

# TOWN OF HARVARD

## MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE



**Meeting Minutes** – Public Presentation Meeting – Meeting # 26 – 14 December 2011,  
7:00 – 9:30PM, Volunteers Hall

### Attendees

Lou Russo, Wade Holtzman, Doug Coots, Peter Jackson, Marie Sobalvarro, Chris Cutler, Ron Ricci

1. Introductions
  - a. MBC: Committee Members and Liaisons
  - b. DTI: Project Manager
  - c. LLB: Architect
2. Project history
  - a. Doug provided an update on the work completed since ATM 2011. MBC report published in February 2011, RFQs for OPM and schematic design architect; unanimous votes for both firms selected.
3. LLB Presentation of three schemes for each project
  - a. Drayton Fair presented (with Aimee and Jason). Designs are based off of information provided in the MBC report (included preliminary programming and building assessment) and the Statement of Intent. Program was refined and more information was gathered through interviews with town employees and Council on Aging (COA).
  - b. Town Hall – 4 Schemes
    - i. “Antique” addition on back of Town Hall was not built as securely as the rest of the building. After a quick review of the programming process, new and old program needs were listed. Program has been translated into “real square footage” illustrated by “bubble” diagrams.
    - ii. Scheme #1: new addition in place of old addition; new entry in “back” of the building; original entry would be preserved; elevator and stair in new addition; restoration of second floor space into a public meeting space with a stage at floor level. Red stars indicate spaces that are smaller than what the program noted. Cross section view of building used to illustrate that very high ceilings make partitions difficult. If the balcony gets touched it will need to be made handicapped accessible – this is a public building, only mechanical spaces are exempt. Attic space is unusable at this point, ceiling does not have load bearing capabilities to be a floor space, would be a huge (expensive) undertaking. Vault not included.
    - iii. Scheme #2: similar, but bigger; removes original addition replaces with a larger addition. New entry on west side of building (where we enter now for meeting room); elevator and stair in new addition. Second floor meeting space would include a raised stage; accommodates everything in program except for vault.
    - iv. Scheme #3: preserves original footprint with an addition on the west side of the building that fills in code requirements (“code pod”). Privacy issues of shared office space should be negated due to scheduling part time positions with no overlap. There is some concern that this scheme creates a long distance to travel to handicapped bathrooms. Town Hall itself would still need to undergo big renovations to come up to code. Vault not included.
    - v. Scheme #4: Takes program needs and fits into existing Town Hall. In order to install elevator in existing building, we would need to underpin existing addition and the elevator tower may pop out of existing roof; entry on west; program very condensed; no stage on second floor. Vault not included.
    - vi. Summary slide of 4 schemes: Any questions on Town Hall?
      1. Is it possible to rank schemes by cost? Drayton: No specific numbers available

- yet, but a bigger addition means higher cost.
2. None of the schemes include the town vault. Location would remain the same, not a part of this particular project.
  3. Meeting room can accommodate 150 (at 2000 square feet); scheme #4 would accommodate 60-80 people.
  4. Documents Storage – plans in progress for electronic storage and offsite storage.
  5. MBC – how much has been spent? Pete: \$185,000 approved at ATM 2011, will stay within that budget; only \$10,000 has been spent so far.
  6. How far into the future does the program look? 20-50 years out.
  7. Seems as though the public would like to preserve the performance area (as part of the large meeting area). Stage as it currently exists will cease to be – is it important that it remain? It would be great to have a stage; but if it is a huge cost...tradeoffs are often expressed in dollars. How can we choose a design if we don't know what the project costs? Drayton: This is part of the process. LLB has been instructed to fit in program elements. Every square foot has a cost. Balance want versus need.
  8. Has relocation of certain government functions (meeting rooms) been discussed? Was not what LLB was charged with, but has been discussed with MBC.
  9. Square footage of existing addition? 1600 square feet.
  10. Is it cheaper to tear down and re-build or to renovate? Similar cost to do either. A real preservation would be more expensive.
  11. Cronin exists – do we need performance space?
  12. Reconfigure space so first and second floor bathrooms are stacked on top of one another.
- c. Hildreth: Beautiful building; same programming process (less controversy over what Hildreth needs).
- i. Scheme #1: parking on east; addition on north side of existing building; preserve existing view of house; covered entry, service entrance for kitchen; partition between dining room and multi-purpose room. Public program spaces on 1<sup>st</sup> level; administrative offices on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor
  - ii. Scheme #2: “dumbbell” scheme; preserve views (not look out over parking); 3<sup>rd</sup> floor is being left alone (will remain attic space).
  - iii. Scheme #3: parking on west; drop off with covered entry; up stairs/ramp to entry; terrace attached to dining room; views to north and east. No entry at grade.
  - iv. Virtually any of the plans could be flipped (parking can be put on east or west side); original entrance and porch will be preserved.
  - v. Summary Slide: Questions on Hildreth designs?
    1. Will there be a hallway that leads to the original porch? Intent is to preserve Hildreth's “salon” layout – walk from room to room; use existing dining room as a way to pass into the original house.
    2. Preserve green space between Hildreth and Town Hall as well as historic landscaping between the two buildings.
    3. There are some concerns that will need to be addressed if parking is located to the west of the building: Hildreth is the highest point in town center - run off in case of a re-grade? West side parking in the winter means that the parking lot will not get much sun.
    4. Sewer access?
    5. All three are schemes are comparably sized (and priced).
    6. Terrace in scheme three is a favorite. Allows flexibility for various functions.
    7. Exterior roof lines? Addition will only be one story, roof lines will compliment current building (mimic Hildreth's wrap porch); use of sympathetic materials; traditional new England material
    8. Split mechanical systems between original house and new addition.
    9. Preference for scheme three; preserves existing outside walls of Hildreth – allows in more natural light. Strong consensus to locate parking to the west of Hildreth.

- d. More Town Hall questions and comments:
  - i. What does each scheme net us in terms of square footage?
  - ii. Does the second floor meeting space meet needs of public meeting space? Partitions at TH would be difficult (high ceilings); if the idea is to capture all the open meetings currently being held, the proposed schemes don't capture the current needs. More flexible spaces are needed.
  - iii. Broaden feedback from town committees (one survey has already been circulated). Pete set up an email system for gathering feedback: [MBCmailit@gmail.com](mailto:MBCmailit@gmail.com)
  - iv. At last year's public workshops there was public support to maintain Town Hall as a community space (with stage if possible).
  - v. Is it included in the scope of the project to address all meeting space needs of the town? Was not a stated charge, but is being considered as part of the project. Large and small conference room to address meeting needs.
  - vi. It is possible to consider different shapes for scheme three while keeping the idea of a "code pod."
  - vii. The design we choose should serve for at least 20 years (preferably closer to 50).
  - viii. Integration of volunteer and "retail" government; how can we get volunteer government to function at the TH during off business hours; secure areas, and areas open to volunteer government employees; security points; different options for securing the building/individual offices.
- 4. Schedule
  - a. One plan for each building by February 15
  - b. MBC has a meeting scheduled tomorrow morning.

Rachel Holcomb

Approved