

**Date: July 9, 2019, 6:00 PM**

**Place: Brookline Town Hall, Room 111**

**Commissioners Attending:** John Bain, Nancy O'Connor, Clara Batchelor, Daniel Lyons, Wendy Sheridan, Antonia Bellalta, Jim Carroll

**Commissioners Absent:** None

**Staff:** Leigh Jackson, Recreation Director, Scott Landgren, Senior Landscape Architect-Parks and Open Space, Annie Blair, Landscape Architect-Parks and Open Space, Jessica White, Parks and Open Space Assistant

TOPIC	KEY POINTS/DISCUSSION	
<b>Chairman's Welcome</b> <b>Approval of Minutes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J. Bain opened the meeting. N. O'Connor moved to approve the June 11, 2019 Park and Recreation Minutes. Seconded by J. Carroll. All in favor.</li> </ul>	
<b>Public Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Public Comment</li> </ul>	
<b>Brookline Reservoir Update</b> <b>Discussion and Vote for Approval for construction Approach at Reservoir Gatehouse</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A. Blair is here tonight to present the Brookline Reservoir update.</li> <li>➤ Presented construction updates overall and highlights of a conversation with preservation staff commissioners and Dennis Dewitt.</li> <li>➤ At this point the Brookline Reservoir Park construction project is approaching one month of work on site, and work is progressing steadily on the park and gatehouse improvements as part of two separate construction contracts.</li> <li>➤ Tree Removals were detailed</li> <li>➤ A Cofferdam update was given.</li> <li>➤ A masonry crew has been working on cleaning the joints and re-pointing. The real intent was to make this surface as water tight as possible and to help limit weed growth.</li> <li>➤ The temporary support system has been removed from the inside of the Gate House. The bathroom that was installed on the right of the Gate House in the 1900's has been taken out.</li> <li>➤ There is currently 8-9 feet of water left in the Reservoir.</li> <li>➤ The fish concerns were shared with the commission.</li> </ul> <p><b>Brookline Reservoir Gate House Restroom</b>  Two issues are under discussion:</p>	

C. Batchelor moved that the Park and Recreation Commission support the design as developed by the consultant, that does not cut through the threshold and does not drill through the bulk head. Second by J. Bain. All in favor. W. Sheridan and A. Bellalta abstained. The motion passed 5-2.

- **Two issues are under discussion:**
  - Floor elevation inside the restroom
  - Routing of the plumbing from the restroom to utilities outside
  - There is a difference of opinion among some of the participants—DPW staff ( Parks, Engineering and Preservation), architectural consultants Spencer, Sullivan & Vogt (SS&V), Preservation Commission subcommittee, Preservation staff, and a former Preservation Commission member.
  - Goal is to balance the current program and budget for the building versus potential future uses
  - Reversibility of what the Town does now is key—no program or budget exists at this point for the rest of the building
  - Looking for a vote of support of approach to install rest room with minimal changes to the historic structure and that modifications are reversible.
- An image of the Brookline Reservoir Gatehouse was shown to the Commission.
- In the proposed design, there is the existing doorway (there will be a new door installed) and it slopes up to be flush with the entrance and floor inside. The condition is that there is the proposed floor elevation to make it handicap accessible and there is historic granite floor below. This means that you would have to step down and that will not work for ADA. The temporary existing wooden floor is higher and currently you step up, but that is going away.

**Conclusions regarding floor height:**

- Accessibility is critical, so the new floor needs to be flush with the doorway.
- The only way to meet the existing historic granite floor in a flush condition is to cut down the granite sill, which is a significant change and irreversible.
- There is no immediate need to reveal the historic granite floor before having a future

program and budget, and the public would only have access to the restroom, not the rest of the interior.

- DPW and Preservation staff, SS&V, and the Preservation Commission all agree with keeping the door sill intact and having the new restroom floor flush with the sill. D. Dewitt believes it is worth cutting down the sill provide access to the historical granite floor. He thinks that this is best approach for future use. A. Blair stated that our feeling right now is the need to make an accessible bathroom.
- Differing opinion is that it is worth cutting down the sill to reveal and make use of the historic granite floor.
- A. Bellalta assumes that that D. DeWitt wants to reveal all the granite floor and yet she wondered if the whole floor was granite. S. Landgren stated that there are sections of granite floor, but there are also areas with openings that contain the historic gate valves. C. Batchelor stated that this is not permanent and if and when we have money in the future for renovations, it is easier to do all plumbing between granite and the new wooden floor. S. Landgren stated that the way the current proposed design will be configured is that both water and sewer piping will be in the section of the floor, sitting above the granite floor and exiting through building without making any new penetrations in the building.
- J. Bain and A. Blair discussed the width of the doors.
- A. Blair pointed out were the openings/holes currently are on the granite floor.
- The plan is to run water and sewer line tucked against the inside of the exterior wall.
- Pictures of the existing plumbing, water and sewer lines were shown.
- Pictures of Dennis Dewitt's proposal were shown to the Commission. D. Dewitt would like to drop the plumbing stack down, core through the one to two foot thick granite bulk head, run pipes over and down inside

the wall that separates the staircase and come out the existing punctures at the bottom. The troubling part of this to them is coring through the bulkhead, is a significant change that can't be reversed. The current proposal is proposing running the lines close to the wall and bringing them down somewhere between the two flights of stairs. This would allow for them to not have to punch through the cast iron stair structure.

**Conclusions regarding plumbing:**

- Currently proposed plumbing route is an improvement over the existing route for the former restroom as it allows stairs to be restored.
- Currently proposed plumbing route does not require coring through the granite bulkhead, which is a significant change to the structure and not reversible.
- Plumbing will be visible, but only to authorized staff using others areas of the building, not to the public using the restroom.
- Town staff and SS&V are against coring through the granite bulkhead, and support the current design.
- Along with Dennis Dewitt, two of the three Preservation Commission (PC) subcommittee members support coring through the bulkhead. The third member did not participate in that part of the conversation. It was noted that the PC role is advisory here, not regulatory.
- A. Blair listed the preservation subcommittee members
- W. Sheridan asked A. Blair what the proposed floor material for the bathroom is; A. Blair stated that as of right now that has not been identified. W. Sheridan feels like the choice of material is significant because you are walking into a historic building. She doesn't want it to feel like a plastic liner. She stated that for her to take a vote on this she would want to know the final material of the floor. A. Blair stated that she can guess that the goals for the floor material were that they

	<p>not mimic being historic but that it be appropriate and maintainable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ N. O’ Connor supports not cutting into the sill and not support coring through the bulk head, especially knowing that down the line it potentially being used for something different. She would maintain the sill and would like to know the final decision on the floor material.</li> <li>➤ C. Batchelor stated that in terms of the material it needs to be maintainable. It will be an 8x 8 cube stuck in the building. She thinks the material to her personally is not important.</li> <li>➤ J. Bain and A. Blair discussed the fact that everything they are doing is reversible.</li> <li>➤ A. Bellalta stated that D. DeWitt is probably looking at the gate house in its current shape as historic. If the bathroom is eventually removed the least intrusions on the historic space would be the most desireable. W. Sheridan is assuming that his feeling may be once you do it, no one is going to undo it. She would agree that it seems premature right night to core through this not knowing what the programing will be in the future. She would venture to guess it is significantly more expensive and structurally significant to core through.</li> <li>➤ S. Landgren stated that he believes the proposed material is will be tile but that staff could confirm with the Architects.</li> <li>➤ C. Batchelor moved that the Park and Recreation Commission support the design as developed by the consultant that does not cut through the threshold and does not drill through the bulk head. Second by J. Bain. All in favor. W. Sheridan and A. Bellalta abstained.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>CIP Review</b></p>	<p>A. Blair presented an update on the Park and Recreation Commission Capital Improvement Planning for FY2021-FY2026  In reviewing the following are considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Capital Asset Conditions assessment</li> <li>2. Safety and accessibility</li> <li>3. Life cycle analysis</li> </ol>	

	<p>4. Preliminary cost estimates  5. Public input and user needs  6. Commissioner site visits  7. Advertise &amp; Public Hearing  8. Vote of the Park and Recreation Commission  September 17, 2019  The following describes the process  1. Park and Recreation Commission CIP Update  May 2019  2. Park and Recreation Commission Review  June 2019  3. Park and Recreation Commission Cost Updates &amp;  Prioritization  July 2019  4. Site Visits and Detailed Description  August 2019  5. Vote by Park and Recreation Commission  September 2019  A. Blair described items that have been updated  throughout:  Unit cost increases seen in recent bids  Unit cost increases based on further information  Unit cost increase caused by recent changes  Almost all design fees at 10 percent of construction  cost, not including contingency and  Overall costs increased by adding new work  Increase in inflation when projects are pushed  further into the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The overall spreadsheet of the proposed capital improvements was shared with the commission. The changes since the last time the Commission reviewed the CIP were highlighted in red. Please see attached</li> <li>➤ N. O'Connor thinks the 4 school ground/ Playgrounds should be rolled into an override. She isn't sure who to talk to, but she thinks the best way to do it is add them to overrides over several years. This would allow you to do a park a year.</li> <li>➤ Pictures of Monmouth Park were shown.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Larz Anderson Park  Tempietto Project Update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Larz Anderson Park Project Updates were given by S. Landgren</b></li> <li>➤ In 2018, the Town engaged Klopfer Martin Design Group (KMDG), Structures North Engineering (SNE) (John Wathne), Building</li> </ul>	

Monument Conservation (BMC) (Ivan Myjer) to assess three structures in the lagoon.

- Structures North conducted another assessment in 2017
- Building Monument Preservation had previously conducted an assessment in 2009. A new assessment was conducted by them in 2018.
- Historic photos of the Temple of Love, the Causeway and the Footbridge at Larz Anderson were shown.

### **Larz Anderson Park- Temple**

From recent assessment, BMC reports:

- Exposed edges weathered to a point where concrete is friable
- Extensive cracking caused by corrosion and subsequent expansion of metal reinforcement within the components
- Cast stone units that comprise structure have reached end of service life and must be replaced.
- Much of structure has been repaired several times and these repairs are all failing. This type of repair is no longer viable due to irreversible corrosion of internal metal reinforcement.
- Loss of material from cornice, capitals and column bases increased dramatically in last 10 years.

### **Conclusions**

- **Dome** was created with monolithic concrete casting. Despite numerous repairs, the dome is weathering irreparably and should be replaced.
- **Columns** were created with monolithic concrete casting.
- Design Team recommends full replacement of the structure from top of foundations.
- A new Dome will need to be cast in sections, resulting in jointing.
- Exterior options of the jointing were shown
- Interior will be purged and painted
- S. Landgren stated that there are no original drawings of the temple, causeway or the footbridge. He stated that all that exists are photos.

- Multiple photo simulations were shown of what the new built temple could/would look like. S. Landgren stated that one big difference in the replacement structures is that there will be joints, where there was none in the original. The dome would need to be pre-cast offsite and brought into the park in four sections. Examples of the joints and their angles were shown to the Commission. In the proposed conditions where there are the 4 sections, that will be pre-cast individually but where they come together might not be perfect. There are two conditions now they are looking at. One is to add a 6 inch wide joint and the second is option is to add a one inch joint. He stated that they are recommending that wider joint because it is easier to maintain in the long run, it allows more flexibility and what you are left with is just a half inch caulked joint. The inside would be parged. The other way is to have a one inch joint, it would be more susceptible to movement and would not be as water tight.
- Overall, the new temple would be dimensionally the same as the existing.
- The material inside the font was discussed. This element would be replicated, (currently it is not operational) but potentially made in a way so that it does not have as much depth.

**Larz Anderson Park- Causeway**

From recent assessment, SNE reports:

- Current railings from Olmsted Brothers in 1956, replaced original design
- Concrete has suffered map-cracking, spalling of edges and failure
- Recommendation is for full replacement on existing foundations.
- Two railing designs are being developed: replacement in kind with code-compliant railings, and precast concrete baluster and planter design to replicate the original historic photographs

**Larz Anderson Park- footbridge**

- From recent assessment, SNE reports:
  - No historical documentation of the

	<p>bridge has been found.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Similar to Causeway, concrete has suffered map-cracking, spalling of edges and failure</li> <li>○ Recommendation is for full replacement of stairs and bridge.</li> <li>○ Studies were completed for making the footbridge handicapped accessible, but in keeping with nature of the structure, accessibility is being recommended via a pathway that connects to the larger pathway system and encircles the lower part of the lagoon.</li> </ul> <p>➤ KMDG have been contacting various pre-casters to make sure they can build this and area working on making it look as authentic as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● N. O'Connor and S. Landgren discussed the time frame for the work of the Tempietto. The roadway work at Larz Anderson is happening before the Tempietto work.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Cypress Field Design Discussion Vote Regarding Permitting and Design associated with men's/ women's softball</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A Cypress street playground overall plan was shared with the Commission by S. Landgren.</li> <li>● The Slow Street Concept was discussed.</li> <li>● A detailed layout of the playground was shown to the commission. S. Landgren discussed the numerous requests staff has heard to incorporate more swings in the new design.</li> <li>● Diagrams of the different field dimension for high school girls' /women's softball, men's softball and little league. S. Landgren stated that there has been a lot of discussion around changes of rules in softball in the last ten years. The implications of this diagram are basically recommending putting a netting system along the edge of Davis, to capture those home run balls. A white line/sports netting line was pointed out on the plan near the edge of existing sidewalk for the Commission. One potential is to install netting for 190-feet, having an opening in the middle of 100-ft, then another section of 200-feet of netting, along with a fence along the sidewalk (that is 7 feet). The bottom of the</li> </ul>	<p>The vote Regarding Permitting and Design associated with men's/ women's softball was put on hold in order to get more information.</p> <p>J. Bain made a motion to remove the middle entrance of the field. O'Connor stated that this is something that will go through design review. J. Bain moved to remove the middle entrance of the field in the Cypress Street Playground design. Seconded by C. Batchelor. All in favor. J. Carroll and N. O'Connor abstained. The motion passed 5-2</p>

netting is proposed to start at ten feet. There is a small space between the 10 and 7 where if you hit the perfect ball it will go through. S. Landgren stated that part of implication is that a section of where the 30 foot netting would go and there are a lot of trees staying(except for any trees and poor conditions would require pruning of some of the trees

- The netting poles were discussed. It is anticipated they are 6-8 inch poles that would stay in year round. The netting would be lowered in off-season.
- J. Carroll asked if there is any data on how many people have been hit by softballs in that area. S. Landgren discussed the stories that he has heard from the neighbors.
- D. Lyons doesn't believe that the netting by the MBTA Station is necessary. He stated that your biggest threat is the line drive.
- N. O'Connor stated that her feeling is that men's softball would be better to play on the western field and she would net that side only. The eastern field would not be netted and men's softball would not be permitted on that side. It will all be lit so men's softball can play on the western field. D. Lyons stated that you have more right hitters and you would need to protect the edge along Greenough. N. O'Connor suggested swapping her original comment and only netting the eastern field and not permitting men's softball on the left hand side.
- S. Landgren stated that we are trying to save the tree canopy and there would need to be pruning.
- Men's softball has been using wooden bats for years, which changes how far the balls can be hit.
- W. Sheridan stated that if you look at the trajectories on the slide, some homeruns will still go over this netting.
- The pole placement was laid out for the Commission.
- D. Rivers addressed the commission. She would like us to get some data on the

difference of the number of balls going into the streets/houses when the bats were switched from aluminum to wood. She knows it's less and her concern is that as an abutter the netting will change the character of this park. She understands the concern of safety, but she thinks it would be nice to have that data. She was trying to get neighbors to come, but a lot of people are on vacation. She stated that it would be helpful to know when men's softball switched over to wood bats before a decision is made. D. Rivers stated that her recollection from the past was there was an issue, but we need to know since changing the bats how much that has reduced the number of balls coming out of the field.

- W. Sheridan thinks we should visit real life batting practices and see what is happening out there. Having a home run derby
- J. Carroll stated that the driving range has netting, it is pushed back and it has a dramatic look.
- N. O'Connor would feel better knowing more about trajectories and information from the neighbors in the area over the past several years. She worries that it is an issue and it has been brought to the Commission's attention. She stated that we need to be responsible. N. O'Connor discussed getting lighting up at Larz Anderson.
- W. Sheridan stated that we know we have a shortage of fields around Town, in particular baseball and softball diamonds and she would not want to make a decision to take away another location that is a multi-generational athletic use without looking further at the information.
- N. O'Connor stated that she is proposing that we don't permit men's softball on the left side, they use the right hand side and we just have the netting (if needed) on that side.
- S. Landgren discussed the pruning that would need to take place to make the net operational from day one.
- C. Batchelor stated that she would like to

know the liability that the Commissioners would have if they vote against the netting.

- J. Bain stated that we need to get some hitters out there.
- N. O'Connor stated that she will end up voting for some type/amount of netting.
- A. Bellalta suggested posting signs to make people aware of the danger of the balls.
- W. Sheridan and S. Landgren discussed how many feet would be needed on the right hand side if you follow N. O'Connor's recommendation.
- J. Carroll stated that this netting/posts would completely change the look of neighborhood and he feels that if the activity is dangerous than don't do the activity. A. Bellalta agrees.
- J. Bain and D. Rivers discussed the opening in the middle of the field. She doesn't understand why the path on the Davis Field side is not enough.
- W. Sheridan stated that in the data shown by S. Landgren she wonders if the data is based on aluminum or wooden bats and if those trajectories are from a wooden bat and the balls are still going over the netting, then why do the netting at all.
- J. Bain stated that there are no real hard figures from people/property being hit by balls.
- J. Bain made a motion to remove the middle entrance of the field. O'Connor stated that this is something that will go through design review. J. Bain moved to remove the middle entrance of the field in the Cypress Street Playground design. Seconded by C. Batchelor. All in favor. J. Carroll and N. O'Connor abstained. 5-2
- D. Rivers stated that there will be serious concerns in the neighborhood about this netting and changing the character. She will make sure people are aware of it before it's a final decision. Her goal is to have a win win. She feels like the neighborhood needs to weigh in on this.
- The vote was put on hold in order to get more information from neighbored, data

	<p>reflecting wooden bats and how permitting plays into it. A. Bellalta would like to also take into consideration the visual impact. The Commission would like to know what Town Counsel's opinion. They would like to know the liability to the Town and the Commissioners personally. W. Sheridan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Rivers discussed neighbors that have vocalized the issues with their houses being hit with the balls.</li> <li>• N. O'Connor thinks it would be important to know if there were fewer or no balls due to wooden bats or lesser activities by men's programming. She would like to see data and not go off speculation.</li> <li>• J. Carroll wonders why are we permitting the field now if we know there is a liability.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Parks, Recreation and Open Space Strategic Plan Update &amp; Athletic Fields Needs Assessment and Master Plan</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S. Landgen discussed the various meetings that took place while the Athletic Field Needs Assessment consultants were in Town.</li> <li>• An Information gathering slide was shown to the Commission.</li> <li>• The questions that were asked to all those who attended the information gathering meeting were shared with the Commission.</li> <li>• The summary presentation is up on the Park's website.</li> <li>• The project vision was shared with the Commission.</li> <li>• The next steps have been updated and were shared with the Commission. The statistically valid survey will be sent out around September 7<sup>th</sup> the Open Link Survey will be three weeks later. The upcoming meeting dates were shared with the Commission. N. O'Connor asked S. Landgren if he can find out which user groups were missing from the focus groups. S. Landgren discussed having some focus groups at the end of summer in order to obtain input from user groups that were not represented. N. O'Connor asked S. Landgren if the consultants are looking at the relationships of the fields with private School, S. Landgren responded with a yes. N. O'Connor wonders if their scope includes looking into user fees, how much Recreation</li> </ul>	

	<p>takes in for every single program and how the funds get dispersed. She was looking for clarification to see if the consultant would have this information for the Commission, along with all contracts and payments or in kind offerings with private schools etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L. Jackson stated that it should be included in their scope of work.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Recreation Update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The books have been closed. Recreation did well with the numbers. Those numbers were detailed for the Commission. There was a surplus that was moved to retain. That retained money is for Capital Improvements. The reasons for the surplus were detailed.</li> <li>• She stated that there has been a lot of great energy and new faces around Summer Camps. The Summer Camp numbers were shared with the Commission.</li> <li>• Nature Camp numbers and pictures were shared with the Commission.</li> <li>• This year Recreation did not receive any grant money from the Brookline Community Fund to help support the 30 campers from the Brookline Center for Community Mental Health who attend Recreation camps, but fortunately the center was able to apply for a grant from the Department of Mental Health and they were awarded \$18,694 to help with the camperships. Brookline Recreation covered the additional cost to ensure that the 30 children will have a fun-filled summer. The Commission would like more information on why there was no money given to recreation from the Brookline Community Fund.</li> <li>• THE FY2019 revenues retained earnings were detailed for the commission.</li> <li>• There were 30 days that the golf course was closed for this season due to the weather.</li> <li>• The golf course hosted the Mass Amateur Qualifier on June 24<sup>th</sup> with 70 players competing for six spots for the state amateur championship.</li> <li>• The Golf Course held the Spin Four Ball tournament in June which had 42 players</li> <li>• The course also has the Stroke Play</li> </ul>	

	<p>Championship scheduled for the weekend of July 20<sup>th</sup>, with an expected field of 40 to 50 players</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The New Bocce courts have created some great feedback with local residents reaching out to reserve court time. A summer league will be promoted after the holiday. She stated that recreation can do a better job of marketing the Bocce Courts to get it activated.</li> <li>• The Driving Range is installing new hitting mats on the driving range tee this week.</li> <li>• L. Jackson is looking to purchase some promotions flags. She wants to work on marketing better. W. Sheridan stated that there is a signage approval process in Town, but is unsure if the free standing/ temporary signs have to go through that process as well. She would suggest reaching out to the Town, before making the purchase.</li> <li>• Renaming and rebranding the golf course was discussed. The naming committee process was discussed.</li> <li>• Hiring updates were given.</li> <li>• The community is communicating concerns over the playability of the courts, some good and some bad. L. Jackson and the Parks Department will work together to try to address the concerns for poor playability. W. Sheridan stated that there are some areas of the court that are unplayable; she compared it to a ball hitting sand.</li> <li>• L. Jackson discussed the meeting with the Vendor she had about sharing the community’s concerns.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2019 U.S Open-Golf Tournament Report</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This item was put on hold.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Vote to approve acceptance of a donation of an inclusive play carousel at Eliot Playground</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A. Bellalta voted to approve acceptance of a donation of inclusive play carousel at Eliot Playground” with all decisions regarding placement, installation, safety surfacing, schedule or any other matter pertaining to the gift to be made by the Director of the Park and Open Space Division. Seconded by J. Bain. All in favor.</li> </ul>	<p>A. Bellalta voted to approve acceptance of a donation of inclusive play carousel at Eliot Playground” with all decisions regarding placement, installation, safety surfacing, schedule or</p>

		any other matter pertaining to the gift to be made by the Director of the Park and Open Space Division. Seconded by J. Bain. All in favor. The motion passed 7-0.
<b>Other Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No New Business</li> </ul>	
<b>Adjourn</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J. Bain moved to adjourn. Seconded by D. Lyons. All in favor.</li> </ul>	

**Next Meeting: August 13, 2019 Location: Town Hall, Room 111**

**A true record**

**Attest Jessica White**

**Date: 7/9/2019**