

**Tisbury School Building Committee 2019-2021
in Joint Meeting with
Tisbury Historical Commission/Williams Street Historic District
Commission
4:30PM, Wednesday, January 6, 2021
by Zoom Cloud Conference due to Covid-19 Restrictions**

1

TSBC Members Present: Chair Harold Chapdelaine, John Custer,
Sean DeBettencourt, Peter Gearhart, Rita Jeffers,
Reade Milne*, Rachel Orr*, Jim Rogers, Michael Watts

WSHC Members Present: Co-Chairs Harold Chapdelaine/Dana Hodson,
John Bacheller, Judy Federowicz, Greg Milne,
Christine Redfield, Craig Whitaker,

Others: Bob Crane, Lou Eimovich, Melinda Loberg, Nancy Weaver,
Recorder – Marni Lipke,
Daedalus Projects – Richard Marks, Christina Opper,
Amanda Sawyer,

MVPS: Tappé Architects – Chris Blessen,
Nevette Previd, Melissa Ogden, Nancy Dugan,

Town: Select Board – Jeff Kristal, FinCom – Sarah York,

* TSBC members late arrivals or early departures.

1. Call To Order & Virtual Meeting Reminders

- The Tisbury School Building Committee 2019-2021 (TSBC) meeting was called to order at 5:36PM.
- The Tisbury/Williams Street Historic Commission (THC/WSHC) was called to order at 5:36PM.

- (*Recorder's note: Discussions are summarized and grouped for clarity and brevity.*)

- In keeping with transparency in government, TSBC Chair and WSHC Co-Chair Harold Chapdelaine declared his dual role, and with the consensus of all present, continued to facilitate the meeting. He reviewed the protocol for remote meetings occasioned by the pandemic. All participants were welcome. In order to facilitate the technology he asked that:

- microphones be muted to reduce background noise,
- participants raise hands either by Zoom option or on video;
- non-TSBC members turn off their video to preserve bandwidth.

The meeting was being recorded for posting, along with all background documents, on the Project website <http://www.tisbury-school-project.com>. Written WSHC minutes would be available by contacting stonebridgeone@comcast.net.

2. Tisbury School Building Committee (TSBC) Attendance - was called, as was THC/WSHC attendance.

5. Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair Within 48 Hours of the Meeting

* During this discussion Ms. Rachel Orr entered the meeting at 4:47PM.

Tisbury School Building Committee 2019-2021
January 6, 2021

2

Mr. Chapdelaine formally requested a Finance Committee (FinCom) Reserve Fund draw from the Board of Selectmen for a variety of voter education measures—somewhat restricted by the Covid-19 pandemic (see Minutes: 11/18/20 p.2 #5, & 12/14/20 p.4). As the TSBC had no budget or account, Select Board member Mr. Jim Rogers asked that the motion be restricted to asking for funds to allow the Select Board latitude in determining source(s) and mechanisms.

• ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. MICHAEL WATTS AND SECONDED BY MS. READE MILNE THE TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE UNANIMOUSLY AUTHORIZED THE CHAIR TO SEEK \$25,000 IN TISBURY SCHOOL PROJECT VOTER EDUCATION FUNDING FROM THE SELECT BOARD; 9 AYES, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSTENTIONS: PRIN. JOHN CUSTER—AYE, MR. SEAN DEBETTENCOURT—AYE, MR. PETER GEARHART—AYE, MS. RITA JEFFERS, MS. MILNE—AYE, MS. RACHEL ORR—AYE, MR. ROGERS—AYE, MR. WATTS—AYE, MR. CHAPDELAINÉ—AYE.

* Ms. Milne apologized and left the meeting at 4:49PM to attend another meeting.

3. Presentation of the Approved Schematic Design for Tisbury Historical Commission Consideration and Comment (See documents on file.)

(Note: As the Chair of the THC/WSHC, Harold Chapdelaine would not vote on any action initiated or taken by the WSHC or THC.)

Mr. Chapdelaine introduced the design/Owners Project Manager (OPM) team: Mr. Chris Blessen of Tappé Architects, and Mr. Richard Marks, Ms. Christina Opper, and Ms. Amanda Sawyer of Daedalus Projects. The new design was superimposed on the existing building noting and marking the 1929 original school and subsequent additions—of which only the 1929 original and 1993 addition (coincidentally designed by Tappé) would remain. The plans were reviewed emphasizing a number of features.

• The School was on a topographically challenging site. The proposed building used space from the “White House” on the west side to the parking lot stairs on the east side—preserving all current play areas and parking.

• A major component was to drop the gym to the level of the parking lot, essentially creating an additional floor, and allowing American Disabilities Act (ADA) access to the community use portion of the building. After hours this portion could be separated/locked off from the rest of the school for community events. This level also included music rooms.

• The gym/music rooms height extended to the next or first floor. This level housed the kitchen/cafeteria, close to a loading/delivery dock—also near vocational classrooms needing heavy equipment.

- A one story administrative and Project Headway wing at this level was adjacent to the new, secure and ADA accessible entrance/exits.

• The interior was redesigned to improve the traffic flow within the building, which was a major concern of all staff. For example the side stairs were removed to provide programmatic space, with a central staircase/elevator at the original West Williams St. entrance—also preserving entrance functionality.

Tisbury School Building Committee 2019-2021
January 6, 2021

3

- The elevations focused on massing rather than exact depiction of materials. The additions were designed to frame and be subordinate to the 1929 building, while tying the parts together as gracefully as possible. A glass tower on the east side increased interior light and mirrored the existing west side glass tower.
- Windows would be replaced with the original design but better glazing systems to enhance the sustainable/net zero energy goal.
- The north (or Spring St.) elevation accommodated the gym, cafeteria, arts and administration as compactly as possible with a light touch, so as not to overwhelm existing architecture.
- Interior sections would show off the brick (not covered with drywall) to emphasize historic sections.

THC/WSHC Commissioners then expressed their comments.

- The Commissioners commended the work and acknowledged the design solved a number of challenges and honored the historic school, particularly noting the solutions to non-parallel streets, the interior design, and the preservation of play areas and parking.
- The cafeteria and other parts of the interior received direct or indirect daylight through roof monitors and clerestory windows.
- The roof would be solar ready. A space was available and could be considered for an outside classroom or roof garden—although not included in the current cost estimate.
- There was disagreement over exterior materials, some liking the varied brick of the 1993 addition, others feeling too much brick signaled an incarceration institutional aesthetic—which could be ameliorated with larger or more generous window patterns, or different exterior materials.
- There was general agreement that the new entrances were not architecturally clear or attractive. The West Williams St. entrance although functional could not be made ADA accessible. At this schematic design level entrance locations were established but were pictured as placeholders that could be amended.
- The community/gym entrance on the other side of the building was well designed and there were commendations for the clerestory light into the gym space.
- It was also agreed that the administrative/Project Headway wing was the least attractive part of the design—especially with its small windows and shed-type roof. Administration had to be adjacent to the entrance/exits but again as a placeholder the wing could be modified in the next design phase.
- Bricks and floorboards from the old gym could be saved and sold as a fundraisers.
- One comment proposed simplifying the play area site-work to allow more wide open spaces.
- The Commission was impressed with the current level of work and expected to have further input on the next design phase.
- *MR. CRAIG WHITAKER MOVED THAT A LOT OF GOOD WORK HAS BEEN DONE AND THAT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE ON ELEVATIONS, AND THAT BEFORE RENDERING A FINAL VERDICT THE COMMISSION WOULD LIKE TO LOOK AT THE PLANS DURING DESIGN DEVELOPMENT; MR. JOHN BACHELLER SECONDED;*

**Tisbury School Building Committee 2019-2021
January 6, 2021**

4

MOTION PASSED: 6 AYES, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSTENTION—due to conflict of interest; MR. BACHELLER—AYS, MS. JUDY FEDEROWICZ—AYE, MR. DANA HODSON—AYE, MR. GREG MILNE—AYE, MS. CHRISTINE REDFIELD—AYE, MR. WHITAKER—AYE, MR. CHAPDELAINE—ABSTAIN.

The TSBC thanked the Commissioners for the excellent feedback.

4. Public Comments - None

6. Adjournment

• ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. WATTS AND SECONDED BY PRIN. CUSTER THE TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING UNANIMOUSLY ADJOURNED AT 5:58PM: 8 AYES, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSTENTIONS: PRIN. CUSTER—AYE, MR. DEBETTENCOURT—AYE, MR. GEARHART—AYE, MS. JEFFERS, MS. ORR—AYE, MR. ROGERS—AYE, MR. WATTS—AYE, MR. CHAPDELAINE—AYE.

Appendix A: Meetings/Events:

• SB/TSC/TFC Financial Workshop – 6:30PM, Wednesday, January 13, 2020 – Zoom

Appendix B: Actions

Mr. Blessen:

- consider roof learning space/garden.
- amend new entrance design;
- redesign administration/Project Headway aesthetics.

TSBC:

- research saving bricks or floor boards from old gym for fundraiser.

Appendix C: Documents on File: Available at:

<http://www.tisbury.mvyp.org/> click on Tisbury School Project

(Official archive hard copies on file at Tisbury Town Hall & Tisbury School):

- Agenda 1/6/21
- Chapdelaine email re: TSBC Agenda for Jan 6 2021 12/31/20
- Chapdelaine email re: TNC/WSHDC Tisbury School Presentation (2 p.) 12/30/30
- Presentation (20 p.)
- Chapdelaine/Grande emails re: Tisbury School Building Committee (2 p.) 1/6/21

Minutes respectfully submitted by Office On Call/Marni Lipke.

Marni Lipke – Recorder

Date

Harold Chapdelaine – TSBC Chair

Date

Approved as amended by the TSBC 1/25/21