

CABOT SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE (CSBC) + DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)					MEETING MINUTES		
Cabot School, Newton							
May 21, 2015							
5:30 PM							
ATTENDEES:							
NAME	ASSOC.	VOTING	PRESENT	NAME	ASSOC.	VOTING	PRESENT
Margaret Albright	SC	✓	Y	Peter Barrer	DRC	✓	Y
Susan Albright	BOA	✓	Y	Arthur Cohen	DRC	✓	Y
Mary Lou DiBella	CSBC	✓	Y	William Eldredge	DRC	✓	N
Diana Fisher Gomberg	CSBC	✓	Y	Robert A. Franchi	DRC	✓	N
David Fleishman	CSBC	⊘	N	Tom Gloria	DRC	✓	Y
Ruthanne Fuller	BOA	✓	Y	James Freas	DRC	⊘	N
Sandra Guryan	NPS	✓	Y	Jonathan Kantar	DRC	✓	Y
Matt Hills	CSBC	⊘	Y	Andrea Kelley	DRC	✓	N
Maureen Lemieux	CSBC	⊘	Y	Ellen S. Light	DRC	✓	N
Joshua Morse	NPB	✓	Y	Marc Resnic	DRC	✓	Y
Emily Norton	BOA	✓	Y	Scott Ross	DRC	✓	N
Cynthia Paris Jeffries	CSBC	⊘	N	Steven Siegel	DRC	⊘	Y
Angela Pitter-Wright	CSBC	✓	Y	Eve Tapper	DRC	✓	N
Nicholas Read	CSBC	⊘	N	Deb Crossley	BOA	⊘	Y
Andrea Steenstrup	CSBC	✓	Y	Carol Chaftez	NPS	⊘	Y
Alex Valcarce	NPB	⊘	N	Jeffery Luxenberg	JLA	⊘	Y
Setti Warren	Mayor	⊘	N	Tom Murphy	JLA	⊘	Y
Karen Wasserman	CSBC	✓	Y	Kiersten Mailer	JLA	⊘	N
Dori Zaleznik	CSBC	✓	Y	Ken DiNisco	DDP	⊘	N
Michael Cronin	NPS	⊘	Y	Donna DiNisco	DDP	⊘	Y
Ouida Young	ACS	⊘	Y	Leno Filippi	DDP	⊘	Y
				Jeff Oxilida	DDP	⊘	Y
				Bob Derubeis	NPR	⊘	N
				Julie Kirrane	NPS	⊘	N

The meeting was called to order at 5:40PM.

1. Design Approach Review

- a. J. Morse, NPB began the meeting by reminding Committee members that the decision to be made at this meeting was to approve an Addition/Renovation approach or a New Construction approach to the building. The traffic and site issues would not be decided at this meeting.

- b. The project team noted that either approach met the project program and both were within the project budget of \$45 Million. Estimates show a cost differential between the two approaches, with the Addition/Renovation estimated to be approximately \$1M more, but some of that cost is anticipated to be offset by an increase in State reimbursement for an Add/Reno project. Potential schedule delays that may occur in the approval process for historic building considerations should a New approach be approved were discussed.

2. Public Comment

- a. A neighboring resident stated that they had been waiting for improvements to be made to Cabot for years. He favored the Addition/Renovation because of the historic context of the existing Cabot building, maintaining a part of the fabric of the neighborhood. The existing structure would favorably inform the new design in a way that a fully new design would not and preserving such structures is in the long-term interest of cities.
- b. A current parent of a Cabot student also noted that the community had been waiting a long time for a Cabot project and felt that the decision should be made based on the best building choice for the future. Looking forward to the 21st century her opinion was the new construction offered more flexibility on site and would work better.
- c. Another neighbor and former Cabot student thought that the existing building may be too difficult to upgrade and preferred new construction. She noted that the Humpty Dumpty figure should be preserved though.
- d. A neighbor and parent whose son just left the Cabot school noted that the parking should be further discussed.
- e. Another neighbor agreed that traffic and parking is a critical issue.

3. CSBC+DRC Comments

- a. A. Cohen, DRC Chair noted that the approval of Massachusetts Historical Commission may cause a delay which could have cost implications on a New Construction approach to the design. He noted that 7 of the 11 DRC members reported to him that they preferred the Addition/Renovation approach.
- b. S. Guryan noted that she had listened and participated in almost all of the meetings of the CSBC and believed that both options fully accommodated the school's program. She noted that the renovation would fully upgrade the existing structure and would essentially new and would be proud if Newton opted for an Addition/Renovation. For these reasons, and not just for the risk of a delay due to approvals for New Construction she would be voting for Addition/Renovation.
- c. S. Albright stated that the inside of the renovated structure would be completely new and contain all the same 21st century technologies as a new structure. She noted that the existing building has a certain grace that would add to the new addition and that the neighbors often referred to it as an iconic structure. She would vote for Addition/Renovation.
- d. D. Crosley stated that all systems would be new and that she appreciated that an older building could add to the texture and contrast of a new addition. She was confident in the work of the DRC and the design team in evaluating the cost differential between the two approaches and the risks involved in each.

- e. R. Fuller asked for clarification of a couple of issues and the project team responded that the discussions regarding the definition of renovation were correct and that off-site costs and underground improvement costs related to the project that were discussed were accommodated in the overall project budget. She stated that if not for the risk of an approval delay for new construction she would vote for new but with the uncertain approval process from the Mass Historic Commission and the understanding that program, budget and schedule goals could be met with the Addition/Renovation approach she preferred Add/Reno
- f. A. Wright noted that she was concerned that the project stay on budget and preferred New Construction
- g. M. DiBella indicated that the faculty sees both options as great but preferred New construction. However, she noted that she understood they were temporary stewards of the building and the risk of a delay with New Construction was concerning.
- h. M. Albright noted that the existing Cabot structure was a beautiful building and with the current issues encountered in Boston on the Dearborn School building she was concerned about the risk of a delay with a New Construction approach.
- i. E. Norton believed it would be a loss to see the old historic structure torn down, noting that everything that the students and staff experience will be new construction. She enthusiastically preferred Addition/Renovation.
- j. K. Wasserman did not feel that the existing building was of sufficient quality to maintain and did not believe the risk of a delay for New Construction would be an issue. She preferred a New Construction approach
- k. A. Steenstrup stated she preferred New Construction approach, feeling it offered greater flexibility in the design.
- l. D. Gomberg stated that she appreciated the efforts of the design team and commended the process. She preferred New Construction, feeling that it worked better on the site and looked better from the exterior. The gym location and courtyard were preferable in the New approach. She felt the small risk of MHC approval delay should be outweighed by the long term benefits of the New approach.
- m. D. Zaleznik liked that the two design approaches were very equal with no significant differences. She noted that Cabot was somewhat unique to Newton schools in its location within the neighborhood and preferred to save the historic structure.
- n. J. Morse noted that he was not a Newton resident and that he deferred to the public opinion.
- o. S. Segal noted that the fact that the program was met with both approaches was critical and that the preservation of the historic fabric was important
- p. M. Lemieux noted that she appreciated the value to the Addition/Renovation approach. She was originally in favor of New Construction but with the recent changes to the design she now favored Add/Reno. She noted that she was not a Newton resident but that the MHC approval process was a concern.

5. Preferred Design Approach

MOTION: R. Fuller moved to approve an Addition Renovation as the Preferred Schematic Approach for the project. D. Zaleznik seconded. The motion was approved 8 in favor, 5 against.

MOTION: S. Albright moved to authorize the project team to submit the Preferred Schematic Report to the MSBA based on the Addition/Renovation approach as the basis to move forward to the Schematic Design phase. The motion was seconded by R. Fuller. The vote was unanimous in favor (13-0-0)

4. Meeting Minute Approvals

- a. **MOTION:** M. Albright moved to approve the 5/7/2015 meeting minutes as submitted. M. DiBella seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor (13-0-0)
- b. **MOTION:** S. Albright moved to approve the minutes from this 5/21/2015 meeting pending the subsequent distribution to Committee members. J. Morse seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor. (13-0-0)

5. Other Business

R. Fuller suggested that the Design Review Committee write a letter to the Board of Alderman and School Committee regarding that committee's preference for the design approach for the project.

6. Meeting Adjournment

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 6:50. Votes were unanimous in approval (13-0-0)

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Murphy
Joslin, Lesser + Associates, Inc.

[End of 5/21/15 Meeting Minutes]