District Office History
District Administration Building Proposal

Current office placed on site 1969 as temporary structure to last 3 years

- 46 year old building in disrepair
- Building is not handicap accessible
- Bathrooms are not ADA compliant
- Health and building code violations MUST be addressed
- Water and power supply tapped from SIS
- Septic system is insufficient for building occupants
- Substandard office spaces for employees
- Inadequate parking
Current temporary structures accommodates (21) employees

- Superintendent’s office
- Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
- Assistant Superintendent of Business
- Business office personnel
- District Clerk
- Human Resources personnel
- District receptionist
- Director of PPS
- Special Education support personnel
District Administration Building Proposal

- Missing from current DO
  - Director of facilities office and staff
  - Desk space for auditors and accountants
  - Historical records retention room within building
  - Conference\ Meeting Rooms
  - Adequate storage and filing space
  - Adequate bathrooms for number of employees
  - Adequate parking
May 2009: Southampton community approved creation of a capital reserve for the specific purpose of a new District Office and Bus Garage;

Portion of reserve funds have been used to renovate Bus Garage at its current location

$8.2 million dollars left in reserve which require voter approval to access – No New Taxes

District is considering options for use or sale of Majors Path property.
In 2015 District Officials considered the following Four Options:

- Find open space within District
- Build new structure on current site
- Lease office space
- Purchase existing structure within Southampton
Key Criteria considered for New District Office in 2015:

- **Size**: Minimum of 10,000 square feet – Maximum 17,000 square feet
- **Location**: Close proximity to current campuses
- **Condition**: ADA-compliant; in good condition; renovations possible
- **Parking**: Must have adequate parking for employees and visitors

**Construction Disruption**: Minimize noise disruption; preservation of existing fields and organic garden

- **Cost**: Include ancillary costs associated with leasing temporary space, architects, engineers, landscaping, furnishings, etc.
- **Financial flexibility over long term**: Retain options for an unforeseeable future
District Admin Building Proposal

Option 1: Find New Space Within District

- Enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All current spaces being efficiently utilized
- New mandates require additional instructional space
- Some teaching is occurring in less than ideal locations
District Admin Building Proposal

Option 2: Build New Structure on Current Site

• Pros:
  • Remain on current campus
  • Built to specific District specifications

• Cons:
  • Cost
    • Wicks Law, prevailing wage of an estimated $500 to $550/sq.ft.
    • Architects, engineers, environmental studies
    • Lease of space during construction
    • Major on-campus and neighborhood disruption
  • Minimum 2 years for occupancy
  • No additional parking and loss of parking during construction
  • Loss of field space
  • No exit strategy in the future
District Admin Building Proposal
Option 3: Lease Office Space

• Pro:
  • Provides flexibility in the event space opens up within District’s existing buildings

• Cons:
  • Lease options limited to proximity of District
  • Expensive, approximately $300K according to comparables
  • School Boards are limited to 5 year lease agreements
  • Lack of control for the District
    • Rent could increase over time
    • Building could be sold and District forced to surrender lease
District Admin Building Proposal

Option 4: Purchase Existing Structure Within Southampton

• Pros:
  • Minimal disruption to both students and employees of District
  • Preserves fields, organic garden and increases limited parking
  • Preserves an “exit strategy”
    • Should change in need for space arise in the future, the district could sell the property and recoup the funds
  • Asset will appreciate in value over time
  • Structure on building property will not appreciate over time
District Admin Building Proposal

Option 4: Purchase Existing Structure Within Southampton

Pros (continued):

• Opens new space for possible SIS recreational space

• Cons:
  • Not on current District property
District Admin Building Proposal

Option 4: Purchase Existing Structure Within Southampton - continued

• In 2015 District administrators looked at a number of properties, including:
  • Old post office, old library, warehouse-type structures
    • None met the criteria regarding size and parking
    • Cost for acquisition and renovation was too expensive
District Admin Building Proposal

Option 4: Purchase Existing Structure Within Southampton - continued

Previous Recommendation: Purchase of 300 Hampton Road, Southampton
District Admin Building Proposal

2015 Recommendation
Option 4: Purchase Existing Structure Within Southampton – 300 Hampton Road

**Size:** Met the District's needs; excess space can be leased, generating revenue for the district on an ongoing basis

**Location:** Across the street from Intermediate School and current District Office

**Condition:** Building is in turn key condition; no improvements needed

**Parking:** Ample parking availability, 76 spaces

**Construction Disruption:** Virtually eliminated construction disruption; preserves existing fields and organic garden

**Cost:** Current funds available cover cost

**Long-Term Financial Flexibility:** Allowed the District flexibility in the future, should a need/desire arise to divest the property
Current District Needs
## District Enrollment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pre-k-12 Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>1622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-Present</td>
<td>1637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What can BBS do to assist the process?

• Re-think and re-size the previously proposed plans.
• Evaluate the revised building program to see how it would inform a revised building plan.
• Develop a basic building plan that could be used to determine the appropriateness of potential sites relative to size and shape.
• Develop a more specific building plan that would be situated on the existing Intermediate School site.
Potential Additional Parking
Existing/ Potential New Building
Potential Playground
Existing/ Potential Gardens
Potential Additional Parking
Potential Site
Core Evaluation
Parameters
Base Assumption

Program of new spaces to mirror Superintendent’s evaluation.

Building Space per Program

First and Second Floor Office Space  10,000 to 12,000 GSF
Basement Storage, etc.  5,500 GSF

Parking

Approximate Number of Employees  30 (plus growth)
Approximate Number of Visitors  15
Total # of Parking Stalls by Program  45
Parking

Actual Square Footage required per Parking Stall = 320 SF

Town & Village Parking Ordinance = 1 stall per 180 GSF Building

10,000 GSF/ 180 SF = 55.6
12,000 GSF/ 180 SF = 66.6

Approximately sixty (60) stalls would be required by Ordinance.
Rule of Thumb for Office Buildings

The square footage of a new office building to “fit” on a site with required parking, setbacks, sanitary, etc. is approximately equal to 20 to 25% of the overall lot area.

Theoretically, for a 12,000 GSF building:

@ 20% lot area \((12,000 \text{ GSF})/(.200) = 60,000 \text{ SF min. lot area req’d} (+/- 1.37 \text{ Acres})\)

@ 22.5% lot area \((12,000 \text{ GSF})/(.225) = 53,333 \text{ SF min. lot area req’d} (+/- 1.22 \text{ Acres})\)

@ 25% lot area \((12,000 \text{ GSF})/(.250) = 40,000 \text{ SF min. lot area req’d} (+/- 0.92 \text{ Acres})\)
Minimum Physical Lot Size

The minimum physical lot size to support a two-story 12,000 GSF building with a building footprint of 6,000 GSF and forty-five (45) parking stalls, without any other paving, landscaping, sidewalks, etc., w/out regard for potential setbacks, easements, etc.

(6,000 GSF Building Footprint) + (45 stalls @ 320 SF each) = 20,400 SF (+/- 0.547Acres)
All site evaluations would be affected by the actual shape and dimensionality of each parcel under consideration. For example, a rectilinear shape would be more efficient than a triangular shape, etc.
Potential Site Evaluation Criteria Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+/- Property Size (Acre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/- Approximate Building Footprint (SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/- Number of Stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Site Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/- Available On-site Parking (Stalls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Parking Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/- Distance to Other School Facilities (miles):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Future Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Development Cons/Constraints/Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Development Pros/Advantages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability for Intended Program/Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Base/Core Thought Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior Studies

2012 New Building as presented at January 17, 2012 BOE Meeting, Including Programming Information

2012 Interior Reconstruction of 300 Hampton Road Analysis

2015 New Building Analysis
New Building
2012
Proposed Administration Building & Associated Projects

January 17, 2012
300 Hampton Road 2012
New Building

2015

I.T. and Athletic Director not included as they were in the 2012 new building plan. Other program stayed the same.
Potential Time Line
Oct-Nov 2017

Redesign building as a specific structure to be on Intermediate School site connected to the I.S.

Evaluate alternative parking concepts on I.S. site.

Evaluate alternative existing buildings and or sites within the Southampton UFSD boundaries as suitable or not suitable for consideration as new District Office.

Present all efforts above to the Board of Education.
Nov-Dec 2017

Refine designs as necessary to refine all alternatives both on Intermediate School site and/or any alternative site(s) so as to focus on best alternative(s).
January 2018

Board of Education to review final design option(s) and move ahead with same.
If the purchase of another building and/or site is chosen, then time line is not yet able to be fully defined.

If a building on the Intermediate School site is considered, SEQRA and required voting publications can be accomplished prior to submitting this option to the voters along with the May 2018 Budget Vote.