an educational model.
  - Appreciates the exercise of taking a little SF from the Media Center and seeing them as small break out spaces in academic neighborhoods. This is a purposeful way to accommodate the current practice of students spread out on the floor of the corridor working on projects.
  - Likes how this is looking for the efficiencies as well as for comfortable student-centered learning.
7. SLAM to provide an analysis of the time it would take (or walking distance) in this plan option to go from the 8<sup>th</sup> grade area to the gym, and compare that to the current building for a walk from 6<sup>th</sup> grade to the band room (for example).
8. Discussion of building size:
- Clare: To help explain the reason why this new building would be larger than the existing CMS, can SLAM calculate the additional SF needed to accommodate current code requirements, ADA requirements, and state requirements like security vestibules?
  - Laura: How can we drive the Gross area closer to the net area (increase net to gross)?
  - Joe: Can you put us in contact with a town that replaced a school, where a new school needed to be larger to replace the old building in kind?
  - Kemp: This is tough to do, since new schools typically replace others that were built when teaching was entirely different. The educational experience we are building today is not the same as what was being built in the 1950's. But we will try to think of a good example.
  - Q: What size corridors are minimum in schools? A: 6' wide, but we would never design a school with less than 8' clear, especially in double-loaded corridors. Perhaps in a minor back of house area.

- Jim: As architects, we need to design within a set of rules – in this case, the Ed Spec program areas, codes and state statutes, gross building area, etc. – so if the overall building size needs to change, we will need new rules.
9. Jim wrapped up the presentation with framework for the next DRC meeting (slides 22 and 23) as well as a list of next steps for building design (slide 24).
  10. Chris: What are next steps in order to get to the right building size? How do we move the design forward from here?  
Tony: Should the Building Committee make suggestions to the BOE on program reductions or not? Will the BOE be open to suggestions? No need to do so if it's a futile exercise. This will be discussion Tuesday at the building committee.  
SLAM: the third column on the Program Comparisons document lists suggested program area reductions and can serve as something to select from. We are also open to any other suggestions people can think of.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy A. Samuelson, AIA, LEED AP  
Associate Principal