



Meeting Minutes – Design Review Committee #2

Project: Central Middle School
Greenwich, CT

Issue Date: March 6 2023
r. June 23, 2023

Meeting Date: February 22, 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, Clare Kilgallen, Josh Caspi, Steph Cowie, Michael Kieselak, Laura Kostin, Christina Poccia, Dennis Yeskey
School Administration/BOE: Tom Healy,
Public: Dan Ozizmir

Distribution: Building Committee Project Google Drive
GPS and CMS Administration

1. Discussed the Site Walk with the committee:
 - Ed Spec indicates the need for 6 courts
 - Will need to discuss resurfacing existing, replacing the existing fence so everything looks the same and new
 - Will need to discuss striping for pickle ball

2. Discussed the updated Site Plan Option 3 (presentation slides 35-36):
 - Clare: How many spaces? Henry: Around 200.
 - Dennis: If there's a change from the Ed Spec on the number of spaces, SLAM will need to report this to the BC and the BOE to receive a variance that will then be accepted by P&Z.
 - The driver for the 250 spaces is the RTM meetings. They park on the grass and "wherever they can" now.
 - SLAM presented the July 1, 2023 State requirement (by statute) for 20% of all parking spaces to be Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging stations
 - Is the State providing credits?
 - Eversource may have a program to help with funding.
 - FM will likely require an A/B switch.
 - Dennis: The Federal Government may be developing programs to fund EV stations.
 - Question about the building footprint showing on this site plan: This is 115-116,000 SF, but was determined educationally deficient at our Program/Ed Spec verification meeting at 1pm. It will change.

3. Discussed building siting and general access (presentation slides 35-36):

- Clare: Is this the optimal siting or will other options be explored? Henry reviewed the advantages of some of the decisions that have been made in Option 3. Reminder of some discussions from DRC Mtg #1.
 - Discussion of adding a sidewalk along Orchard Street.
 - Since that would be an off-site amenity, it will not be part of the reimbursable cost of the project. Could this be funded by the town in a parallel project?
 - The project should consider a crosswalk to cross Orchard regardless of the sidewalk.
 - Henry described that there is an inboard sidewalk so pedestrians/students can walk from the building within the site to the corner of Orchard and Indian Rock.
 - Mike K: will P&Z require a sidewalk along property frontage?
 - Dennis Y: generally developers will install for sub-division projects, the school project being a town funded project will need to address funding for sidewalks separately from school funding.
 - Steph C: concern about speed of cars going north on Orchard and possible left turns into the site. SLAM: Agreed – traffic study will need to look at this closely.
 - Will the design team consider parallel parking along the service entrance currently shown with access from Stanwich?
 - May not be efficient from a cost standpoint due to cutting the slope to make parking. Also, even though the lane is designed to accommodate WB-50 vehicles, it will still be tight.
4. Discussed site circulation (presentation slides 35-36):
- Consider flipping bus and parent loops, to avoid the volume of parent drop traffic along Orchard.
 - May consider a one-way bus lane entering from across Coachlamp Lane and exiting at the blue dashed curb-cut.
 - Need to verify there's enough sight line for busses stopping at a Coachlamp for cars going north on Orchard.
 - May consider access-control traffic gates at the bus lane.
 - Speed tables is an option for helping to reduce speed. Mike K: He believes the town made a decision for no vertical displacement devices on collector roads.
 - Can administratively require buses to only approach from the north on Orchard Street, for right turn into school.
 - Pedestrians from the Ponderosa neighborhood also include students who cut through to that cul de sac from neighborhoods to the south. The project should consider providing a crosswalk at that intersection across Indian Rock.
 - If P&Z will require certain pedestrian safety improvements, there will need to be funding to make those improvements, which (if "off-site" will not be eligible for state reimbursement.
 - Will need to earmark money in the project budget to account for this and any other town-specific requirements.
5. March 8th Community Meeting will have a refined building footprint/design and refined site plan.
- Share with key constituents: How their life will be made better (traffic issues reduced) and other items regarding how the building will work, etc.
 - Communication Sub-committee will be advertising the community meeting.
 - Site Plan
 - Building Plans
 - Meeting will be in the CMS Auditorium.
 - This will be a building committee meeting and they will host.
 - SLAM to provide a preview of the presentation at the 3/7 building committee meeting.

- Provide a review of the various approval processes.
 - SSIC
 - OSCGR
 - Town MI/P&Z process

- 6. The Security Review Committee was discussed because meetings of this committee will be required prior to State Approvals. In addition to a subset of the building committee, this should include the superintendent of schools, the (new) Greenwich emergency management director, the Fire Marshal, police representative, fire department personnel, and other first responders.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy A. Samuelson, AIA, LEED AP
Associate Principal