



HOLMDEL TOWNSHIP LIBRARY SITE SELECTION

The Township desires to build a new library, having outgrown its current facility of approximately 3,500 square feet, which is in the basement of the Town Hall. The Township has identified three potential sites for the new building. Each of the sites is under public jurisdiction, eliminating the costs of acquisition.

DENNIS KOWAL ARCHITECTS has been retained to evaluate the sites based on their years of professional experience as public library designers. All factors are to be considered in evaluating the sites including Engineering Concerns, Cost, Image and Overall Suitability based on the particular nature of a public library.

Summary of Services

- For each of the three locations, DENNIS KOWAL ARCHITECTS [DKA] will evaluate the site access, traffic impact, parking requirements and feasibility, utility access, site conditions, environmental impact, and environmental requirements. [see supplemental Engineering Report and enclosed Design Challenge Summary in the Diagram Section]
- For each location that could support a library building of 12,000 – 20,000 square feet, (range provided as a given to Architect) DKA will provide a conceptual site layout. [see enclosed Conceptual Plans in the Diagram Section]
- DKA will conduct a brief cost analysis for each site and offer a recommendation as to which is most cost-effective and which best meets the program requirements. [see Cost Analysis page 4]
- DKA will prepare schematic site designs of the two most desirable sites for comparison. [see Conceptual Plans enclosed and Schematic Site Plans in Engineering Report]
- DKA will recommend the most appropriate site in consultation with the review committee. [see Conclusion page 3-8]
- DKA will prepare written documentation of the process to substantiate all conclusions. [see supplemental Engineering Report]



D E N N I S K O W A L A R C H I T E C T S
52 West Main Street • Somerville • New Jersey 08876 • Telephone 908-231-0201 • Fax 908-218-7979

The three sites pre-selected by the Township for this Study are:

SITE D A 10-acre section of the DePalma Farm, abutting Wind Hill Way

SITE F A 6-acre parcel on the southwest corner of the F&F tract abutting Roberts Road.

SITE M A segment of vacant land adjacent to the municipal complex that lies between the Post Office and the Community Center.

This report is a summary of the findings. For a detailed description of each site with respect to the engineering portion of this analysis, see the accompanying Engineering Report by Goodland & Clearwater, Inc., who worked in concert with DENNIS KOWAL ARCHITECTS on this Study. It should be noted that this Study does not reach its final conclusion from an engineering point of view alone.



TABLE OF CONTENTS		page
SECTION ONE	OVERVIEW	1-1
	LOCATION	1-2
	IMAGE	1-2
	COST	1-3
	SELECTION FACTORS	1-4
	FUNCTIONAL NEEDS	1-4
SECTION TWO	LIBRARY SIZE	2-1
	LIBRARY LEVELS	2-3
SECTION THREE	EXPLANATION OF DIAGRAMS	3-1
	LIBRARY PLAN	3-2
	SUMMARY OF ASSUMPTIONS	3-3
	COMMUNITY CENTER	3-4
	RECOMMENDATIONS	3-4
	CONCLUSION	3-8
SECTION FOUR	COST ANALYSIS	4-1
	SITE D COST ANALYSIS	4-1
	SITE F COST ANALYSIS	4-1
	SITE M COST ANALYSIS	4-2
SECTION FIVE	DIAGRAMS	Insert
	HOLMDEL SITE FEASIBILITY STUDY	
	SITE VIEWS – SITE D	
	EXISTING CONDITIONS – SITE D	
	CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS – SITE D	
	SETBACK ANALYSIS – SITE D	
	CONCEPTUAL PLAN – SITE D	
	DESIGN CHALLENGE SUMMARY – SITE D	
	COST ANALYSIS – SITE D	
	SITE VIEWS – SITE F	
	EXISTING CONDITIONS – SITE F	
	CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS – SITE F	
	SETBACK ANALYSIS – SITE F	
	CONCEPTUAL PLAN – SITE F	
	DESIGN CHALLENGE SUMMARY – SITE F	
	COST ANALYSIS – SITE F	
	SITE VIEWS – SITE M	
	EXISTING CONDITIONS – SITE M	
	CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS – SITE M	
	SETBACK ANALYSIS – SITE M	
	CONCEPTUAL PLAN – SITE M	
	DESIGN CHALLENGE SUMMARY – SITE M	
	COST ANALYSIS – SITE M	



D E N N I S K O W A L A R C H I T E C T S
52 West Main Street • Somerville • New Jersey 08876 • Telephone 908-231-0201 • Fax 908-218-7979

HOLMDEL LIBRARY OVERVIEW

“Our new library should not simply be about getting a book but about getting people interested in going to the new Library as well. The exterior should reflect the traditional and rural character of the Township and the interior should model the exceptional high-technology orientation of the residents and local corporations.”ⁱ And so began the charge given to DENNIS KOWAL ARCHITECTS by the Township Committee.

This is a site feasibility study prepared by DENNIS KOWAL ARCHITECTS to assess the values of the Township, the needs of the Library, the use patterns of the Community, and the pros and cons of three potential sites. The ninety-day study which roughly began on 1 January 2005 is meant to be a broad brush analysis of each site with reference to wetlands, traffic, utilities, slope, location, and suitability for a new public Library. With no actual library design in hand, a placeholder shape of up to 20,000 square feet was considered for each of three sites that each had been pre-chosen for consideration by the Township. The following dialogue is a useful introduction to the thinking by some of those involved in the site selection. However, this study quickly transitions into a quantitative analysis of the sites and concludes with simple recommendations.

The three sites were: The lower section of the F&F nursery site along Ramanessin Brook which is nestled nicely into a hillside and back-dropped with a tree-line; a portion of land behind the DePalma farm buildings which is on a high bluff of land with splendid views; and the existing Municipal Building Site between the Post Office and Senior Center which offers a unique campus approach. Various groups with interests or knowledge of the Library or sites were chosen by the Township to be interviewed by the Architect. Individuals and groups often had a favorite among the three. The purpose of this study is to identify the new Library needs, the relative fit of the needs and those sites, and the costs required to make each site work with those needs. While opinions varied widely on the favored sites, there was uniform agreement on the vision and much of the function of the new library.

“The bottom line is functionality, but not at the price of austerity. I would like the new Library to compete with Barnes & Noble.”ⁱⁱ “Our high school students go to Barnes & Noble or to Shrewsbury’s Eastern Branch Library to work on projects or to hang out. We want the new Library to change that. Meeting rooms in the new Library should be additive to those here at the Municipal Building.”ⁱⁱⁱ “We need a new Council Meeting Room and what better place than visible in the new Library. Youth in the Library can witness or glimpse the political process and integrate learning, books, and the greater processes of society going on around them.”^{iv}



D E N N I S K O W A L A R C H I T E C T S
52 West Main Street • Somerville • New Jersey 08876 • Telephone 908-231-0201 • Fax 908-218-7979

“We need to bring people together in this new building. While e-mail is a great medium with which to communicate, it is not *communication*.”^v

Specific thoughts were also communicated about the number of floors and the special needs of a branch location of the Monmouth County Library System:

“The Monmouth County Library’s policy is to have public space on one floor. If you must have books on a second floor, then a very open plan with monitoring from below would be required.”^{vi} “However, we desire a single floor Library with no other services on another level because it would be the most accessible, least expensive to staff, most versatile and the easiest to expand. Parents generally do not want to leave a younger child on a separate floor while they search for their own books.”^{vii}

“The new Library will not require a large area for Technical Services (just two desks, mail sorting station, shelving, storage, sink and a loading dock of sorts) because the Main Monmouth County Library will handle the rest. The Library would not store back issues of periodicals beyond one year and on-line periodical reference would be available to patrons.”^{viii}

LOCATION

The location of the library was mentioned in terms of having enough land for patron ease and comfort and accessibility to all of the residents. “Holmdel is a growing community with a need for a strong local branch location.”^{ix} “In some respects, the DePalma site is actually the most centrally located of the three, when you consider the sites from a population density perspective.”^x

“I’m ambivalent about two of the three sites: The F&F site and the Municipal Complex location. The F&F site emphasizes our agricultural heritage, the rural nature of the community, and environmental importance. The Municipal Complex site is near existing services and on the same side of the street as the two schools; we really want more use of the Library by the students. Cost may be a determinant.”^{xi} “We should consider recommending a phased approach to constructing the Library if the cost is too high and we should not sacrifice sufficient parking or create traffic jams.”^{xii}



IMAGE

“There is a great appreciation of history and historic structures and Holmdel contains some of the best examples of historic Dutch barn construction. Because some of the great examples have been lost, it might be fitting to have a local history room in the Library to contain the artifacts, history, books and memorabilia.”^{xiii} “The Library should blend in; it could be farm-like, with sloped roofs, representative of the equestrian rural life and not too modern”^{xiv} “The new Library could be seen as *Wi-Fi in a rural setting* with an exceptionally high tech inside where 5 year olds challenge 55 year olds.”^{xv}

“Because of our demonstrated commitment to the environment, Holmdel would also appreciate an environmentally friendly building.”^{xvi} “If the Municipal Site is chosen, renovation of the existing Senior/Community Center should be considered part of the project to tie it into the new Library design.”²⁰ “The two buildings should connect.”^{xvii}

COST

It was reported that there was no target budget for the proposed library project at this time but \$4 million has been discussed in the past.¹⁹ It was further reported that time is of the essence on picking a site and designing the library because a federal \$250,000 library *-technology grant has been received and needs to be spent on the Library by September 2006. The Mayor and Committee also want a design and budget ready for the next round of New Jersey Library Construction Grants should they become available.

COMMENTS

The strengths and unique qualities of life in Holmdel should be represented in the design and location of the new Holmdel Library. If the only factor in site selection were image, then either the DePalma or F&F Nursery site would be seen as contenders. On the other hand, a careless disturbance of the farmland on either of these sites to build a non-compatible building could be labeled by opponents of development as not environmentally friendly. It is possible to design a building and site that compliments the natural qualities of each site without disturbing hardwood forests, diminishing the quality of the watershed, constructing on steep slopes or “destroying the environment”. Destroying



someone's *open view* to portions of a site should not be confused with destroying the *environment*. In actuality, a building which dialogues with the views on the site, when properly designed, can open up even more enjoyment of the site to more people. If one of the rural sites is ultimately chosen, then Holmdel could make this a model for how development and farmland preservation appropriately work together. However, the site shall be selected by more factors than image or development issues.

One of the factors which is not in the scope of this study is the analysis of whether Holmdel needs a traditional "downtown" or should remain a collection of individual destinations. "Holmdel has evolved from a very rural farming community to "farm suburban" mostly developed community. Many residents are professionals. The development has been controlled so that there remain a number of farms and the community has a mixed rural/suburban character. The old center of Holmdel is known as the Village and is in southern Holmdel (intersection of Main Street, County Route 520, and Holmdel/Keyport Road). The Village is quite small and does not have the critical mass to be a destination to which anyone goes. The northern part of Holmdel along Route 35 is more densely developed with retail shopping, strip malls, and higher density residential developments. Although Holmdel is now about 90% built-out there is no "center" to Holmdel. That is, if you ask anyone where the "center" of town is you won't get a consistent answer (or any answers). A combination library, senior center, a real community center, the post office, and town hall with the middle school and high school nearby could possibly provide this."^{xviii}

SELECTION FACTORS

The factors that shall be considered in this feasibility study (in no particular order) fall into six basic categories:

1. Functional needs met
2. Image needs met
3. Safety needs met
4. Environmental needs met
5. Engineering needs met
6. Cost needs met
7. Expansion needs met



FUNCTIONAL NEEDS

The following sections LIBRARY SIZE and LIBRARY LEVELS describe some of the functional needs of the library. After site selection is complete, a Library Program phase should commence which includes interviews with the County Library, Library Staff and the Library Planning Advisory Committee. An actual Program would be created based on those interviews and would drive the design of Holmdel's new library.

ⁱ Committeeman Terence Wall at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005 (Serena DiMaso presented similar sentiments)

ⁱⁱ Committeeman Tony Orsini at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

ⁱⁱⁱ Committeewoman Janet Berk at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{iv} Township Administrator Chris Schultz at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^v Committeeman Terence Wall at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{vi} Director Kenneth Sheinbaum of the Monmouth County Library System at an interview on 14 December 2004.

^{vii} Library Planning Advisory Committee member Peg McEowen at an interview on 14 December 2004.

^{viii} Holmdel Branch Library Director Karen Nealis at an interview on 14 December 2004.

^{ix} Holmdel Branch Library Director Karen Nealis at an interview on 14 December 2004.

^x Mayor Larry Fink at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{xi} Committeewoman Janet Berk at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{xii} Mayor Larry Fink at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{xiii} Mayor Larry Fink at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{xiv} Friends of Holmdel Library member Pat Kozol at an interview on 14 December 2004.

^{xv} Committeeman Terence Wall at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{xvi} Mayor Larry Fink at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{xvii} Committeeman Terence Wall at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

^{xviii} Planning Board Chairman Ralph Blumenthal, speaking as a citizen of Holmdel, after the Council Meeting on 24 January 2005.

¹⁹ Township Administrator Chris Schultz at a private interview on 14 December 2004.

²⁰ Committeewoman Serena DiMaso at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005

²¹ Attendees at interview session on 14 December 2004 Library Planning Advisory Committee were Director Kenneth Sheinbaum of the Monmouth County Library System, LPAC/FOHL member Peg McEowen, Holmdel Branch Library Director Karen Nealis, LPAC/FOHL Pat Koziol, LPAC/FOHL member Frank Daly, LPAC/FOHL member Jenni Blumenthal, LPAC/FOHL member Marlene Maley, Township Engineer (T&M) Edward Broberg and and Dennis J. Kowal, Principal of Dennis Kowal Architects.

²² Attendees at interview session on 14 December 2004 Interviews with Engineer attendees were Township Administrator Chris Schultz, and Township Engineer (T&M) Edward Broberg and Dennis J. Kowal, Principal of Dennis Kowal Architects.

²³ Attendees at a public Township Committee Meeting on 24 January 2005 were Township Administrator Chris Schultz, Committeewoman Serena DiMaso, Committeeman Tony Orsini, Mayor Larry Fink, Committeeman Terence Wall, Committeewoman Janet Berk and and Dennis J. Kowal, Principal of Dennis Kowal Architects.

²⁴ Attendees at interview session on 27 January 2005 Site Visits with Engineer attendees were Township Engineer (T&M) Edward Broberg, Planning Board Engineer with T&M Bonnie Heard, Tom Cannarella principal of Goodland and Clearwater, Project Manager Frank Rebel with Dennis Kowal Architects and Dennis J. Kowal, principal of Dennis Kowal Architects.



LIBRARY SIZE

The population of Holmdel according to the 2000 census is 15,781. A recent estimate released by Monmouth County in puts Holmdel's current population at 17,207 and one 2020 projection is 20,990. The State's Library Construction Grant application requires that the proposed library be planned for at least ten years into the future. The Township Master Plan projects the Township size at full build-out to be 19,600 residents. The County adopted the Cross Acceptance 2004 Report which projects the population of Holmdel for 2025 to be 19,608. Therefore, the library should be designed for 19,600 residents with the possibility of expansion room for future shifts in either library use, zoning, or technology. In other New Jersey Libraries, technology has actually increased the square footages.

Based on the Library Grant (minimum standards), the Library should be at least 13,594 square feet to qualify for grant submission. Based on a survey of the averages of our last six libraries all built in the last two years and programmed in size to maximize services to the community, a library for a population of 20,990 could be as much as 28,336 square feet (and 21,300 square feet for your current population). A 28,336 square foot library would not fit on a single level on any of the proposed sites. Therefore, a size between the 13,594 square foot minimum and the 28,336 square foot maximum shall be used for planning. For the purposes of this Study, a 19,600 square foot library on a single level shall be used to test all three sites. 19,600 square feet is slightly less than the median of 20,965 square feet for similar libraries but still exceeds the grant minimum by over 5,000 square feet.

The tendency is for the public library to become a community center of activity and thus provide more services than minimum library standards. The success of this goal is dependent on (a) adequate arrival space to prevent patron bottlenecks, (b) a variety of seating areas including traditional tables but also including lounge furniture, computer workstations (with generous room to spread out materials) and study carrels, (c) enclosed rooms for working quietly, enclosed rooms for working in conversation, and enclosed rooms for training, (d) new services such as wireless hotspots and café to read, write, browse, and sip, (e) media centers for previewing media including software, music, videos, and books on tape, (f) business, financial and employment/resume information centers, (g) face out display of books which consumes more space but increase patron satisfaction (bookstore look), and more emphasis on beauty which includes interior and exterior gardens, public art display, and open space. Elements of good library site design include the following items; single level, spacious drop-off area, obvious entrance, single, public access point, night exit for Community



Room, open perimeter for day lighting, interesting views, good visibility from road, centrally located, room for expansion, and blends with the community.

Budget affects all library planning. Not all libraries can be built as state-of-the art or include community services. Simple solutions to meeting a budget include phased construction. A location for expansion can be designed into the building. As a guide, a simple 20,000 square foot, single-level library on a flat site with adjacent utilities could range between \$3.8 and \$4.6 million including fees, furniture, sitework and building construction. The same size library on a sloped site with no utilities and with an interesting shape can range between \$4.6 and \$5.6 million.

Programming the library specific to Holmdel was not part of the scope of this Study. Instead, a similar program common to most new libraries is used as a “placeholder” until such time that the Library Design Committee can be interviewed and specific needs analyzed. Since an emphasis on technology and an emphasis on the meeting room was made during the initial investigation for this site selection, a modest increase in the square footage has been added to supplement these two areas. Some of the ideas to be discussed may include an Internet Café, Media Center, built-in Dias at the Meeting Room for Council Meetings, Art Gallery, Computer Training Lab, etc.

Other libraries currently being planned or built in New Jersey include many of the following:

- Entrance Foyer
 - Vestibule
 - Bulletin Boards
 - Book Return
 - Display
 - Waiting
- Restrooms
- Meeting Room for 200
 - Storage Closet
 - Kitchenette
 - Foyer
 - Dias
- Circulation Desk
 - Circulation workroom
 - Supply Closet
 - Returned Materials Room
 - Book Trucks



D E N N I S K O W A L A R C H I T E C T S
52 West Main Street • Somerville • New Jersey 08876 • Telephone 908-231-0201 • Fax 908-218-7979

Public Copiers
Two Copiers
Change Machine
Fax Machine
Vending Card Machine
Adult Collection
Fiction
Non-Fiction
Adult Basic Education
Reference
Reference Desk
Carrels
Tables
Map Area
Copier
Micro Fiche
PC stations
Reference Workroom
ILL
Workstations
Shelving
Counter
Files
Storage
Popular Materials
DVD/Video
Music CD
Large Print Fiction
New Books
OPAC
PC stations
Periodicals
Newspapers Lounge Furniture
Media Room
Young Adult
Collection
Tables
Soft Seating
Listening Devices
Shelving and Racks
OPAC
PC stations
Children's Collection



D E N N I S K O W A L A R C H I T E C T S
52 West Main Street • Somerville • New Jersey 08876 • Telephone 908-231-0201 • Fax 908-218-7979

Children's Circulation
Parenting Collection
Homework Area
Reference
Picture Books
Puppets
JV
Non-fiction
General
OPAC
Interactive
PC stations
Copier
Misc.
Bulletin Boards
Display Case
Fish Tank
Quiet Study Room
Nursing Mothers
Alcove
Children's
Restroom
Story Room
Children's Office
Storage
Quiet Study
Internet Cafe
Computer Training
Lab
Computer Server
Room
Computer Technician/Repair Office
Local History Room
Administration
Director's Office
Closet
Board Room
Secretary/ Reception
Bookkeeper
Staff Restrooms
Staff Room
Storage
Volunteer Room



Staff Room
Lockers
Technical Services
Book Trucks
Files
Cabinets
Workstations
Storage
Work Table
Shelving
Janitor's Closet
Seasonal Book Storage
Overflow Storage
Shipping and Receiving

The library shall include expansion methods to increase it to a modest 25,000 square feet. At 19,600 square feet, this size will meet grant application standards but will not allow every idea to be included in the final design.

Parking required for a 19,600 square foot library would be in the 75 car range. Per some codes and standards, parking is 1 car per 300 square feet or 64 cars. Other methods include calculating one car per three seats in the meeting room or 67 cars (but not adding the two together even though this is likely to occur occasionally).

In a similar study of the community of Livingston with a population of 26,000 people using an existing Library of 21,000 square feet, the lot rarely has more than 60 cars parked (including patrons and staff). Livingston patrons are vehicle users and rarely walk to the Library, with the exception of students from the local schools. This confirms that 75 parking spaces would be a reasonable target number knowing that during special events, some parallel parking along interior curbs may be necessary. Our recently constructed libraries are averaging .0034 parking spaces per square foot or 63 parking spaces in the case of a 19,000 square foot library. The Holmdel Municipal Engineer recommends 70 spaces. Therefore, for the purposes of this site selection study, 75 parking spaces were planned for each site.



LIBRARY LEVELS

It has been requested that all public space be located on a single level to minimize staffing. When public space exists on two levels (no matter how small the second level), at least two staff members are required to monitor that level (for safety concerns). Staffing is sometimes difficult to maintain during lunch hours, etc. and the second level sometimes will go un-monitored.

If a two-level facility is created, then at least non-public space such as workrooms, storage and staff rooms should be placed on the second level. It is also possible to locate the meeting room on a separate level. At best, this will account for about 5,000 square feet of area resulting in an uneven distribution of space. In addition, the program will require an increase of at least 2,500 square feet to account for two stairwells and one elevator and equipment room. There may also be increases for courtesy toilets because of the second level. The additional expense of a second level for simple stairs, elevator, equipment room and additional circulation area can be as much as a half million dollars. Single level libraries have been used as the basis of design in this Study. Although not part of the cost estimates, expansion could occur into a lower level built during construction at either Site F or Site D (taking advantage of the land slope).

A future second level is not as expensive as an active second level because the stairs and elevator can be constructed as openings or “knock-outs” for later development. This is especially true of lower levels which are walk-out spaces due to grade change where access can be temporarily obtained from the outside.

EXPLANATION OF DIAGRAMS

The following diagrams represent an analysis of each site. The sites have been keyed by letters. For example, the Municipal site is Site M, the DePalma Farm Site is Site D, and the F & F Nursery site is Site F. Each site has a series of diagrams representing the important findings. A complete discussion of the basis of the findings, e.g., the set-backs, can be found in the companion “Project Engineering Review”. It should be noted that it was an agreed assumption of this report that the analysis would be based on data, codes, information, and zoning as it existed on 1 January 2005.

It is also important to note that some watercourses are under discussion by authorities for more restrictive classification but the current classification is the classification used in this report. If the more restrictive classification occurs, it will simultaneously affect both the Municipal Site (Site M) and the F & F Site (Site F) with the most negative impact on the Municipal Site. For example, the Set-Back diagram for Site M indicates that a 150' stream buffer (per municipal ordinance)



would bisect the proposed Library site. This would prevent practical development of the Municipal Site for a single level Library. The same 150' buffer is shown on Site F but it does not change the conceptual Library plan nor interfere with development of this site. Also, the State's new storm water management regulations have strict buffer requirements that may be even more stringent than the Township's, e.g., up to 300'. However, the state's buffer requirements may be relaxed on previously developed/ disturbed sites.

The diagrams developed for each site are:

Site Views

Views to each parcel and from each parcel are shown photographically.

Existing Conditions

The proposed property line and topography are shown in context with adjacent parcels.

Set-back Analysis

After research into all of the ordinances and restrictions that apply to each site with careful attention to environmental concerns, the legal boundary for development of building and parking is shown in red. It should be noted that access driveways/roadways are permitted to cross the set back line to gain access to the public roadway system.

Conceptual Analysis

A brief analysis of how the site suggests locations for building and parking.

Conceptual Plan

A scaled representation of a typical Library footprint for 19,600 square feet on one level, parking for 75 cars, desired green space and roadway access. The Conceptual Plan is further developed as a site plan in the accompanying Preliminary Project Engineering Review. Detention basins, septic systems, and other engineering elements are added for accuracy in estimating.



Design Challenge Summary

The Conceptual Plan is evaluated and graded based on Engineering Challenges and Architectural Design Challenges.

Cost Analysis

A conceptual cost estimate is provided for each site based on the sketch designs. More detailed estimates can be provided when a site is selected and an actual design is developed. However, the Conceptual Designs create a method of evaluating how the costs would differ if the same Library and Parking were built on any of the sites.

LIBRARY PLAN

An interior layout of a Library Plan is also beyond the scope of this study. Library footprints were created to represent a 19,600 square foot, single-level facility using shapes that would easily accommodate the Library Program (based on twenty years of Public Library Design experience of DENNIS KOWAL ARCHITECTS) while conforming to the characteristics of each site. The site development costs included the variances from site to site for economies achieved by construction on a level site verses the cut and filled sites, utility extensions and other factors. While the site development costs varied widely for each site studied, the cost of building construction of 19,600 square feet of Library space was assumed to be the same on any site in Holmdel. Also, two sites could easily accommodate a walk-out lower level which could be built at the time of construction as a shell and core for future expansion. This is seen as a great advantage to the DePalma and F&F Sites. However, the cost of additional square footage as a lower level was not included in the analysis so that all comparisons were even.

The conceptual plans were then engineered to evaluate conformance to set-back lines, turning radii, and other standard practices before they were cost estimated. However, an engineered site plan is not in the scope of services for this Study and these drawings are included for reference purposes only. However, the exercise of testing the concepts against actual designs increased the accuracy of the cost estimates for the site development.



COMMUNITY CENTER

It was suggested that the main meeting room of the Community Center could be shared by a new Library thus reducing the size of the Library. This suggestion was incorporated into the Site M Conceptual site plan because a single-level, 19,600 square foot Library would not fit in the proposed site at Site M. By connecting the two buildings, renovating the Community Center and constructing a new 16,600 square foot Library, a workable solution can be achieved.

There is mixed reaction from the Library community about sharing a community room. The director of the Cranford Library, John Malar, was interviewed for this report because the Library and Community Center of this 20,000 population town share a meeting room. Although he must “make an application to use the room like anyone else in town”, his experience in getting the room when he needs it “has been excellent”. He says he also saves the cost of administration of the room for community events. It should be noted that the Library does have a smaller meeting room of its own for Children’s programming. John also noted that they have a combined 184 parking spaces for their Library and Community Center and only occasionally do they need to over-flow park in the adjacent Church parking lot. Comparatively, the enclosed Conceptual Plan for Site M shows 163 spaces for the Library and Community Center (not including the specific Post Office spaces which could also be considered overflow spaces).

Other librarians feel that sharing a meeting room with a senior citizens center or a community center has inherent problems because inevitably some group begins to claim the room. John Malar said the only problem he had was that often the public did not realize that the programs they were attending in the Community Center were actually sponsored by the Library.

SUMMARY OF ASSUMPTIONS

1. This study is based on the codes, standards and data available at the time of the data collection (January 2005)
2. The Planning Board can waive any of its own requirements for a building developed by the Township, but this study will not assume any waivers, especially with respect to the environment. The Library plan shall meet the Township’s own standards except variations that are normally assumed on other projects.
3. The Study shall, however, assume the best-case interpretation of standards, as they would apply to the Library.



-
4. For an equal comparison, all sites will be first studied with a single level facility (the desired design based on interviews). It is assumed that public space placed on more than one level would increase operation costs (staffing) of the Library and analyzing operation costs is beyond the scope of this study. However, the operation cost is an on-going expense and very real and should eventually be considered.
 5. It is assumed that non-public space could be placed on a second level without major increase in operational costs if it were for storage, staff, etc. Public space in the form of meeting rooms could also occupy a lower level without increasing staffing.
 6. It is assumed that all designs should meet the New Jersey Library Construction Grant Program standards so that the new Holmdel Library will qualify for this important grant program. The last published standards (2001) for library size shall be met at a minimum.
 7. It is assumed that the New Jersey Library Construction Grant Program standards are minimums and do not reflect additional space required in today's libraries for meeting rooms, special collections (such as local history rooms) and "merchandizing concepts" (Barnes and Noble look verses a warehouse look).
 8. It is assumed that technology has increased, not decreased, the size of public libraries. This is because computers actually take up more square footage than the old card catalogues that they have replaced. Adequate expansion space should be anticipated in the site design for a building expansion.
 9. Study and cost estimating of the Community Center Renovation was not part of the Scope of Services of this Study. However, suggestion to include a Community Center renovation was made during the interviews. A budget number for this renovation was assumed. It was further assumed that sharing the Community Center meeting room could reduce the size of the new Library at Site M by 3,000 square feet. The community center is 5,685 square feet and all of it was assumed to be renovated to make the exterior blend with the new Library.
 10. It is assumed that some new parking should be built for Site M to accommodate the Library and increased use of the Community Center. To make equal comparisons between the sites, 75 spaces were added to each of the three sites. However, if Site M were to be selected, it is quite likely that fewer than 75 new parking spaces would be needed.
 11. The engineering portion of this study is based on a reasonable best-case scenario for location of building setbacks and buffers.
 12. The impact of a 300' (reduced to 150' in the areas that have been previously disturbed) NJDEP C-1 buffer has been shown on the diagrams. This setback is under consideration by the NJDEP but not yet required.



-
13. Site acquisition costs were not part of this study. The assumption was that there was no cost to purchase any of the sites as they are already under the control of the Township.
 14. In the Design Challenge Summary Diagrams various factors are listed in terms of “slight”, “moderate” and “severe”. It should be noted that these designations refer to the impact of the factor on the site and not the impact of the site on the factor. ^Therefore, a “severe environmental” designation means that the challenges to planning caused by environmental concerns are severe (and not the other way around).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Choosing a site is a combination of objective and subjective factors. Depending on which factors are emphasized, a different result can be achieved. If site development cost is emphasized and all other design values are ignored, then the Municipal Site would be considered. If some of the values expressed by the Council such as room for expansion, appreciation for the environment, and a rural character are considered more important than utilizing the existing infrastructure at the Municipal Site, then the F & F site seems a good choice.

While the DePalma site is arguably the closest site to the center of the population mass of Holmdel, it has the most obstacles to overcome which creates the highest site costs. If the proposed site delineation lines could be adjusted, some of these costs could be decreased. Also, visibility from the road could be increased. The obstacles can be turned into interesting solutions including the winding, tree-lined access road, which creates a leisurely approach, excellent views into beautiful landscapes, a connection to farm life, and the ability to use the slope for grade-level access to a lower level. However, this site will be dropped from the recommendation list in its present delineation, primarily due to its higher costs, leaving two sites: F and M.

The site development costs of Site M are \$478,581 and the site development costs of Site F are \$755,581, a \$277,000 difference. Remember, to compare oranges to oranges, all sites were treated equally in terms of development. One could argue that the Municipal Site M could get by with less new parking and this would reduce the site costs. Someone could equally argue that the post office is already double parking and many of the existing parking spaces are not convenient and will therefore remain unused. Therefore, for the purposes of this site comparison, all sites were developed equally as possible to get a base number. From the base number, many adjustments could be made to make any site more or less expensive.



Since the overall cost of developing either the Municipal Site or the F & F site are fairly close, other considerations should be discussed. The total cost of Site F site and building is \$4,381,581 while the total cost of Site M site and building is \$4,402,331. Three additional considerations will likely be the talking points for either site.

1. Which site is the most convenient to use?
2. Which site best contributes to adding to the character of Holmdel?
3. Which site solves over-crowding of other municipal services?

Which site is the most convenient to use?

Adding a 19,600 square foot library on one level at Site M and intensifying the use of the Community Center by renovating it and making it the location of Township Committee and other meeting venues will create a bustling parcel. Vehicle traffic between the existing Municipal Building and the new Meeting Room will also increase due to the need to access last minute papers, maps, or other documents necessary for official meetings. Patrons may not find crossing this activity to park and use the Library as convenient as a site dedicated solely to the Library. But more importantly, the tightness of the Municipal site affects the convenience more than mixed use. Vehicle turn-over is high at a public library, some visits are just to drop off books and some visits are to pick up tax forms, make a copy, etc. While seventy parking spaces may be provided, those spaces may turn over every hour; a twelve-hour day producing over 700 car exchanges.

Speaking in favor of Site M is the ability to pay taxes and buy stamps all at one campus site. Comparably speaking, it has been requested that you compare paying taxes to taking out library books, (i.e. now if people pay taxes and go to the post office they drive, because of the time limit on parking spaces. If the community center site is used as the library, people will park at the library and walk across the bridge to pay taxes, because there will not be a time limit on parking.) However, it is likely many will park at the post office and drive and park again to pay taxes at Town Hall. The U.S. Government now has a program allowing the public library to sell stamps from the circulation desk (not just a machine), which could weaken this argument. But this also makes Site F attractive because stamps could also be purchased there. However, if a Community Room for municipal meetings were created at Site F, moving papers, maps, and other documents to the meetings could become a factor.

Since Site M and Site F are fairly equi-distant from the schools, convenience is minimally different.



On the issue of convenience, there is no clear winner between F and M. Site M has the convenience of municipal facilities closer together but the convenience of parking and shuffling around the site could be more difficult while Site F has the space to create a generous parking lot and clear circulation lanes but offers no adjacent facilities.

Which site best contributes to adding to the character of Holmdel?

Goal 2.F of the Master Plan is to “Encourage high-quality design for all development throughout the Township.”

Goal 2.B of the Master Plan is to “Protect the unique character of Holmdel which consists of desirable residential neighborhoods, attractive commercial areas and business campuses, and the historic hamlet of Holmdel Village and its agricultural environs.”

Goal 3.G of the Masterplan is to “Avoid the appearance of sprawl along the Township’s commercial corridors, and encourage a high standard of visual quality, architectural design, landscaping and maintenance for all developments.”

Site F is a farmed area, which might be an area the Master Plan seeks to protect from development. But a closer look based on Figure 2.1 of the Master Plan Land Uses indicates that Site F is actually an orphaned corner of an R 40 B zone currently used for agriculture. Site F is a parcel of land separated from the remaining farmed open space by a Residential Parcel adjacent to the site. It has been suggested that this Residential Parcel be purchased and used in conjunction with the Library Site. This option was not part of the Scope of this Study but is a reasonable suggestion to explore should Site F be selected.

Since development would not occur in the middle of the farmed area, this might be an appropriate location for the Library and consistent with the goals of the Master Plan.

Site F is also a good trailhead location for a public building and parking since it is adjacent to a proposed greenway trail and a proposed bicycle path in the Ramanessin Brook Conservation Area (See Figure 4.1 of the Master Plan).



By in-filling the property between the Community Center and the Post Office, a nearly continuous façade of buildings 300' long will be created. While it is possible to minimize the impact of a wall of building faces by changing the roof heights, etc., the creation of “a strip-type municipal mall” might go against the spirit of Master Plan Goal G3 which seeks to avoid façade “sprawl along the Township’s commercial corridors”.

In favor of the Municipal site is that no farmed land is being developed with new construction for the Library.

Again, there are pros and cons for each site and there is no clear winner.

Which site solves over-crowding of other municipal services?

During the interviews, it was hoped that the new Library could solve some of the over-crowding of other municipal services. By creating a meeting room for the Library that was also designed for public meetings, the current municipal meeting room could be relieved of overcrowding.

Development of a Library at Site M would most help this cause. Developing Site M appears to have the most direct effect on easing some over-crowding of services at the municipal complex. Another option is to develop Site F for the library and then renovate and expand the Senior Center in order to provide more meeting space for the municipal complex.

The concept of having a municipal meeting room within the Library and exposing more of the public to civic government and its operation is an appealing concept, which is worthy of exploration during the Library Programming Phase, which precedes Library Design.

CONCLUSION

Based on the spirit of the interviews, which focuses on the Environment and Technology, the F & F site offers the most potential for an environmentally friendly design. It is the opinion of DENNIS KOWAL ARCHITECTS, based on all factors, that Site F be selected for the new Library Location.

- The un-congested location (plenty of green space around the building and parking) allows for safer circulation, a more welcoming site, and better interaction between the land and the building.
- The building and parking can serve as a greenway trailhead location for exploring the preserved land.



- The cost of development of this site is the least cost.
- There is room for expansion.
- There is the potential of additional uses at the adjacent Residential property.
- The Library will offer a relaxed setting with exceptional views for all to share.
- A freestanding building will allow the most perimeter for windows.
- A freestanding building is most compatible with the rural expectations noted during the interviews.
- All new construction means all systems will be the same age.
- The building can be an example to future developers of compatible design.

Site F meets all seven of the Needs explained in the introduction of this Study.

1. Functional needs met
2. Image needs met
3. Safety needs met
4. Environmental needs met
5. Engineering needs met
6. Cost needs met
7. Expansion needs met

One potential concern for Site F is the impact of the State's stream buffer zone upon the location of building and parking structures. The NJDEP needs to be consulted to assess the possible extent of this impact. (The State's storm water management rules are relatively new and are subject to interpretation.)

Site M has no room for expansion and would require construction in a proposed environmental buffer zone. It would be the most difficult site to develop for Image and it saves no money over Site F, although it may be possible to relax these requirements since it is a previously developed/disturbed site.

Site D, in its present delineation, is the most expensive to develop and the Library would be difficult to observe from the road which impacts its image.



SITE D COST ANALYSIS

LAND ACQUISITION		\$	0
SITE COSTS			
DEMOLITION / CLEARING	\$	38,750	
OFF-SITE WORK	\$	28,446	
GENERAL SITEWORK	\$	515,775	
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	\$	126,323	
SEPTIC SYSTEM COMPONENTS	\$	18,860	
PUBLIC WATER SERVICE	\$	30,020	
NATURAL GAS SERVICE	\$	9,570	
ELECTRIC SERVICE / SITE LIGHTING	\$	59,750	
TELEPHONE & CABLE SERVICES	\$	10,000	
LANDSCAPING	\$	28,735	
SOIL EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL	\$	30,725	
SITE CONTINGENCY (25%)	\$	224,238	
SUB-TOTAL		\$	1,121,192
BUILDING COSTS			
NEW CONSTRUCTION OF 19,600 SF AT \$185 PER SF		\$	3,626,000
TOTAL		\$	4,747,192

SITE F COST ANALYSIS

LAND ACQUISITION		\$	0
SITE COSTS			
DEMOLITION / CLEARING	\$	16,450	
OFF-SITE WORK	\$	48,570	
GENERAL SITEWORK	\$	187,575	
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	\$	97,930	
SEPTIC SYSTEM COMPONENTS	\$	95,000	
PUBLIC WATER SERVICE	\$	36,500	
NATURAL GAS SERVICE	\$	4,480	
ELECTRIC SERVICE / SITE LIGHTING	\$	41,700	
TELEPHONE & CABLE SERVICES	\$	3,500	
LANDSCAPING	\$	54,860	
SOIL EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL	\$	17,900	
SITE CONTINGENCY (25%)	\$	151,116	
SUB-TOTAL		\$	755,581
BUILDING COSTS			
NEW CONSTRUCTION OF 19,600 SF AT \$185 PER SF		\$	3,626,000
TOTAL		\$	4,381,581



SITE M COST ANALYSIS

LAND ACQUISITION		\$	0
SITE COSTS			
DEMOLITION / CLEARING	\$	12,525	
OFF-SITE WORK	\$	8,700	
GENERAL SITEWORK	\$	174,25	
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	\$	78,195	
SANITARY SEWER SERVICES	\$	6,620	
FIRE AND WATER SERVICE	\$	13,160	
NATURAL GAS SERVICE	\$	4,620	
ELECTRIC SERVICE / SITE LIGHTING	\$	41,600	
TELEPHONE & CABLE SERVICES	\$	2,500	
LANDSCAPING	\$	23,388	
SOIL EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL	\$	17,432	
SITE CONTINGENCY (25%)	\$	95,716	
 SUB-TOTAL		\$	478,581
BUILDING COSTS			
NEW CONSTRUCTION OF 16,600 SF AT \$185 PER SF		\$	3,071,000
RENOVATION OF 5,685 SF AT \$150 PER SF		\$	852,750
TOTAL		\$	4,402,331

Notes

1. Utility demolition, relocation, and service upgrades or improvement costs are only "allowances" and are to be confirmed with each individual utility authority prior to final budgeting. All projected utility loads or utility service demands are to be provided by the Project Architect and existing mains are expected at that time to be fully evaluated. At this time, all existing mains are anticipated as being of adequate size. This cost estimate assumes only minor utility improvements will be necessary.
2. Please be advised, there are various savings or additional expenses that may be capable of being made to this Cost Estimate upon the preparation and review of the Site Plan Design Documents necessary to obtain all jurisdictional approvals.
3. Building costs do not include furnishings and equipment.
4. Professional fees are not included.
5. Owner contingency is not included in the above estimate.
6. Costs are for construction in 2005.