



OBERLIN CHURCH GLORIFY GROW GO

Oberlin's Master Plan Presentations
Small Group Discussions and Feedback
March 5, 2008

Introduction

This document is a prayerful attempt to organize your feedback regarding the Oberlin Master Plan from small groups meetings and individual discussions. A consistent and overwhelming theme from these forums is that our immediate concern and need for decision centers on Phase 1 – the remodel of our existing building. For that reason we will focus this document and the March 9th Informational meeting on Phase 1 considerations and opportunities only. Also the vote on April 20th is for the Phase 1 conceptual design only; Phase 2 and 3 will simply exist as a master planning document to be referred to as a starting point for further building changes at the appropriate time in the future as determined by growth and future congregation needs.

Below we have categorized your input on specific Architectural elements as well as General thoughts of the Phase 1 concept. Additionally, we document the feedback we received on your “vote for Phase 1 only” direction. This document's purpose is to capture and communicate your feedback on the Phase 1 concept to everyone for their careful consideration and prayer. It will be used during the March 9th Informational meeting to convey the thoughts of our congregation at large, answer the questions posed, and discuss the feasibility and merit of incorporating many suggestions that were made.

Questions you raised about growth are not addressed in this document, as the first phase is a remodeling and renovation project, and this is where we want to spend the most effort in preparation for our decision on April 20th. However, since Phase 1 will promote growth Pastor Alvin will address it in relation to Oberlin's growth mission at the March 9th meeting. We will also answer these questions in updated versions of our Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) that will be on the web and available in the office.

In addition, questions about fundraising are not addressed in this document. Once Oberlin has agreed that Phase 1 is the direction that we, as a body, desire to move toward, a fundraising committee will work to develop a plan to bring back to you. Oberlin will not move forward without an approved financial plan. Again, we will address these questions generally on March 9th, but would ask everyone to remember to use our precious time together on the question at hand: the approval of Phase one architectural concept.

Findings from Phase I feedback

Architectural Elements

Restrooms - The majority of participants liked having more restrooms:

- Enlarging the restrooms is a good idea and should be an essential part of Phase I.
- We need more bathrooms now.
- Proposed family restroom is too small, and there needs to be more restroom facilities for the toddler/nursery area than the one toilet (shown).
- Bathrooms: do we really need this many? Other public places don't even have this many.
- Can there be access to the upstairs restrooms from both sides; hallway and the fellowship hall?
- I don't like the location of the family bathroom or where the door opens.

Sanctuary – the majority of the input toward minor renovation of the existing sanctuary is positive.

- We need a prayer room in the Sanctuary!
- Like the idea of lightening up the Sanctuary and making it more pleasing.
- Glad sanctuary is maintaining same overall look.
- There is current difficulty with seeing the projector from all portions of the sanctuary. The font is too small and/or too many words per screen to read it effectively currently.
- Devices for hearing impaired need to be included in the upgrades to the sanctuary in Phase I. The current devices do not work and/or are not present. This needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.
- Will there be more lighting in the Sanctuary?
- Has there been any discussion about chairs and pews in the Sanctuary (Phase 1, II, and III)?
- Does the Baptismal stay in Phase 1?
- Cry room or cry area for phase 1?
- Do the sanctuary improvements include movable chairs?

Nursery – the majority supports the concept of moving the Nursery upstairs

- Like security of nursery but process of running it parents need to be able to come in with hesitant kids at first.
- Like the nursery upstairs!
- Will we hear kids in the nursery with it being so close to the sanctuary?
- Also-parents should be able to see back into all of it-if new it's scary dropping kid off to room that can't be seen by parent. One way glass maybe so kids don't see back.
- Concern for secondary "emergency exit" - possible emergency windows. Scenario: drop off area is on fire, where do they escape?

Fellowship Hall – having few changes the input in this area is neutral.

- Will there be access to the downstairs area from the fellowship hall?
- Can windows be opened in the fellowship hall? Are they currently up to code?
- Will there be windows from the fellowship hall open to the sky lighted area?
- Will there be access to restrooms from the fellowship hall?

Downstairs–Classrooms/Offices – the majority feedback on relocation of the offices and reconfiguration of class rooms is positive.

- Like the lower level angled halls. Gives that section personality.
- Classroom space is needed for the kids and adults we have now.
- More office space is needed for staff we have now.
- Advantage of interior rooms for videos and other media.
- Like the security better (for offices, building can be closed off easier).
- Will the youth room have sound blocking?
- Too bad the offices are down stairs and out of view for people.
- Why is office space so much larger (Phase 1, II and III)?
- Does the new youth room require excavation in order to have a larger nursery above it?
- What are mechanical rooms?
- Is there space in choir room for robes? Performance costumes?
- Could mechanical rooms be swapped to be on an interior wall?
- Mechanical room, at vault, we need to save/keep this space
- Not enough custodial storage
- Not enough archival storage
- Appreciate skylight and natural light to same number of rooms downstairs.

Narthex/Elevator/Atrium – while the majority support this design element, and there is strong desire for the elevator and the advantage of an expanded Narthex, several expressed concerned about this change at the expense of the Atrium.

- Love the elevator!
- Gaining an elevator is very good.
- We need the elevator
- There are bottlenecks in the Narthex now and we like that this will make that area more open and friendly.
- This will be a wonderful addition to Oberlin
- Has anyone thought of a coffee bar in the new Narthex? Have visited several churches that have this and it is wonderful.
- What a great open concept and inviting
- Like the idea of increased natural lighting.
- Loved John's comparison to the Narthex as the living room of the church. It fits Oberlin

- We like to fellowship in the narthex, and it is too crowded
- With multiple services, we need space to talk (Christmas Eve, Easter, and other events).
- Love this, I have seen many churches using this concept and it is so welcoming.
- Can we get the coffee area sooner, I love the idea of having espresso, or mocha's available. Regular coffee could be free, but would not mind paying for specials. I have seen this in other churches.
- Like the bigger narthex - it is too congested currently after church in there.
- Coffee area- Please do not charge money for this, especially during Sunday mornings. We love the area, just not the idea of making money.
- Hate the atrium being filled in
- Can the elevator location be changed save the atrium?
- Can we move out the back wall of the sanctuary towards Rainier to gain extra seats and Narthex space, to save the atrium?
- The narthex is too big, wasted space.
- To gain a bigger narthex, why wouldn't we just put an entrance into the current fellowship hall? That would give the "bigger" fellowship area feel.
- Can we have a glass enclosed elevator to let in the light?
- What is the square footage of the expanded Narthex compared to what it is now?
- An elevator will help the elderly and disabled.
- Will we be able to have a table for things of interest in the larger narthex?
- A large narthex is needed to bring us into the 21st century for fellowship and ministry – it will be multi-functional.
- Does the stairway stay where it is?

Covered Entrance on Rainier – This topic did not come up in all groups so it is not clear as to what the majority may think.

- Like the covered entry for rainy days
- This will help our elderly and our young
- Entry way canopy not allowed in the historic district
- Will the covered area look like a hotel?
- Are we doing anything about the drop off area in front of the church? The curb is too high to let off handicapped people except at the ramp. That isn't always possible. It would be good to grade it so it isn't so high.
- We need to more completely address parking?

General Thoughts on Phase 1 concept

- Parts of Phase 1 are good, while other parts are not.
- Our church look is very dated, and does not look inviting to new attendees.
- Most comments as to design/facilities were very specific and reflected a sincere interest and concern in making the Phase 1 work/workable or improve it. The detail really showed involvement and excitement.

- We do have more attendees now because of the second service. Some will certainly become members. We have made the service more user friendly for younger people and we need to do the same for the building with amenities that young people expect.
- Ultimately it is not about church (structure) growth, but Kingdom Growth.
- Let's build it...God will fill it!
- The majority (I spoke with) are in favor or had no strong emotions against the concept/pictured design.
- Change is VERY hard, but this group realizes that it is necessary for the future. Maybe not near future, but not too far down the road we'll be in trouble if we don't think about this now.
- We want to make the community feel welcome and embrace our church.
- This from the military people who will come and go "we really appreciate the church looking forward and thinking about people like us who will come and go in the future" -they all really liked the plan and also felt like support (financial) would come not just from long-term members but those who are here now.
- Parts of Phase 1 are good, while other parts are not.
- Leave the church alone, the way it is.
- This church has charm to it as is, why change it?
- What's in it for me right now? Yes, we are doing this for future generations, but a remodel will help us immediately with.....please answer this question. A Phase 1 remodel will help us immediately with providing a safer and more welcoming traffic flow in the Narthex, create a true multi-functional space in the Fellowship Hall, catch us up in the areas of our deficient spaces (nursery, office, bathrooms and the Narthex), we will now be brought up to the existing ADA standards, provide more overall storage, improve the dated aspects of the sound functions of the sanctuary, and esthetically improve our overall look, while maintaining a small community church feel.
- Not a good use of God's money. Should be spent on missions and missionaries.
- We don't have to follow the trends, we are Oberlin!
- What are the consequences of the status quo? Are those consequences acceptable?
- Will the building be ADA compliant?
- Will services stop during construction? Offices?
- Creation of multiple "plumbing corridors" increases costs significantly. If things can be redesigned to provide one "plumbing corridor", costs will decrease significantly.
- Is there a drop in insurance costs if the nursery is upstairs?
- Does the funding include adding a pitch to the flat roof to avoid future leaks?

Remodel vote vs. Master Plan vote –

It was very clear that the majority of participants felt that just moving on Phase I was the appropriate step at this time.

- Why do we need to do this (entire) project? We need to address phase one of the Master Plan as the “**remodel of the church**”. The idea is that it needs to be remodeled now even at current membership levels. We need facts and details to back this up. The other phases would be driven by growth in “membership” and financial giving.
- Voting on all three phases would be a mistake. Too big of a chunk to handle. Phase one would be easier to deal with.
- Let us vote for Phase 1. When approved, we want that to be the approval to start the funding portion of the plan as well. The timing will still depend on how fast we raise the money. There is no reason for two votes. If the plan is approved, then the funding to consummate the plan is naturally approved as well.
- Staging of the process. We have already paid for the Master Plan and we have it regardless. Why would we vote on the Master Plan? What we need to vote on is whether or not the church body wants to “**remodel the church**” or leave it as is.
- Why are we voting on P2 and 3, really only need to vote on Phase 1?
- The issue might have to be remodel versus the total plan and all its Phases.