Ms. Riley,

I attended the meeting on 13 November but had to leave before the meeting ended. I have a few concerns about the schemes presented.

1. The architects seemed to think that it was essential to give each school its own identity and entrance. This priority should be reevaluated. This should NOT be a priority at the cost of giving up much potential shared drop-off, parking and entry real estate at the cost of eliminated open space to fulfill this imagined requirement.

   • The current schools share and entrance and this works out much better for me as a parent who has had kids in both the Tobin and the Vassal Lane schools. The schools don’t start at the same time. A shared entrance works better for me as a parent.

   • A shared entrance and limiting public entries to the school is safer for the students and the staff.

   • Speaking to the principals of the two schools, they both agreed that a shared entrance and drop-off is preferred.

Please consider sharing these resources to save more open space on the site.

2. The administrative office should be closer together to facilitate close coordination between the school’s administrative staff.

3. I have a slight preference for the 3rd scheme for Pavilions because of the reduced building frontage on Vassal Lane and because of the enclosed courtyards but feel that the building massing scheme that facilitates energy conservation should be prioritized.

4. It is wrong to assume that there is one outdoor play area for the Vassal Lane Students and one for the Tobin School students. Usually playgrounds are broken up into 2-5 year-old kids and 5-12 year old kids. The preschool and Children’s House of Tobin need one playground and the Lower Elementary and Upper Elementary and Tobin School kids need another. It probably makes sense to place the ball fields closer to the Vassal Lane School.

Thank you,

Douglas Flandro
Parent