



## Meeting Minutes – Design Review Committee #4

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

**Issue Date:** March 28, 2023  
r. June 23, 2023

**Meeting Date:** March 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, Nisha Arora, Steph Cowie, Clare Kilgallen, Laura Kostin, Dan Watson, Dennis Yeskey  
School Administration/BOE: Tom Healy  
Construction Manager: Tim Klepps, Valerie Donahue  
Public: Laura Erickson

---

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

---

1. Jim Hoagland presents meeting objectives. Review of:
  - a. Exterior character of the building
  - b. Building construction types (steel structure vs cross laminated timber (CLT))
  - c. Occupiable space without building larger building (green roof potential).
2. Overview of plans with highlighted areas for potential reduction based on Building Committee meetings from earlier this week. (Slides 3-8)
3. Green Roof discussion (Slide 9):
  - a. Can be adjacent to 8th grade neighborhood.
  - b. Dan Watson expresses concern about maintenance.
  - c. Laura Kostin expresses concern about scale of roof garden (JH - can scale down the roof garden size within the roof, might have different roof types to work around anyway.)
  - d. Tom Healy sees this as worth exploring because the students like to use outdoor spaces. To address a concern brought up about how a garden might be cared for, especially when school is not in session: currently the raised garden beds are maintained over the summer by parents who take turns.
4. Building Character (Slides 10-12):
  - a. The design team would like the building to be enduring and lively - not the grey box currently in our renderings – but something more reflective of what is going on inside.
  - b. Description of 3 "boards" with multiple design/character options to get feedback on.

- c. Request for the committee to react to the design with 5 red dots (negative) and 5 green dots (positive) on each board.
  - d. *Results of this exercise are attached to these minutes with the number of dots listed and color coded on each image that received dots.*
- 5. Review of exterior elevation studies (Slide 14). The next versions of this will be colored and shown with texture as influenced by the selections from today's building character study boards.
  - a. Description of sloped vs flat roofs and options for roof material.
  - b. Description of location of green roof as mentioned in previous slide.
  - c. Description of sawtooth roof as shown on 2 options of the gym.
- 6. CLT/Mass Timber conversation (Slides 15-16):
  - a. Looking for reaction of the committee on the look and "feel" of the timber structure.
  - b. Val Donahue: mass timber is more expensive by 5-15% compared to steel, as a net including premium at exposed MEP systems and reduction at concrete footings and foundations. This is a function of the small number of CLT contractors in this market.
  - c. Embodied carbon impact - mass timber has far less impact on the carbon footprint of the building. From a sustainability impact it makes a lot of sense, but you may pay a premium.
  - d. Suggestion/discussion - could be used in large scale spaces but not everywhere.
    - i. Tom Healy - likes it in the image of a gym. (Slide 19)
    - ii. Tony Turner - wonders about the look standing the test of time 30 years from now
    - iii. Clare Kilgallen - "wood is always in style"
    - iv. Jim Hoagland - other options would be for CLT in the lobby only (sim. to Slide 17); or in the cafeteria to promote an interior/exterior connection (sim. to Slide 18).
    - v. Laura Erickson - any concern about allergies? SLAM response - no more so than any other construction type
- 7. Upcoming schedule:
  - a. Need to reschedule the next DRC meeting to avoid Passover on 4/5-6.
  - b. Need direction from the BOE to move forward with building plans design and size.
  - c. Mechanical system decisions necessary. Our MEP engineers, CES, will present options at an upcoming meeting.
- 8. Sustainable design discussion:
  - a. Dan Watson - there is a strong push to have highly efficient/new mechanical systems by groups in town.
    - i. Geothermal - potentially great system, currently have it at Hamilton Ave School, but it can't be maintained by current custodial staff;
    - ii. Have a failed system of solar panels on one of the schools
  - b. Clare Kilgallen - if the Town wants to promote Net Zero, there needs to be an acknowledgement of the need for support and additional maintenance personnel.
  - c. Kemp Morhardt - part of our charge is to explore Net Zero and to provide the committee with the costs associated. The only way to do that is to have on-site generation.
  - d. Discussion of PV panels and options - including it in the project, doing a PPA, purchasing off-site power, etc.
- 9. State review process discussion: Prep Meeting is currently scheduled for 3/30/23. CSG recommends rescheduling because we will not have a budget and we will not have a building size by that date.
  - a. Turner will provide a budget after BOE recommendation of size:

- i. Need building footprint and level by level area (see below)
  - ii. sustainability requirement,
  - iii. mech systems, structural system decision,
  - iv. Site w/ contaminated materials known
  - v. Exist building with haz materials known for abatement and demo
- b. SLAM will need 2 weeks to layout the new building design per BOE area, then provide design to Turner for estimate.
- c. Tony would like to bring this decision to postpone the Prep Meeting to the full building committee on Tuesday.
- d. Grant application - CSG stated they can prepare the paperwork necessary "quickly" once the "2 major things" are achieved: budget (from Turner Const) and Ed Spec (approved by the BOE before the June 30 deadline).

Respectfully submitted,

Amy A. Samuelson, AIA, LEED AP  
Associate Principal