

Follow Up Notes from John Freidin--Alternate Schemes 12.2.2021

A. Bar Scheme (p. 45)

1. No **accessible entrance** from Main Street.
2. Does not **reveal beauty** of the original building.
3. **Check-out Counter** not within sight of all entrances/exits -- both on main floor and Community Room.
4. Does not **improve structural flexibility** for future needs. The 1988 addition continues to be rigid due to its intrusive and essential trusses that support both the floors of the '88 addition and the ceiling of the Community Room. It also leaves a jumble of different floor levels and changes in ceiling heights.
5. **Circulation/flow** within the building is circuitous and the new building is not incorporated into the original building.
6. Retains existing **Community Room** and, thereby does not improve lines of sight, capacity, or ability to be subdivided into smaller spaces.
7. **Usage of 3rd floor** of 1988 addition would require construction of a second staircase.
8. Hangs over half of the parking area behind Ilsley.
9. In short, the Bar Scheme creates two essentially separate libraries: the original structure and the addition. The LBC was concerned that the original building might become a "museum," and require additional staff.

B. Link Scheme (p.46)

1. No **accessible entrance** from Main Street.
2. Does not **reveal beauty** of the original building.
3. **Check-out Counter** is within sight of entrances/exits but not the addition.
4. Does little to improve structural flexibility for future needs. The 1988 addition continues to be rigid due to its intrusive and essential trusses that hold up both the floors of the '88 addition and the ceiling of the Community Room. It also leaves a jumble of different floor levels and changes in ceiling heights.
5. **Circulation/flow** is slightly improved within the building, but is still awkward, and the new building is not incorporated into the original building..
6. Retains existing **Community Room** and, thereby does not improve lines of sight, capacity, or ability to be subdivided into smaller spaces.
7. Usage of 3rd floor of 1988 addition would require construction of a second staircase.
8. In short, accomplishes less than Recommended Scheme but its estimated cost is nearly the same.

. Umbilical Scheme (p. 48)

1. Provides **accessible entrance** from Main Street in much the same way as the Recommended Scheme, but requires walking further.
2. Reveals **beauty** of the original building.
3. **Check-out Counter** may be within sight of all entrances/exits on the main floor, but not of the Community Room.
4. Improves **structural flexibility** for future needs, because this scheme eliminates 1988 addition.
5. **Circulation/flow** within the building is better, but new building is not incorporated into the original building.
6. **Community Room** is brand-new and provides good lines of sight, greater capacity, and ability to be subdivided into smaller spaces.
7. **Usage of 3rd floor** of 1988 addition would require the construction of a second staircase within the original building, and this could be very challenging..
8. Umbilical Scheme requires use of land (in parking area behind existing building) that is not owned by Ilsley. Therefore, it eliminates all the parking spaces on the upper level of the parking area behind Ilsley. This is the only area that offers accessible parking. Finally, this scheme obstructs current traffic patterns within the existing parking area.
9. In short, the Umbilical Scheme creates two essentially separate libraries: the original structure and the addition, The LBC was concerned that the original building might become a "museum," and require additional staff.

D. Adjacent and Restoration Scheme (p. 47)

1. This scheme is nearly the same as the one recommended by the LBC. Therefore, it **achieves all the that the Recommended Scheme does**, although the flow/circulation within the structure is not quite as good, and it is farther from Main Street than the Recommended Scheme.
2. It might be possible to construct this scheme without removing the 1988 addition, but that is not certain.
3. In 2017 its projected cost was \$200,000 (2%) less than the Recommended Scheme.

E. Build new at different site:

The LBC discussed the possibility of building a new library on a different site, especially if the site were between the Mary Hogan Elementary School and the Hannaford Supermarket. However, once it received an estimate of the cost of constructing a building from scratch (approximately \$2.2 million more than the recommended scheme, not including the costs of purchasing land, site improvements, and the construction of a parking lot), it did not pursue this scheme.