

Project: Recreation Center Historical Stewardship Committee 2006 (RCHSC)
Park District of Oak Park (PDOP)

Meeting Date: June 19, 2006

Location: Field Center

Attendees: Committee Members:
Tom Phillion, Chair / Park Board Commissioner
Beth Burden, Member
Doug Gilbert, Member (OPHPC chair)
Lesley M. Gilmore, Gilmore Franzen Architects, Inc./ Technical Advisor
Chris Goode, Member
Nancy Holmes, Member
Maggie Kelly, Member

Others:
Gary Balling, Executive Director PDOP
Mike Grandy, Superintendent of Buildings & Grounds PDOP

I. Presentation by Gilmore Franzen Architects, Inc. summarizing the physical assessment of Andersen, Carroll, and Field Centers:

- A. Excerpts of the *Facility Assessment Report* that related to Andersen, Carroll, & Field Centers were provided to each attendee.
- B. The three buildings are generally in good shape, with necessary repairs and replacements indicative of those required for materials that have reached the end of their useful lives. This is coincident with renovation campaigns that occur every 25-30 years.
- C. The commonalities of the condition of these buildings – and the few singular conditions – were summarized. This summary is attached.
- D. The prioritized work on the centers would bring them into good condition and make code-compliant and accessibility improvements.
- E. Exterior restrooms - Accessibility to the exterior entries of the restrooms would require:
 1. Ramps and landings at Andersen and Carroll to accommodate rises of 18” to 25”.
 2. Changes in grade at Field Center to accommodate rises from 7½” to 10”.
 3. The restroom exterior entry doors will require clear swing hinges in order to provide the required 32” clear opening.
- F. Estimated costs associated with the recommended improvements:
 1. The estimated costs are based upon those provided by AME, who performed an assessment of the centers for the Village of Oak Park in 2002. GFAI utilized only those figures that related to work similar to that recommended by GFAI. The figures provided have not been escalated in cost; they are in 2002 dollars.
 2. Andersen Center improvements:
 - a) \$230,000 (excluding kitchen work which has been completed and roof work which will be completed this summer).
 - b) Accessibility to exterior entries of restrooms: \$15,000-\$20,000.
 3. Carroll Center improvements:
 - a) \$230,000 (including kitchen work, as well as roof work which will be completed this summer).
 - b) Accessibility to exterior entries of restrooms: \$15,000-\$20,000.
 4. Field Center improvements:
 - a) \$300,000 (including kitchen work, as well as roof work which will be completed this summer).
 - b) Accessibility to exterior entries of restrooms: \$5,000.

II. General Discussion

- A. Restrooms:
 - 1. Per PDOP, the toilet fixture counts complied with code in 1995.
 - 2. Current exterior access to restrooms is provided when outdoor activity leader has a key.
 - 3. Discussion ensued about providing more extensive exterior access to the restrooms.
- B. Condition of centers:
 - 1. The renovations would last 25-30 years.
 - 2. The buildings are probably taking less abuse than in prior years.
 - 3. PDOP stated that the plaster behind the wood paneling is in poor condition, and that the paneling has required painting to conceal abrasions.
 - 4. Concern was expressed about spending money (long-term investments) on the centers prior to determination of the centers' ultimate fate. It was agreed that reroofing and protecting the buildings was important and that it was important not to let the buildings deteriorate beyond repair. This also allows continuance of the current programming.
 - 5. PDOP state that the Capital Improvement Plan includes about \$200,000 expenditure in improvements at each of these centers. Some of this might help fund site master plans.
- C. What it might take to restore the centers to their original appearance:
 - 1. Brick removal might reveal stucco in good condition; the stucco soffits are generally in good condition. Brick removal would more strikingly distinguish the additions from the original buildings, and might require major modifications at some of the window openings.
 - 2. The possibility of reducing one of the centers to its original size and converting it to a comfort station was posed.
- D. Programmed use:
 - 1. PDOP stated that the centers are well-suited for early childhood programs.
 - 2. If the centers were larger, they could be used for dance as well.
 - 3. The future of the centers will be partly dependent upon programming and the recommendations of this committee.
- E. Historical Significance
 - 1. It was agreed that the centers' significance and integrity – as individual buildings and as a group – should be discussed further.
 - 2. Integrity of location – current and potential relocation – should be explored.
 - 3. The committee asked for a list of what original materials and spaces remain at the centers.
 - 4. Future meetings will continue the discussion of programming and historical significance.

III. Next Meeting

- A. The next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for Monday, July 17, 2006 at Carroll Center, to review:
 - 1. The recreation programming of the centers.
 - 2. General review of the current site master plans.
- B. The following meeting has been tentatively scheduled for Monday, August 21, and will include former Village Recreation Board members and Tim Kelly who will talk about moving buildings.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Distributed to: All attendees
Roy Phifer, Member