

**Town of Darien  
Tokeneke and Royle School Building Committee  
Regular Meeting  
Thursday, October 24, 2013**

**MINUTES**

Attendees: Deb Ritchie, Bruce Hill, Gwen Mogenson, Katie Stein, David Genovese and Mike Lynch (Darien Schools, Director of Facilities & Operations). Board of Education (BOE) Operations and Facilities sub-committee members Morgan Whittier, Jim Plutte, BOE Chair Betsy Hagerty-Ross.

Ms. Ritchie called the meeting to order at 9:33 AM. All members were present. The meeting was broadcast live by Channel 79.

Motion made and seconded to approve agenda for this meeting. All building committee members voted in favor.

Mr. Hill asked for a wording change on the 10/17 minutes to characterize the Tokeneke classroom design requirements as “flexible” rather than “modular” since “modular” could convey a particular construction style. Motion made and seconded to approve 10/17 minutes as amended. All building committee members voted in favor.

Building committee and BOE participants discussed the architectural conceptual presentations made by TSK and JCJ for both Tokeneke and Royle.

**Tokeneke School:** there was strong consensus that TSK, architects for the recent Tokeneke school construction project, was the logical choice for the Tokeneke addition. Plans are to construct four new classrooms, two of which will be used to relocate Royle ELP classrooms to centralize the program at Tokeneke.

The building committee informed the BOE that plans to provide ELP vehicle access from Tokeneke Road are being dropped since it is improbable that access from a state highway, can be accomplished and there is no desire to develop a circumference access road along the property perimeter as one TSK proposal offered. Access will continue to be walk in from the main school entrance. ELP drop off is ½ hour later and 1 hour earlier than the regular school day so no additional parking was planned.

**Royle School:** building committee members felt that TSK and JCJ, provided good proposals for Royle expansion. The original plan to relocate the kitchen to abut the existing common room was not deemed preferable by either firm.

- Kitchen construction is the most expensive element of school construction and there are no functional problems with the existing Royle kitchen.

- Relocating the kitchen to the northwest corner of the school would require a permanent service road to be constructed along the east side (Mansfield Avenue).

Both firms propose leaving the kitchen where it is and constructing a new classroom wing addition on the southeast side of the existing main building (corner towards intersection of Royle Road and Mansfield Avenue). Both proposals are staged to allow continued occupancy of school building and both include additional parking. JCJ also has a more comprehensive Option 3 that would expand the cafeteria and relocate the media center (library) to the Common Room location.

Mr. Whittier noted that the revised construction proposals for Royle should involve a review of expansion possibilities at Holmes school. He also noted that any construction raises parity issues among the 5 elementary schools.

Ms. Hagerty-Ross reminded the committee that their assignment relates only to Tokeneke and Royle and while Holmes concerns may impact decisions, the committee is not responsible for a review of the Holmes school property.

A discussion ensued as to whether the revised architectural proposals for Royle are within the approved Ed Specs or represent a significant expansion. It was agreed that razing the existing first grade wing falls within the Ed Specs. Cost savings from not relocating the kitchen will offset construction costs for a new wing so it was determined, at this time, it is not a significant expansion of the project proposal.

All participants agreed that the plan should be considered as two projects (Tokeneke and Royle) and that Tokeneke should be expedited as the Royle issues were resolved.

Mr. Lynch has edited existing RFPs (request for proposal) to request architectural fee proposals from TSK and JCJ for both Tokeneke and all three Royle options from JCJ and they will be sent shortly. Since architectural fees are generally a percentage of total project costs, the responses will provide a general idea of the cost differential among the various options. Mr. Hill had noted in a previous meeting that there is no advance payment required to request fee proposals.

A follow up meeting with the BOE Operations and Facilities sub-committee will be scheduled as soon as the architectural fee responses are received.

Motion to adjourn proposed and unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 AM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gwen Mogenson, Clerk