

**PENFIELD BUILDING COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, June 12, 2014 at 6:00 pm  
Board of Education Center  
2nd floor Conference Room  
501 Kings Highway, Fairfield, CT 06825  
[penfieldcommittee@town.fairfield.ct.us](mailto:penfieldcommittee@town.fairfield.ct.us)**

**Members Present:** James Bradley, Robert Bellitto, William Sapone, Ian Bass, Ken Jones, Jane Nelson, Ellery Plotkin, Richard Speciale via Skype

**Members Absent:** Andrew Graceffa

**Also Present:** Joseph Michelangelo, Public Works; Gerry Lombardo, Parks & Recreation; Judy Ewing, Selectman's Representative, Kevin Chamberlain, Ken Procino and members of the public

1. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 6:12 p.m.
2. Confirmation of Quorum – A quorum was confirmed.
3. Confirmation of Meeting Agenda – The committee confirmed the meeting agenda.
4. Approve Meeting Minutes – Ellery Plotkin moved to approve the May 13, 2014 Special meeting minutes, Ken Jones 2<sup>nd</sup>, and the motion passed.

Jane Nelson moved to approve the May 15 Special meeting minutes, Ellery Plotkin 2<sup>nd</sup>, and the motion passed.

Ellery Plotkin moved to approve the May 22 Regular meeting minutes, Robert Bellitto 2<sup>nd</sup>, and the motion passed

5. Organizational matters – None.
6. Review and approve glass removal and protection plan by construction manager - Shawmut submitted Action Item #2 to the committee for confirmation. The Action Item involved removing glass from the pavilion east side, storing the glass on-site for possible re-use, and replacing with plywood. The estimated cost was \$35,003. The work was tentatively approved by Mr. Bradley after polling the committee, as this was a safety item. It was agreed to proceed with the work to avoid any delay which could result in glass breakage. Mr. Michelangelo was satisfied with the scope of work and execution. After some discussion, Mr. Bellitto moved to approve Action Item #2 for glass removal and protection, Mr. Plotkin 2<sup>nd</sup>, and the motion passed unanimously.

There was a question raised on whether the additional protective fencing could be removed after the glass was preserved, to put more beachfront back in use. Mr. Procino agreed to check with the building department to see if it could be pushed back

7. Presentation and discussion of design recommendations for foundation and building repairs by the project engineer and construction manager –

Mr. Chamberlain reported that a test pit was excavated to verify conditions under the building, though the test pit could only be dug on the perimeter. The test pit showed a peat layer at elevation 5, similar to the other perimeter test borings. There was a discussion on the need to do test borings under the building. Mr. Chamberlain agreed to arrange for additional test borings to be taken under the building at a cost of about \$5K. After some discussion, the committee approved the testing with a request for the results to be presented at the next meeting on June 26.

Mr. Chamberlain then presented and discussed six options.

1. Repair the Pavilion to pre-storm Sandy condition;
2. Repair the Pavilion to pre-storm Sandy condition, with piling support added only where footings had failed;
3. Remove footings, install piles and reset the entire building at a higher elevation compliant with FEMA (approx. 3.5 ft. higher) with two sub options:
  - 3a. Raise the building vertically, work under the building, then lower into position; or,
  - 3b. Raise the building, move to the parking lot while piles are installed, then move the building back and set on the piles.
4. Install pilings in the parking lot and move the building back into the parking lot, set at the higher FEMA;
5. Only raise the center and west part of the building (Phase II portion) and leave the locker wing in place.
6. Demolish the center and west wing (Phase II portion), reconstruct as a smaller elevated pavilion, leaving the locker wing in place.
7. Demolish the locker wing and raise only the Phase II wing

An additional option was presented by the committee, designated as:

7a, demolish the phase II wing and reconfigure the locker wing as the sole pavilion space.

Mr. Chamberlain then advised the committee that he recommended either of options 3a or 3b. He believed that options 1 and 2 were not acceptable because he believes the building should be set on pilings. He then presented a plan view of the recommended option. Among the changes proposed was a reduced front deck area, and elimination of the ADA ramp along the locker wing. According to the proposed plan, the locker wing would have a floor at a different level from the Phase II parts of the building, requiring a step. There followed a discussion about these proposed changes. There was some concern about the loss of front decking and the ADA

ramp. Mr. Lombardo advised that the RTM had wanted more shaded deck space and that they had added the handicap ramp along the locker wing because it was needed to provide balanced handicap access to both sides of the beach. There was also a discussion about whether there was a need for lockers. While most municipalities don't have lockers, there has been a long history of having lockers at Penfield.

The committee discussed the viability of options 1 and 2, as regards insurance, FEMA and getting funding approvals from the various town bodies.

Mr Procino was asked about constructability, and he favored option 3a, as having the building overhead would allow better enclosing the work area, to provide protection from the elements.

Mr. Chamberlain then distributed his report on the options to the committee members.

The committee the requested that Shawmut work with Mr. Chamberlain to develop estimates for each of the options so that the committee can review the costs associated with each before making a recommendation, specifically as to options 1-5 and 7, including possible demolition of the locker wing.

8. Review progress and priorities - No Discussion was had on this item

9. Old Business – None.

10. New Business – None.

11. Public Comment – Mr. James Gallagher former PBC chairman said the footing design was certified by an engineer, and the excavation was caused by the bulkhead, which wasn't anticipated. He believed that elevating the building by 3.5 feet will limit accessibility and also reduce water views for the neighboring homes. He does not believe it is necessary to drive piles beneath the building. He advised against moving the building into the parking lot even temporarily, as this would require destroying trees that they were required to protect. Serious consideration should be given to dealing with the bulkhead. Also, the locker wing is only five years old and shouldn't be torn out.

Ms. Judy Ewing discussed getting an estimate to address the bulkhead, and also advised that many people use the decks but don't use beach. Her advice was to pick an option and defend it.

A member of the Flood and Erosion Board discussed increasing the dune height and also about raising the bulkhead to elevation 15.

12. Adjourn – At 8:46 p.m. Ellery Plotkin moved to adjourn, Robert Bellitto 2<sup>nd</sup>, and the motion passed.