



TOWN OF WELLFLEET

300 MAIN STREET WELLFLEET MASSACHUSETTS 02667
Tel (508) 349-0300 Fax (508) 349-0305
www.wellfleetma.org

To: Board of Selectmen and Comprehensive Wastewater Management Planning Committee
From: Harry Terkanian, Town Administrator
Subject: Baker Field Rest Room Project; Review of Design Study
Date: May 28, 2014; Revised June 13, 16, 18, 2014

ATA Tim King, Recreation Director Becky Rosenberg and I met on May 28, 2014 to review the design and site study for the Baker Field Rest Room project prepared by Touloukian Touloukian, Inc, the project architect. The primary focus of the May 28th meeting was on the site options. On June 12, 2014 a further meeting was held at Baker Field attended by Ted Touloukian and Benjamin Thomas from Touloukian Touloukian, Dave Michniewicz from Coastal Engineering, Becky Rosenberg and three Recreation Dept. staff members, ATA King, myself and Assistant DPW Director Paul Lindberg. On June 16, 2014 a further meeting was held between me, ATA King and Recreation Director Rosenberg. Notes are keyed to the corresponding site option on the May 22, 2014 study by Touloukian Touloukian or to the attached sketch:

- A. This site is in the current location of the tent. Negative: it occupies the site currently used for the tent. This space is heavily used for performances, etc. Recreation is not in favor of giving it up because there is no comparable open space on the property. Positive: It is closer to the Marina than some of the other sites.
- B. This site is a slightly different building footprint in the same location as Site A. Essentially the same considerations as option A.
- C. This site is a further variation on a building located in the same general area as Sites A & B. Essentially the same considerations as options A & B. It could provide some seating space for events on one tennis court by adding a grandstand seating above, but likely at additional cost.
- D. This site is directly in front of the existing recreation building. It also occupies the limited open space bounded by the parking lot, recreation building and tennis court. It blocks the view of Wellfleet Harbor from the existing recreation building and impairs the ability of the recreation staff to observe small children in the vicinity of the parking lot. It is further from the Marina than Sites A, B or C. The inability to monitor the entire front portion of the property from the recreation building is considered as a serious safety issue for the Recreation Dept. staff.
- E. This site is between the existing parking and Kendrick Ave. Negative: more distant from the playing fields and may impair visibility of the crosswalk. Positive: close to Mayo Beach, close to parking and handicapped accessible areas, good vehicular access for maintenance.

- E.1 Alternate E.1 located on the East side of the parking area. E.1 is where the portable toilets are located during the summer and provides separation from both abutting properties. E & E.1 both appear to provide the best balance between respect for the abutters, proximity to Mayo Beach and preservation of the open space in front of the recreation building. Site E and alternate E.1 were both initial choices, but concerns raised about the ability to monitor children near Kendrick Ave. and the impact on views from the recreation building and possibly from the abutter to the West are serious drawbacks.
- F. This site is between the tennis court and Kendrick Ave. at the southeast corner of the property. Negative: requires a zoning variance from the front yard setback. It presents difficult access for maintenance vehicles. The site is close to Easterly abutter. Per Coastal Engineering, the site is the only area on the property where there is suitable soil for subsurface disposal of tennis court runoff. This latter concern precludes consideration of this site.
- F.1 Alternative F.1 – (not shown on a sketch) move the building back (north) 30 feet from location F to place it outside the zoning front yard setback. This impacts the tennis court, which if moved back impacts the playground and/or the skateboard park. There would be costs and likely delays associated with redesigning the tennis court project and the relocating playground equipment. Additionally it was pointed out that moving the tennis court to a new area might require additional subsurface site preparation at additional cost to insure an adequate construction base for the tennis court. Uncertainty about additional cost is a serious drawback for a project where cost estimates are already problematic.
- F.2 Alternative F.2 – located along the East side of the property behind the tennis court and in front of the skateboard park. Close to easterly abutter. Distant from Mayo Beach. Closer to the Marina than Site E. Possible additional redesign costs for tennis courts and/or impact on playground and/or skateboard park sites. A disadvantage to this site is its visual remoteness from Kendrick Ave which makes effective building security monitoring difficult. This site may be a tight fit, but might warrant further consideration.
- G.1 Alternative G.1 is a site between the parking area and the most westerly tennis court. This site would require either relocating the tennis court at additional cost or reworking the parking area with the possible loss of a few spaces. The tennis court cannot be moved further North (away from Kendrick Ave.) without impacting the soccer field and possibly the baseball diamond. A building in that area can be distracting to tennis players according to the recreation staff. Any spacing between the tennis court and the building becomes an area for trash to accumulate and persons to hide. The staff in the recreation building would be unable to monitor the entrance to a facility at this location because the entrance would face Kendrick Ave. Physical separation between the parking area and the tennis court may also be required to address child safety concerns.
- G. Two additional sites were discussed at the June 12th meeting. Site G, at the southwest corner aligned so the back of the building was aligned with the side yard setback (20 feet off the property line). This site provides good visibility for recreation staff. It would require reconfiguration of the parking lot with

some loss of parking. The parking loss is not seen as serious by the recreation staff as there is normally space available at that end of the Mayo Beach parking lot. There is a potential that the entrance to a building at this location would be distracting to tennis players, and care would have to be taken to insure that there is a walkway from the recreation facilities which is separated from the parking lot. This site does limit views of the harbor from the site and may interfere with views from adjacent properties which could engender concerns about this location.

- H. The second site is alternative site H was between the existing recreation building and the easterly tennis courts behind (North of) the tent area. This site was not discussed in detail, but might minimize interference with existing uses of the property and preserve views necessary for monitoring recreation participants. It is close enough to the existing building that joining them by a common deck would allow a single handicapped ramp to serve both. It would also permit removal of the bathrooms from the existing building and abandonment of the existing tight tank. Handicapped and other access to the playground would have to be addressed and might require routing the pathway to the West of then behind the recreation building. Access by rescue personnel to the playground and skateboard park areas would also be impacted by a building in this location since current emergency access and handicapped access would have to be relocated to use this location. There may also be sight line issues not considered. One advantage is that it would allow removal of the restrooms in the existing building with resulting increase in storage and staff space. Windows could be installed in the recovered space the enhance sight lines.
- I. Another alternative discussed (alternative "I") was the demolition of the existing recreation building and construction of a single building with public restrooms, recreation staff office space and storage space. While the existing building is about 30 years old and is a bit tired, it is serviceable and the additional cost associated with its razing and the construction of a larger building would require town meeting action which may be difficult to obtain.
- J. An alternative not discussed is site J, located behind the existing recreation building between the westerly most tennis courts and the skateboard park. This site is also not visible from Kendrick Ave. with resultant building security concerns.
- K. Not discussed was rehabilitating the existing shellfish department building to house the restrooms and possibly shellfish department offices and storage. (Site "K") Recreation staff would have to escort participating children across Kendrick Ave to use this site unless portable toilets were to continue to be provided at Baker Field. Because this site may lie in a flood plain velocity zone, construction or renovation in this area might become more challenging and expensive or may even be precluded by flood plain regulations.

Building Massing. This is going to be a large building for the site. The rectangular option is at least 52 feet by 13 with additional space for stairs, decking and a ramp. First floor elevation needs to be about 4 feet above grade to meet flood requirements. So the total building height may be as much as 16 feet or more above grade. This height requirement would apply to all

buildings regardless of the type of toilet used or whether toilets are present at all. First floor elevation will require a handicapped accessible ramp, stairs and exterior decking to reach all entrances. Wherever the building is placed it will impact someone's viewscape to some degree.

Consensus choice at the May 28th meeting was Site E with consideration also be given to Alternate E.1. However this is no longer the case. Overall, the concern is that this is a challenging site made more challenging by flood plain requirements. All of the discussed alternatives reflect compromises to some degree. The order of magnitude construction cost, which does not include any costs associated with redesign or relocation of existing improvements, is about \$275,000 which, together with design fees of \$60,000 exceed the current appropriation (\$324,000 at the 2013 ATM) by about \$11,000. It is unknown whether actual costs could be funded within the current appropriation, only a complete design and bidding can answer that question.

Further study and wider community involvement may be prudent before proceeding with design and construction. My recommendation is that unless locations G or K are viable this project and the tennis court reconstruction be temporarily placed on hold until: 1) a comprehensive plan for the improvement of Baker field can be prepared with professional assistance and input from all stakeholders; and, 2) if further consideration is to be given to the existing shellfish building (Site "K"), a determination can be made as to whether the existing shellfish building can be adapted to include support this project and can be renovated in a cost effective and useful manner.

1455

1455

