

1. Call to Order & Seating of Members

The Chester Library Building Committee held its regular meeting on Wednesday, September 2, 2015, at the Chester Town Hall, 203 Middlesex Avenue, Chester, CT. In attendance and seated were Denny Tovey, Terry Schreiber, Doreen Joslow, Lois Nadel, Chuck Mueller, Steven Tiezzi, Bob Gorman, Ed Meehan, Pat Holloway and Peter Harding. Chairman Tovey called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion by Holloway, second by Nadel, to approve the June 24, 2015 Minutes as written. Much discussion followed regarding inaccuracies in the minutes. It was decided to table the motion to approve to the next meeting.

3. Presentation from Architect

Chairman Tovey noted there were a few people in the audience this evening. The architects would be doing a presentation. Comments and questions would be welcome, but if a committee member makes a motion, that will have to be acted on accordingly.

Chairman Tovey noted Drayton Fair, Kathy Bartels and Mallory Demty were present from LLB and will present what they have been working on for the last 2 months.

Kathy Bartels noted it had been agreed there was a buildable area we thought most viable on the site for the Library. This area was bounded by the Trolley tracks and held back a bit from the street. This was what had been discussed and agreed upon at the last meeting. Chuck Mueller noted he would not have excluded the buildable area further to the north. It was Chuck's understanding that was one of the options to continue to look at.

Kathy Bartels reviewed various aspects such as the buildings, streets, parking area, trolley tracks as a nature trail and another loop and green space. Drayton Fair noted the site plan basically hasn't been changed at all. Approval was received at the last meeting to the basic concept of parking. Once there is a building design, Mike Cegan will redesign the parking to work.

Kathy Bartels noted they looked at the street frontages and alignments. The alignment of the building was potentially an influence on the building form. She also noted the nature trail (trolley track) was a feature of the Library. It had also been noted

the view coming in from Main Street was very important. She noted the Park views are an important feature that could be taken advantage of in terms of it being a part of North Quarter Park.

Kathy noted there had been discussion regarding solar panels and other types of ways to be sustainable. Things to be considered are the east/west access, prevailing summer and winter winds, the occasional nor'easter, etc.

Kathy next reviewed 3 aerial view of the site - process development 1, process development 2 and process development 3 - which took advantage of certain aspects of the architecture. Ed Meehan asked if these could be shown on an existing site plan for the Park. He pointed out this does not show the spatial impact of the building on the Park. He also asked how much space this takes up going into the Park. Ed suggested everyone visit the site.

Steven Tiezzi noted this is a 6,000, 7,000 or 8,000 square foot building and it will change what is out there. Everyone has agreed it would be a one story building so the footprint will be 6000 to 8000 square feet.

Drayton Fair noted the program had been based on 8,000 square feet and we are approximately 7,800 in this plan as a one story building. This is a completely new floor plan from what was looked at before. Drayton noted there were a couple of different layout options. One would enter the building from the center of the bend. There would be a welcoming presence as one approaches the building from the parking or drive. He reviewed the following areas - circulation desk, staff work area, director's office, the Friend's room, program room, public toilets, children's room, security point for after hours, the young adults area, computers, study tables, fiction/nonfiction seating area overlooking the Park. He also noted the location of the 2 Park restrooms.

Drayton reviewed Library Layout 2 and differences from Layout 1.

Drayton reviewed differences in Library Layout 3. He noted the Children's room had been brought to the front. He also noted there had been talk about flipping the Program room and Children's room.

Drayton noted these were developments of the site and direction taken based on the 2A/3 Hybrid connecting the building to the community and

an organizing element being the trolley trail. He further noted this isn't carved in stone. The Committee is just seeing this for the first time and they welcome any feedback.

Ed Meehan asked if there was a way to access the community room from the outside without coming in thru the main entrance. Drayton replied yes but access is still needed to the toilets. He reviewed the security point.

Kathy Bartels noted in previous discussions there was talk about the front space being a garden area with perhaps an amphitheater. Drayton suggested French doors and that the space between the building and the street is a great place for an amphitheater/garden area.

There was a question regarding supervision of the Children's room. Is the Librarian or staff person in there when its open or just visibility to look in? Linda Fox replied probably visibility but ideally it would be a staff person. It was noted the Children's room probably should not be down at the end.

The 2 Park bathrooms were discussed. Do we really need 2? Could they be located in the Parks Recreation Building being proposed? Drayton noted he would research the number but it was his assumption there should be a mens and womens.

Dimensions of the building were reviewed. Doreen Joslow noted there is a beautiful site line along the line of the trolley line of the Catholic Church Steeple. Steven noted the angle of the building is somewhat forced by a preconceived idea of a trolley trail which could have some flexibility of where it goes.

Kathy Bartels reviewed the exterior views. The first one had a heavy timber frame with wood siding, wood ceiling and large overhang. She noted the entry would be recessed to be under cover. There would be a glass facade, big window, sun screening on the upper level, etc. She felt in terms of the site, the building could be moved around. The square footage was good and had the program elements needed. There could now be discussion about the elements and how they go on the site. The presence on Main Street and relationship to the Park have been addressed.

The height of the building was discussed. Kathy noted it looked

proportionally right for the scale and was tall enough to have a presence towards Main Street. There needs to be a good pitch on the roof, not flat.

Chairman Tovey asked if there would be exposed duct work due to all the glass. Drayton replied yes in places. He reiterated this plan was very conceptual.

Ed Meehan noted he understood the floor plan but asked how the building fits on the corner of Main Street coming into Chester. He didn't see this as a New England building. He understood the function requirements internally but didn't see that building fitting in North Quarter Park in Chester.

Chairman Tovey noted that by going to a one story building, a lot of space will be disturbed.

Steven Tiezzi noted he was always nervous about a one story building and having to look down at a roof from the street. He was impressed by the solution which creates a light and airy building, but there is still a lot to be done to make it work. He was excited by the imagery, however, the bend in the building seems a little forced. Drayton reviewed the bend in the building, the alignment with the street and the trolley track. It was noted the bend has an advantage in that it doesn't make it look so massive. This would enhance the neighborhood.

Chuck Mueller noted there had been discussion that if the building would be in the Park and not on the street, it could be a Park Building or Pavilion as opposed to a street building. He applauded the basic gestures, shapes and approach.

It was noted there had been a concern about drainage.

There was discussion regarding the entrance.

There was discussion about having a building totally not like any other building in Chester. Do we really want this?

Steven noted the word that keeps coming up in Chester is eclectic. There isn't any one particular style that has been built up over the years. Every generation has done their own thing. The Town was not made historic. Chester is built of many different styles, forms,

masses, etc. Its' Chester.

Kathy Bartels noted its good to talk about the various aspects. They didn't see this as shocking. Perhaps there is a lot of glass or the roof forms need work. They are open to anything. There was discussion regarding the wood ceiling, types of materials, maybe relocate the public bathrooms across the trolley tracks.

Chuck noted one thing in these images that gives it an appearance of more contemporary is the color or tone of the wood. Imagine it warmer and that would change the character a lot. Discussion ensued regarding look, shape and color of the building. Some felt the outside does not give a feeling of a warm inviting space similar to the inside floor plan. There was a question about the amount of glass and whether that would effect the heating of the building.

Chairman Tovey asked what the next step was in this process. Members gave their various thoughts on what was presented and what they would like to see changed. Drayton explained what drives the design is what was submitted to the State for the Grant.

Chuck noted after reviewing this, he has gone from seeing it as "dumb and simple" to "attractive."

Steven noted Doreen brought up a good point that by breaking this up a little, it helps the building create outdoor spaces.

Drayton noted they tried to make this as efficient and compact as possible because they have heard during the process to make it tight and smaller.

There was a suggestion to take the bathrooms out and use that space for the lobby. There was further discussion regarding the amount of glass. Was less glass considered? Drayton noted this is a very preliminary concept and hearing these suggestions are great to develop this more. It was suggested the Program room be a little dark in order to be able to show slides, etc. There was discussion about flipping the Program room.

Drayton noted what he was hearing was that the Committee would like to see more development of this plan.

Ed Meehan mentioned the issue of the wing look, color changes or

breaking up the walls a little to soften it, connection to the Park, etc. All these things should be put on a site plan.

Motion was made by Joslow, seconded by Schreiber, to further develop this plan. Discussion followed. Steven noted there were 3 issues as he saw it - exterior imagery, bent bar scheme and the way it sits on the site. Doreen noted she would like to see it as close to the street as possible. Ed noted he would like to see it follow the concept of the Main Street Master Plan as close to the street as possible given grading constraints and connecting the south end of the building with some sort of a landscape feature (garden or seating area). It was agreed this needs to be seen on a site plan. Ed asked if options could be done on how it sits closer to the street and relationship to the residential property to the west. Chuck also mentioned the tree element. It was again suggested a site walk should be done.

Chairman Tovey called for a vote on the above motion to further develop this plan given all the comments. Unanimously Approved.

The meeting schedule was discussed. Chairman Tovey noted he would get back to Drayton on the schedule, but it was felt a special meeting would be needed in 2 or 3 weeks prior to the next regular meeting in October.

With regard to Fund Raising, it was noted the Fund Raising Committee has been working on a couple of things and also wondering about the schedule and timing of a referendum.

4. New Business - none.

5. Audience of Citizens - none.

6. Adjournment

**Motion by Nadel, second by Gorman, to adjourn at 8:50 PM.
Unanimously Approved.**

Respectfully submitted,



Judith R. Brown, Recording Secretary