

- 1) Meeting Minutes from 10/18/18 meeting were approved.
- 2) Summary of Community Feedback: B. Lummis summarized the meetings to date with the community, faculty, and various committees. (See attached).
 - Highlights from the Educational Visioning session, Staff and Community sessions, and Educator and Staff input were provided. A full summary page has been prepared for review and is posted on the website.
 - As suggested at the last Community Meeting on 10/29, a running FAQ page for questions and answers will be posted on the project website.

S. Wolf Dittkoff emphasized that at this point in the Feasibility Study the design team is looking for comments on the larger scale features of the project such as overall site and massing. As the design phases progress, the smaller scale features will be reviewed with the School Building Committee.

S. Stoutland noted that in her conversations, parents liked the new construction options because the students would not need to move during construction.

- 3) Space Summary: B. Lummis presented the current Space Summary (see attached) and noted that it integrates what is happening at other Brookline schools along with the specific needs of Driscoll. The current draft incorporated comments made by the School Committee the previous week and will be presented to the School Committee next week for approval.

S. Wolf Dittkoff encouraged the Committee to review and provide comments to B. Lummis. This Space Summary provided direction and guidance to the design team to develop the building options. There will be some room to refine as the design develops.

- D. Lescohier identified an increase in number of additional classrooms from the 7 previously proposed to 14. This was necessary to fulfill the requirements to change from a 3 section school to a 4 section school and to include BEEP programming.
- 4) Traffic Report – Preliminary Findings: Giles Ham, Traffic Engineer from Vanasse Associates, presented status report (see attached). Items included:
 - Site Location and Study Area Map identified areas studied. Future developments along Washington Street were identified to be included in projections.
 - Counts and directions for vehicles, pedestrian, and bikes at 1hr interval at morning and afternoon provided. Noted afternoon pick-ups are about half than in the morning, due to afterschool programming.

- Trip Generation Summary indicated current volume and projected volume of morning trips to increase from 317 to 412 with the change to 4 sections.
 - Preliminary recommendations to accommodate the increased trip generation included:
 - Bus drop-off on Washington St. - widen for full pull over area.
 - Separate parent drop-off/pick-up from bus drop-off.
 - Parent drop-off/pick up area on Westbourne Terrace - widen to a full pull over area plus passenger side buffer to travel lane.
 - Staffed drop-off/pick-ups area recommended.
 - Next Steps for Traffic Study to finalize Report documenting existing conditions, Projected Conditions, and provide more detailed recommendations on a preferred option.
 - Committee/Community comments and responses included:
 - Proposed Drop-off/pick-up on Washington: Washington/Beacon area already has back-ups, concern drop-off on Washington may make it worse. J. Levi responded Washington pull over area for busses to be clear of travel lanes, primary parent drop-off/pick up would be on Westbourne.
 - Proposed parent drop-off/pick-up on Westbourne: Comment that parent drop off on Westbourne Terrace looks to be far away from the front entry on Washington St. in new construction options. JL noted that Option H has a community entrance closer to Westbourne Terrace. Additional entry points closer to Westbourne may be considered.
 - Pull over lanes: JL clarified that pull over areas proposed at Washington and Westbourne Terrace for buses and parents included road widenings for vehicles to pull out of the lane of travel. An additional passenger side buffer area is proposed at Westbourne for parent drop-off.
- 5) Revised Design Alternatives: J. Levi reviewed the previous 4 design options, Options A.1, C.1, E, F, G, and introduced 1 new, Option H, as directed in the previous SBC meeting (see attached). Features and comments noted below for new construction options are typically interchangeable and may be applied to other new construction options.
- Option H - Modified Star – new construction

- Combined features from Options E and G to create a 4-story option with a smaller building footprint and increased open space. The building height negotiates the site slope so that the side facing Westbourne Terrace would be 3 stories high, and with a lower level be 4 stories at Washington.
- Main entry at Washington and community/parent drop-off entry near Westbourne proposed.

Comments and responses included:

- **Building Height: Suggested new construction options not exceed the current building height.**
- Parking: All options included a combination of surface and 50 structured parking spaces. Distribution and number of surface and structured parking spaces can be modified per SBC direction.
 - Options A.1 and C.1- structured parking at grade with tennis courts on top, and surface parking lot.
 - Options E, F, G - structured parking below grade, under playing field, and surface parking lot.
 - Option H - parking below building, no surface parking lot.

It was suggested at the 10/29 Community Meeting that the SBC consider the mostly vacant metered parking spaces along Beacon St. for teacher parking.

A. Tali commented maximized on-site parking is ideal. Design Team requested to work with the Transportation Department to get community feedback for on-street parking options. J. Levi responded all the options can accommodate surface parking, but will decrease the amount of open space made available.

- Buses: Options indicated bus pull over for 4 buses, anticipating future growth. B. Lummis clarified there are now 2 buses and 1 van. The buses are not currently full and could accommodate the future growth.
- Alley behind Beacon St. retail: existing side alley proposed for service and possible supplemental drop off area.
 - Observed to be a busy alleyway; currently community uses it as cut through in both directions.
 - Property designations to be clarified for potential use.
 - Appropriate width to be determined, may need to be widened.
 - Difficult to make left turns from alley on to Washington.



- Security: The district has a separate security consultant that will conduct a review as part of the overall design process.
 - Open Space: Open Space diagrams for each option were reviewed along with the Open Space Table (see attached).
 - H. Hamilton liked Option H because has clear connection of cafeteria to adjacent open space.
 - Option H identified as having the most amount of open space at about 20% more than existing. Options A.1 and C.1 Addition/Renovation provide the least amount of open space. All new space Options E, F, G provide more open space than current.
 - Suggestion to optimize Options E, F, G to maximize potential open space including top of building if possible. J. Levi clarified the Add/Reno options were already optimized for open space.
 - Observation that Option H is the only option that meets the amount of open space requirement.
 - Existing 'triangle' area in corner of site is used by daycare – recommended this programming be considered as design develops.
 - Open Space Table separates out the Tennis Courts from the Useable Play Area. Recommended to incorporate as part of Useable Play Area.
 - Suggestion to include comparisons of Lincoln, Runkle, and Coolidge Corner schools to the Open Space Table.
 - Parks and Recreation: Parks and Recreation Department have been contacted. The project will go through their review of the programming for useable play areas and structures.
 - Wayfinding: A. Bott emphasized wayfinding as an important feature for all individuals including those with disabilities. J. Levi noted the new options provided clear visual access throughout the interior and exterior. The Add/Reno options are constrained by the linear nature of building as the areas are not visually connected and therefore not optimal to navigate.
- D. Lescohier suggested to develop the building canopies to emphasize entry – particularly at the parent drop off/field side entry of Option H.**
- Pick-up/Drop-off areas: L. Rutherford identified the need for sight lines at drop-off/ pick-up areas for parents to see their children from the car to the entry of the school. J. Levi clarified that in Option H there is an

additional entrance and walkway with visuals between the school entry and Westbourne. This would be a staffed pick-up/drop-off area with clear sight lines for staff as well.

Further clarification of the full pull over areas/road widenings requested.

- Building entrances: Request to consider a kindergarten entrance from Westbourne to second level (Option H).
- Bartlett Crescent: Clarification on property line to the drive behind residences abutting school requested. The residences currently have access both ways and at both ends as it currently connects to Washington St. and Bartlett St.
- Historic Review Status: Not designated on a historic register nor in a historic district. No demo permit has been submitted. A demo permit submission would likely automatically activate a 1 year stay of demolition.

Cost Estimate: Cost estimates of the options, including Option H, were reviewed (see attached). Option H is less because consolidated in a smaller footprint and incorporated parking under the building. The designer's Cost Estimator, Delwyn Williamson from Daedalus Projects, was present for questions.

- 6) Evaluation Matrix: J. Levi presented the Evaluation Matrix for the options. A blank matrix is to be provided for committee to review in detail and fill out as a group at next meeting.
- 7) Upcoming Meetings: Select Board asked for Town Meeting to vote on Schematic Design funding on Dec. 13.

An additional SBC meeting requested before the next Advisory Nov 26. The next SBC meeting, Nov. 15, will be extended for an additional hour. Nov. 26, 7:30-9:30am to be held for a supplemental meeting if needed.

END OF MEETING NOTES

Addressees believing these notes are in error or are inaccurate should contact the writer within five business days, otherwise these notes will be considered accurate.

by Carol Harris, JLA

