

CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 2006

Present: Ald. Schnipper (Chair), Weisbuch, Albright, Salvucci, Gentile, Yates, Mansfield and Lappin

Also present: Baker, Burg, Danberg, Fischman, Harney, Hess-Mahan, Johnson, Lennon, Linsky, Merrill, Samuelson, Sangiolo and Vance; School Committee Members present: Ann Larner, Susan Heyman, Reenie Murphy and Claire Sokoloff; city personnel: Ouida Young (Associate City Solicitor), Nicholas Parnell (Commissioner of Public Buildings), Sandy Pooler (Chief Administrative Officer), Michael Kruse (Director of Planning David Turocy (Deputy Commissioner of Public Works), Heidi Black (Administrator of High School Construction and Strategic Planning; School Department), Clint Schuckel (Traffic Engineer), Shawna Sullivan (Committee Clerk)

#224-06 DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE petition pursuant to Sec 5-58 for site plan approval of the new Newton North High School.

ACTION: **OPTION 5B APPROVED 6-2 (Albright and Mansfield opposed)**
DRAFT BOARD ORDER APPROVED AS AMENDED 6-1-1 Mansfield opposed; Albright abstaining

NOTE: The Public Facilities Committee continued discussion on site plan approval of the proposed Newton North High School. The Chair expressed her hope that the Committee had the opportunity to review the material, which included a draft board order, sent to the Board the previous evening. The Chair worked with the Law Department to include as many conditions in the draft board order; however, there may be other necessary conditions. Residents of Trowbridge Avenue, Walnut Street and Kirkstall Street submitted a petition to clarify that they have never supported Option 4A (attached).

In response to some of the concerns raised at the previous meeting, the design team gave a presentation, which included computer generated model photographs of the site, different site entry options, landscape plans and civil engineering plans. Copies of the presentation will be sent to the Board on August 11, 2006. Mr. Gund began the presentation with the various model views of the site. Mr. Gund also presented some very preliminary drawings of the massing of the building. The building is portrayed as having a brick exterior.

John Prokos of Gund referred to the standards in the Architectural Graphic Standards to explain the siting of the stadium. It states that the preferred orientations of athletic fields are northwest southeast, which is the orientation of the football field. A few states have mandated the northwest-southeast orientation in their school construction guidelines for safety reasons. Ald. Schnipper pointed out that in the responses to questions asked at the previous meeting, there is an advisement from The American Academy of Ophthalmology that injuries caused by sun

glare can be prevented by a south to North orientation of fields. 40% of eye injuries in young people are attributed to participation in sports or recreation.

Ald. Weisbuch asked if there was light east to west from the skylights in the athletic complex. Mr. Gund responded that there are three different roof configurations that have been shown and it has not been determined, which will be used. The plan is to bring north light into the athletic area because the east light would be in peoples' eyes. Ald. Lappin wondered if it was appropriate to discuss solar panels or other energy saving issues. The Chair responded that the discussion would take place during review of mechanicals for the building. Ald. Albright asked the design team to review the slides of the Hull Street elevations. The first slide shows the view looking up the hill on Hull Street showing the existing building and the light monitor. The next slides depict the view about half way up Hull Street and you can see the hill is getting higher. The next slide shows the view almost at the top of the hill. The last slide is the view from the street and shows how the building begins to disappear as you move higher up the hill. The building cornice is even with the top of the hill. Ald. Albright asked how far the proposed building is from Hull Street. The distance varies as you go along Hull Street but it is approximately 40' from the street. Ald. Mansfield asked what a light monitor is. The light monitor is one of the three approaches shown on bringing light into the athletic area. A light monitor is an element that gets light into it that obscures the sun light but lets natural light into the area. Ald. Mansfield asked if the abutters looking across at the school would be looking at light from the rooftop. There would be a glow but it would not be an area that is lit. The lighting fixtures would be considerably below the rooftop level. Ald. Albright asked if the mechanicals on the Elm Street side could be seen from the street. There may be a transformer but it will be screened behind a wall and landscaping.

The design team reviewed the various site plan options. Each of the site plans has approximately 335 parking spaces. Option 4A and 5A have 380' of site distance, which is 25% more than the 296' mandated by the Transportation Engineering Manual. Ald. Salvucci asked if cars using the entrance on Walnut Street to Elm Street could get through to Lowell Avenue. There is a turn-around for all traffic entering from Walnut Street. There will be do not enter signs after the turn-around and the shape of the road forces vehicles to use the turn-around. Ald. Gentile asked if the entrance at Trowbridge Avenue in Option 5A has been narrowed down to 24 feet. The design team stated that the entrance is 24' and there are 27 parking spaces including six handicapped spaces at the entrance. Ald. Mansfield inquired whether the only difference between Option 4A and Option 5A is in the number of parking spaces in the entrance circle at Trowbridge Avenue. The design team explained that Option 5A also includes the narrowing of the entrance way and the addition of more parking by the Elm Street entrance. Ald. Weisbuch asked if there were any other uses besides a walkway for the space between the soccer field on Walnut Street and the building. There is courtyard area for the theater, which part of Main Street opens out onto the courtyard area. There are art studios located by the walkway, which could move outdoors into the courtyard. The space between the soccer field and the building is landscaping and part of it is to provide an attractive way to get from the parking area to one of the entrances. It is the main foreground for the school and is an attractive area for a garden. It is one of only two places on the site where there is not a playing field or does not have a use that is

specific to the program. It is also the one area on the site that the school can use as an outdoor classroom space for science experiments or art projects.

The design team presented Option 5B, which moves the entrance across from Trowbridge Avenue to between Trowbridge Avenue and Clyde Street. This gives an additional 118' of sight line, which is 65% more than what is mandated. The move pushes the soccer field over. There is also a loss of parking spaces in the lot at the corner of Elm Road and Walnut Street and additional parking added to the new entrance. Ald. Albright asked if there was not a basketball court located along Elm Road, could there be more parking spaces. There could be more parking but it was a program choice to have the basketball court. Ald. Gentile pointed out that there is currently an outside basketball area right off of the cafeteria. Ald. Weisbuch asked if there was any consideration of an egress with a right turn only at the southern end of the parking lot at Walnut Street and Elm Road to relieve some of the flow onto Walnut at Elm Road. The Chair does not believe it has been considered, as 70% of the people coming to the school are coming from the north and if you do not allow a left, there will be more traffic going around the entire site to go north. Mr. Prokos stated that they have discussed a right turn only for busses coming out there with the school and it seems it is agreeable. Ald. Sangiolo asked how many parking spaces are located in the parking lot on Elm Road. There are 331 planned parking spaces between all of the lots, which is the same number of parking spaces currently on site. Ald. Mansfield asked if it was part of the design to have some of the spaces at the visitors entrance serve the tennis court when school is not in session. It is part of the plan to have those spaces be used for the tennis courts. The tennis courts can also be reached from Hull Street, which has parking.

Ald. Weisbuch inquired how it would negatively or positively affect the bottleneck at the egress at Elm Road at Walnut Street, if the first few parking spaces were eliminated to provide a right turn lane. Providing a right turn lane would provide some benefit and the City Traffic Engineer has suggested possibly eliminating parking within 40' of the entrance to create less friction around the entrance. However, it is proposed that there not be any parking on Elm Road during the school day. The parking on Elm Road would only be used for evening events, such as theater and athletics. Ald. Albright asked about the width of Elm Road. Elm Road varies depending whether it is the portion that is one-way or the portion that is two-way with parking. In the area where it is two-way with parking on both sides it 36' in width, and when it transitions into the one-way portion it could be narrower. Ald. Mansfield asked why Elm Road is being designed to accommodate two-way traffic and two-sided parking on some portions of it resulting in a 36' width for off-hours parking. If there are multiple events going on in the evening, the need for parking is greater than what is available on site. Ald. Mansfield felt it was not intuitive to design for off-hour usage rather than primary usage. All of the parking spaces both on and off site are full during the day and there are 650 seats in the theater alone, which will generate quite a need for parking during an evening event. There is also Community Education classes and a large performance gym that will be used in the evening. The intent was to not take any parking spaces away from what is already available on the site. Ald. Schnipper pointed out that there is a municipal lot by the site that could provide parking for evening events. Ald. Hess-Mahan was assured that the bump out on Elm Road still existed on Elm Road in Option 5B, as it was not evident from the plans.

The Committee then reviewed Option 5C with the architects. Option 5C was a result of a request from Ald. Mansfield and Albright's request to look at moving the visitor entrance from the connector between the gym and academic core closer to the northern end of the site. Option 5C shows the entry opposite the church on Walnut Street. The entrance to the building would be where the garden courtyard is in Options 5A and 5B. There are essentially two drop offs in the same location in this scheme. The design does not give the benefit of having two entries that serve the building; both entries come in at about the same point in the building. There is quite a length of distance between the entrances and the gyms. Option 5C does not give the school the benefit of spreading some of the traffic out and to spread out the entries works much better from a programmatic standpoint. It also would require that the whole building be left open, as there would be no way to limit access to parts of the building. There have been three independent Traffic Engineers state that the further away the second entrance is from Elm Road the better from a circulation point of view. The two entries side by side would concentrate a lot of the traffic at one end of the site. Ald. Mansfield recalled that when he asked the question that led to Option 5C he realized that opposed to 4E, which shows the same egress on Walnut Street but the same entrance into the school as the other options, would require a redesign of the building. It appears that Option 5C is essentially a different entrance without a redesign. He is aware that Option 5C would not work without a redesign. Ald. Mansfield asked why the different aspects of the program could not be moved within the school. The technical vocation area needs to be located by the loading docks on Elm Road. The art studios are in the most favorable position with north light and the design team felt it was important for the art students to have easy access to the landscape. The main issue is that it does not make sense to have two entries adjacent to one another and to have a great distance to one end of the buildings from the entries. Ald. Mansfield agrees with these points but a new entrance requires a new design of the building. Ald. Schnipper did not get the sense that the Committee is heading in that direction but if the majority of the Committee would like to explore the possibilities than it will happen.

Ald. Sangiolo stated that the way the building is configured there is no way to get to the football field from the tennis courts. She raised the issue of an attack occurring on the site and Ald. Schnipper suggested installing panic buttons. The architect reviewed the various walkways around the site. Ald. Weisbuch asked if there was any advantage to having a lighted basketball court next to a lighted tennis court. The basketball court is not lit.

The Landscape Architect, Dan Selene, presented section of the landscape plan to exhibit several various conditions that exist and how they will be different. The first section illustrates the scheme where the loop and parking are located on Elm Road. There will be a large planting area between the theater and Elm Road, which functions as a buffer for the residents of Elm Road. The next section depicted a 4' fence with room to establish trees for screening around the softball field at the Elm Road one-way portion. There will be many trees preserved along Walnut Street, which will be augmented with under story shrubbery that creates an effective screen between the parking lot and neighbors to the north. Most of the existing vegetation can be preserved at Hull Street near the tennis courts. There will need to be some clearing of vegetation along Hull Street where the proposed building is to be constructed but it will be restored. The next section displayed Hull Street at the baseball field. There is a site walkway

that converges with the sidewalk but there is enough room there for additional vegetation that would help catch baseballs that might leave the site. It also creates a visual screen. There is room in the plan for a screen of hedge like vegetation between the double-loaded lot on Lowell Avenue and the residences on Lowell Avenue.

Ms. Sandy Brock of Judith Nitsch Engineering gave a broad overview of some of the drainage on the site. The impervious surface of the proposed site is about the same as the existing site. None of the existing drainage structure meets the current guidelines that are followed for storm water management. There is no water quality treatment currently on the site, which is requirement under the Department of Environmental Protection's Storm water Guidelines. There is no storm water management that stores water underground. The new drainage system will meet the guidelines and it may be possible to improve on water quality and introduce some storm water mitigation. The engineers are looking at the stadium for water retention because the turf and system underneath it are extremely permeable and you have a structure that is already going to hold some volume of water. There would be an underground detention area for storm water under the stadium. It would create an area of volume that would mitigate the storm water. The engineers are looking at collecting the storm water on the whole route and coming into a system in the area of the stadium and discharging into an existing drainage system. This allows for infiltration into the ground and provides some mitigation of the amount of volume getting into the public drainage system. The other thing that is being investigated is collecting the roof runoff, storing it and reusing it for a variety of things. One of the reuses could be toilet flushing. If 50 to 70% of the water for toilet flushing is generated through roof runoff, the City will be saving over 1 million gallons a year. The engineers are also looking at also using the runoff for irrigation on the site.

Ald. Yates asked how the storm water in the retention area underneath the stadium gets into storm drainage system. Ms. Brock responded that she is extremely conservative when she does elevation and it can run at a 1% slope to the street. Ald. Yates asked if there was any way to stop the culvert from overflowing. Ms. Brock has had discussions with the City Engineer, who stated that the issues is not capacity but maintenance. There is a trash trap, debris trap and a gate that gets clogged creating flooding. There is nothing that can be done from an engineering standpoint but there will be a reduction in the water coming off the site. The site is not causing the problem with the flooding of the culvert. Ald. Salvucci inquired if the site drainage is being designed for a 100-year storm. It is being designed for the 25-year storm for the closed drainage system and the 100-year storm for the retention. Ald. Linsky asked what the difference between natural turf and artificial turf is in terms of drainage. The artificial turf drainage is exponentially greater than natural turf. Ald. Linsky than inquired how far down can the retention tanks be placed. The engineers are still looking at the site, as there is variability through the site and not all of the boring data is not in. Ald. Mansfield questioned whether it is still possible to do the retention if the stadium is not depressed and Ms. Brock responded that it is still possible. It may add a restriction to the depth that can be used or it might allow it to be deeper. Ald. Mansfield felt it would be useful to have data on the groundwater under the footprint of the building because it might help determine if a basement is possible in any portion of the building. As the engineers go through the design, they keep adding layers of the information. They are beginning to receive further information but they have not had the baseline. As the engineers receive data,

they will adjust the plans. Ald. Weisbuch inquired how far the stadium could be depressed before the engineers run into problems with their drainage plan. Ms. Brock responded that it would depend on where ground water is that is going to govern the elevation of the storm water management, which ultimately governs the field depth.

The Chair asked if there was anyone who needed clarification on the answers received on the questions from the previous meeting. Ald. Yates felt that the design team had missed the point regarding the right turn in and right turn out at the visitor entrance. He was asking what the traffic situation would be if there were a right turn in and a right turn out, and whether there would still be a need for a traffic signal. The right turn in and out does not really help with the traffic mitigation, as 70% of the traffic comes from the north and wants to go back to the north. It would create additional vehicle miles traveled around the site. Ald. Yates stated that it begs the question that if the principle we are espousing here is that we are trying to disburse the impact of the traffic coming to the site, why is it not appropriate that the impact of getting there would be disbursed further so that some people will have to drive further in order to get back to where they are coming from. There will be a pedestrian light, which would allow for the left-turn. The Chair suggested that if one of the options were chosen, it would be appropriate to add a condition to the Board Order for further study of the right turn only and the location of the pedestrian light.

Ald. Mansfield asked if putting the stadium on grade allowing the perimeter fence to be located closer to track reduce the square footage devoted to the stadium. If the fence can be pulled in closer to the track, it will give a few more feet for landscaping. Ald. Yates would like clarification on the response to the answer provided on the orientation of fields and safety. He was given to understand that at the orientation was based on the request of the Athletic Department of Newton North due to injuries caused by the sun. It appears that the orientation is based on engineering standards and not the recommendation of the Athletic Department. In response, the design team stated that the Athletic Department is recommending the north south orientation as well as the engineering standards recommend it. In addition, the American Academy of Ophthalmology recommends the north south orientation to avoid eye injuries.

Ald. Weisbuch asked what consideration has been made to expand the bus stop on Walnut Street for accommodating people with disabilities. The MBTA is responsible for the bus stop and Ald. Salvucci explained that each bus is equipped to aid people with disabilities entering and exiting the bus. Ald. Samuelson questioned the number of school busses that will be picking up and dropping off at the school. The expectation is for eleven school busses, as the expectation that ridership will increase through redistricting. Ald. Samuelson stated that that she is not trying to suggest that parents are the enemy, that there should not be a theater drop off or that circulation around the site is not viewed appropriately. She is trying to do some problem solving because what exists now at the high school does not work and she would not like to see it recreated on Walnut Street where there is more traffic. Ald. Samuelson is not in favor of a traffic signal and thinks the visitor entrance should be used for preschool drop off and bus drop-off. She suggested using Lowell Avenue and Elm Road for parent drop off, reversing the loop so that people exit onto Lowell Avenue and only use the Walnut entrance for parking. It is not possible to stack all of the busses at the visitors' entrance.

The Chair took an informal vote to determine if there was support for any of the site plan options before the Committee. The President and Chair have talked about the possibility of convening into the Committee of the Whole to give the entire Board to ask additional questions, if the Committee is able to send the item forward. Ald. Salvucci could support two of the options. Option 5B answers many questions for many people. It takes the entrance the away from Trowbridge Avenue and it still works well between Trowbridge Avenue and Clyde Street. It makes sense to put a traffic light there for pedestrian crossing and to get cars in and out of the site. Ald. Salvucci's second choice would be Option 5A. Ald. Lappin feels similarly about the options. Although if she lived on Trowbridge Avenue, she would want a light to exit onto Walnut Street but if the neighbors want the visitors entrance further down she will support Option 5B first and Option 5A. Ald. Albright has struggled with this decision for quite some time and has spoken with the City Traffic Engineer, Phil Herr and various members of the Board to try to determine the right thing to do. She feels that there is a fatal flaw in all of the designs because Walnut Street is a terribly overburdened street. She felt that if you had a choice about where tot put the entrance to the high school, you would not choose Walnut Street. She understands that for a variety of reasons such as the location of the fields and school in the designs it is hard to get an entrance off Lowell Avenue. However, in all of the 45 or 50 designs produced by the architects, the changes have been very minimal and they all put the entrances off Walnut Street. Ald. Albright cannot support Option 5A, 5B or 5C; because she believes, it is a mistake. She does not think that any of the options are the right design for the City. Ald. Weisbuch will support Option 5B. He read a statement into the record, which is attached. Ald. Yates agreed that Option 5B is the best of the offered design and is willing to vote for it to advance the process. He would like to include a condition in the board order for a study of what a right in and right out would do to the traffic on Walnut Street. Ald. Yates addressed the next steps in the process. Voting for the site plan and design money in his mind is no commitment to the new building; it is advancing the process. This is a serious matter that deserves to come to conclusion but \$3 million put into design is a drop in the bucket next to \$160 million. The case needs to be made that every step of the way that this is in fact necessary and a good investment of the people's money. Ald. Mansfield provided the Committee with a memo stating why he cannot support any of the options (attached). The memo also included a proposed resolution to request the School Committee and the School Department review certain aspects of their program requirements, not including the basic educational requirements, with the suggestion that they consider one or more of the following: A) reduce the size of the football field requirements, which may include moving it back to its current location; or, alternatively, eliminate on of the other proposed playing fields, B) eliminate one of the indoor athletic facilities that duplicates facilities that are or could be built, at Newton South where the site space constraints are less restrictive, e.g., the field house/large gym, or pool, C) reduce the foot print of the indoor athletic facilities by stacking the components similarly as they are now arranged in the present Newton North High School. The Board really needs to be sure that it has the right design. This project is at least three times anything the Board has ever considered in magnitude and cost, since the site plan approval process was implemented in the 1970s. Most of the residents of Newton will be impacted by this project.

Ald. Salvucci stated that the resolution did not mention anything about coming off Walnut Street. The resolution asks to cut out various parts of the project but his understanding is that Ald. Mansfield's concern is that Walnut is the only entrance to the site. He asked how Ald. Mansfield would layout the school and enter the site. Ald. Mansfield responded that he felt that if there was more flexibility on the site, if one of the elements was reduced or eliminated, that there would be more flexibility on the site and that the architects, who are very skilled at this, could find a way to have at least one of the major entrances coming from Lowell Avenue rather than Walnut Street.

Ald. Gentile stated that no matter what plan goes forward, there is not anybody in this room, or outside this room, that is going to know for sure what will happen when it comes down to traffic and traffic patterns. He thinks that no matter what happens the city is going to have to be prepared to continue to work on this after the fact. It is his hope that he is still around and will continue to work to make sure that as we figure out how people actually do get to this site that mitigation continues to be done to make this project better for the neighborhood, and that includes enforcement issues that are not appropriate to deal with now. The city is going to have to do everything that it can to mitigate traffic in the neighborhood.

Ald. Gentile stated that he has spent a tremendous amount of time going to the site to make sure that he clearly understands the concerns that have been expressed by some of the residents of that area and in particular the Trowbridge entrance. As recently as yesterday, he met with a neighbor and walked the site so that he could say that he had done his homework. Reasonable people disagree; however, he continues to believe that the best option is Option 5a. He was struck at the last meeting by the traffic consultant who was extremely clear in stating to the Committee that when you design things like this, that the primary concern is safety and then after that was convenience. He was very clear in talking about the furthest distance that you had between the entrance and the best design that was the safest. He did not hedge, he did not qualify it, he was very clear on what he thinks is the safest proposal here. Now that the entrance has been reduced down to 24 feet, it has eliminated a lot of the parking, there are now 26 or 27 spaces, and six of those spaces are handicap spaces so there are 20 spaces for the rest of the folks. It has reduced it back to a much more ceremonial entrance, which was what most of the neighbors were asking to be done. It is Ald. Gentile's belief that Option 5A is ultimately the best design. He happens to disagree with folks about the traffic light. He thinks that a light there would make it a safer area. If he lived there, he would want a light there, but if people decided that, they do not want a light, then we can certainly look into removing the light. If the majority of the Board felt that Option 5B was the better option then he could certainly support 5B. Moving the entrance further down Walnut Street would be a mistake. There are several points that others have made that he would like to respond to, but he is not going to because it will ultimately be decided by the full Board as it should be, because this is such an important issue, and there will be plenty of time for discussion at the full Board. Ald. Gentile thinks Option 5A is the best, but could support Option 5B.

Ald. Schnipper stated that she found herself in a similar situation. She thinks that for the people on Trowbridge, having a light so that they will be able to get out of the street is a better situation. In addition, there are fewer parking spots in that immediate area if you have Option

5A. However, she is perfectly comfortable supporting Option 5B. She hopes that people see that as being responsive to the neighborhood. The traffic light at the entrance requires further study and she would like to see that put as a condition. If one looks at Option 5B, the soccer field and parking lot are not quite as close to one another because they have been shifted and she would like to explore the possibility of pedestrian access opposite the church as this area is a natural pathway, although it will lose some of the screening that could be a natural pathway. She understands the desire for the pathway, and would like to study it. She would also like to look at a pathway for students coming from the south, as they are not likely to walk all the way up there, so having a safe access for them from the south on the site would make sense. In the spirit of cooperation, she could support Option 5B.

The Chair stated that right now two members of the Committee are unable to support any of the options before us. No one has expressed support for Option 5C, so barring some outcry from the Committee, Option 5C can be taken off the table. Ald. Mansfield stated that Option 5C, as it has been developed and presented, is not a viable option. If there were more flexibility on the site, if there could be an alternate entrance from Lowell Avenue that was more than just entrance and exit for busses, it would be reasonable to have one entrance on Walnut Street. It would probably be best at the location of the Option 5C entrance but it does not work with this design.

Ald. Schnipper asked if there was support for the resolution that Alderman Mansfield has before the Committee. Ald. Salvucci stated that there were some comments made in the resolution that has been gone over repeatedly with the School Department. When it went through the Design Review Committee, members asked about reducing athletic space and the answer was no, the school needs every field and every inch of athletic space. As far as taking some of the athletic fields away, that is not a decision that the Board should make. Is the Board going to say that we know what the School Committee has proposed is inaccurate. That they do not need the program space for athletics. Can we second guess them and take a field out for athletics; we cannot do that. That is up to them to say that they can eliminate this. As far as the pool, we had the chance to put the pool over at South while we were under construction, now it is too late to put in a pool there. It would cost us two times as much as it would have originally cost if we had done it while we were under construction. Ald. Salvucci would never at this point suggest that we would take the pool out of North and take it over to South, as we have the opportunity to put the pool here as we go under construction. The pool gets a lot of use by the community it is not just students that use the pool. Ald. Salvucci thinks the resolution has merit, but thinks it is premature. Unless we hear from the school people what their intentions are in terms of giving up these fields, we have to stay with what we have.

Ald. Albright stated that she has heard from the School Committee several times that if asked, they would consider changes. She is not 100% saying that they would agree to it, but if asked they would consider it. Ald. Albright thinks asking is a reasonable thing to do. The other point that she would like to make is one of the first questions that she asked Graham Gund was if he had considered stacking the gym facilities and he responded that he was told by the athletic director that he wanted everything at grade. She thinks that it is great to have everything you ever wanted and to have it all the time. However, if stacking the pool and the gym would allow

some flexibility on the site so that the design could accommodate one entrance off Walnut it seems that the city benefits. Maybe the Athletic Director would not have everything he wants, but the city benefits. It is worth asking that question. She does not think the resolution is asking anything except to solve a problem. To have one more stab at trying to get some of this traffic off Walnut Street and to free up some space on this site seems to be a very reasonable request.

Ald. Yates stated that the Chairman of the School Committee said back at the original public hearing that they had never been told officially that this was a tight site. Well, it is time to tell them that. The impression that he got from the School Committee was that well, once we go through the whole process, and as we get down to a figure that is really too much and will not pass, then come back and we can look at it again and maybe we can cut something out then. If there is something that is removable, then it is good to have them start the thinking process, because they are not prepared to respond definitively at this point. He does not see any downside to sending the resolution forward.

Ald. Lappin stated that we might have to cut this depending on how much money we come up with and that would be an issue. She has a question about stacking the athletic facility and whether it would contradict the buffer. Maybe the building would be further away, but the view for the neighbors would not improve. She would think the building would be four times as high, if it were stacked. Ald. Mansfield responded that no it would not be any higher than the main building as proposed and it would be further away. Ald. Lappin stated that it would be a little further, but what about the view for the neighbors; even if it would be a little further away, it would be significantly larger. The resolution is not completely unreasonable. Her main issue has always been that two entrances on Walnut Street are too much. If what Ald. Mansfield is proposing would enable an Elm road entrance it would be great but she was told that we could not do the Lowell entrance because there is not enough space for the busses to turn around and we need to take away space from the site. She does not see how these suggestions would change that. Ald. Mansfield stated that if you reduced the size of the football field then that would change exactly that. Ald Lappin asked if the football field has to be that size. She would think that they would not make it bigger than it has to be. If there were a way that there could be a Lowell Street entrance, she would like to know about it, but everything she was told is that it could not be done with what exists.

Ald. Gentile stated that he urged the Committee to vote against this resolution for several reasons. First, is all that we will do is delay the process and what he is hearing from constituents is how much longer are you going to drag this out and how much more are you going to cost the city before you get moving on this project. If you remember to use a 3% escalator, it is \$300,000 extra per month, and if you use a 10% escalator, it is \$1,000,000 per month. The constituents that he is hearing from are tired of the Board dragging its feet and dragging out the cost in that manner. Ald. Gentile disagreed with the proposed resolution. It is not just a football field, it is a multi-use field. It is designed for use by several teams, both males and females, and this is something that we have never had before. It is the size that it is because it needs to be that size to play one of the particular sports, which is football. He respects the fact that some people do not like this and they are certainly entitled to their opinion, but what he really finds troubling at this point is that people want to keep asking the same questions in the hopes that they will get

some kind of different answer. The School Department has been asked on several occasions the very thing that Ald. Mansfield has brought up. Most recently, the Design Review Committee asked them specifically about program. They got a written response back and to now say that the School Committee Chair who is not in the room is willing to go back over this again is bothersome. She is not here and he has never heard her say she is willing to review it again. He heard just the opposite that the School Committee is telling the Board what they need for program. There have been some 70 odd meetings so far trying to design program. It is a fact that there are 15 athletic teams that are practicing off site now; it is not like there is an overabundance of fields. There are 15 undergraduate teams where kids are traveling day in and day out on their own to sites all around the City. It is not as if we are building an overabundance of fields because we have all this luxury. We are not building one more field to bring any of those teams back. We are going to have the same number of teams and the same number of fields and kids are going to still be dispersed all over the city. To suggest that we can just eliminate another field, is not going to improve the situation it is going to make the situation worse. At some point, you are going to just have to acknowledge the fact that these questions have been asked. Ald. Gentile does not believe they going to come back with a different answer because the Board asked them. It implies that the School Committee does not respect the Design Review Committee, they do not respect everyone else that asked and that they are going to come back differently. He thinks we just need to acknowledge the fact that if the site plan is voted down they will have to do something, but that is not what their preference is. Do not ask them to come back here when they have been asked several times through the process, it is unfair.

Ald Baker stated that the site design has gone through the design review process, where the key to unlocking this design was composed of two things. The first is the sentiment that the building should be set back as much as possible to create some green space on both sides. Second, there is an existing school that we need to take down, we cannot just sort of build a building out there and hope that everything works out, it has got to be away from the site of the existing building. That is a design constraint that we cannot alter. His memory of the Design Review Committee discussions was that when it became clear that by putting the baseball fields and the soccer fields and overlapping them in a multi-use athletic field was the point when things began to fall into place. The 5B Option preserves some green space opposite Trowbridge. It gets it farther away and gets some parking next to the athletic facility where it is needed. Without producing the impact, that other people were concerned about. The difficulty with the resolution is that while those things might be feasible to take away, they do not necessarily produce an improvement in the situation because of the way the site really does constrain what you can do given the current school at this location. Ald. Baker went and walked the site and he understands the need to have more buffering and more landscaping up the Elm Road side. You can get access from Lowell Avenue by making Elm Road a two-way road all the way down. However, the busses have to come in so that they can drop off on the right and then go out that direction. You could put the public coming in that direction, but he does not think anyone wants to see that occur, and by dispersing this around the site, it gives the best of the traffic solutions possible. Option 5B at least moves it a little down from the S-curve, which he has heard people are concerned about and he thinks this is the optimum solution. As Ald. Lappin indicated, if you try to stack the building there are cost implications but it also means that you are going up. If we go up, we can make this a high-rise building. We are trying to have a design that works on this

site that is as low-rise as possible given all the concerns that people have expressed. Ald. Baker does not see the resolution gaining us ground and he sees it losing us time.

Ald. Johnson wanted to thank Ald. Mansfield for doing this and she wanted to respectfully disagree with Ald. Gentile. We had a memo dated June 12 from Dr. Young, Superintendent of Schools, where she had asked that the School Department look at how they could do some things differently in regards to the site plan. Reading from the memo, she stated that the School Committee has voted an educational program that conforms to the goals of the school department. The School Department stands ready to engage in further discussion. She has heard Dori Zaleznik say in this room that she is ready, as well. They need to be asked. When they designed this school and then the Gund partnership designed it and Ald. Yates said that they did not know the constraints, they are not architects, nor are we. Now when we see what this ideal program is in this box, it is 10 pounds of potatoes in a 5-pound box, it warrants coming back. What if we cannot afford it, then they are going to have to go back anyway. Contrary to what Ald. Gentile said, yes, this has been a long process – we have had renovations, hybrids, we have had a task force, but this Board of Aldermen has only been talking about this for two months. We got the site plan in May and it is July. For a \$160 million dollar building, that is going to have a lifetime of impact on this neighborhood it warrants some review and she would strongly urge this committee to pass this resolution. The Board has time, yes, it is costing us more money, but weren't we thinking about that when we have been discussing this for several years. We all know that the cost went up. We are a deliberative body, we are checks and balances, and we are in place to have a role. She is asking to please let us ask that the School Committee, the School Department and the architects go back and see how they might adjust now they know the constraints that are there.

Ald. Sangiolo did not want to contradict what Ald. Johnson said, but wanted to get clear that it is true that the School Department and School Committee are fixated on this program. If it does come to the point where we don't have enough money to pay for this, are they going to be willing to start pulling back and look at the types of programs or the size of the fields, are they going to be willing to look at that when the time comes, because if we are hearing that they are not willing to do that now, I am not sure that they will be willing to do that later when we end up with it costing \$200 million. You have to make sure that the willingness will be there.

Anne Larner noted that Dori Zaleznik has been quoted at length and that she is not here but to the last point, it has been said from the get go that we do not look at the ultimate budget, but that we are willing to work within whatever ultimate budget is there.

Ald. Gentile stated that he wanted to correct two points. He never stated that the School Committee would never look at it. They have been asked and have come back with their professional opinion throughout this process. If forced to look at it, they will look at removing program. The other point is that he disagrees with Alderman Johnson. We have been working on this for over a year. We were originally faced with a request for over \$10 million for a design, site work, legal fees, site fees and so forth and this Board did do the responsible thing. We reduced that substantially to about \$3 million so that we could keep a hold over this project. We are doing our job in this respect, but to suggest that the Board has only been looking at this

for 3 months is ludicrous. We voted to approve the original \$3 million over a year ago. It is not fair to give the people in the room the impression that we have only been working on this for 3 months. We have been working on it for a long time and a lot of us have been on commissions and went to the Design Review Committee meetings so it has been a little bit longer than that.

Ald Johnson stated that what she was referring to was site plan review. We may have gone to the Design Review Committee meetings but we were not able to participate. We had Ald. Salvucci there and we sent messages through him, but we have not had this for more than a few months. Yes, we have talked about finances, and she agrees with Ald. Gentile on that, but was referring specifically to the site plan.

Ald Salvucci stated that one of the things that bother him is that this is not one of the first buildings that we have ever put up in the city although we have never had a building of this magnitude and cost before us. He thinks this is what is shaking everyone up here. The fact of the matter is that we have a Design Review Committee of experts. He is not an architect or an engineer but did work in construction and has some knowledge of how a building is put up, and he is sure that others do as well. The fact of the matter is that our experts went for 15 meetings over six months to review time after time different schemes, and there were some that Ald. Salvucci liked that they rejected. The point that he is trying to make is lets get rid of them, what do we need them for. Why have the Design Review Committee go through all this time and all this effort and then tell them hey boys you do not know what you are talking about. You made a mistake. It is a design that is no good. We do not need you anymore. Take a Walk. Tell the architects, the engineers, the HVAC system engineer, the structural engineer, hey take a walk, we do not need you. Now, Gund Associates, if he was them he would quit. These people have gone through hoops to try to put this thing together and make it palatable for everybody. Move this, do that. Hey you know, we re only trying to build a school here, not the Taj Mahal, it may end up being one but, the fact of the matter is, he cannot criticize something he does not know anything about and he does not know how anybody else can do that. He does not like the entrance OK, and he does not like that fact that busses are going down this way. We all have a different opinion and he respects that but to say that this design is out of the question after all the time and effort that has gone into it just does not make sense. First, do we want to build a school, then build the school. We started with the commitment to design, we have put money into it already, but someone said here tonight that is not a commitment. That sure is a commitment and we have a long way to go with this commitment. We need to either fish or cut bait. For those who do not like the design, design it.

Ald Albright stated that the architect works for us. We do not work for the architect. It is true that it has been going through Design Review for a long time and she does not want to go back to design review. We do not want to give it back and they do not want it back. We want it right here at the table. The issue is that in all of the many, many designs that have come through and probably because of the constraints that you have been put under with the site, the design hasn't change any, well it may have moved forward off the hill a little bit, but it hasn't changed very much, it is the same design we started with a year ago when it went through design selection. She does not hate this design, there are some things about it that she likes but there are some things she does not like and if there are chances to fix it we should. This school is going to

be with us a very long time - we hope. She believes that we can all agree that the traffic on Walnut Street is horrible and it is going to get worse. If there is any chance at all to fix some of these problems, then why not take this chance. She does not want to design this building, she is not an architect. We can come up with the problem we can present it to them and say can you solve this problem and I bet they can. Ald. Gentile stated that the architects are in the room. Why don't you ask them. Ask them what they would do. Have them pull a field out and tell us what they would do. Ald. Salvucci stated tell them to change it. Ald. Albright stated that she wished that we had had conversations like this before now. She would like to have an iterative conversation with the architects we have not ever had that opportunity, that would be lovely.

Ald. Yates asked the Chair if the Committee could vote on the resolution. Ald. Schnipper stated that she would like an opportunity to speak. Ald. Gentile stated that at some point he would like the architects to speak because everybody assumes that these folks have been handcuffed and forced into this design. If that were the case, then he would like to hear about it. If it is the case that they would have done things totally different then let them, speak for themselves. He is tired of people just assuming that they were forced into doing this because of what the School Department told them they had to do. He would like to hear them address that instead of us all talking around it.

Ald. Schnipper stated that she would like to speak to the resolution first. She cannot support the resolution. She feels very strongly that the School Department and the School Committee worked very hard on the program and yet she was there in the main chamber when Dori made that comment. She made that comment in response to if there is not enough money to pay for the school will; they go back and make changes. There has never been a question about that. They can only have what the city can afford, but she would not be so quick to assume that the first thing they would eliminate is a playing field. To say that they did not understand how tight a site this is not right. Ald. Schnipper started serving on the school committee twenty-one years ago and everyone knows how tight the site is and what the constraints are on that site. However, unlike anyone else on this Board, she has spent her life in public education working with 14 to 19 year olds and she did it for over 36 years. She would like to say as a parent to three, and a grandparent of two, that the entire program is really so very important. When she moved to Newton in 1974, she was flabbergasted at the opportunities that the Newton Public Schools presented to their children. It had never ever crossed her mind that a public school could present the kinds of opportunities that are presented here. When my children went through the program and they were active participants in many activities, not all athletic, although some of them certainly were athletic, but keeping children, particularly adolescents on site and supervised for as long a period of time as you can is the healthiest thing that you can do particularly in today's society. The thought of changing the program so that you are sending kids off site makes absolutely no sense. This is a community that values its children and wants to provide for them. She truthfully has been so disappointed with the cuts that have been made to South, and they were not made in site plan review and they were not made when we looked at program, they were made when it came back and we did not have the money to pay for it. There are countless things that have been cut that she is heart sick about because we did not get what we all anticipated. Now that may well happen at North if we ever get to a design and one of the things that is devastating at this time and she understands colleagues wanting to be thoughtful,

and careful, and deliberate and not rushing, but we are cutting program every single month that we refuse to move this forward. Every single month we are cutting program, because the cost is escalating and our ability to pay is lessening. So let us understand that. It is easy to say you know we absolutely want it perfect. There is no perfect. We have the potential for an entrance on Walnut, well more than a potential. This building is going to have an entrance on Walnut. There is one entrance on Walnut, there is the potential for traffic on Walnut coming from Elm, but the entrance is actually on Elm. There is another entrance, which is at the back of the building. Part of the condition that she presented to the Committee is to have more of a drop-off on Lowell. This is one of the things that she certainly wants to explore so that we would be spreading drop off out. Another condition that she presented was to cover the walkway off Hull so that more students would be encouraged to use that. We are attempting to spread this out around the site. Are we going to come up with something perfect – No. What she does know is that the community surrounding the school fought very hard to move this building toward the center of the site, because no one wanted the mass right next to their private homes, and the architects were very clever in responding to that. That was what was going to get the support of this community. Therefore, they put it in the center of the site. We certainly cannot put it on Lowell because there is a building there and we cannot tear it down until the new building is up. We looked at putting it on Walnut but then the people on Walnut are going to face a huge wall. By placing it were they placed it no abutters have a huge monolithic structure facing them. Now we are talking about stacking the gym, well they responded to us by saying that we are very concerned about the view from Hull. The first part of tonight's meeting was let us look at what the people on Hull are going to see. You stack that higher you make the whole thing a four-story structure and the neighbors are going to be looking at much more building. They designed it is so that the pieces closest to the neighbors were as low as possible. Does this building have many bells and whistles as proposed. Yes. I think that is what this community wants. If the cost comes in much higher than this community can afford, then the School Committee and the School Department will have no choice but to cut program. She would urge that the Board does not have them cut any more program because we are looking at October, November, December for site plan review. That to me would be irresponsible on our part. She thinks the Board look at the right time at cutting program, and she is quite sure it is going to need to be cut, but she does not want to do it at this point in time. Barring any other member wanting to speak on the resolution, she would like to take a vote on it. Ald. Mansfield, Yates, and Albright voted in favor and Ald. Schnipper, Gentile, Salvucci, Lappin, and Weisbuch were opposed to the resolution.

The Chair suggested that the Committee begin looking at the draft Board Order. She asked that the brick and glass be put in the order because there was some concerns that when we spoke about masonry that it could be concrete blocks. It is now very clear that the expectation is that this will be a brick building. Should this receive a vote tonight, she believes that plan numbers would have to be changed before it comes to the full Board. There is no question in Ald. Schnipper's mind that it is different from what design review sent to the Committee. Ouida Young stated that she would need to go through the plans with the architects to be sure that the exact plans the Committee is approving are the ones reflected. There might be some changes to them, but some of them might not change. The biggest change would be with the site plan itself

because right now the plans which are referenced here go to the original set that was filed and dated May 4 and that is neither 5A or 5B.

Ald. Albright asked if the floor plans that came along with this also changed during the course of the time that we have had it. Ms. Young responded that her expectation and what she suggested to the architect is that we use the ones that were at the table and being looked at in the most current set that have been evolving. For example on that 5,000 sq. feet, or whatever the right number is, we should reference the most current plans that are available and that have come to this table. She is not going to reference something that has not been looked at by the Board. Ald. Albright stated that the Committee has not looked at those plans. Ald. Schnipper stated that those plans were simply for the purpose of showing that the program fit in the building. The floor plans are evolving, all of that is changing.

Ms. Young stated that has been one of the areas of confusion in trying to make it clear since there is such a heightened level of concern. We will look to this Board Order and perhaps come away with an understanding about what is being controlled by this Board Order that is different from the Board's understanding of what 5-58 does. She tried to make that clear not so much for the education of the Board but for other people that might look at this Board Order by saying in condition one what is clearly obvious and what Ald. Schnipper and Salvucci have mentioned, is that those building floor plans and elevations are going to continue to be clarified as you proceed through design. These are schematics and the nature of the design work will be to modify both the interior floor plans and the elevations as it goes through. You are going to see how those plans evolve as it comes through. Ald. Albright asked that even though they are referenced here, it is only because of the footprint of the floors and not the inside of the floors. Ms. Young stated that it is necessary to understand that the program is going to fit within that building. One of the things that the Design Review Committee is required to do is to understand that the program objectives of the user have been satisfied by the architects site plan and floor plan. That is the primary purpose of seeing the floor plans at this stage, but they will be changed. They were for South, they had been for the Library, and they have been changed for every one of the buildings that have come through. Ald. Lappin stated that it states in the Board Order that the floor plans and elevations are subject to modification. Ald. Schnipper stated that they would come back before us before we vote the money. The Board will see them when they are close to finalized, well finalized before we start to make cuts because we cannot afford it.

Ald Yates asked about references to the City shall do certain things that seem to be design features in the Board Order. Ouida responded that it is somewhat stylistic and can be rephrased to talk about the design team, but we have in the past Board orders incurred the city. She can make it clear that it will be the design team that is doing that, however, some of it is not in the control of the design team. Ald. Yates stated that he saw the distinction and Ms. Young stated that she could clarify that to make it a specific obligation for some entities. She has in some instances talked about the Public Works Commissioner, so she can make that modification.

Ald. Schnipper stated that if we support either 5a or 5b that will be reflected. Ald. Mansfield stated that what he thought he heard Ms. Young saying goes back to the beginning of condition 1 on page 1, which says that the it shall be consistent with a set of plans. That is the

normal terminology that is used, but therefore as the plans develop in more detail they will change, but they should still be consistent with what we vote. Looking at the list of A through N, he expects that parts of all those plans have changed throughout the process, from the time we got them to what we have now and are considering for which we do not have a set of plans. The utility plan, for example, with the kind of drainage that we talked about here tonight is not on these plans. Now they are being incorporated and we want to make sure that they are incorporated. The grading plan that we have does not allow the kind of landscape that the landscape architect has presented with this. All that has to change and if this is voted out of committee, is the Board going to get those plans and see those plans before a Board vote. Ald Salvucci stated that he would not vote unless we do. Ald. Schnipper asked if before the full Board votes will there be an updated plan.

John Prokos stated that the Board and this Committee has two options. They can approve the original Design Review Committee plans with the understanding that they are going to go back to the Design Review Committee and they are going to review the updated changes that have come out of the almost 70 meetings with the schools and the teachers, and everyone else. The design team can incorporate all of that information into the drawings and go back to Design Review Committee, they will go through the design development, and then the project comes back to the Board for review and a vote. The second option is that the Board look at the changes that have happened in the intervening time since you first got these drawings and you approve those plans but you would be approving those plans before the Design Review Committee. Ald. Mansfield stated that if we go with the first option though then we are voting on something that we have heard in many pieces but never seen together in one place, and there is no record of what we have voted on. The plans that we have here are not what we voted on. If we have vote on these plans that is wrong, because that is not what we have been discussing for the past two months. Commissioner Parnell stated that you can addendumize these plans to reflect what is cut and that way it allows it still to go back to design review. You can essentially bubble those areas on the plan. Your talking about needing additional and then it is not a full set of plans, you can addendumize a set in which you saw the original, you are going to get a finalized set, but it is a little premature for us to piecemeal, it is going to be going back and forth. Ald. Salvucci stated that he is concerned about the materials and what is going to go on the interior of this building, because I have already witnessed some of the stuff in the building we just worked in. Commissioner Parnell stated that the plans would come back to the Board. We are not talking about the interior finishes right now; we are talking about the site right now. Ald. Salvucci stated the site period, not the interior, which has to come back to the Board for a vote. Commissioner Parnell stated that the Board would get a working set of drawings and a schedule.

Ald. Salvucci stated that if he votes this now he is not committing to it. Ms. Young stated that you are committed to the site plan and as to the general floor plan and layout, but in fact, those plans do not show a lot of the stuff you are asking about and they are not intended to. That is not the point of site plan approval. Ald. Salvucci stated that they are going to come back to us and show us the classrooms and the music rooms, as they did at Newton South. Ald Mansfield stated that these plans dated May 4, show a lot of detail, a lot of site plan detail, not the interior finishes, but site plan detail. A lot of that has changed and we have to have a revised set of plans or we have an extensive list of conditions that documents everything that is different

from this plan. Ald. Albright stated that she looked on the web for site plan approval and our criteria for site plan approval are hiding from the world. She was looking around and found Cambridge's site plan approval criteria and it talks about site construction and buildings, widening the road about the site, easements, access and parking and loading, grading and drainage, and all the things that you would expect, and those are the things that we should be voting on tonight. That is site plan approval. Ms. Young stated that those are in these plans. The Board has a grading plan and a plan that shows the roads. Ald. Albright asked if it included everything that we agreed to. Ms. Young reiterated that there are two ways to approach it. First of all, one of the things that you could get by the 14th is the actual site plan with the option that is approved, even if some of the other plans still need to be formally modified might not be ready, but the site plan itself, either 5B or 5A would in fact be available in the same kind of format that we have here. She does not know if the utility and grading plan and all the rest would necessarily be able to be available by the 14th. However, you can, as those on the Land Use Committee know, put in specific condition, directing that there be specific items that would be addressed, and some of this is to come out of the study, and have an expressed provision that those items be incorporated into the plan themselves.

John Prokos asked Ms. Young if we are approving these plans but referencing Option 5B as an amendment to those plans, so that the final drawings would have to be revised to reflect those changes. Ms. Young responded yes, if there is anything, the Committee is particularly wedded to in terms of a condition, like the trees on Hull Street, which could be expressly put in as a condition of the Board Order. Ald. Baker stated that the simplest thing to say is that you have these plans and say that with the exception of the modification if you adopt 5B and as Ms. Young indicated if you have any conditions that reflect further modifications, because you are not going to have a full set coming back. You will have the modification that is clear that relates to whatever access provision the committee votes for. He thinks you want to make it relatively simple to deal with on the Board floor. If somebody wants to make a substitution for instance, 5A for 5B, they would substitute that, but by taking what you have here and saying these plans as amended by the additional scheme and then having a condition for those other things that are going to come forward, then you have a fairly manageable product, rather than waiting for a completely done set. That way you can send it back to design review for the next round, for design development without getting to a completely different iteration of complexity.

Ald Salvucci stated that the Design Review Committee only picked the site, they had nothing to do with grading, they had nothing to do with the Landscape Plan, we had them, but they never discussed them. That has to go back to them for discussion now. Ms. Young responded that it will, but in fact, you can forward this set of plans as approved to the full Board of Aldermen. Ald. Salvucci stated that they never discussed it. Commissioner Parnell responded that they did review the plans. Ald. Salvucci stated that they reviewed it, but there was no discussion at the meeting. Ald. Albright stated that she was at the meeting where they stated that they never saw that stuff, and Commissioner Parnell said that we will get it prepared for the meeting, but they never looked at this stuff. Ald. Salvucci again repeated that they never discussed it. Ald. Yates asked then what did they send to us. Ald. Salvucci stated they sent the site plan. Ald. Lappin asked if we could just approve the site plan and not all these other ones if they have not looked at it. Ms. Young responded that you must approve the site plan and

schematic floor plans and elevations, and that is what has been sent to you by the Design Review Committee. They are going to be looking at them further as it goes through the design process. Ald. Lappin asked how do we approve something if they have not looked at it. Ms. Young stated that they have looked at it, not that they spent a great deal of time on the façade, which is another issue, but they did send the entire set of plans as they are required by ordinance to this Committee, as the approved site plan submittal. Ald Schnipper stated that they had to send those, but they are understanding was that they were going to be modified as we got to the next stages of design.

Ald. Lappin then asked why do we need to approve them. Ald. Mansfield stated so that it could go to the next stage. Ms. Young explained that it is because the ordinance requires that the Design Review Committee send forward a site plan and schematic floor plans and building elevations. It is what the ordinance says. Frankly, it is premature to be sending that through, but that is what the ordinance says. That is how it gets presented to you, but clearly, they have design development to go through.

Ald Yates stated that is specifically referenced in the draft Board Order that the building floor plans and elevations subsequent to modification as the plans are developed in the subsequent design and construction phases of the project. Pursuant to Section 44 whatever, the Design Review Committee shall make periodic reviews of the project during the various design phases. Ald. Salvucci asked what if they do not. It has been voted and already approved. Ms. Young wanted to make it clear that whatever comes out of here must be approved by the School Committee and by the Mayor as well and then it will go back for further approval to the Design Review Committee and then as that Committee makes those approvals it will come back to you as well. Ald Salvucci stated that he remembers, and he guesses that Ald. Mansfield and he were the only two here when the Library was built. They came back and discussed every floor and what was on it, the mechanicals and everything. The mechanical room for example, we had a lot of questions about that because it was on the third floor. Commissioner Parnell stated that that is what they are going to be coming back to do. Ald. Salvucci stated that if they are coming back then OK. The Board still has the power of the purse here. Ald. Albright asked if this was in the ordinance. Ald Schnipper, reading from the draft Board Order, noted that approval is conditioned to the Board of Aldermen, acting through its Public Facilities Committee, will receive regular updates on the status of this project including reports on the issues to be analyzed pursuant to the conditions contained in this Board Order.

Ald. Salvucci stated that he thinks it is wrong to put something down and say OK, I approve this when they did not even discuss it. Ouida reiterated that it is in the nature of the ordinance to send various plans. Ald. Salvucci stated that we have to do something with the ordinance. responded that that is something you might want to consider, but that is how the ordinance is worded. You send through very preliminary plans and a schematic and there is a lot of designing that has to go on before you get to the stage where you will have construction drawings. There is a lot of review, but you are right that it does not come back to this Board as a 5-58 site plan review. Ald. Salvucci stated that that was exactly his point. Ms. Young stated that the driving force here is the site plan, not the building elevations. Ald. Lappin asked then why have that in the ordinance. Ald. Salvucci stated that they do not have to come back here.

Ald. Schnipper stated that they then would not get \$100 million. Ald. Salvucci reiterated that they do not have to come back here after we vote for this. Ms. reiterated that your Board Order is making them come back. Ald. Salvucci stated that if it were not in there they would not have to come back. We need to put it in. Ald. Schnipper stated that the full plans are going to come before us, before we agree to vote the money. Ald. Albright responded that was way down the road. Ald. Schnipper said that we are going to have them come to us at stages along the way.

Ald. Baker stated that it is really important to keep in mind the basic policy here. We are asked to vote a site plan with associated documents that gives the baseline for the Design Review Committee and the architects to go to the next round. We have to turn around and trust the process that we have the professionals to do the job. They are going to come back and report to us. If there are going to be sore points about any of those designs, they are going to be sensitive to those, because ultimately they are going to reflect themselves in the funding decisions that are made. Therefore, the condition here that the Public Facilities Committee gets regular reports and updates is a really important part of the process of continued review. Let us not mistake our role here; our role here is at two points in this ordinance. One is the Site Plan Review ordinance, 5-58, which we are doing now and the second is to vote money. We are building in a condition to have further updates so that we can make sure that when we do vote the money, it is going to be voted with an understanding that this is a design that we can support. We are not going to vote for it if we do not think it is good. We cannot create a new vehicle beyond that without changing our ordinance, and it is a mistake to try to do that because we have professionals who work in stages. They do schematic designs, then design development, then construction documents. When they get to construction documents, then they come to us and say, this is what it is going to cost and we vote the money at that point. You will have the opportunity for further input.

Ald. Salvucci stated that he thinks the Committee should review and approve plans, not just receive updates. Ald. Lappin asked if that included plans A through N. Ald. Salvucci responded all the plans. Ald. Mansfield stated that he has two really contradictory questions. He has listening to the discussion and what concerns him is that when they come back for these updates and when they come back with these final set of plans and requests for funding. We need to have a memory and a documentation of what the Board voted in terms of site plan review. That is why he is pushing to get the details of all that we have been talking about for the last few months into some kind of documentation in plain form that we can refer to. First of all, he does not expect the vote of this Board, if there is a vote of this Board, on the site plan review to be unanimous. There is going to be some dissension. If there are issues that cause that dissention, that the Design Review Committee and the architects and the schools find that they can solve, as we go forward, if we have that set of documents that we voted, are we constrained not to change it. In other words, if there is some change that could be beneficial to the project that is identified later, can we undertake that change or if once we have voted site plan approval we have voted site plan approval of that site plan. Ms. Young responded that it would depend on the nature of the change; you may find that the change really is impossible to say fairly that you would be building it consistent with the approved site plan. Ms. Young stated that many aspects of this process, which are fundamentally political, and as things go forward and you fund money, if you come forward and say this is something different, you have to go through the site plan again, then that is a political issue that would be taken up between the Board and the

administration. She cannot give any other answer than that because there is a political reality that underpins the way 5-58 works and the ordinance very specifically says and allows the opportunity of coming back and amending that approved site plan. For example, the school suddenly reverses and is now a long school along Elm Road, I do not think anyone would say it is consistent with what you are approving or might approve tonight or the full Board might approve. You will find people who are genuinely expecting the site plan review process to come back to this board through the Design Review Committee and the Design Review Committee would look at that modified plan and send it back to this Board for amendment of the approved site plan. Ald. Mansfield asked if the Design Review Committee would be making the judgment and they would be making it on the basis of a site plan. Ms. Young thinks they have a very significant goal because it is under their oversight that the plan will go forward and be modified.

Ald. Lappin assumes that they will have another set of plans that reflect 5A or 5B, before it is voted but the Board will not have any of the grading plan or the drainage plan. She asked if those plans would be easily changeable. She would think on a project of this magnitude the Board would be more specific because we are that specific on sewer extensions. She would like to be sure what is voted on provides flexibility for changes. Ald. Schnipper responded that the sewer extension, when voted is the Board's last crack at it. Ald. Lappin felt that there needed to be language to specify that if the plans change the Board will eventually see them. She is not happy about voting on the grading plan that does not reflect the plan the Committee is voting. Ms. Young explained what Ald. Baker suggested that it be a condition that any plans that need to be modified to deal with the option of 5B site plan will occur and the Board Order can specifically address that. It is fairly easy, it was more a question of what Nick was talking about which is to do an annotated set of plans, which could include the discussions that have gone on and the representations that have gone on. In terms of things such as the landscaping, she is not sure that she heard that there has been any discussion of landscaping other than to talk about augmenting landscaping in various areas. The Board can have a condition to study that and come back

Ald. Baker made a suggestion that in condition 6, for example, "The city shall use best efforts to retain and protect existing trees along the north side of Hull Street and provide a landscape buffer for the adjacent residential properties..." the Committee could just add a phrase "...and will prepare a plan so indicating." into the condition. Ald. Lappin stated that the Committee could not possibly go through every change that has happened. She is happy to vote the plan if we have the new plan but the language has to be specific to say that we are not just approving this, we are approving this subject to reflecting the new plan. Commissioner Parnell pointed out that the Committee heard Sandy Brock talk about the drainage area on-site. The engineers may have an additional drainage area or another manhole, which is reflected on the plans. The Commissioner stated that based upon the board order, the Committee will go through the amended plans. Ald. Yates asked if specifically, condition 1, could you say "The building and site approved for Newton North High School shall be constructed in accordance with site plan 5B present by the Design Review Committee to the Board. The improvement shall be consistent with site plan approval set prepared by Gund Partnership.blah, blah, blah, and with the following conditions below....and you would also have to approve the language or subject to modification as the plans are developed. He thinks that says the basic vote is on a version of a site plan. There is all this other stuff that is sort of related to it, but can be changed as it is

developed. Ms. Young has the library board order and it was even less specific. Ald. Lappin stated that less specific might be better if it did not have all these specific plans. Ald. Salvucci asked if the design team came back during the library project. Ms. Young responded that they did come back but not through the 5-58 process. The board order directed the designers to look at specific issues and analyze them and that is the same sort of approach that was used for paragraph 3 of this board order, where there are specific items that need further study and the Board is clearly directing that further study be made. Paragraph 2 right now requires the reports to come back, but it can include a specific response to the areas you have called for in the study. The site plan itself could be available and referenced expressly with whatever option it is.

Ms. Young explained that the Committee would be approving with the caveat that, as was pointed out, the plans will continue evolving as you go forward and the issue is at what point does the next iteration become so changed from what was approved that you cannot say that it is consistent with what is on the plan.

The Chair moved to condition #2. There was a desire to change that condition to include seeing plans and not just updates, which would include updated plans. Ald. Weisbuch asked if the condition could include seeing updates in cost estimates, changes in the scope and changes in cost estimates. The Chair stated that the Board is not going to see cost estimates until the plans are done. Ald. Weisbuch pointed out that as they go forward they are basing their plans on cost estimates. Ald. Salvucci responded that until the final plan is made and the working drawings are in place, they do not know how much it is going to cost. Ald. Baker stated that the Committee did not overburden the process. There is a whole financial question that has to be sorted out as the process goes along. The Board needs to remember these folks are going to be doing a lot of work and it is important to make sure that they are allowed to concentrate on what they can do best. Ald. Baker felt that there is a limit to what the Committee is going to be able to do effectively. Ald. Mansfield pointed out that condition #3 addressed Ald. Weisbuch's request - "During the Design Development Phase, the City shall undertake a comparative design and financial analysis, etc." Ald. Baker stated that is different from each iteration to come through, It is one thing to say, look, we'd like to see you look at a field at grade versus a field that's sunk and what the cost implications are of doing that. It is a reasonable question, that is a design choice, but if you are saying you want to get the cost implications of every piece of the iteration, it seems that is a far bigger problem. You really just try to isolate one or two variables that you think at the committee level you would like to really understand. Ald. Mansfield felt the Committee should get regular plans and updates, because updates allow you to get different kinds of information.

Ald. Weisbuch asked for the design team to look at courtyard space, to determine if there can be a different design for a non-permeable courtyard space where children and teachers can learn and sit. Outside the cafeteria is paved and there are seating areas are located along the path. Any redesign of that area will come in the next stage of the development.

Ald. Albright requested an analysis of not only the first cost, but also the operating cost in the analysis of moving the mechanicals for heating and so forth in the building. It may be more expensive to do in the first place; it is cheaper in the long run, that kind of analysis. Not just installation but also operational. She also requested a condition that requests the issue of the heat generation and co-generation and the all the issues of what are the most efficient ways to do this and the cost of it in the short and the operating costs. The Chair believes that it is certainly

going to be before the Design Review Committee. Ald. Salvucci pointed out that the Board is going to see mechanicals. They are going to come back with a set of plans showing where the mechanicals are and you will get an estimated cost of the mechanicals.

Ald. Mansfield would like to add 3e, not only a drop off area because of what he reported before that the kids who are going to be dropped off on Lowell Avenue and that are going to walk to the entrance of the school doesn't work very well. He would like the design team to look at the drop off area and the vehicular access from Lowell Avenue, as any pressure than can be taken off Walnut Street is a plus.

Ald. Salvucci suggested that cars could come off Lowell Avenue onto Elm Street, as it is going to be wide enough. There is not going to be any parking during the day. He does not understand why cars cannot come in from Lowell. It is to eliminate any conflict between the buses and cars. Buses can pull out without other cars trying to get through; it simplifies the circulation for the buses. Ald. Baker suggested studying it. The design team felt that Elm Road is certainly wide enough; it is just the conflict between the two uses. Ald. Gentile stated that the studies have been done and is not sure what purpose will it serve to put in board order. You are only going to know what is going to happen there once the school is open. The road has been modified over the years to try and make it better. What more will anyone find out before the school opens. The design team has reviewed all the options with the city traffic engineer, the school department, transportation officials and their traffic consultant, they have gone through the different options and it was the consensus to keep Elm Road one way, buses only during the day, as it is the safest thing to do. Ald. Gentile stated that it is the people on Elm Road that are, in his opinion, most impacted no matter what we do and we don't seem to be too concerned about that, maybe because we don't hear from them so much, but they are getting the bulk of the impact from both the building and traffic. Ald. Gentile does not understand why we would want to try to send more traffic down Elm Road. That is one of the reasons they are only allowing buses in the morning because those folks expressed concern about having too much traffic all day and it is a legitimate concern. Ald. Gentile would like to add at the end of (d) where it talks about Elm Road, and limiting the width of the road to no greater than 30 feet. If we can do it and the traffic consultant is saying that it is more than enough then it will allow us to provide additional buffer for the houses along Elm Road. They may come back and say that for whatever reason they cannot do it, but he would at least think that we owe it to those folks to look at it. That was specifically requested in the presentation that was given to us by the neighborhood and it is a reasonable thing to do. Ald. Gentile is referring to the entire length of Elm Road, which means that in certain areas he is asking them to look into reducing it from 36 feet to 30 feet. If they come back and say that in certain areas it can be reduced to 30 feet and in other areas the 36 feet needs to be retained, we can have that discussion.

Ald. Mansfield stated that the issue that is pointed out by Ald. Gentile's request is the steepness of the stairs and so forth. There was a letter somewhere in the packets from a neighbor who pointed out that it doesn't meet ADA requirements, but that is because there is an alternative access and that is at the east end of the tennis courts. His suggestion is that we ask the design team to look at the alternative of having the drop-off area at that path rather than at the stairs, so that is the preferred path. It also takes it away from the intersection of Dexter and Hull.

Let us look at putting the drop off there.

Ald. Albright asked if there could be a condition about noise... a study of noise. If the mechanicals end up on the roof, what is the noise impact. She realizes that you can abate the noise and would like a study of the costs of abatement. The design team explained that there are mechanicals on the ground in an enclosure, not just the roof mechanicals.

Ald. Salvucci stated that any widening or shrinking of Elm Road has to come to the Board. Ald. Mansfield stated that the Public Works Commissioner was not just talking about the intersection of Hull and Walnut; he was talking about Walnut between Dexter and Mill Street, that whole stretch. They will remove the traffic island at Hull, but the Commissioner was talking about perhaps narrowing the roadway...he was talking about the whole corridor, not just that intersection, south as well. Ald. Mansfield thinks the condition should reference that corridor rather than just the intersection. Ald. Baker suggested language stating, "promote safety on Walnut Street between Dexter and Mill, including the intersection of Hull and Walnut Streets."

Ald. Yates would like to include something about looking at the only right in and only right out and if that would in fact obviate the need for a traffic light and if you could then do a pedestrian crossing further up. Ald. Schnipper suggested changing that and saying "whether or not a traffic signal would be needed if there were right only in and out policy for the ceremonial entrance." Ald. Salvucci why there was a problem with a left hand turn. Ald. Yates stated that if you are coming from the north you go right in, you come out and then you take a right and go back to the north. Ald. Lappin pointed out that the traffic consultant stated that there is more idling and more pollution to do force everyone to go around the site to get back north. Ald. Baker stated that one of the problems is not just the right turn out, it is the fact that you can only turn right in which means that if somebody is coming from the south, they have to go around through Newtonville. Ald. Yates stated that we are trying to reduce the impact on the people at this location and if people are, only coming from that direction it will go further and impact the rest of the city not on the people in this area.

Ald. Schnipper suggested that the design team include a study of the possibility of a pedestrian crossing further north on Walnut.

Ald. Mansfield had a technical point regarding that there are no street trees on Hull Street; it should say "the existing trees on the site". Ald. Schnipper reminded people that if we pass this, we are sending this to the full Board. It can be amended at the full board, it not the last shot. The issue before us is 5A versus 5B. Ald. Salvucci made a motion to support 5B, as amended, which carried 6-2. The Committee then voted on a motion of approval of the draft board order as amended, which carried 6-1-1.

Respectfully submitted,

Sydra Schnipper, Chairman