

Meeting Participation

WE VALUE YOUR INPUT



Participate in Poll Questions

When a poll question is asked, submit your response by clicking the option in the Zoom window.



Ask a Question

At designated times after each topic, you can click the “Raise Your Hand” button to be taken off mute and ask a question on that topic. Please be mindful of time constraints.



Share Comments via Email

During and after the meeting, submit questions and comments to Jen at jstartz@newlondonct.org with subject line: “Community Recreation Center Comment.” Submissions will be confidential, and we will respond to questions in the coming days following the meeting.



COMMUNITY RECREATION CENTER PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT CONCEPT COMMUNITY
MEETING

October 21, 2020



Meeting Agenda


01 Overview & Context

02 Program

Program Q&A

03 Site Selection

Site Selection Q&A




01

OVERVIEW &
CONTEXT



Process

DEVELOPMENT OF AN IMPLEMENTABLE PLAN



Poll #1

New London Data Analysis

CONTEXT

- › New London is a racially diverse community.
- › The population distribution currently skews young. Projections indicate growth in school-age children and adults 65+.
- › Economic characteristics like household income distribution show that many in the community have limited disposable income.
- › **Why we analyze these data points**
 - Age and income distributions can indicate potential levels of participation in different recreational activities.
 - Population characteristics can inform project concepts like membership cost model and program size.



Criteria Setting

CONTEXT

Criteria were developed based on New London's core values to ensure the Community Recreation Center contributes to achieving the targeted outcomes.

Core Values

- › Make a city of diverse constituencies function as one community.
- › Address the needs of every household and family to raise children with the opportunity to compete in the world and achieve well-being.
- › Continue the ascension of the city into a place worthy of investment by industries and families alike.
- › Take advantage of the city's locational attributes and neighboring populations to create positive revenue streams that make access to New Londoners affordable.
- › Ensure the center's long-term financial viability.



Criteria

SUMMARY

- › The center vision is a combination of a traditional community center and a recreation center, which must accommodate demand for the **most popular activities** and prioritize **youth development**.
- › The physical building should signify the City's commitment to **community wellbeing** and achieve bold architectural expression via **building form and experience**, rather than the liberal use of expensive materials.
- › Every New London resident should be accommodated **regardless of their ability to pay**.
- › The center management must be **aggressively entrepreneurial** and pursue opportunities to generate speculative revenue for the sake of cross-subsidizing programs for low- and moderate-income residents.

Criteria will rigorously applied to ensure City resources are appropriately invested and results are optimized.


New London partners engaged:

- City Council Economic Development Subcommittee
- Community Task Force representing a wide variety of industries and perspectives
- Economic Development & Planning
- New London Recreation
- New London Youth Affairs
- Office of the Mayor
- Schools
- Senior Center and Human Services
- Sports clubs

Poll #2

Project Concept

FOCUS OF FURTHER REFINEMENT



Every decision regarding the Center's program, location, and operations will be made with the residents of New London at the forefront.

We've been busy, but we're not finished yet.

How we gathered the facts:

- Criteria setting
- Demographic analysis
- Competitive context
- Participation analysis
- Demand projection modeling
- Stakeholder engagement & interviews
- Site investigation
- Preliminary program model

02

PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS




Project Concept

- › The project concept is a combination of a traditional Community center and a public Recreation center, to be called a Community Recreation Center, of approximately 67,000 square feet.
- › A community-centric recreation center prioritizing youth development and family wellness
- › Certain program elements have a regional draw
- › Majority of the diverse population partakes in general cardio and weightlifting, basketball, and swimming
 - Two court **gym** with retractable bleachers around one court
 - Six lane **Swimming pool** (8 lane pool alternate for regional draw)
 - Leisure aquatics feature
 - Fitness center
 - Multipurpose rooms convertible for rec and education
 - Outdoor ropes course if possible



Gymnasium

MAJOR PROGRAM ELEMENTS



Southern Area Aquatic and Recreation Center Prince George's County, Maryland

- Tournaments
- Leagues
- Open play
- Basketball
- Volleyball
- Futsal
- Children's games
- Teen programs
- Community events (flooring dependent)

**Hypothesis: two-court gym,
with retractable bleachers
around one court**

14K

Total square feet

Includes Gymnasium Storage, Spectator Seating (~150 spectators), and retractable side hoops.

 **18K**

**Basketball Participants
30-min drive**

Including potential Frequent, Occasional, and Infrequent participants

Gymnasium

MAJOR PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Concept: Two-court gym with retractable bleachers around one court

- › Criteria Alignment
 - **Flexible space and scale** accommodates diverse activities plus local and regional demand.
 - Courts host sports and activities that promote **youth development**.
- › Competitive Context
 - New London school gyms have limited public accessibility.
- › Alternatives
 - Larger / Additional Courts
 - MAC court and 1 wood floor gym



Aquatics

MAJOR PROGRAM ELEMENTS



Mount Vernon Rec Center, Fairfax VA
Barry Farms Aquatic Center, Washington DC

- Learn to Swim
- Lap swimming for exercise
- Swim team practices
- Local-level Meets
- General family recreation
- Youth camps
- Water aerobics
- Other fitness classes
- Senior use

Hypothesis: both a lap pool and a leisure pool with kid-friendly water feature

15K

Total square feet

Includes 6-Lane Lap Pool, Leisure Pool, Whirlpool, Spectator Seating (~100), Lifeguard Room, Storage, and Wet Classroom

 **35K**

Swimming Participants

30-min drive

Including potential Frequent, Occasional, and Infrequent participants

Aquatics

MAJOR PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Concept: both a 6-lane lap pool and a leisure pool

› Criteria Alignment

- Pool rental provides opportunities to **generate revenue** for the sake of cross-subsidizing other programs.
- Pools accommodate **highly popular** activity and **youth development**.

› Competitive Context

- There are few indoor pools around New London, and they tend to be inaccessible due to scheduling.


› Alternatives

- Single pool for competitive and leisure purposes
- Competitive pool with 8 lanes
- 50-meter pool



Fitness Center

MAJOR PROGRAM ELEMENTS



Jacksonville State University, Alabama
University of Alabama at Birmingham

- Cardio equipment
- Free weights
- Strength training machines
- Functional fitness
- Boot camps
- Personal training
- Stretching and mobility
- Running, jogging, and walking

Hypothesis: a ~6,500 sf weight & fitness area and an elevated jogging track

13K

Total square feet

Includes fitness space, storage, and elevated track

 **10K**

Frequent Participants

15 min drive

Working out, Running, and Weightlifting. Not including occasional and infrequent participants (24,200).

Fitness Center

MAJOR PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Concept: a weight & fitness area and an elevated jogging track

- › Criteria Alignment
 - Space promotes physical health, a key component in quality of life and **community well being**.


- › Competitive Context
 - There are limited accessible general fitness center close to New London; Planet Fitness (Waterford) and Renegade Fitness at Ocean Beach Park are two of the only centers in the area.

- › Alternatives
 - Scale size according to budget and operational realities



Multipurpose

MAJOR PROGRAM ELEMENTS



California State University, Monterey Bay
Frostburg State University, Maryland

Fitness Classes

- Yoga
- Pilates
- Martial Arts
- Aerobics

Education Programs

- Tutoring
- Study Halls
- Classes
- Enrichment

Cultural Programs

- Music
- Arts
- Community Events
- Meetings

Recreation

- Game room
- eSports
- Social gathering
- Clubs

Hypothesis: central lounge,
three multipurpose rooms,
and two classrooms, all
varying sizes

10K

Total square feet

Includes Multipurpose Room Storage

- Large Classroom
- Small Classroom
- Large Multipurpose Room
- Medium Multipurpose Room
- Small Multipurpose Room
- Large Lounge

Multipurpose Rooms

MAJOR PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Concept: three multipurpose rooms, two classrooms, and a lounge of varying sizes

› Criteria Alignment

- Spaces accommodate programs for **youth development** not limited solely to sports: leadership, arts, employment, and academic activities for youth as well as the broader community.
- Dedicated wellness resource room supports **community well being**.
- **Flexible** rooms allow rental **revenue generation**.

› Competitive Context

- Limited opportunity for fitness and wellness classes and meeting rooms. Existing space is highly utilized and at a premium.

› Alternatives

- Scale size and quantity



Poll #3

Overall Program

PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS

- › Including offices, locker rooms, support areas, and other spaces, the total preliminary indoor building program is about 67,000 square feet.
 - For reference: Mystic YMCA building ~40,000 square feet
- › Including appropriate parking and other outdoor space, the total footprint should ideally be around 4 acres.
 - Total site footprint needed depends on configuration of building and surrounding space
 - For size reference: Jennings Elementary School lot ~4 acres



Poll #4

Q&A: Program Considerations




03

SITE SELECTION



Relationship of Development Factors

SITE SELECTION



- › The budget will be fixed, so changes to Quality, Site, or Building Program will require tradeoffs.
- › An increase in site costs could result in a reduction in quality or recreational opportunities offered.
- › Site will impact achievable revenue and patron accommodation.

Site Selection Process

SITE SELECTION

1. Real estate ownership database search
2. City inventory
3. Preliminary analysis of accommodation
4. Review and affirmation by City administration
5. Detailed evaluation
6. Preliminary presentation to Council
7. Public vetting
8. Final approval

The minimum site requirement to accommodate the targeted program and associated parking would be 4 acres. Site configuration could require a site to be materially larger.

Potential Sites Analyzed

LOCATIONS


A. 126 Green St

B. 234 Bank St

C. Bates Woods Park

D. Edgerton School Property


E. Fort Trumbull



A. 126 Green Street

SITE SUMMARY


- › **Description:** City-owned municipal parking lots on Green Street between Tilley and Golden Streets
- › **Footprint:** approximately 82,000 square feet (1.9 acres)
- › **Pros**
 - Ability to enhance civic pride / New London brand
 - Support existing and new development
 - Pedestrian and transit access
- › **Cons**
 - Narrow footprint will not accommodate even the minimum program
 - Parking challenges



A. 126 Green Street

SITE DEVELOPMENT FACTORS

- › **Site Development Cost Risk: High**
 - Long narrow site not conducive to efficient facility design or construction
 - Lack of footprint will require substantial vertical construction and structured parking
 - Demolition and abatement
 - Potential environmental remediation



B. 234 Bank Street

SITE SUMMARY

- › **Description:** Privately owned downtown property near waterfront
- › **Footprint:** approximately 106,000 square feet (2.4 acres)
- › **Pros**
 - Support existing and new development
 - Ability to enhance civic pride / New London brand
 - Pedestrian and transit access
- › **Cons**
 - Property acquisition and site development costs
 - Schedule risks
 - Accommodation of required parking
 - Includes building of potential historic significance



B. 234 Bank Street

SITE DEVELOPMENT FACTORS

› Site Development Cost Risk: High

- Land acquisition and approvals
- Lack of footprint will require some vertical construction and structured parking
- Potential 100-year flood and water table risk
 - FEMA designates 1% chance of flood in a given year
 - Mitigatable through grading plan and drainage system
 - Commercial property not subject to same vertical building requirements as Residential
- Demolition and abatement
- Potential environmental remediation



C. Bates Woods Park

SITE SUMMARY

- › **Description:** City owned park with existing ballfields, playground, pavilions, and parking; Animal Control facility
- › **Footprint:** minimum 150,000 square feet south of existing amenities (~3.4 acres)
- › **Pros**
 - Accommodate targeted building footprint, required parking, and site development
 - Complement other civic assets
- › **Cons**
 - Limited pedestrian access
 - Site specific costs (topography, site clearing, drainage, etc.)



Area drawn represents 150,000 square feet; actual footprint and location dependent of topography.

C. Bates Woods Park

SITE DEVELOPMENT FACTORS

› Site Development Cost Risk: Medium

- Sloping site will require substantial grading and retaining wall construction
- Potential environmental approvals
- Potential environmental remediation
- Site Utilities



Area drawn represents 150,000 square feet; actual footprint and location dependent of topography.

D. Edgerton School Property

SITE SUMMARY

- › **Description:** Privately owned vacant school property adjacent to Veterans Memorial Field
- › **Footprint:** approximately 145,000 square feet total (3.3 acres)
- › **Pros**
 - Capture of largest target market within short travel time
 - Vehicular, pedestrian, and transit access
- › **Cons**
 - Site acquisition and demolition cost
 - Accommodation of target building program and required parking



D. Edgerton School Property

SITE DEVELOPMENT FACTORS

› Site Development Cost Risk: Medium

- Land acquisition and approvals
- Demolition and abatement
- Potential environmental remediation



E. Fort Trumbull

SITE SUMMARY

- › **Description:** City owned property adjacent to Fort Trumbull State Park
- › **Footprint:** approximately 324,000 square feet total (7.4 acres)
- › **Pros**
 - Support for existing and new development
 - Accommodation of target building program and required parking
 - Potential for timely development
- › **Cons**
 - Pedestrian access
 - Potential to share facilities with other City agencies



E. Fort Trumbull

SITE DEVELOPMENT FACTORS

› Site Development Cost Risk: Low

- Potential 100-year flood and water table risk
 - FEMA designates 1% chance of flood in a given year
 - Mitigatable through grading plan and drainage system
 - Commercial property not subject to same vertical building requirements as Residential
- Environmental remediation



Criteria Used

SITE SELECTION

Design & Development

- Complement other assets
- Maximize facility sharing potential; support existing & new development
- Enhance civic pride and New London brand

Transportation

- Maximum capture of largest target market within shortest travel time
- Maximum access by vehicle, pedestrian, public transit

Schedule

- Minimal constraints and timeline for public/zoning approvals and property acquisition
- Maximum potential for timely development

Site Suitability

- Accommodate the community recreation center footprint, as well as parking and site development needs
- Minimal environmental or historic impacts and constraints

Cost & Economics

- Minimal costs for property acquisition, demolition, relocation, environmental, and site-specific construction costs
- Maximum potential to generate other revenue

Energy & Utility

- Maximum alternative energy opportunities (e.g. micro-grid, central plant, solar, etc.)

Note: Green Street site was not included in criteria scoring because its configuration will not accommodate even the minimum program.

Overall Criteria Scoring Summary

SITE SELECTION

- › Fort Trumbull emerged as the most practical location.
- › Fort Trumbull’s score is driven by the ability to accommodate the full program and parking footprint on a build-ready site.

| | 234 Bank Street | Bates Woods Park | Edgerton Property | Fort Trumbull |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Development and Design Considerations | 81 | 82 | 79 | 85 |
| Transportation Considerations | 85 | 70 | 90 | 65 |
| Energy & Utility Considerations | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Site Suitability Considerations | 75 | 95 | 95 | 105 |
| Cost and Economic Considerations | 37 | 51 | 54 | 99 |
| Schedule Considerations | 12 | 32 | 28 | 56 |
| Overall | 299 | 339 | 355 | 419 |

Overall Criteria Scoring Summary

SITE SELECTION

- › When only non-cost factors are considered, Fort Trumbull remains the most practical location

| | 234 Bank Street | Bates Woods Park | Edgerton Property | Fort Trumbull |
|---|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Development and Design Considerations | 81 | 82 | 79 | 85 |
| Transportation Considerations | 85 | 70 | 90 | 65 |
| Energy & Utility Considerations | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Site Suitability Considerations | 75 | 95 | 95 | 105 |
| Cost and Economic Considerations | 37 | 51 | 54 | 99 |
| Schedule Considerations | 12 | 32 | 28 | 56 |
| Overall | 299 | 339 | 355 | 419 |
| Overall (excluding Cost and Economics) | 262 | 288 | 301 | 320 |

Poll #5

Q&A: Site Selection



Site Context

SITE SELECTION

| PART A: CONTEXT | Criteria Weighting | 234 Bank Street | | Bates Woods Park | | Edgerton Property | | Fort Trumbull | |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | | Raw Score | Weighted Score | Raw Score | Weighted Score | Raw Score | Weighted Score | Raw Score | Weighted Score |
| Development and Design Considerations | | | 81 | | 82 | | 79 | | 85 |
| Complement other civic assets | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 6 |
| Consistent with land-use planning | 5 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 |
| Support for existing /new development | 4 | 5 | 20 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 20 |
| Potential to share facilities with other City agencies | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 6 |
| Potential to share facilities with private partners | 2 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 8 |
| Ability to enhance civic pride / New London brand | 5 | 5 | 25 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 |
| Transportation Considerations | | | 85 | | 70 | | 90 | | 65 |
| Capture of largest market within short travel time | 5 | 4 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 25 | 3 | 15 |
| Vehicular access | 5 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 |
| Pedestrian access | 5 | 5 | 25 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 10 |
| Public transit access | 5 | 5 | 25 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 3 | 15 |
| Energy & Utility Considerations | | | 9 | | 9 | | 9 | | 9 |
| Alternative efficient energy opportunities | 3 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 |

Criteria Weighting: On a scale of 1 to 5; 5 indicates most important to selection. Multiplied by Raw Score to calculate Weighted Score.
 Raw Score: On a scale of 1 to 5; 5 indicates strongest satisfaction of criteria.

Site Context

SITE SELECTION

| PART B: RESOURCES | Criteria Weighting | 234 Bank Street | | Bates Woods Park | | Edgerton Property | | Fort Trumbull | |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | | Raw Score | Weighted Score | Raw Score | Weighted Score | Raw Score | Weighted Score | Raw Score | Weighted Score |
| Site Suitability Considerations | | | 75 | | 95 | | 95 | | 105 |
| Accommodate targeted building footprint | 5 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 25 |
| Accommodate required parking and site development | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 25 |
| Access to existing utilities | 5 | 5 | 25 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 |
| Environmental impacts or constraints | 5 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 25 | 2 | 10 |
| Historic, archeological, or cultural impacts | 5 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 |
| Cost and Economic Considerations | | | 37 | | 51 | | 54 | | 99 |
| Property acquisition costs | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 25 |
| Demolition, relocation costs | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Environmental remediation costs | 5 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 20 |
| Site-specific costs (topography, ground water, etc.) | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 |
| Potential to generate additional fiscal revenue | 3 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 |
| Schedule Considerations | | | 12 | | 32 | | 28 | | 56 |
| Public approvals constraints / timeline | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 16 |
| Property acquisition constraints / timeline | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 20 |
| Potential for timely development | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 20 |