

DRAFT

N.B. The following record is in draft form and has not been approved by the Subcommittee. This record should not be relied upon for any actions or decisions, which should await the final version when approved by the Subcommittee.

**Building and Facilities Committee
Police Station Site Review Subcommittee
Minutes of 5-12-22; P.D. Training Room**

Members Present: Chief Cobb, Cardillo, Hoglund, Marashio, Keith, Bowers, Vance

Also in attendance: Kim Hallquist, Town Administrator; Adam Ricker, Town Planner; Colin Beasley, resident

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

Colin Beasley noted that he had been asked to attend the meeting by Kim Hallquist, and asked if his presence, due to the presence of three other BFC members, constituted a meeting requiring formal notice. Kim Hallquist responded that that was not a problem as he was attending solely as a resident of the Town.

1. Discussion of BFC Request for further information

Chief Cobb introduced the topic of the request from the BFC for additional information related to the committee's Report. She noted that the Report was thorough and complete as to the limited purpose of the committee to review possible sites for a new police station. Bob Bowers suggested that rather than try to formulate a written response the committee simply meet with the BFC and respond to their questions and have a conversation on these concerns. Joe Cardillo stated that a lot of the questions relate to the design phase and are not part of this committee's charge. Nancy Marashio suggested that the committee should proceed to file a written answer to the Request as the proper and appropriate response. The committee then went through each item of the Request and provided answers, all of which are set forth in the Attachment.

2. Other business

Bob Bowers raised as a question whether the committee wished to reconsider its decision to remove the "Bar Harbor" property from consideration. This property consisted of the lots owned by Bar Harbor on Main Street which were not the bank building itself – the lot on which the red building was situate which has been torn down, and related lots owned by the bank. In that earlier consideration, the committee included the property known as the Kidder office building which abuts this property and is for sale. The committee at that time also discussed the other abutting property owned by the Bergers and then being used by a day care center. At that time the Berger property was not for sale. The day care center has now closed and the Bergers would consider a sale of the property if the Town were interested. The combination of the properties would provide a lot of about 1 ½ acres with frontage on Main St., Gould Rd., and Pleasant St. The committee discussed the original reasons for rejecting the parcels and reconsidered some of the issues, of which two were access issues and the close proximity of the intersection. Joe Cardillo asked Chief Cobb and David Keith to offer their thoughts on this.

May 12, 2022

David Keith stated that he believed there were issues with the site which would make the site not appropriate, including that it is at one of the more congested intersections, its location would have a negative effect on nearby businesses, and the communications tower would have to be taller than at other locations, which would have a significant visual impact. He would be opposed to reconsidering the site. Chief Cobb noted that one of the stated objections to the Stahlman building as a possible site was its proximity to this intersection. Joe Cardillo stated that for the reasons stated he thought it should not be reconsidered. The committee was in agreement not to reconsider the site.

3. Approve Minutes of March 22, 2022

A motion was made by Chief Cobb and seconded to approve the minutes of the previous meeting of March 22, 2022, which were then approved unanimously.

4. Other business

None.

5. Next meeting date

It is anticipated that there will be no further meetings unless specific requests are addressed to this committee by the Building and Facilities Committee.

Action Items

5-12-22

- A. Upon receipt of the Response by the committee, unless there are changes Chief Cobb will forward that Response to the BFC.

Motion to adjourn.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert Bowers, Recorder

ATTACHMENT

Police Station Site Review Subcommittee Response of May 12, 2022, to:

BFC Requests to Police Station Site Review Subcommittee

Please update the submitted report with the following information:

1. Please identify the total number of meetings and site visits held by the subcommittee. **9 meetings; no formal site visits – members reviewed on own or relied on own knowledge of site and input from Adam Ricker and other subcommittee members**
2. Each issue identified in Attachment A should be addressed in Attachment D.

Attachment A

Police Department Preferred Characteristics:

Future planning important to consider (plan for a long-term solution)

May 12, 2022

Land:

2 acres **Acres is addressed in Attachment D**

Building:

- Single story **Bewley and Cricenti, yes; Broom requires engineering study**
- Basement, or a portion thereof (land dependent) could allow for storage of HVAC equipment, fitness room, etc. **Bewley and Cricenti, yes; Broom requires engineering study**
- 12,000 – 14,000 GSF **Bewley and Cricenti, yes; Broom requires engineering study**
- Access to public water and sewer **Bewley, Cricenti, and Broom, yes**
- At least 3 oversized garage bays, along with outside carport **Bewley and Cricenti, yes; Broom requires engineering study**
- Parking for up to 40 cars (employee/public), **Bewley and Cricenti, yes; Broom requires engineering study**
- Ability to have solar power installation and/or charging port for electric vehicles **Bewley, Cricenti, and Broom, appear to be yes; requires engineering study and input from Energy Committee**

Geographic location:

- Hardening and security (separation of personal vehicles from public parking, secure area to enter sallyport, transfer prisoners, security of generator, etc) **Bewley and Cricenti, yes; Broom requires engineering study**
 - Elevation and pre-existing obstructions for the radio tower **Bewley, Cricenti, and Broom, appear to be satisfactory (based on review by Beltronics)**
 - Accessibility **Bewley and Cricenti, yes; Broom requires engineering study**
 - Means of ingress and egress **Bewley, Cricenti, and Broom, yes**
 - Along main corridor of Main Street / Newport Road **Bewley and Broom, yes; Cricenti, no**
 - Town identity considerations **This is subjective and is based on the Town Master Plan and the Town survey on which it is based; the BFC should reach its own conclusions**
3. Each issue identified in Attachment D should be addressed in Attachment A. May need a “nice to have” category. **The Report identifies “preferred,” not “required,” characteristics; the Report used those characteristics to review the site, not the design.**
 4. Please explain or discuss, relative to previous requirements Identified by NLPD
 - a. Increase parking from 18 to 40 cars. If for training purposes, provide an estimate of how many times per year lot will be used, if intended for a community room, clearly state this. **Site Review Regulations seem to require 40 spaces for 10,000 sq. ft. of building space.**
 - b. Why did the size requirements go from 9400 sq ft to 14,000 sq. ft. **14,000 gsf represents an attempt to be sure to meet the preferred characteristics. It was not the committee’s charge to define “required” characteristics. It is also attempts to include possible future growth for the next 50 years.**
 - c. Previous discussions highlighted the benefit of proximity to the elementary school and the college. **Proximity to the elementary school and college were not identified as preferred characteristics.**
 - d. What is meant by future needs? Please define. **Does the site have the capacity to grow with the department and satisfy Town needs.**
 5. Need further explanation/description

May 12, 2022

- a. If basement and three garage bays are included in the 12-14k SF, are they not descriptors and just part of the same requirement? **These are preferred characteristics and they are included in the 14,000 gsf. The basement is a decision that needs to be made in the design phase.**
 - b. What are parameters for solar? Clear view? 3 phase power, Other? **See Report Attachment E, #11. If “clear view” is a reference to the communication tower, the answer is yes. Three-phase power is a design/engineering decision.**
 - c. What does accessibility requirement mean? Wheel chair, vehicle, pedestrian? **The committee was primarily concerned with walking and vehicle accessibility; but the ADA requirements certainly must be addressed.**
 - d. Please discuss “street presentation” issues more clearly. The terms “limited visibility”, “street presence”, “integrated and prominent”, “visual impact”, “removed from general observation”, and “not visible” are all used in the report. What is desired? Standardizing terms would be helpful. **No definition was reached, nor does it seem possible to do so. It was a perceptual characteristic arising from the Master Plan. Other considerations took precedence, and it was not necessary to reach specific conclusions.**
 - e. What is meant by town identity considerations? **This is subjective and needs to be addressed in the final design phase.**
6. Issues that do not seem to be addressed in the report and should be:
 - a. Presence of three-phase power. **See answer to 5.b. above.**
 - b. Decrease or increase in driving times to various parts of town, relative to current. Interstate was mentioned in discussions, what about school, college, Elkins, Fairview, etc. **The overall preferred criterion was the Main Street/Newport Road corridor, which satisfies these concerns.**
 7. Provide clarity on land adjacent to the Broom property **This is currently not feasible as it is part of a Planned Unit Development. However, if the Broom property is the preferred site, this would have to be fully addressed with the Town Planning Department, the owners, and other affected parties.**
 8. Provide Subcommittee Meeting Minutes as an additional attachment to the Report. **See Report, third introductory paragraph with link to these minutes on the Town website.**