Town Center Buildings Committee
Public Information Meeting
November 12, 2011
Approved November 17, 2011

Members Present: Bruce Healey, Chair; Jim Powell, Pat Sherman, Clay Rucker, Hal Krueger, Wayne Whitford, Ken Holmes, Members; Dennis Pavlicek, Hank Thomas, Bob Lee, ex-officio members, Peter Tennant, consultant.

The meeting commenced at 10:10 a.m.

Mr. Rucker and Mr. Tennant presented the following three Options/Approaches to the public in attendance. (See Attachment)

- Approach A – Fire Department (FD) on Bald Sunapee/Camacho site
  Police Department (PD) on Bald Sunapee/Camacho site
  Veterans Memorial placed in front of the PD building

- Approach B – PD on Current site
  FD on Bald Sunapee/Camacho site
  Veterans Memorial placed on Bald Sunapee/Camacho site

- Approach C – FD on Current site
  PD on Bald Sunapee/Camacho site
  Veterans Memorial placed on Bald Sunapee/Camacho site

The public commented on the above presentation as follows:

1. Request for a description of the Veterans Memorial (VM) design.
2. Request for the square footage of the VM.
3. Why not place the VM behind the PD on the Current site by the fire pond?
4. Is the VM a walk-through memorial or will seating be provided?
5. Are there any other sites considered for the VM?
6. None of the Options/Approaches show where the sidewalks are located.
7. Where is the sally port located in Concept A?
8. What is a sally port?
9. Re Concept A: When the FD responders arrive where do they park their cars? Where is the apron that the FD trucks turn in and out of the building? What is the purpose of the "J" shaped piece of land on the design? Couldn't that be paved over for more turning radius?
10. Has consideration been given to where snow will be plowed and deposited on all three Concepts?
11. What is the current square footage of the FD and PD?
12. What is the projected square footage of the proposed FD?
13. How many bays will the new FD have?
14. Is it better for the FD to be able to pull out from another location than where it is

now?

15. There are 28 responders currently for the FD. That means 28 parking spaces are needed.
16. Having five bays for the FD is important because of the times when the FD responds to Bradford.
17. Re Concept B: Having green space is important because it breaks up the site. Parking behind the PD is good. Allows for walking to Vet Hall and down to the harbor.
18. Re having a larger FD: Does it match the proposed build-out for downtown Newbury?
19. Is the likelihood for future FD expansion low?
20. What are Chief Lee's and Chief Thomas' preferences re the Concepts presented?
21. Why not combine the VM with the Vets Hall which would allow more parking for Concept B?
22. Concepts A & B hinge on curb cut approval. Has the DOT been contacted?
23. Are there any access problems or safety problems for the PD with any of the Concepts?
24. Re Concept B: Concern that there is so little flat land and the FD is pushing back into the hill.
25. Suggest placing the VM in front of the Town Hall which would open up more flat space at BS/C site. Could then move the FD further away from the hill. Would increase parking space, too.
26. Suggest redesigning the VM to fit in with Town Hall.
27. What is the height of the new FD building?
28. What is the footprint size of the new FD?
29. Request to explain the process/procedures used by the TCBC to arrive at the three Concepts.
30. Was this a problem-driven process or because there was extra funds available in the Town coffers that needed to be earmarked?
31. FD currently is not complying with code so something has to be done. The existing building needs to be demolished.
32. VM could be placed on the corner of the Center Meeting house or (in Concept C) to the right of the FD. It could also be located at Fisherfield Park.
33. Re Concept B: There is no landscaping for PD. Could have VM in front of the PD.
34. Disappointed with the BOS for choosing to have just one woman on the TCBC.
35. Consider a two story PD with a smaller footprint.
36. When the BS/C property was first purchased, there was consideration for having a community center. What has happened to that in this planning process?
37. Leave the hillside on the BS/C site open for future development.
38. Each Concept shows two separate buildings. Why not combine the PD and FD in one building?
39. There is more to Newbury than the center of town. South Newbury and the buildings there should be considered as possible locations for the FD and PD since those south Newbury buildings are not being used.
40. Why can't the buildings in South Newbury be considered for FD and PD?

41. South Newbury buildings do not sit on enough land for these proposed FD and PD buildings. Also, there are wetlands, river and there is no possibility for adequate parking. The existing buildings are not suited for this purpose. Finally, the Town doesn't own the land.
42. Concern that FD is close to the playground.
43. With FD on BS/C the access to Rte. 103 must be widened and a lot of sidewalk will be lost.
44. Concerned with FD trucks backing into bays off of Rte 103 at BS/C site.
45. Thanks to the TCBC for the hours spent on research, discussion and presentation. Applause.
46. This planning process will prevent the town from getting into problems in the future regarding when meeting the needs of the PD and FD.
47. Have substations for the FD been considered?
48. Re Concept A: Increases parking in downtown area.
49. FD should be first consideration because it must function in the face of all disasters.
50. Suggests taking Current Site and making it a park overlooking the fire pond. Would add parking to the downtown area.
51. Suggests developing an overall concept to address the beauty of downtown and the parking challenges.
52. Do both buildings have generators?
53. Why hasn't an ambulance been included in the Concept designs?
54. Using South Newbury as a possible location for FD and PD isn't wise since it adds critical time for responders to reach fires/emergencies.
55. Re Concept C: Will need an alternate site for the FD when replacing existing FD with a new building.
56. Where would the Farmers Market be located in these Concepts?
57. What is the cost differential between the Concepts?
58. Re Concept B: Likes it because by cutting back into the hill, the size of the FD building would be mitigated.
59. The Current Site would be a good place for a park. The VM could be placed in front of the park at that location.
60. Question regarding how FD needs assessment was arrived at – using Insurance Services Organization (ISO) guidelines/criteria and NFPCA guidelines?
61. TCBC commended for seeking public input but hearing from the FD and PD Chiefs would have been helpful.
62. Re the Library: Which concept affects library expansion the most?
63. Suggest putting the PD at the old highway garage.
64. Why can't the FD and the PD be placed together?
65. Encourages developing a Concept that will result in the least disturbance possible to the BS/C property.
66. Suggest a combination of Concept C with creating a park at the Current Site and placing the VM in front of Town Hall.
67. Re FD at Current site: Sight line is dangerous.
68. Consider the state shed that has been closed by the state as a possible site.
69. How critical is the fire pond to the FD at the Current Site?

70. Thanks to the TCBC for its thoroughness.

Mr. Rucker requested that the public “vote” on which Option/Approach they preferred and place their “vote’ in the ballot box provided. He thanked everyone for their attendance and participation.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meg Whittemore
Recording Secretary