

March 20, 2016

Nicole Lafond

[nlafond@news-gazette.com](mailto:nlafond@news-gazette.com)

RE: TIER 2 MEETING: SITE FIT PRESENTATION

Nicole,

I am responding to your request to review the five options for the Central site and the Interstate site that were presented at the Tier 2 meeting on March 17 regarding my opinion as to the pros and cons.

I was at the facilities meeting and was impressed with the presentation and the options presented.

Two items stood out to me:

The architect's approach in several options was selective demolition of parts of the existing Central building, preserving the good and replacing 55,000sf of outdated space with a 3 story 150,000sf addition. This keeps the entire campus very compact.

Secondly, several options propose a field house at the current Central site. The field house would provide additional desired options for PE, band, and athletic uses such as practice fields in a year around all weather environment. Also, in a phased building plan it would have the added advantage of providing temporary classroom space during construction and renovation of the building.

Nicole, I know that the fate of the Burnham house is a concern for some. Almost all of the options could be tweaked to preserve the house.

Attached are some pros and cons as I see them for the six options.

### **Interstate Site**

#### **Pro**

- Clear open site.
- All recreation amenities are onsite.
- New construction usually does not incur the problems associated with remodeling.

#### **Con**

- High offsite development costs for streets and utilities.
- Urban sprawl
- High ongoing operational costs for transportation.

### **Option 1: Central Site - Selective Demolition**

### Pro

- Selected demolition (55,500sf) is replaced with 150,000sf of new construction.
- A major portion of school building asset is retained.
- The design retains Park Street as major entrance and drop off without increasing congestion to University Avenue.
- Compact and efficient site is maintained.
- An additional 100 surface parking spaces are added.
- Outdoor PE/ Athletic support spaces added.

### Con

- The selective demolition of the school may require temporary relocation of programs, staff, and students.

## **Option 2: Central Site – Selective Demolition + Remote Field House**

### Pro

- Selected demolition (55,500sf) is replaced with 150,000sf of new construction.
- A major portion of school building asset is retained.
- The design retains Park Street as major entrance and drop off without increasing congestion to University Avenue.
- Compact and efficient site is maintained.
- An additional 139 surface parking spaces are added.
- Outdoor PE/ Athletic support spaces added (less than added in Option 1)
- Remote Field house added providing additional all weather program space.
- Field house can be considered as a future option.
- Field house could have structured parking below (100 spaces)
- If phased, Field house can be used as temporary relocation for students and programs as new school addition is constructed.

### Con

- Field house is remotely located and not as convenient to school.
- Remote location of field house may require signals at Church Street crossing.

## **Option 3: Central Site: - Selective Demolition + Adjacent Field House**

### Pro

- Selected demolition (55,500sf) is replaced with 150,000sf of new construction.
- A major portion of school building asset is retained.
- The design retains Park Street as major entrance and drop off without increasing congestion to University Avenue.
- Compact and efficient site is maintained.
- An additional 204 surface parking spaces are added.
- Outdoor PE/ Athletic support spaces added (less than in Option 1)
- Adjacent Field house added providing convenient and additional all weather program space.
- Field house can be considered as a future option.
- Field house could have structured parking below (100 spaces)

- If phased, Field house can be used as temporary relocation for students and programs as new school addition is constructed.

**Con**

- The Park Street entrance and drop off route is more complicated than Option 3.

**Option 4: McKinley Site-New School Construction**

**Pro**

- New construction usually does not incur the problems associated with remodeling.
- New school could have structured parking below.
- Students and programs can be relocated to new school before any demolition occurs at the existing Central High School building.
- An additional 134 surface parking spaces are added.

**Con**

- The demolition of the historically significant Central High School building would be a loss to the community.
- It is unclear as to how drop off would work and what conflicts may be created on the adjacent streets.

**Option 5: McKinley Site: New School Construction + Remote Field House**

**Pro**

- New construction usually does not incur the problems associated with remodeling.
- New school could have structured parking below.
- Students and programs can be relocated to new school before any demolition occurs at the existing Central high School building.
- Parking is increased with a multistory parking structure.

**Con**

- The demolition of the historically significant Central High School building would be a loss to the Community.
- It is unclear as to how drop off would work and what conflicts may be created on the adjacent streets.

Hope this is helpful. Call me if you have questions.

Neil