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LETTER FROM TOWN HALL MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

March 7, 2023

Chairperson Alicia Greco;
Members of the Select Board-Finance Committee-Planning Board and Capital Planning Committee

Dear Members:

On behalf of the MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE (MBC), I am submitting this update regarding the schedule, local permitting/approvals, current estimate of probable costs, proposed building location, schematic layout, and previous meeting minutes.

THE PATH TO TOWN HALL NEEDS

11 years ago the “Public Safety Site Selection committee” was tasked with reviewing all available sites/options for locating a new police station and/or combined Town Hall-Fire Station-Police Station safety complex and reporting back to the selectmen. Town residents rejected the public safety complex option.

6 years ago (2017) Town Meeting authorized a stand-alone Police Station at 7 Morgan Ave with any remaining funds to undertake the remodeling or extraordinary repairs to 25 High Road to meet the needs of the town hall.

4 years ago (2019), a town meeting authorized the increased expenditure from (6.5 million to 8.2) million dollars to construct standalone police, only.

THE QUESTION:

“When extraordinary alterations and a major addition” will cost more than with new construction. Renovating an older building to meet the current building codes, ADA requirements, life-safety standards, and health codes will be more expensive than building a new structure. Renovations can also result in unexpected costs and time delays due to unforeseen conditions or surprises that may arise during construction. Additionally, adding a new addition to an existing older building can pose challenges related to access/egress and floor elevation.
Existing conditions at 25 High Road:

**Exterior walls** are 2x4 construction with about 9’ in floor-to-ceiling height on the main level which is insufficient to house the required MEP/HVAC/ sprinkler systems require about 30” clear space above a finished ceiling. The ground level has a combination of different types of exterior walls and a lower ceiling height of 7’4”, which does not provide enough space for the MEP/HVAC/sprinkler system and a finished ceiling. The state building code requires a minimum of 7’6” finished ceiling height to be habitable office space for Town employees.

**Interior walls** surface finishes include drywall and homasote (soundboard) as painted walls. A majority of the walls are load-bearing. Interior doors are a combination of fire-rated doors and unrated hollow doors with wood jams. Exterior windows are at the end of their useful life and do not meet the current energy code. Existing wiring is a combination of old BX, Romex, and some metal-clad wiring which will require updating to meet current electrical code requirements for municipal/public assembly buildings.

**Bathroom facilities:** Do not meet the current plumbing code/fixture count and floor drain requirements.

**The heating and cooling system:** Lacks among other things, Energy Recovery Ventilators (ERVs) as required by the current stretch energy code adopted by the Town of Newbury.

**Usable Floor area for programming needs:**
The current structure at 25 High Road with front entry steps and ADA ramp has a footprint of about 4,000 SF. This level has about 3100 gross SF. The basement area ceiling height precludes use for programming needs but would be available for MEP/HVAC/ requirements. The footprint of a suitable addition (6400SF) would require a two-story 3200SF resulting in a 6,300SF footprint eliminating more parking spaces than the proposed new building footprint of 5200SF by MBC.

**Option 1-Raise-renovate-expand existing-6400 SF addition:**

two options for expanding the building: raising the upper level and installing a new foundation, or lowering the slab. Both options have potential drawbacks and costs. Raising the upper level and installing a new foundation would provide more headroom, but could create access issues. Additionally, the cost would likely be at least the cost per square foot of new construction ($640.00), or even higher. Lowering the slab could also have drawbacks, including potential water table issues and the high costs to avoid those issues.

*Note:* All new work must comply (Additions and new work within the existing) and anything existing that was altered must comply with current building code requirements.

**Option 2 New Replacement Structure:**

Building a new 2-1/2 story town hall to meet the programing needs that will address Newbury’s projected growth over the next 30 years.
25 High Road is situated in the heart of the Newbury Historic District. The district is home to a variety of important community structures, including residential, civic, educational, religious, cultural, and commercial buildings. The district’s buildings have served as the community center of Newbury for many years and is a fitting location for the long-awaited Newbury Town Hall project and will help to preserve and enhance this historic district for years to come.

The municipal Building committee recommends Option 2 as the most cost-effective, esthetically compatible with the Neighborhood and would reduce potential traffic flow problems; reduce the number of curb cuts, and cars backing out onto Morgan Ave.

PROJECT STATUS:
The committee is working to deliver plans for and construction of an innovative Town Hall that meets the programmatic needs of a 21st-century Town Hall and will address Newbury’s projected growth over the next 30 years.

We are working with all department heads, the planning board, and the conservation commission to analyze and expedite local approvals to meet the projected bid release in November of 2023.

The project has completed the schematic design phase. The project architect has ordered an updated project estimate prepared by A.M Fogerty which will be available in mid-March.

PROJECT SCHEDULE:
- Early March is the target date for the release of Schematic Design drawings and mid-March for the SD Cost estimate to the Select Board for consideration at the Annual Town Meeting (4-25-23) and Debt Exclusion Vote (5-9-23).
- November 2023 is the target date for Bid Documents.
- January 2024 is the target date for awarding a contract and “Notice to proceed”.

ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST
Currently, the committee’s “estimate of probable cost” is based on available information as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction costs</td>
<td>$8,223,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Costs (Designer, OPM &amp; testing costs)</td>
<td>1,427,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF&amp;E, Security, Card Access;</td>
<td>599,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-related expenses;</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency;</td>
<td>635,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimate of Probable cost total;</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,885,275</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Connors, Chairman
Municipal Building Committee Charge

A committee, consisting of 3 voting members and 2 advisory members will be appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements. The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates.
TAB “2”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Newbury Town Hall Project**  
**Draft schedule 1 26 23** | |
<p>| <strong>1</strong> Programing, Pre-schematic Design | |
| <strong>2</strong> AIA amended contract or RFQ | |
| <strong>3</strong> Concept Level planning update | |
| <strong>4</strong> OPM amended contract or RFQ | |
| <strong>5</strong> Program Comparison | |
| <strong>6</strong> | |
| <strong>7</strong> A/E notice to proceed | 11/14/2022 |
| <strong>8</strong> | |
| <strong>9</strong> Concept Design | 11/14/2022 |
| <strong>10</strong> Final Level planning | 1/10/2023 |
| <strong>11</strong> | |
| <strong>12</strong> Schematic Design Start | 1/10/2023 |
| <strong>13</strong> Floor Plans Finalized | 1/26/2023 |
| <strong>14</strong> Site plan, parking, landscaping | 2/13/2023 |
| <strong>15</strong> Exterior Elevations, High Rd, Morgan Ave | 2/13/2023 |
| <strong>16</strong> Complete Documents for SD Cost Estimate | 2/27/2023 |
| <strong>17</strong> Review SD Cost Estimate with committee &amp; Town | 3/27/2023 |
| <strong>18</strong> | |
| <strong>19</strong> Debt Exclusion amount (estimate) | 3/14/2023 |
| <strong>20</strong> Debt Exclusion Amount (final) | 3/29/2023 |
| <strong>21</strong> Ballot question approval SB and Debt Exclusion amount | 3/27/2023 |
| <strong>22</strong> Submission to Town Clerk | 3/29/2023 |
| <strong>23</strong> Town Meeting presentation-approval | 4/25/2023 |
| <strong>24</strong> Debt Exclusion vote | 5/9/2023 |
| <strong>25</strong> | |
| <strong>26</strong> A/E notice to proceed | 5/15/2023 |
| <strong>27</strong> | |
| <strong>28</strong> Design Development Start | 5/15/2023 |
| <strong>29</strong> Update DD package | |
| <strong>30</strong> Consultant Coordination including testing-commissioning | |
| <strong>31</strong> Town planning, Zoning,BOH Design review | 6/8/2023 |
| <strong>32</strong> Planning Board submission &quot;site plan review&quot; | 7/6/2023 |
| <strong>33</strong> Select Board Submission-project update | 7/13/2023 |
| <strong>34</strong> Zoning Board submission | n/a |
| <strong>35</strong> Complete Documents for DD Cost Estimate | 7/21/2023 |
| <strong>36</strong> Review DD Cost Estimate with Town | 8/16/2023 |
| <strong>37</strong> Value Engineering (if needed) | |
| <strong>38</strong> | |
| <strong>39</strong> Construction Documents Start | 7/24/2023 |
| <strong>40</strong> Construction Documentation | |
| <strong>41</strong> Review with Building Department | 8/1/2023 |
| <strong>42</strong> Consultant Coordination | |
| <strong>43</strong> General Contractor Pre-Qualification | 2 months |
| <strong>44</strong> Planning Board Hearings | 8/3/2023 |
| <strong>45</strong> Planning Board Hearing Closed | 9/7/2023 |
| <strong>46</strong> Select Board, Planning, Zoning, BOH final review-approvals | |
| <strong>47</strong> Complete Documents for CD Cost Estimate &amp; Owner Review | 9/29/2023 |
| <strong>48</strong> Review of construction documents and estimate | 10/25/2023 |
| <strong>49</strong> Value Engineering (if needed) | |
| <strong>50</strong> Selection of testing-commissioning consultants | |
| <strong>51</strong> Bid Documents available | 11/1/2023 |
| <strong>52</strong> | |
| <strong>53</strong> Bidding-Negotiations | |
| <strong>54</strong> PEG equipment relocation | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Filed sub bids due</td>
<td>11/23/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>General Contractor bids due</td>
<td>12/7/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Bid Review-Contract Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Notice to proceed-execute contract</td>
<td>1/1/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><strong>Construction Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Construction Duration</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Final finish &amp; furniture selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Furniture Procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>As-built submittals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Professional Affidavit submittals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Certificate of Occupancy issuance</td>
<td>12/31/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Project closeout documents</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Training-staff &amp; facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Furniture installation and move-in</td>
<td>2/1/2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAB "3"
**Draft local approvals/permitting Summary:**

This Existing Conditions Summary is for the old Town Hall Building located at 25 High Road. Garcia-Galuska-Desousa, Consulting Engineers, Inc., is preparing an updated Civil summary due in mid-March.

**Site Conditions:**

The building is located on the north side of Morgan Avenue, east of the intersection with High Road, in the Town of Newbury, MA. The site is located at 25 High Road and is further identified as Assessor’s Lot 31 on Map U-06. The Owner is listed as the Town of Newbury. The site is currently developed as a the old Town Hall with associated building, bituminous concrete parking, concrete sidewalks and grass/landscape areas with a total land area of approximately 31,015 square feet (0.71 acres). The existing building contains approximately 5,666 square feet of finished area according to the Assessor’s Property Record Card.

**Zoning:**

The building is located within the Upper Green Business (UGB) zoning district and Newbury Historic District. The parcel is located within the Water Supply Protection District according to the Newbury Zoning Map dated July 16, 2009. The following dimensions are required in the Upper Green Business District:

**Upper Green Business District**

- Minimum Lot Area: 20,000 Square Feet
- Minimum Lot Frontage: 100 Feet
- Minimum Property Line Setback: 10 Feet
- Minimum Street Setback: 20 Feet
- Maximum Footprint: N/A
- Maximum Lot Coverage*: 25%
- Maximum Height of Structures: 35 Feet

*Under the requirements of § 97-B(4)(b)(3) the rending of 15% or 2,500 square feet of any lot, whichever is greater requires the issuance of a Special Permit by the Board of Selectmen under such conditions as the Board may require.

**Water Supply:**

The existing building’s domestic water is supplied by what appears to be a single 2” domestic water service. The services enter the building on the south side from the water main in Morgan Avenue. The size of the water main needs to be verified to confirm capacity for the new building’s fire protection system.

**Sewer System:**

The existing building is connected to the municipal sanitary sewer system by means of an eOne low pressure sewer pump.
**Drainage System:**

Runoff from the building roof is intercepted by gutters and downspouts. Some downspouts discharge to underground piping while others discharge to grade. The discharge point for downspouts to underground piping is unknown.

Stormwater runoff from the north parking lot accessed from High Road appears to drain directly to High Road where it is intercepted by catch basins within the roadway. The stormwater runoff from the south parking lot along High Road is pitched to both High Road and Morgan Avenue where it is intercepted by catch basins within the roadway. The spaces immediately south of the building appears to discharge to Morgan Avenue where it is intercepted by catch basins within the roadway.

**Natural Gas Services:**

The building is currently served with a natural gas service. The meter is located on the west face of the building north of the main entrance. The natural gas service is fed from Morgan Avenue. The natural gas main in Morgan Avenue continues east past the parcels proposed for the new Police Station. Natural gas service company will need to confirm capacity for new service.

**Soil Conditions & Testing:**

The United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA NRCS) Soil Maps indicate the existing building site is comprised of Amostown fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes, Windsor loamy sand, 3 to 8 percent slopes and Udorthents. Both the Windsor loamy sand and Udorthents are classified as Hydrologic Soil Group ‘A’ (rapid infiltration of water through soil) and the Amostown soils classified as Hydrologic Soil Group ‘C/D’ (poor infiltration of water through soil). The soils at the parcels proposed for the new Police Station is comprised of Merrimac fine sandy loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes and Udorthents. Both soils are classified as Hydrologic Soil Group ‘A’ (rapid infiltration of water through soil). Per MassDEP Stormwater Standards, new stormwater systems need to recharge/infiltrate a prescribed volume of stormwater based on overall site impervious cover and Hydrologic Soil Group. During the design of the stormwater system, test pits will need to be completed to further classify onsite soils.

**Wetland Resource Area:**

The following information is based on a plan title “Town of Newbury Topographical Survey” prepared by Arc Surveying & Engineering Associates, Inc. dated November 15, 2013. Verification of resource area and buffer limits will need to be completed. The existing building parcel does not contain any wetland resource areas or any buffer zones (neither 50 foot or 100 foot). The nearest edge to wetlands resource area from the property line is approximately 120 feet to the east-northeast.

**Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program (NHESP):**

The Massachusetts Geographic Information System (Mass GIS) indicates that the site is not located within an area of “Estimated Habitats or Rare Wildlife” or “Priority Habitat of Rare Species”. The nearest published area is entrance to Newburyport Harbor, which is located approximately 2,600 feet to the east and is identified at Priority Habitat PH 2122. No filing with NHESP is expected.

**Flood Zones:**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel 0136G, MAP 25009, effective date July 16, 2014 indicates that the site is located within Zone X: Area of Minimal Flood Hazard which has no limitations on site build out.
TAB “4”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Estimate of Probable costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Construction costs (10,400 SF)</td>
<td>$ 6,656,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Attic improvements (3rd floor)</td>
<td>$ 1,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Escalation (4%)</td>
<td>$ 317,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td>$ 8,223,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SOFT COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Design &amp; Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Architectural and Engineering fees</td>
<td>$ 950,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Allowance for extra services and Owner changes</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reimbursable expenses</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Furnishing Design fee</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tel/Data &amp; Security Consultant</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td>$ 1,017,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Owners Project Manager &amp; Clerk of the Works</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MEP Commissioning</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Construction Testing</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fixtures, Furnishings &amp; Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Furnishings &amp; Equipment (incl HD storage)</td>
<td>$ 155,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Allowance for Computer Equip., Network cable server</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Allowance for Telephone System &amp; Equip.</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Allowance for Security &amp; CCTV System</td>
<td>$ 144,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td>$ 599,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Project Related Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Topographic and Utility Survey</td>
<td>$ 11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Printing bid sets &amp; advertising</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Moving Expenses</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Utility Fees &amp; Backcharges</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td>$ 56,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Project Contingency (7%)</td>
<td>$ 635,775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>PROJECT TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 10,885,275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25 HIGH ROAD HISTORY

25 High Road was the home of the “Grange hall” built in the 1800’s and was destroyed by fire in 1927.

The replacement building was sold to the Town of Newbury as a town Hall in 1937.
The Town Hall was originally built in the early part of the twentieth century as the town grange and was remodeled to its present state after a fire c. 1927 to serve as the Town Hall.

Town Hall structure after 1977 addition
Newbury Historic District, Newbury (Essex Co.), MA

8. Facing east: Town Hall (#8). (Photograph: Mardges Bacon, 1975)
SITE PLAN  PROPOSED PLAN SCHEME C.1

EXISTING TOWN HALL BUILDING (RENOVATED)

6,462 SF ADDITION

EXIST. FIRE STATION

TOTAL PARKING SPACES = 45

SCALE: 1" = 30'2"  07/06/2018
UPPER FLOOR PLAN  

SCHEME C1

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"  
2183 SF RENO  
3216 SF NEW  
6,399 SF TOTAL + 6,266 SF = 12,665 GSF
LOWER FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
3,050 SF BONO
3,210 SF NEW
6,260 SF TOTAL

07/06/2018

SCHME C1
NEWBURY TOWN OFFICES

PROPOSED SITE PLAN
June 28, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>OFF-SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OFFICES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10 (Fire Station)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12,500 SF
(2,500 SF in Attic)
FIRST FLOOR GROSS AREA : 5,055 SQ.FT.
SECOND FLOOR GROSS AREA : 5,055 SQ.FT.
ATTIC AREA : 4,395 SQ.FT.
FIRST FLOOR GROSS AREA : 5,055 SQ.FT.
SECOND FLOOR GROSS AREA : 5,055 SQ.FT.
ATTIC AREA : 4,395 SQ.FT.
NEWBURY MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE

TOWN HALL PROJECT

Tuesday, September 27, 2022, 7:30AM

ROBERT CONNORS,
ERIC SVAHN,
JOHN KELLAR,
DANA PACKER,
MARTHA TAYLOR
Town of Newbury  
Municipal Building Committee/Town Hall Building  

MINUTES

DATE: September 27, 2022

Present: Bob Connors (BC), Eric Svahn (ES), John Kellar (JK), Martha Taylor (MT), Dana Packer (DP), Geoffrey Walker.

Absent:

Bob Connors opened the meeting at 7:31 a.m.

1. Municipal Building Committee Charge

A committee, consisting of 3 voting members and 2 advisory members will be appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements.

The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates.

2. Organization of the Committee

A motion was made by ES, seconded by JK, to elect Bob Connors as Chairman. Voted 3-0 in favor.

A motion was made by BC, seconded by JK to elect Eric Svahn as Vise Chairman. Voted 3-0 in favor.

A motion was made by BC and seconded by JK to elect John Kellar as Clerk. Voted 3-0 in favor.

3. Kickoff Work Sheet:

A. Reviewed AIA process and assessed time frame for two phases: Design and Construction Administration phases. Lessons learned from the Police Station project would be to not have any Design/Build services in the bid package and that all design services be included in the architect’s fee. Context is currently the architect having completed conceptual documents only. An RFP likely be required for their fee for this project. All to be further discussed in future meetings.

B. Reviewed OPM process which will begin with MT preparing an RFQ draft from the Police Station RFQ to be reviewed by team ahead of the October 25, 2022 meeting where the team will present comments and recommendations to finalize the RFQ for advertising for the OPM services.

C. Project budget estimates will include all costs, hard (Construction) and soft costs. The
architect will include civil and geotechnical services in their fee. The budget will include FFE, IT, Testing, security and Access control, Commissioning, Air Balancing, Secure walls and Windows in reception areas, etc.

D. The town’s Internet Server was reviewed. It currently sits in the old town hall. This will require a change or temporary relocation.

E. The Vault in the old town hall may not have any value worth saving or reselling it foe. Further discussion to be had.

4. **Workspace Benchmarks Review**

The Committee briefly reviewed publication for ideas for space planning and programming.

5. **Town Hall Presentation:**

The Committee reviewed the Town Offices Concept Leveling Plans as presented by Context Architects, June 2022.

6. **Newbury Town Hall Program Comparison:**

   A. The Committee briefly reviewed the comparison space need summary sheets. It was a comparison of the existing space and the needed space.
   
   B. Site Locations were reviewed. A priority was to have municipal services. Morgan Ave and Kent Way seemed to have the most strength. Further discussion will be had at future meetings.

7. **Citizens Concerns:**

   Jack ……, Expressed that having a thorough review of sites needs to be taken to meet all the needs of the town and the cost of the project.

8. **Next Steps:**

   Committee members are to review the draft RFQ and make an initial round of edits. Once the draft is finalized, the Committee will meet with the Selectboard to do a “high level” review of the contents.

On a motion made by **D. Parker** and seconded by **E. Svahn**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52A, a.m.

**NEXT MEETING:** Tuesday, October 25, 2017, 7:30 a.m., via ZOOM

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
NEXT MEETING:  Tuesday, November 15, 2022, 7:30 a.m., via ZOOM

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
NEWBURY MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE

TOWN HALL PROJECT
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2022, 7:30AM

ROBERT CONNORS,
ERIC SVAHN,
JOHN KELLAR,
DANA PACKER,
MARTHA TAYLOR
Town of Newbury  
Municipal Building Committee/Town Hall Building  

MEETING MINUTES  

DATE: October 25, 2022  

Present: Bob Connors (BC), Eric Svahn (ES), John Kellar (JK), Martha Taylor (MT), Dana Packer (DP). Absent:  

Bob Connors opened the meeting at 7:31 a.m.  

1. Municipal Building Committee Charge  
A committee, consisting of 3 voting members and 2 advisory members will be appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements.  

The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates.  

2. Meeting Minutes from October 25, 2022  
Meeting Minutes from the September 27, 2022 meeting were reviewed. A motion to approve was made by JK, second by ES. The minutes were unanimously approved.  

3. Next Steps:  
1. **Revise direction given to Context Architects:** Tracy Blais (TB), Martha Taylor, Bob Connors and Jeff Shaw (JS) of Context Architects reviewed the program direction on a phone call prior to this meeting.  

4. **OPM, RFQ protocol and timeline:** Draft of RFQ was distributed to the committee prior to the meeting for our review. The committee agreed to table any final decisions until the November 15, 2022 meeting allowing for more review time.  

5. **Establish innovative/efficient standards concerning programming needs, workspace utilization and allocation:** TB, MT and JS to further review the needs in more depth in order to establish the best possible use of the spaces/programming.  

6. **Establish an estimate of probable costs:**  
   a. 10,440 sq ft was used as a benchmark for the conversation in this meeting.  
   b. $ 640.00/ SF was used for the Office Space and $ 500.00/SF for the attic space  
   c. Total Budget: $ 10,585,275.00 (100%)  
      Construction Cost: $ 8,233,300.00 (78%)  
      Soft Cost: $ 2,361,975.00 (22%)
d. Reviewed possible long lead items strategy: TON purchase and make assignment to General Contractor at time of contract

7. Communications and IT:
   a. Matthew Cooper reported via email to TB that the broadcast equipment and connections would need to be relocated during the construction phase, the Police Station on Morgan Ave. would be a prime location.
   b. The question came about the TON being in the Cloud for storage.

8. Site Locations:
   a. Hanover Street and The Governor’s Academy sites were deemed not viable. Patrick Seekamp walked the Hanover Street site with the Conservation Agent.
   b. The letter from GARCIA • GALUSKA • DESOUSA, Consulting Engineers, Civil Existing Conditions Systems Report, dated March 26, 2018, was reviewed for the site options. Further consideration of the current High Street site to be reviewed.

9. Newbury Town Hall Program Comparison:
   a. Existing at Kent Way versus Proposed
   b. Used these %’s: 70% for space and 30% for halls, closets, and bathrooms.... etc.
   c. Security review for the reception and front entrance

10. Context is developing a menu of costs

11. Committee expressed an interest in a third-party estimator

12. Reviewed Context’s agreement:
   a. CA to present a Fee Proposal
   b. Committee to review and if acceptable, issue an addendum to their original RFQ (2018)

13. Communications: Maintain same as NPD project

14. Permitting:
   a. Site Plan Review will be required
   b. Review of Water Buffer
   c. Historic District review

15. Communications with Context and Vertex (OPM): BC will be in contact with Jeff Shaw and John Lemieux (Vertex)

16. Citizens:
   Jim Moran questioned what the Probable Cost was: $10,500,000 with $1,000,000 Contingency
   And Gross Area: 10,400 SF plus attic.

On a motion made by J. Kellar and seconded by E. Svahn, the meeting was adjourned at 8:49 a.m.
NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, November 15, 2022, 7:30 a.m., via ZOOM

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
Newbury Municipal Building Committee

Town Hall Project
Tuesday, November 15, 2022, 7:30AM

Robert Connors,
Eric Svahn,
John Kellar,
Dana Packer,
Martha Taylor
DATE: November 15, 2022

Present: Bob Connors (BC), Eric Svahn (ES), John Kellar (JK), Martha Taylor (MT), Dana Packer (DP).

Absent:

Bob Connors opened the meeting at 7:31 a.m.

**Municipal Building Committee Charge**

A committee, consisting of 3 voting members and 2 advisory members will be appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements.

The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates. The Meeting is held via Zoom and Roll Calls are performed for voting.

1. **Tab 1: Meeting Minutes from November 15, 2022**

Meeting Minutes from the October 25, 2022 meeting were reviewed. MT offered an addition and two corrections:

   a. Add: This is a Zoom meeting and Roll Calls are performed for voting
   b. Correct 8B to “High Road”
   c. Correct 14E to “Water Supply Protection Overlay District”

A motion to approve was made by DP, second by BC. The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. **Tab 2: Agenda**

   a. **Tab 3: Project Schedule, all Phases.**

      The timeline proposed is as follows, in preparation for Spring 2023 Town Meeting:

      Ballot Question Approval by Selectboard by March 27, 2023
      Submit Ballot Question for April Town Meeting: March 29, 2022
      Town Meeting: April 25, 2023
      Exclusion Vote: May 09/2023
      Bid Documents: November 1, 2023
      Complete Project: February 1, 2024

   b. **Tab 4: Context (Architect) Contract:** BC asked if ES and Tracy Blais would review proposal from Context. The discussion amongst the committee was that working with Context, who was the Newbury Police Station Architect, that they did a very good job with the
police station project and that we are familiar with each other weighs heavily in this process. With that we agreed to go forward with working out a contract agreement with Context.

c. **Tab 5: Concept Level Planning**

1. Context Concept Plan review
2. Martha Taylor and Tracy Blais Plan review and comments

d. **Tab 6: Establish an estimate of probable costs:**

a. 10,440 sq ft was used as a benchmark for the conversation in this meeting.

b. $ 640.00/SF was used for the Office Space and $ 500.00/SF for the attic space

c. **Total Budget:** $ 10,785,275.00 (100%)

   Construction Cost: $ 8,233,000.00 (77%)

   Soft Cost: $ 2,361,975.00 (23%)

e. **Tab 7: Revised Program Comparisons.**

Tracy Blais and Martha Taylor reviewed the existing areas and the required area needed to provide adequate area for all services proposed. The required area would total out to a gross area of 12,952 sf.

**New Business**

1. **Communications with Context and Vertex (OPM):** BC will be in contact to further discuss with John Lemieux (Vertex) an amended RFQ to continue with Vertex as the OPM. BC expressed an interest in requesting Doug Gordon be the Project Manager/Clerk of the Works if TON goes forward with Vertex. DG was the replacement COW for the Police Station and did an excellent job in that role.

2. **Geotech:**

a. It was discussed that we request that TON procure the services of a firm to perform boring and soil evaluations of the site on High Road and Morgan Ave. Context would locate these points.

b. MT will review the 21E Site Assessment

**Citizens Comments:**

Jack Rybioki: Is the demolition included in the proposed cost. BC indicated it is. He expressed the concern with the impact with the Fire Station

Jim Moran: Can the package be attached to the agenda. Agrees space is well done by TB and MT. Asked if the cost per SF $ 640.00/SF the value was still being used. He felt the schedule was reasonable.

On a motion made by **J. Kellar** and seconded by **E. Svahn**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:44 a.m.

**NEXT MEETING:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022, 7:30 a.m., via ZOOM
Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
Newbury Municipal Building Committee

Town Hall Project
Tuesday, December 13, 2022, 7:30AM

Robert Connors,
Eric Svahn,
John Kellar,
Dana Packer,
Martha Taylor
Town of Newbury
Municipal Building Committee/Town Hall Building

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: December 13, 2022

Present: Bob Connors (BC), Eric Svahn (ES), John Kellar (JK), Dana Packer (DP). Absent: Martha Taylor (MT)

Bob Connors opened the meeting at 7:32 a.m.

Municipal Building Committee Charge

A committee, consisting of 3 voting members and 2 advisory members will be appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without the approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements.

The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates. The Meeting is held via Zoom and Roll Calls are performed for voting.

1. Tab 1: Meeting Minutes from November 15, 2022

Meeting Minutes from the November 15, 2022 meeting were reviewed.
A motion to approve was made by JK, second by BC. The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Tab 2: Agenda

   a. Tab 3: Project Schedule, all Phases.

      No changes from the November 15, 2022 meeting


      Context submitted a revised value for their services. They reduced the Phase II, Schematic Design from $150,000 to $130,000. The Phase III value was reduced from $834,000 to $829,000.

      A motion was made by JK, seconded by BC to approve these values for the TON to go forward with Context. It was stated that we would only recommend the Phase II services since Phase III would be released if the TON votes to go forward with the project at a Special Town Meeting in 2023.

   c. Tab 5: Concept Level Planning

      No changes from the November 15, 2022 meeting

   d. Tab 6: Establish an estimate of probable costs:

      No changes from the November 15, 2022 meeting
e. Tab 7: Revised Program Comparisons.

   No changes from the November 15, 2022 meeting

f. Tab 8:

   Review of Executive Summary of the 21E Assessment from July 9, 2015 indicates that we will not need to undertake any further tasks.

g. Tab 9. Geotechnical Borings. TON Highway department will perform excavating 3-4 test holes on the High Street lot. These will be machine dug near the SW corner, the NE and SE corners of the lot. Following this undertaking, a request may be made that soil borings be taken to further qualify the soil conditions.

Citizens Comments:

   Jack Rybioki: Requested a distinction between test holes and borings

   Jim Moran: Asked for clarification of squared footage and budget cost

On a motion made by J. Kellar and seconded by E. Svahn, the meeting was adjourned at 8:04 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, January 10, 2022, 7:30 a.m., via ZOOM

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
NEWBURY MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE

TOWN HALL PROJECT
TUESDAY, January 10, 2023, 7:30 AM

ROBERT CONNORS,
ERIC SVAHN,
JOHN KELLAR,
DANA PACKER,
MARTHA TAYLOR
Town of Newbury
Municipal Building Committee/Town Hall Building

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: January 10, 2023

Present: Bob Connors (BC), Eric Svahn (ES), John Kellar (JK), Dana Packer (DP), Martha Taylor (MT)

Absent:

Bob Connors opened the meeting at 7:32 a.m.

Municipal Building Committee Charge

A committee, consisting of 3 voting members, (Bob Connors, Eric Svahn and John Kellar) and 2 advisory members (Martha Taylor and Dana Parker) will be/have been appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without the approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements.

The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates.

The January 10, 2023 Open Meeting of the Newbury Municipal Building Committee (MBC) was conducted remotely in accordance with Chapter 107 of the Acts of 2022, which extends the Governor’s March 12, 2020 “Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A § 20,” until March 31, 2023. This Order suspends the requirement of the Open Meeting Law to have all meetings in a publicly accessible physical location and allows public bodies to meet entirely remotely so long as reasonable public access is afforded so that the public can follow along with the deliberations of the meeting. B. Connors stated at the beginning of the meeting that the MBC was convening by video conference via Zoom, as posted on the MBC’s agenda, and that each vote taken in the meeting would be conducted by roll call vote.

1. Tab 1: Meeting Minutes from December 13, 2022

Meeting Minutes from the November 15, 2022 meeting were reviewed.

MT offered two minor corrections under Citizens Comments: Jack Rybicki is the correct spelling and in Jim Moran’s comment, it should be “Square Foot and Budget Costs” instead of “Squared Foot.”

The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

2. Tab 2: OPM RFQ

Reviewed a communication from Jon Lemieux, Executive Vice President of the Vertex Companies, saying that Vertex is not available for this project. With that we will proceed with issuing an RFQ for an OPM. Next steps will be to have the current draft reviewed and finalized by MT, Tracy Blais (TB)/Procurement, and Town Counsel, then sent back to the committee.
“ProjectDog” (your central location for all online procurement needs) was discussed for use in the procurement process of the OPM.

3. **Tab 3: Context (Architect) Contract.**

   The contract amendment with Context has been executed.

   Jeff Shaw (JS) indicated he would be updating the plan/design based on refined program from MT and TB and the square footage parameters provided by BC at the meeting.

   He will prepare an updated schedule for the next meeting.

   We all agreed that we could go to bi-weekly meetings and even weekly when necessary.

4. **Tab 4: Test Pits**

   Test pits were dug in December in three locations on the High Street property. There were no surprises as marine clay was unearthed which will likely require foundation stabilization.

5. **Tab 5: Soil Borings**

   TON Procurement has issued a Purchase Order to New England Borings to proceed with soil borings at the High Street site. Borings will take place Thursday, January 12th. A Geotechnical Field Engineer or Representative will be on site to observe the activity.

**Citizens Comments:**

   Bill Dimaio: Bill wanted to say how grateful he was that this building committee team was working on the Town Hall project after the results the same team produced with the police station.

On a motion made by **J. Kellar** and seconded by **E. Svahn**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:37 a.m.

**NEXT MEETINGS:**

   Thursday, January 26, 2023, 7:30 AM
   Monday, February 6, 2023, 7:30 AM

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
NEWBURY MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE

TOWN HALL PROJECT
THURSDAY, January 26, 2023, 7:30AM

ROBERT CONNORS,
ERIC SVAHN,
JOHN KELLAR,
DANA PACKER,
MARTHA TAYLOR
Town of Newbury
Municipal Building Committee/Town Hall Building

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: January 26, 2023

Present: Bob Connors (BC), Eric Svahn (ES), John Kellar (JK), Dana Packer (DP), Martha Taylor (MT)

Absent:

Bob Connors opened the meeting at 7:31 a.m.

Municipal Building Committee Charge

A committee, consisting of 3 voting members, (Bob Connors, Eric Svahn and John Kellar) and 2 advisory members (Martha Taylor and Dana Packer) will be/have been appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without the approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements. The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates.

The January 26, 2023 Open Meeting of the Newbury Municipal Building Committee (MBC) was conducted remotely in accordance with Chapter 107 of the Acts of 2022, which extends the Governor’s March 12, 2020 “Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A § 20,” until March 31, 2023. This Order suspends the requirement of the Open Meeting Law to have all meetings in a publicly accessible physical location and allows public bodies to meet entirely remotely so long as reasonable public access is afforded so that the public can follow along with the deliberations of the meeting. B. Connors stated at the beginning of the meeting that the MBC was convening by video conference via Zoom, as posted on the MBC’s agenda, and that each vote taken in the meeting would be conducted by roll call vote.

1. Tab 1: Meeting Minutes from January 10, 2023

   Meeting Minutes from the December 13, 2022 meeting were reviewed.
   JK offered one corrections, spelling of Dana Parker should be Dana Packer
   JK made a motion and ES seconded the motion to accept the minutes.
   The minutes were unanimously approved as amended without further discussion.

2. Tab 2: OPM RFQ

   Final review these next two weeks with draft and services with Project Dog.


   Several comments were offered with the latest Context plan:

   1. Widen hallway to 60" to allow service windows to be located on hallway side allowing reception seating in lobby "Dana Packer suggestion; expand footprint as needed.
   2. Expand footprint to allow alignment of town clerk wall and elevator area. Eric suggestion
   3. Create exterior vestibules at stairway 1 & 2 for staff/card reader access.
4. Reverse the floor plan to allow trash room to be located on west side of the building as dumpster pad/enclosure will be located in this area.

Context to update plan with these ideas.

4. **Tab 4: Proposed Schedule**

An updated version of the schedule was reviewed.

5. **Tab 5: Soil Borings**

Soil Borings were taken on Tuesday, January 17, 2023. One day was all that was necessary to sample the sub surface conditions adequately. The invoice for these services was presented. A motion to accept was given by JK, seconded by DP. Voted unanimously to accept and forward with Warrant cover sheet with signatures. Digital signatures are acceptable. BC will sign and forward to JK who will sign and forward to ES for his signature who will forward to BC, JK, MT and Accounting.

**Citizens Comments:**

None

On a motion made by **J. Kellar** and seconded by **D. Packer**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:37 a.m.

**NEXT MEETING:**
Monday, February 6, 2023, 7:30 AM

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
NEWBURY MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE

TOWN HALL PROJECT
Monday, February 6, 2023, 7:30AM

ROBERT CONNORS,
ERIC SVAHN,
JOHN KELLAR,
DANA PACKER,
MARTHA TAYLOR
MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 06, 2023

Present: Bob Connors (BC), John Kellar (JK), Dana Packer (DP), Martha Taylor (MT)

Absent: Eric Svahn (ES)

Bob Connors opened the meeting at 7:32 a.m.

Municipal Building Committee Charge

A committee, consisting of 3 voting members, (Bob Connors, Eric Svahn and John Kellar) and 2 advisory members (Martha Taylor and Dana Parker) will be/have been appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without the approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements. The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates.

The February 06, 2023 Open Meeting of the Newbury Municipal Building Committee (MBC) was conducted remotely in accordance with Chapter 107 of the Acts of 2022, which extends the Governor’s March 12, 2020 “Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A § 20,” until March 31, 2023. This Order suspends the requirement of the Open Meeting Law to have all meetings in a publicly accessible physical location and allows public bodies to meet entirely remotely so long as reasonable public access is afforded so that the public can follow along with the deliberations of the meeting. B. Connors stated at the beginning of the meeting that the MBC was convening by video conference via Zoom, as posted on the MBC’s agenda, and that each vote taken in the meeting would be conducted by roll call vote.

1. Tab 1: Meeting Minutes from January 26, 2023

Meeting Minutes from the January 26, 2023 meeting were reviewed.
The meeting minutes were unanimously approved without further discussion.

2. Tab 2: OPM RFQ

Final review with Procurement. MT is finalizing the arrangement with Project Dog and will then forward to Tracy Blaise for final approval with a late next week public posting through Project Dog.


Several new and additional comments were offered with the prior Context plan: With these comments there is a possibility of adding additional square footage to the proposed building. Context will take these ideas along with thoughts shared during the meeting and see how they can fit into the current or an slightly expanded footprint.
4. **Tab 4: Proposed Schedule**
   
   No changes to the proposed schedule

5. **Tab 5: Soil Borings**
   
   The final report boring from MacPhail Engineering has been forwarded to the Town of Newbury from Context.

**Citizens Comments:**

Jim Moran: Wanted to discuss none Tab items but BC shared that was not available to address in this forum

Jack Rybicki: Commented on the proposed location on High Street is a busy location.

On a motion made by [J. Kellar](#) and seconded by [B. Connors](#), the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 a.m.

**NEXT MEETING:**

Monday, February 13, 2023, 7:30 AM

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
NEWBURY MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE

TOWN HALL PROJECT
Wednesday, February 22, 2023, 7:30AM

ROBERT CONNORS,
ERIC SVAHN,
JOHN KELLAR,
DANA PACKER,
MARTHA TAYLOR
Town of Newbury
Municipal Building Committee/Town Hall Building

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 22, 2023

Present: Bob Connors (BC), John Kellar (JK), Dana Packer (DP), Martha Taylor (MT)

Absent: Eric Svahn (ES)

Bob Connors opened the meeting at 7:32 a.m.

Municipal Building Committee Charge

A committee, consisting of 3 voting members, (Bob Connors, Eric Svahn and John Kellar) and 2 advisory members (Martha Taylor and Dana Parker) will be/have been appointed to work with architects and OPMs to deliver plans for and construction of a Town Hall that meets the needs of the Town of Newbury and will address the projected growth of same over the next 30 years. The committee shall coordinate all bidding and construction with the Chief Procurement Officer of the Town. No expenditure of funds shall be permitted without the approval of the Town Accountant and Chief Financial Officer. The Committee shall conform to all Open Meeting Law and Public Record Law requirements. The Committee shall meet regularly and shall provide the Select Board with periodic updates.

The February 06, 2023 Open Meeting of the Newbury Municipal Building Committee (MBC) was conducted remotely in accordance with Chapter 107 of the Acts of 2022, which extends the Governor’s March 12, 2020 “Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A § 20,” until March 31, 2023. This Order suspends the requirement of the Open Meeting Law to have all meetings in a publicly accessible physical location and allows public bodies to meet entirely remotely so long as reasonable public access is afforded so that the public can follow along with the deliberations of the meeting. B. Connors stated at the beginning of the meeting that the MBC was convening by video conference via Zoom, as posted on the MBC’s agenda, and that each vote taken in the meeting would be conducted by roll call vote.

1. Tab 1: Meeting Minutes from February 06, 2023

Meeting Minutes from the February 06, 2022 meeting were reviewed.
The meeting minutes were unanimously approved without further discussion.

2. Tab 2: OPM RFQ

Final review with Procurement, MT and TB is complete. The RFP is ready to forward to Project Dog for advertising.


Context presented a new layout to accommodate some of the recommendations from the committee as well as MT and TB’s recent review and comment. With these modifications, the 1st and 2nd level area is 10,110 SF along with the attic area of 4,395 sf. for a total of 14,505 sf.
4. **Tab 4: Proposed Schedule**

   No changes to the proposed schedule

5. **Tab 5: Soil Borings**

   The final report boring from MacPhail Engineering has been received by the Town of Newbury from Context.

**Citizens Comments:**

On a motion made by **J. Kellar** and seconded by **B. Connors**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:44 a.m.

**NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, March 01, 2023, 7:30 AM

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kellar, III, TON/MBC Clerk
Newbury municipal facilities continue to operate well past their planned life span and the Police Department’s facility is no exception. The facility has become seriously overcrowded, suffers from a lack of sufficient infrastructure (HVAC, electrical, data, and telecommunication) and is challenged to provide Newbury with vital services given outdated security and safety systems which if not addressed will ultimately result in a decline of operational efficiency and morale.

In brief, the facility does not meet current standards for the programmatic needs of a 21st century police department facility such as a secure entry lobby, a communications center, a cellblock, interview rooms, men’s and women’s locker rooms, training rooms, offices, evidence storage, booking room, squad room, day room, garage or a sallyport.

Building a new police station is of course an expensive and complicated endeavor that will need full public support to be successful. To gain support, the public must first understand why this project is so important as well as how critical concerns and shortcomings with our current Police Department’s facility puts public safety at risk. The following site inspection evaluation and related recommendations are respectfully submitted for consideration in addressing the Newbury Police Department’s facility.
Debate continues over Newbury police station, Town Hall building projects

Officials consider plans for police station, town offices

By Jennifer Solis Correspondent
Sep 4, 2018

NEWBURY — It's deja vu all over again for local officials who are once again considering the merits of building a combined police station and town offices after a new estimate for separate facilities came in at twice what voters approved for the project last year.

But several of the 25 people in the audience for the discussion last week objected, saying the plan is contrary to what voters supported.

After learning from the Municipal Building Committee that the design for a new 13,000-square-foot police station and 12,665 square feet of renovated Town Hall space carried an estimated price tag of $14.1 million — more than double the funded amount — selectmen asked for a redesigned project with a budget not to exceed $8.5 million.

In response, Context Architecture trimmed 2,500 square feet from the police station and 6,432 square feet from the Town Hall, leaving 10,500 square feet for a stand-alone police station and 6,233 square feet for Town Hall.

Current police programming requires 11,549 square feet, according to Context, the designer for the project. The price does not include approximately $500,000 for furnishings and equipment or $900,000 for contingencies.

Context also reviewed an $8.5 million combined facility, which would yield a 15,400-square-foot building in which the entrance to the police station was on the lower level of the lot and a separate lobby into the Town Hall would be on an upper level.

This project would require an additional $2.4 million for furnishings, equipment, contingencies and for temporary office space during construction, but would benefit from the shared systems and other cost efficiencies of a combined building.

"The reduction is very challenging," admitted Police Chief Michael Reilly. It reduces space for people in the training room from 49 to 33 people; removes the emergency management office, garage, bunkroom and two toilets; and leaves no room for expansion in the locker rooms or offices.

The proposed combined facility also has its problems, including the fact it requires police and town offices to share a conference room — something that could be awkward for people seeking police services, Reilly said.

"I know I have spoken privately to many people in this room," he said looking around at the audience. Reilly, a 31-year veteran of the force, stressed that he did not want to appear to "be whining." His officers would work with whatever taxpayers saw fit to provide them.

"But I don't want to be the guy whose name is behind something that is deficient going in," he added. "I don't want to build you a police station that's going to be obsolete the day you step inside," said Selectwoman Alicia Greco.

For more than six years, the town has grappled with finding the right solution for police and town office building needs.
In 2012, committees were formed to address the findings of initial reports on the public safety buildings. In 2015, the Municipal Building Committee recommended spending between $10.8 million and $12.8 million to house a 26,300-square-foot operation in a combined police, fire and Town Hall building, arguing that bringing all three functions together in one project would provide cost efficiencies and economies that would be more affordable to taxpayers in the long run.

The proposal passed at Town Meeting but failed to receive the required vote at the polls.

Strong pushback from some residents - many from the Byfield area - against pursuing an upgrade to the Morgan Avenue fire station, as well as a citizens petition at Town Meeting for building only a smaller police station, prompted the building committee to recommend a $6.5 million phased project in which a new police station and renovated Town Hall would happen first.

The process sharpened town leaders' sensitivity for a need to balance town necessities with the economic realities for many residents - especially those on fixed incomes.

“If this doesn’t pass, then where are we?” asked Fred Davis, a vocal advocate for the petition-proposed police station. “For four years, voters have voted for a stand-alone police station.”

He urged selectmen to spend the $6.5 million appropriated for that project, “bring it in on time and under budget, and then come back for more.”

Resident Jim Morse pushed selectmen to either return both in scope and cost to the project recommended to voters in 2017 or leave the police station where it is on Morgan Avenue, next to the fire station, and find another home for Town Hall- a plan he felt was the most economical.

At risk for each selectman is the faith and trust of the people to uphold their integrity and to maintain the credibility of the vested powers entrusted to the board,” Morse wrote in a letter to selectmen last month.

But Selectman Damon Jespersen had strong words for anyone who wasn’t making the future of the community a priority.

“I think we need to do more, not less, for our civil servants,” he said. “I don’t think we should be shortchanging the future of the town.”

Morse noted that police operate in 6,500 square feet at the former Town Hall and are “doing fine.” Town offices are in rented space in Byfield. But others argued police are operating without certification because many areas of the former Town Hall do not meet the requirements for a police station.

Resident Mark Gleckman stressed that the original vote for a combined facility only lost by 32 votes at the polls in 2015. He felt people should listen more to the police chief, who has decades of experience in the field.

“For any of you to suggest that you know more than he, what a functioning police station needs - shame on you,” he said.

Ultimately, selectmen asked the Municipal Building Committee to further refine the design of the combined facility to make sure it will meet present and future needs. Selectman Chuck Bear, who supported just building a $6.5 million police station at this time, voted no.
### Space Needs Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prgm No.</th>
<th>Space Type Description</th>
<th>Needed Space Size</th>
<th>Tot. Needed NASF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Public Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Vestibule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>&quot;Companion&quot; Toilet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Consultation Waiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Coats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Activity Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Large Assembly / Multipurpose (100 ppl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Table &amp; Chair Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Equipment Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Pantry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Fitness (12 ppl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Art (20 ppl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Art Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Lounge/Library (20 ppl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Activity Storage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Outdoor Patio &amp; Canopy Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Outreach Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Administration (2 ppl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Building Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Delivery &amp; Loading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Trash &amp; Recycling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Electrical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Net Square Footage)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grossing Factor (walls, corridors, chases, etc.)</strong></td>
<td>@</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tracy,

Patrick Seekamp and I walked the Town Parcel next to the Elementary School off Hanover Street.

The wetlands are as extensive as I suspected. We found only three upland areas, only one of which is accessible without crossing wetland resource area to get to it. It was located directly off the school parking lot at the back left side of the school parcel. Unfortunately, it is triangular in shape and only about 20,000 to 25,000 s.f. and is entirely within the 100 foot buffer zone to the wetland boundary.

The other two areas are isolated uplands (essentially island of upland within the wetland boundary). They are both small, the largest being behind house # and is about 30,000 s.f. and the second smaller area is toward the back left side of the property and is about 10000 to 15000 s.f. and both are entirely in the 100 ft buffer.

None of the upland areas would support the size building and infrastructure required by the COA.

If you have any questions of Patrick, I included him in this email.

Patrick will be sending his invoice.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Bill
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) performed by Ransom Consulting, Inc. (Ransom) for the Town of Newbury at 25 High Road and 3, 7, and 7R Morgan Avenue (Map U06, Block 0, Lots 1, 2, 3, and 31) in the Town of Newbury, Essex County, Massachusetts (the “Site”). This Phase I ESA was conducted in general accord with the requirements provided by the ASTM International Designation: E 1527-13, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, 2013 (ASTM E 1527-13) and Ransom’s Scope of Work Agreement with the Town of Newbury dated June 10, 2015. The purpose of this Phase I ESA was to evaluate environmental conditions for evidence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs) in connection with the Site.

The combined 105,786-square foot Site is developed with two permanent structures: the Town Hall and the Fire Department (Protection Fire Company 2). The Town Hall provides space for the various town offices and departments and the Police Department. The Town Hall building was constructed in 1977 and the Fire Department building was constructed in 1967. Limited landscaping surrounds the Site buildings. Two condemned portable office structures are also located at the Site along with three temporary portable structures housing town offices. A large gravel parking lot and undeveloped wooded land are located in the eastern/northeastern portion of the Site, in addition to a concrete foundation associated with former storage shed. The Site is located within a residential and commercially developed area. Prior to the existing buildings, residential structures were located at the Site since at least 1938.

The heating system for the Site buildings were converted from fuel oil to natural gas seven years ago and all associated aboveground storage tanks were removed; no evidence of a release of oil to the environment from the former tanks was observed by Ransom. The Site buildings are serviced by municipal water and each building is served by an on-site septic system with a leach field.

The Protection Fire Company 2 was identified in the environmental database search completed as part of this assessment as a small quantity generator of hazardous waste. The Site is also listed in the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MA DEP) Reportable Release Lookup Database for the release of 12 gallons of hydraulic fluid from a G. Mello trash collection truck at the Site in May 2015 which impacted portions of State Street, High Street, and the asphalt-paved parking lot located north of the Town Hall building. The hydraulic fluid release was remedied and a Permanent Solution Statement was filed with the MA DEP in June 2015, closing this release with respect to the Massachusetts Contingency Plan.

Ransom did not identify surrounding properties with the potential to adversely impact environmental conditions at the Site.

Ransom did not observe evidence of the storage, use, or a release of oil and/or hazardous material at the Site during this assessment.

We have performed a Phase I ESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM E 1527-13 of 25 High Road and 3, 7, and 7R Morgan Avenue in Newbury, Massachusetts. the Site. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 1.4 of this report. This assessment has revealed no evidence of RECs in connection with the Site. Ransom identified the prior release of hydraulic fluid at the Site as an historical REC. Ransom concludes that no additional investigation is warranted at this time.
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## SPACE NEEDS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prgm No.</th>
<th>Space Type Description</th>
<th>Existing NASF</th>
<th>Floor 1st</th>
<th>Floor 2nd</th>
<th>Floor Attic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHARED SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Public &amp; Other Shared Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Vestibule</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Public Lobby</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Toilet (single user)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Media Control Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Large Meeting / Hearing Room</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Medium Conference Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Small Conference Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Printing / Plotting / Storage</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Break Room</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Archive Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.0</strong></td>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Town Administrator</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Executive Administrator</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Town Accountant / Assist. Finance Director</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Accountants (2pl)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Town Clerk (incl state computer)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Assistant Town Clerk (existing counter)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Clerk File Storage</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Vault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Principal Assessor</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Assessors Clerk (existing counter)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Assessing File Storage</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.0</strong></td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Treasurer / Collector</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Assistant Treasurer / Collector (existing counter)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Treasurer File Storage</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.0</strong></td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Planning Board Admin</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Planning File Storage</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SPACE NEEDS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prgm No.</th>
<th>Space Type Description</th>
<th>Existing NASF</th>
<th>Floor 1st</th>
<th>Floor 2nd</th>
<th>Attic Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Inspectional Services &amp; Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Building Commissioner</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Building File Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Conservation Agent</td>
<td>shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>I.S./Conservation/ZBA Admin (existing counter)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Conservation File Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>ZBA File Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Health Director</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Health Inspector</td>
<td>shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Health File Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Health Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>IT Director &amp; Operations</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>I.T. Equipment Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>DPW Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Building Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Building Supplies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Janitor Closet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Elevator (stops)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Elevator Machine Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Network Room</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>Electrical Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Mechanical Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Sprinkler Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>Trash &amp; Recycling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal (Net Square Footage)**: 5,116

**Grossing Factor (walls, corridors, chases, etc.):** 1,644, 1,614, 1,216

**TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE**: 12,952
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The Newbury Historic District is located in the center of the town of Newbury and is characterized by a wide range of domestic, civic, educational, religious, cultural and commercial structures, all of which face either High Road, the main thoroughfare, or the town green, known as the Upper Green. Contiguous to one another in this rural townscape, the buildings in the district continue to serve as the community center of Newbury.

The Newbury Historic District is composed of forty structures spanning four centuries of development. Most of them date from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, there is an unusually high concentration of buildings (nearly a third) which date from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. While most are residential buildings, those for civic, educational and even commercial use continue to maintain a domestic scale, represent for the most part the anonymous local building tradition, and are principally of frame construction with clapboard or shingle exteriors. The District also includes The First Parish Burying Ground on High Road which dates from the time of the first settlement in the mid-seventeenth century. There are also a number of commemorative works on the Upper Green, among them the Arnold monument (A) and the Soldiers and Sailors Civil War Monument. (B).

The oldest structure in the district is the Tristram Coffin House (#35), 1654, which represents one of the outstanding examples of First Period architecture in New England and is the most important seventeenth century house in the District. It is set in deeply from High Road on a lot with a creek just beyond its western edge. A recent examination of one of the posts in the original portion for dendro-chronological corroboration resulted in a reading of about 1654. This portion facing south was enlarged with a First Period addition. A more extensive enlargement occurred after 1750, expanding the house to its present size while establishing a new orientation facing east. By 1785 all major elements of the house as it now stands were named in a division of the property. The east facade facing the High Road continues the seventeenth century use of unpainted clapboarding, vertical chimneys and vernacular character of the original portion; its organization is now regularized and classicized so that its entrance and fenestration are symmetrically disposed into five bays, two and one-half stories in height. The placement of windows on the south facade reflects the additive nature of the house.

The Henry Sewall House (#31) is purported to have been built by Henry Sewall, Jr., between 1660 when he purchased the land and 1678 when the house was named in his will of that date. The U-shaped plan reflects a collection of additions and alterations. The house has two entrances: one to the east on High Road; the other to the south on Parker Street. In the twentieth century this two-story structure, like others in the district, was "colonialized" with its formerly unpainted clapboarding now painted white and the addition of black shutters.

The Dr. Peter Toppan House (#2), 1697, is a fine example of a First Period structure whose gambrel roof and overhang are evident on the west elevation facing High Road. The unpainted shingles and clapboards of the restored exterior duplicate its original wall fabric, similar in treatment to the unpainted clapboarding of the Coffin House (#36) and Short House (#15). The presence of two central fireplaces and the somewhat irregular design of its windows, despite their symmetrical disposition into five bays, is residual evidence that the house had formerly been divided into a duplex arrangement.
The Luther Dame House (#35), 1876, is a mansarded structure set back from High Road in a natural setting. Its prevailing axial organization and so-called "wedgewood" treatment of yellow clapboarding with white trim convey the strength of residual Federal motifs. A cupola, like that at 35 High Road (#13) quotes the architectural features of the house itself. Further, a similar use of post-Civil War architectural elements, including bracketed cornice, entrance and projecting bay windows, as well as the decorative treatment of slate and dormers of the mansarded roof show a design informed by restrained picturesque eclecticism.

A number of other houses in the District are informed by a nineteenth century interpretation of colonial forms. These include the Deacon N. Little House (#26), c. 1825, whose planar approach to each elevation of this frame structure reflects traditional eighteenth century treatment, while its entrance on the gable end facing Green Street, and granite foundation evidence a strong Greek Revival influence. The Reverend Leonard Withington House (#7), 1843, and the Hale-Knight House (#33), 1880, illustrate other houses in the District which reflect the survival of eighteenth century colonial forms and geometric massing characteristic of the Greek Revival period.

The District also contains a number of twentieth century buildings including two notable civic and educational structures as well as a number of domestic structures, two of which are representative. These four works exemplify different aspects of Colonial Revival architecture or mid-twentieth century (more recent) interpretations by local builders.

The Woodbridge School (#12) was built in 1898 as a two-room structure and enlarged to its present size in 1908. This two-story frame building, cruciform in plan, is an important example of Colonial Revival architecture. Its projecting entrance enclosed within the wall plane reflects an American interpretation of the ubiquitous Palladian temple front. Engaged ionic columns flank the door, and an oculus punctuates the pediment above.

The Town Hall (#8) was originally built in the early part of the twentieth century as the town grange and was remodeled to its present state after a fire c. 1927 to serve as the Town Hall. This one-story structure with shingle exterior and projecting entrance portico maintains a low, crisp profile. Its essentially vernacular character and domestic scale are in harmony with other structures in the townscape.

The Houses at 20 Green Street (#21), 1900, and at 2 Green Street (#29), c. 1940 are two representative examples of the survival of colonial forms into the twentieth century. The house at 20 Green Street (#21) is a provincial example of turn-of-the century Colonial Revival. The large scale, symmetrical organization and marked verticality of this three-story elevation with hip roof and tall chimneys, characterize the house as a product of Queen Anne influence. The house at 2 Green Street (#29), is a fine example of a two-story structure with gambrel roof and exterior of unpainted
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GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

ACREAGE OF NOMINATED PROPERTY 38 acres

UTM REFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VERBAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION: The northern boundary line begins 113' west of High Road at the northern property line of #40, and extends east across High Road to Marlboro Street and runs northeast to the back property line of #1, 100' east of High Road. The eastern boundary line of the District begins at the back property line of #1 and runs south along the back of properties #2 to #5, approximately 200' from High Road, extending along the back property line of the First Parish Burying Ground, and continuing along the back property line of properties which face High Road from #7 to #15.
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#9:
Little and Ilsley, editors. *The First Parish, Newbury, Massachusetts, 1635-1935.*
Newburyport, 1935.

#10:
The southern boundary line of the District begins at the back property line of #15, approximately 140' east of High Road and runs west across High Road to the back of properties #16, #17, and #18 at a distance of approximately 200' from Hanover Street. The western boundary line of the district begins at the southern property line of #19 and runs north along the back of properties #19 and #20 at a distance of approximately 250' from Green Street, and continues along the back of properties #27 to #34, and along the back of properties #35 and #36 at a distance of approximately 225' from High Road and properties #37 and #40 at a distance of approximately 200' from High Road.
Newbury Historic District, Newbury (Essex Co.), MA

8. Facing east: Town Hall (#8). (Photograph: Mardges Bacon, 1975)
Newbury Grange  formerly at the location of the current Town Hall
Formerly located on the site of today’s Town Hall, the Newbury Grange was destroyed by fire in 1927. The replacement building was sold to the town in 1937 for use as a Town Hall. In 1938 the old Town Hall building on Middle Road was sold and moved to the Littlefield Farm, where it remains a farm building.