

Longwood Public Library

October 26, 2011

Design Team Design Charrette #1

Community Room A

3:00PM –6:00PM

Attended:

Suzanne Johnson (SJ), Juliana Podd (JP), Jennifer Bollerman (JB), Kim Giery (KG), Tracee Ugenti (TU), Vincent Rodgers (VR), Jan Miller (JM), Dave Clemens (DC), Kathrine Soscia (KS) Lauren O'Connell (LO), Longwood Public Library, Bob Viola (BV), Sandpebble (SBI) Chic Voorhis (CV) NP&V, Peter Gisolfi,(PG) Frank Craine (FC) PGA, David Strunk (DS) SAE, Tammy Cunha (TC), PWGC

PG: Addressed the Committee with remarks about the overall project and what it may attempt to achieve: Identity on Rt. 25 with an aerial photo of the library and surrounding properties. He pointed out that the library is situated in a low lying area and the first view of the building is that of roof top mechanical equipment. The road now is identified by parking lots. It is important to learn about the environmental constraints and then double back to what is important; the Staff. In reference to the prioritized list of goals from the Goal Setting Charrette; some of the goals are not really helpful for design mentioning staying on budget. This is a matter of course.

PG: Review documents produced: aerial photos of the site, spatial diagrams and a baseline sketch of a possible two story addition located on the west side (based on a scheme that came from the Community Design Charrette in July) with a small bump out at the existing entry and a redistribution of existing spaces. This is a baseline sketch that will have several different iterations as the design moves forward.

Even with the prospect of a developed road on Lafayette a connection to nature is still possible from within the library.

SJ: First program on the south parcel is 10/28—Owl Watch. The local mountain bike community wants to extend the trail from Cathedral Pines through the south parcel.

PG: With the views and connection to nature looking south the utility services are visible; electrical transformer and gas header.

CV: This is the “back of house” side of the building. There are many environmental features on Rt. 25. The property immediately north is a wetland and this area is near while not exactly in the Wild Scenic River area.

Continued to give a brief narrative about the ground water impacts on the head waters of the Carmans River that is beyond the library property. It's difficult to determine if water present in

the trench on the south parcel is ground water intrusion or outfall from Rt. 25 through the pipe under the parking lot. The water in the trench will eventually get into the Carmans River. The south parcel is in the outer most ring of 100 year potential based on the Carmans River Study. The property (both parcels) falls under the Pine Barren's Commission purview as a Compatible Growth Area which means it's ok to build on but within limits and criteria set by PBC. The ground water is high within the parcels and the entire area is prone to flooding. NP&V will forward maps to PGA. Continued to describe some of the constraints on the properties based on previously disturbed land.

PG: The sense of being in the Pine Barrens should be incorporated into the project. Can we trade undeveloped land to the west? We can highlight the water on the property through rain gardens and possibly daylight the water. Approvals?

CV: Since the land is not necessarily developed it may be possible to trade areas of development. Had a onsite meeting prior to the community charrettes with DEC and discussed the possibility of relocating the sump. DEC person in field wondered why it was ever designated a wetland in the first place so, the DEC was not opposed to this as long as a reconstructed wetland replaced it.

Concerning the developed roadway on Lafayette; CV did a cross section with the existing elevations shown and discovered that 12' of fill would be required as well as retaining walls to support it. This is an ill conceived plan.

PG: Not to mention the potential Pine Barrens impact of a road in a sensitive area.

TC: Can the road be purchased?

SJ: This is School District property.

CV: Review the abandonment process for the team. The project involves the filing of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan which will be completed by NP&V.

FC: Discuss and explain the spatial diagram as based on the corrected Aaron Cohen Associates needs analysis and program. This diagram will be used to check the design against the use requirements in order to stay on track.

Discuss the amount of "Unassigned space" in that this description of space varies from viewpoint and PGA's may be different than ACA. This will be worked out in plan development.

PG: The change to the Adult services area is a shift from traditional design according to the program

SJ: The adult shelving space is adequate now.

PG: Review the sketch with colors coordinated to the spatial diagram area designations. It is unusual that the meeting space is on the second floor.

DC: Explained the shift in design based on the board decision at the time of construction which came late in the process and the mechanicals were never revised which is why there is only a single use bathroom on the second floor originally designed for staff.

PG: Discussed the sketch created from the design developed at the Community Design Charrette. It includes views to the south, meeting rooms on first floor, removes the existing mezzanine. Reiterate that this is a starting point and PGA is not trying to sell the plan to anyone.

Break

Staff asked for their response to the sketch:

KG: It's exciting.

JM: Flip where the YA area and share some overlap space with Adult area. This would allow daylighting and views of nature and we want a kitchen.

PG: There are views to nature toward the north as well.

CV: Plan approved by PBC shows native meadow planting and a meandering walk.

FC: If the YA area were situated on the north side it could have transparent wall which would close off the area while not isolating its patrons.

PG: Is circulation central, can the space with the use of RFID self check and return become something else, i.e. café?

TU: Can circulation be oriented north south to see the entry?

PG: The layout of the building on the property orients it east west and it is a natural progression to stay within those constraints.

SJ: Discussed the three story concept which deals with the mezzanine and would include a connection to nature.

DC: Can't align the floors and would need another story.

PG: this diagram will lead to others.

JB: The diagram shows Adult services spread out within the library and she felt it was a good thing so the area may have quiet sections, public access computer areas and different uses.

KG: To PG; were you visualizing ceilings as low as they are now in Children's?

VR: We could have a sloped floor to be used in a meeting room to connect.

DC: Explained how the low ceilings on the main floor came to be; the architect did not realize the size of duct work and the lighting fixtures had to be tented leaving the library with all the windows in pockets because they extend beyond the ceiling height. We can get this space back.

PG: We have done this successfully in the past; it works.

PG: Library use changing.

Discuss the objectives:

- 1) Connection to the south parcel
- 2) Make site more natural
- 3) Look creatively at surface water
- 4) Make library more visible/identifiable from Rt. 25
- 5) More daylight and outside awareness
- 6) Flexibility
- 7) Identifiable entry
- 8) Low energy consumption
- 9) LEED; Certified or Silver
- 10) User friendly building space
- 11) Manage traffic flows leaving library
- 12) Active/quiet environment

DS: Is daylight or windows? Trying for any degree of daylight autonomy?

PG: Both

FC: Step back; we are designing a library construction project around not closing. Suggest the possibility of moving out. A cost impact study should be done.

BV: SBI has looked at this preliminarily and found that there are many factors involved in the appreciated costs; additional time, weather exposure, negative impacts to staff and patrons, numerous moves, and the tie-ins to the completed spaces. There will be workmen in the finished space. Suggest moving from the idea to build addition first and then move in rather build addition and part of existing immediately adjacent to the additions.

PG: Investigate a series of schemes concerning phasing. Split the library in half and build in two phases.

SJ: We'd have to give up the meeting rooms and move collection in.

VR: 5-6 programs daily in the meeting spaces now.

SJ: Would have to offer some programs off site.

JB: Has been involved in libraries where construction was going on; uncomfortable to staff and patrons, too noisy, dusty.

FC: Be realistic about phasing, worth it to see it on paper.

BV: Roughly 25% more time required at a minimum to phase the work. Workmen spend valuable work time closing up an area near the public spaces instead of advancing the work.

DS: Discussed how the current HVAC system would perform during phased construction. The ventilation system would be compromised but can deal with phasing.

VR: We have a system that is supposed to tell us our energy use.

PG to DS: Would you consider a centralized system?

DS: The building is border line now in overall size if it is worth it. A centralized system requires more mechanical space.

PG: Started a discussion about ground source water heating and cooling

DS: Thinks it's generally a good idea but would have to do the economics on costs of electricity. If the costs in the region are high; it's probably not worth it.

TC: Discussed a new GSW system in a school building locally which is similar in size where the cost of one production well and two injection wells was \$800,000. These wells are 450' deep.

PG: This is an unusually expensive system

TC: This includes design, feasibility study, and construction oversight. These are services PWGC offers.

BV: SBI and PGA will manage oversight.

VR: Will DEC allow it?

CV: That's why you need a feasibility study.

Continued conversations and clarifications about the various systems; open or closed. Closed loop, while desirable requires many wells using lots of real estate. Discuss the possibility of a hybrid system that works in conjunction with a gas fired boiler. Related equipment and quality of water added to the discussion.

DS: For a closed loop system; it all depends on the makeup of the soil where wells are drilled. The more sand; the more expensive the system is to install. A quick calculation uncovered the need for a well field of roughly 120'x120'.

Current HVAC system;

No energy recovery

Not an efficient system

Need ventilation which has a large impact on energy use.

Better cooling systems available now

Boilers are not of high quality and have reached their designed lifespan.

Some of the units are difficult to service and maintain.

No HVAC management system in place

JP: Discussed the Cohen program and the desire to swap some space uses.

PG: When a basic plan has evolved will be a better time to examine the costs of phasing.

For the next charrette;

PGA will provide updated and additional sketches based on this charrette

SAE will look at the feasibility of a centralized HVAC system and a overview look at GSW heating and cooling.

This represents a recap of the meeting to the best of my understanding. Please make your comments by 11/3 or the information will become a matter of record.

The next charrette will be on 11/16 at 3:00PM