



Newton - Franklin School

Meeting Date:	February 14, 2024, at 6:00 PM	Design Review Committee Meeting
Prepared by:	Amanda Sawyer – CHA	Zoom Conference Call

School Building Committee Members	Design Review Committee Members
<input type="checkbox"/> Jonathan Yeo <input type="checkbox"/> Mark Chitty <input type="checkbox"/> Ayesha Farag <input type="checkbox"/> Maureen Lemieux <input type="checkbox"/> Anping Shen <input type="checkbox"/> Paul Levy <input type="checkbox"/> Liam Hurley <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Julia Malakie <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Wright <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aaron Goldman <input type="checkbox"/> Jessica Allen	<input type="checkbox"/> Peter Barrer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ellen Light <input type="checkbox"/> Ambrose Donovan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Gillespie <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Gloria <input type="checkbox"/> Robert Hnasko <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jonathan Kantar <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SingNing Kuo <input type="checkbox"/> Amy Mackrell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Schein <input type="checkbox"/> Steve Siegel
DRC City Council & School Committee Member Reps.	DRC Project Community Reps- Franklin School
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emily Prenner <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrea Kelley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Baccari <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Halle
DRC Committee Staff	General Public
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joshua Morse <input type="checkbox"/> Barney Heath <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alex Valcarce <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephanie Gilman <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jini Fairley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geoffrey Keenan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monique Airasian <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rick Sheiber <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phil Grgurich
CHA – Owner’s Project Manager	
<input type="checkbox"/> Tom Gatzunis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amanda Sawyer <input type="checkbox"/> Aditya Modi	
HMFH Architects and consultants	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James Liebman <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Melissa Greene	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lori Cowles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jake Picariello <input type="checkbox"/> Josh Burgel- Lemon Brooke	
--	--

Item	Description:	Action
1	Call or Order: 6:03	Record
2	<p>General Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M. Greene reviewed specific concerns and suggestions HMFH has heard through Working Group meetings and DRC meetings and discusses how those elements have been incorporated into the design. • M. Greene discussed the design process of starting with studying the massing of the building, then moving to the elevations, then exploring materials. The site will be focused on more in depth at the next meeting. • M. Greene discussed the project statistics including student enrollment, square footage, window to wall ratio, EUI (Net-zero ready), mechanical systems, and zero combustion/all electric status. 	Record
3	<p>Exterior Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Greene explained HMFH simplified the massing in plan by adjusting overall alignments and building access/circulation. ○ M. Greene discussed the addition of a service corridor located between the kitchen and gym. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was suggested this could provide separation between voters and general school population. ○ M. Greene identified primary vs. secondary entry access points in the plan. • Elevations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Greene discussed the massing options that were reviewed with the Working Group focusing on stair tower, main entry, music, library, and reading/art volumes. ○ M. Greene explains the design focus of defining a welcoming main entry among the massing. ○ M. Greene discussed the elevation studies related to window arrangement and materiality. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Option A – shifting some windows lower and using patterned/glazed brick as a vertical element at those lower windows. Projected volumes would be rain screen and stair tower glazed/brick pattern. 	Record



- Option B – windows remain aligned, with patterned/glazed brick between windows. Typical brick as the field material and stair tower would be expressed as a special moment with patterned/glazed brick.
 - Option C – windows arranged in a playful wave pattern with gradient glazed/patterned brick beginning one story high and fading as it moves up the façade.
 - M. Greene stated the Working Group prefers the simplified window pattern.
- Materials
 - M. Greene reviewed Exterior Envelope Materials Palette.
 - M. Greene discussed brick patterns and relationship to windows.
 - Using material to create interest, shadow pattern and provide texture to the elevations.
 - M. Greene discussed Rainscreen material options.
 - Metal rainscreen material offer possibilities with projections, rotation, shapes, graphics and color.
 - Phenolic can have a wood look or other color options, it is durable and colorfast.
 - M. Greene reviewed Elevation Options showing various options using the materials.
- M. Halle commented about the “surprise and delight” aspects of the overall design, and “story telling” through design, which he appreciated. He asked about sustainability and longevity of materials.
 - M. Greene responded that the materials being proposed are durable and HMFH is considering longevity when selecting the materials (50 year building).
- D. Gillespe commented that the rainscreen elements are visually strong and that the window patterns should relate to the interior function. He felt that there is “one too many elements” happening on the façade, he suggested incorporating the stair tower material with one of the other facade treatments.
- T. Gloria likes the themes across the building and the attention to the sensitivities of the massing. He stated he likes the three material distinctions being shown. He asked about the rainscreens, phenolic vs metal embodied carbon comparisons and cost.
 - M. Greene replied that phenolic can be more costly but that the design team is looking at using it sparingly as accents. She continued that she did not have the data points on embodied carbon, but that metals typically have more embodied carbon. M. Greene added that phenolic wood pattern may be more appropriate choice for the neighborhood.
- J. Kantar favors lighter material at stair tower and suggested not making it a focal point. He asked if there will be enough natural light in the stair tower.
 - M. Greene replied that there will be plenty of light in the tower. HMFH uses creative design strategies to reflect light in spaces.
- S. Kou stated she likes overall direction. She would like to see more studies with the stair tower color/material to blend into the façade, it currently stands out and looks singular to the rest of the design.
 - M. Greene explained that there are similar elements on the other elevations that are not being shown to tie the design together.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.Kou likes the large corner windows but is concerned about glare and solar heat gain in the spaces. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Greene discussed studying sun shading to reduce glare and explained the type of window will reduce heat inside the building. • J. Baccari likes the material suggestions and stair tower as a design element. She stated the tower feels reminiscent of the cupola on the existing building and does not think there are “too many” design elements on the façade and likes the whimsical feel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Greene stated the stair tower creates a civic presence. 	
4	<p>Updated Site and Floor Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Greene reviewed the site plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The approach to the main entry and gently sloping walk to the building was discussed, as well as play zone at the front of the building. ▪ Pedestrian and bicycle access off Cherry St. was pointed out along with bike parking areas throughout the site. ▪ Fire Dept access was discussed and identified. ▪ Rain gardens and bioswales were identified. ▪ Bus loop was compressed slightly from previous iterations. ▪ West side parking for Special Ed., teachers and secondary access through the cafeteria was discussed, as well as access to the gym for voting. ○ J. Morse added that the generator location is being studied. • E. Light asked if the current school will be occupied during construction and how close can the two buildings be? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J. Morse responded that the City is working with the school to determine the best course of action related to occupying the site during construction. ○ L. Cowles stated HMFH has had projects that are within four feet of another building during construction. The more complicated piece is demolishing the old building while protecting the new building. • G. Keenan expressed concerns about students being distracted and disrupted during construction activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J. Morse stated the team will consider all pros/cons related to this concern. • Floor Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Greene reviewed the floors plans discussing access points, circulation and flow throughout the building and classroom arrangements. ○ M. Greene reviewed sections through the building as various points showing relationships to the site and abutter’s properties. 	Record
5	<p>Interior Views</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interior renderings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Greene shared interior views pointing out various design elements within the spaces. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Materiality and motifs from exterior to interior are repeated. ▪ Creating moments of whimsy throughout the building. ▪ House shape motif defining classroom entrances. 	Record



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T. Gloria asked about the cafeteria rendering with glass wall to the parking lot and how this relates to the long interior service hall/entry. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Greene explained the vision is that the secondary entry into the cafeteria will be used for teachers. ○ J. Liebman clarified that students, general public, and guests will enter the building using the main entrance. Teachers and students arriving by school van will use secondary entrance. Emergency personnel and voters would use service entrance. ○ A. Valcarce added that after school program would likely use secondary entrance. Gym rentals access will be discussed. • D. Gillespie asked if Mass Timber has been considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J. Liebman replied that it has been considered for certain elements of the building and will be explored further. • J. Kantar stated he is not sold on the glass wall in the cafeteria facing the parking lot. He questioned the secondary and service entrances during performances and suggested the service entrance be enlarged. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Valcarce explained that the main entrance would be used for performances and events in the cafeteria and gym. ○ M. Greene stated the Lobby is large enough to accommodate egress from cafeteria or gym events. ○ E. Light shares J. Kantar's concerns • J. Malakie asked what prevents cars from driving through the glass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Valcarce responded there would be wheel stops or bollards. 	
6	Adjourn Franklin School: 7:37pm	Record

Meeting Minutes prepared by CHA shall be deemed accurate as the record of matters discussed. Please provide corrections to CHA within three days of distribution.



