



## Meeting Minutes – Design Review Committee #14

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

**Issue Date:** November 9, 2023

**Meeting Date:** November 7, 2023

**Project No.:** 22367.00

**Meeting Time:** 4:00 pm

**Present:** Design Team: Jim Hoagland, Henry Withers, Cole Peterson, Kemp Morhardt, Andrew White (joined mid-way for Q&A)  
Owner's Project Manager: Jim Giuliano  
Construction Manager: Tim Klepps  
Building Committee: Steph Cowie, Clare Kilgallen, Christina Poccia, Joe Rossetti, Dan Watson, Dennis Yeskey, Tony Turner,  
School Administration/BOE:  
Public:

To All Present:

The following is believed to be an accurate representation of discussions and decisions made at this meeting on 11/7/23. If any of the items are incorrect or fail to record discussions at the meeting, please notify the writer of these minutes, in writing, within 5 days of the issue date. Failing such notification, these minutes will be considered a matter of record.

---

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

---

1. Jim reviewed the schedule outlook for regulatory, Design, Documents and Review, which are directly from the recent Turner schedule. Reported that the team is still on-track to deliver the final DD package on December 13<sup>th</sup>.
2. Jim reviewed the Final Site Plan Application criteria and reported that the team has been gathering information in response to the final comments that were issued by P&Z after the preliminary Site Plan Application was approved. Final Site Plan Application may be made in early January to possibly be on the February agenda for presentation. This may be adjusted based on the status of the ARC submission and review period.
3. Jim reviewed the OSC CR/SDR & DDR checklists which are one of the goals the team is continuing to work toward completing. SLAM and CSG are in frequent contact relative to the material necessary for this submission.
4. P&Z process: The design team is addressing the final comments from departments and will start to form responses and coordinate the necessary efforts to properly respond. Some of the primary issues are:

- a. Proposed Sewer Relocation – T&B has been meeting with the Sewer Division and has proposed several alternate solutions that address the concerns documented in the Site Plan Review meeting with P&Z. Jim presented 2 sketches and the documentation of the existing conditions (see presentation material). Andrew White joined the meeting and explained that the Sewer Department did not look favorably upon the idea of placing the new manholes adjacent to the sidewalk and would prefer to relocate them to the roadway. Andrew and T&B is developing a drawing that shows that and, when complete, will forward it along to Turner for estimating. Clare stated that since this is an existing condition that we are being forced to improve, that there should be additional conversations about how the work gets paid.
  - b. Photometrics for the site lighting are underway and the team is evaluating the fixture location strategy along with the budget that was set in SD to be sure that the criteria of the new lighting regulations are met. The initial approach appears to meet the “no light spillage” criteria at the edges of the property line. Engineers are looking at options for pole heights and possible shields on the fixtures that face neighbors.
  - c. Construction phasing plans and logistics. SLAM, CSG and Turner will be working together to develop these plans for the Final Site Plan Application.
5. Building Plan:
- a. Jim reviewed the current plans. There have been no significant changes since the last DRC meeting. The lower level plan has grown due to the mechanical rooms that are located directly below the academic pod cores. Structural and mechanical have coordinated the location of the retaining wall and the design team has requested feedback from both CSG and Turner on the configuration of the mechanical spaces. The professional team agrees that despite the increase in SF, a portion of the design contingency will cover the increase and would be an appropriate use of those funds.
  - b. The diagrams identifying the expanded mechanical spaces was included in the presentation and the team also presented a summary of the current overall Sf and a breakdown of what portion can be attributed to the mechanical spaces that house the indoor air units. It should be noted that the overall building SF still falls within the net-to-gross range that SLAM has been targeting throughout the design process (62-65%).
  - c. An enlarged Academic Pod was presented and Jim explained the subtle changes that were made to the “Floor Captain” area to accommodate the spatial adjacencies that the school administrators have requested.
  - d. A coordination meeting with the Food Service consultant and GPS food service representatives was held on 10/31 and the kitchen plan was reviewed. Based on the feedback from that meeting, the plan is being adjusted. Some of the primary items discussed were:
    - i. Changing the proposed 12 burner range to a 4 burner with a griddle on the side
    - ii. Providing a POS location with future power and data in case a 4<sup>th</sup> serving line needs to be added.
    - iii. Reworking the dry storage room to break into 2 separate rooms to accommodate dry goods and paper storage in distinct areas.
  - e. Jim also presented some aerial 3D views of the Academic pods to demonstrate one of the tools that the design team utilizes to coordinate the interior design. Some discussion ensued surrounding the Learning Commons and the furniture layouts. Jim stated that the next DRC meeting will focus on interior design and that the team will have more of these detailed images to share. The eye level renderings are “works in progress” and currently do not depict all o the material selections and colors that will be assigned to various elements in the building.
  - f. There were several plan updates that were shared. They included:
    - i. Typical Classroom
    - ii. Typical Science Room
    - iii. Family Consumer Science
    - iv. Band Room

- v. Orchestra Room
- vi. Media Center
- vii. Art Room
- viii. Wood Shop / Innovation Lab

6. Building Exterior

- a. Jim reviewed the sample board. Timber beams and CLT, stone veneer, Cementitious panels, glass sample, frame sample and color. Jim also explained that, per State bidding requirements, the material selections need to have three options for "equals" and the design team is starting to make those selections to prepare for the CD phase and eventually the bidding phase.
- b. Several exterior renderings were shared – the DRC responded favorably to the progress.
- c. Clare asked the question about where the flagpole was going to be located. Jim answered that it is currently shown on the east side of the parent dropoff (not in the middle circle).

7. Building Interior

- a. Jim shared some new 3D sectional cuts through the Main Lobby and talked about the character of the space as well as the materials that are being anticipated in this area. The Main Stairs at the end of each lobby will be developed further and be presented in detail at the next DRC meeting.
- b. Color schemes are being developed and will be presented and reviewed at a future DRC meeting (likely the 11/28 meeting).
- c. Enlarged plans and interior renderings were shared with the committee. The spaces were:
  - i. Main Lobby
  - ii. Main Stair(s)
  - iii. Auditorium
  - iv. Gymnasium
  - v. Feature wall at Auditorium Entry Lobby –
    - 1. This is an area that the design team is considering for the "tile replacement project". This will be discussed in more detail at the next DRC meeting,

8. DD meeting schedule:

- a. Shared the various meetings through the course of DD
9. Tony asked to revisit the SF increase due to the mechanical spaces. The group discussed the reasons it was done and the timing of the decisions. Tony expressed a strong objection to using design contingency funds for the cost of the expansion of the mechanical rooms. He also indicated that he didn't know whether or not the BC will approve such.
10. The meeting adjourned at 6:06pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Hoagland, AIA, LEED AP  
Senior Associate