

HINGHAM CENTER FOR ACTIVE LIVING

BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, November 19, 2024



MEETING AGENDA

DESIGN TEAM

TIM EAGLES

AIA, LEED AP

Principal Architect

CHRIS WANTE

AIA

Senior Architect/
Project Manager

DOUG GALLOW

FAIA, NCARB

Senior Center
Design Specialist

MONICA PEREZ DEL RIO

AIA, LFA

Senior Architect/Community
Outreach Specialist

BRIAN KAYE

PLA

Landscape Architect

MEETING AGENDA

01 FEASIBILITY STUDY SUMMARY

02 TOWN HALL DESIGN CONCEPT

03 BARE COVE PARK DESIGN CONCEPT

04 SITE COMPARISON

01

STUDY SUMMARY

PUBLIC OUTREACH

THREE STEP PROCESS



PUBLIC OUTREACH

QUESTION 1.

What types of **scheduled activities** might you be interested in going to at a new Center?

QUESTION 2.

What would you be most interested in "**dropping in**" to do at a new Center?

QUESTION 3.

What kinds of **outdoor amenities** and activities would you like to see included in the plans for a new Center?

QUESTION 4.

Does the **current location** of the Center impact your attitude towards it, and whether you attend?

QUESTION 5.

What issues should be taken into consideration in looking at options for the **location** of a new Center?

QUESTION 6.

Who should the new Center be **open to** for programs and services?

1

SURVEY

2

ONE ON ONE

3

FOCUS GROUPS

PUBLIC OUTREACH




1

SURVEY



2

ONE ON ONE



3

FOCUS GROUPS

PUBLIC OUTREACH



1

SURVEY

2

ONE ON ONE

3

FOCUS GROUPS

PUBLIC OUTREACH

summary

Everybody agrees...

Location is important, because it influences the types of activities and layout of the amenities.

- Adequate parking with safe pedestrian access was at the top of everyone's list.
- Safe drop-off and entry to the building.
- Accessibility of all spaces for older adults.
- An area that feels safe and secure.
- An outdoor area with a relaxed environment.
- Interior spaces with connections to nature through natural daylighting and views of outdoors.
- Activities such as games, exercise, art, cooking, class-type cultural sessions, and outdoor activities like gardening were the most requested.

ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM

With the findings of the public input effort in hand, additional information was gathered through interviews with Center for Active Living staff.

Because form follows **FUNCTION**:

We focused first on the activities the new Center will accommodate:

- Scheduled activities
- Drop-in activities
- Personal services and counseling
- Outdoor activities



ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM

for the center for active living

Developed a detailed list of **dedicated-use** and **flexible-use** rooms and spaces to accommodate the desired activities and services, with consideration given to:

1. Target group sizes
2. Associated infrastructure, furniture, equipment, and storage needs

The program also addresses:

1. Staff needs
2. Restrooms
3. Building systems, corridors, wall thicknesses, and everything else not included above



ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM

key elements for the new center

The result:

~**28,000 square-foot program** that includes:

1. Assembly, Dining & Multi-Purpose Rooms
2. Exercise & Fitness Spaces
3. Arts-focused Spaces
4. Variety of Flexible-use Lounge Spaces



ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM

detailed space needs spreadsheet

Room/Space Name	Study Sq. Ft.	Study Size
Vestibule	140	10' x 14'
Lobby-Main Lounge	1,000	24' x 40'
Lounge	400	20' x 20'
Café/Kitchen	750	25' x 30'
Large Multi-Purpose Room	2,400	40' x 60'
Table and Chair Storage	340	17' x 20'
Teaching Kitchen	300	12' x 25'
Auditorium	1,950	49' x 40'
Classroom	1,462	34' x 43'
Clean Arts Room	960	32' x 28'
Dirty Arts Room	960	32' x 28'
Maker Space	960	32' x 28'
Cards Room	1,248	32' x 39'
Conference Room	396	18' x 22'
Equipped Fitness Room	1,000	25' x 40'
Exercise/Dance Studio with Storage	1,900	35' x 54'
Meals on Wheels Prep Room	261	14.5' x 18'
Director's Office	130	10' x 13'

Room/Space Name	Study Sq. Ft.	Study Size
Assistant Director's Office	120	10' x 12'
Administrative Assistant Office	110	10' x 12'
Outreach Coordinator's Office	120	10' x 12'
Program Coordinator's Office	120	10' x 12'
Office Assistant	110	10' x 12'
Transportation Coordinator's Office	150	10' x 15'
Volunteer Work Room	437	17.5' x 25'
Flex/Future Office	120	10' x 12'
Copy Room	100	10' x 10'
Staff Break Room	255	15' x 17'
Personal Services Room	120	10' x 12'
Nurses/Personal Services Room with Companion Restroom w/ a shower	188	10' x 11'
Reception	165	11' x 15'
Friends' Room and Storage	140	10' x 14'
Kitchen/Nutrition Coordinator	100	10' x 10'
Kitchen Assistant	100	10' x 10'

Room/Space Name	Study Sq. Ft.	Study Size
Greenhouse	240	15' x 16'
Maintenance Office/Storage	180	12' x 15'
Janitor's Closet	24	4' x 6'
Laundry Room	64	8' x 8'
General Storage	160	10' x 16'
Staff Restrooms	120	7.5' x 8'
Companion Restrooms	240	7.5' x 8'
Group Restrooms – Men A	266	10' x 28.34'
Group Restrooms – Men B	266	10' x 28.34'
Group Restrooms – Women A	266	10' x 28.34'
Group Restrooms – Women B	266	10' x 28.34'
Mechanical Room(s)	600	20' x 25'
Outdoor Storage	200	10' x 20'
Subtotal All Functions (Net)	21,904	
Efficiency Factor (28%)	6,133	
Total proposed Gross Sq. Feet	28,037	

ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM


site needs for the center for active living

- Parking needs for Senior Center patrons were projected at **~200 spaces**
- Parking lots configured to optimize safety and ease of use for drivers and pedestrians
- Passenger drop-off zone with protection from the elements at the main entrance
- Site amenities of high interest include:
 - Patios for outdoor activities and informal use
 - On-site walking trail
 - Lawn areas to accommodate a variety of games and activities
 - Gardens

SITE ANALYSIS


proposed viable sites

There were 2 sites that could best support the full program we are looking to achieve:



TOWN HALL

- Acreage: 8.6 acres
- Ownership:
Town Owned



45 BARE COVE DRIVE

- Acreage: 4.8 acres
- Ownership:
Town Owned

SITE ANALYSIS

ideal site program requirements

SENIOR CENTER:

1-Story: **28,000 SF footprint**


(If 2-story, the footprint will shrink to 20,000 SF, but the overall SF will increase to 30,000 SF.)

SENIOR CENTER PARKING:

200 spaces

OUTDOOR PROGRAM SPACE:

10,000 SF



EVALUATION CRITERIA


- Wetlands Restrictions
- Water Service
- Sewer Service
- Gas Service
- Electrical Storm Service
- Storm Service
- **Adequate Buildable Area**
- **Adequate Parking Capacity**
- Quality of Outdoor Activity Space
- Site Configuration + Layout
- Use Appropriate

#1

- Proximity to Public Institutions/Resources
- Site Visibility
- Vehicular Access/Traffic
- Public Safety/Security
- Future Expansion Potential
- **Environmental Impact #2**
- Project Sequencing Impact
- Topography
- Relative Site Development Cost/Complexity
- Potential Neighborhood Support

SITE ANALYSIS

town hall



SITE ANALYSIS

proposed viable sites – town hall



**210 CENTRAL STREET
(4.3 ACRES)**

1

3


**CRONIN FIELD –
EXPANSION POTENTIAL
(3.9 ACRES)**

2

**EXPANSION
POTENTIAL
(5.5 ACRES)**

TOWN HALL

options studied




RENOVATION OPTION WITH REMOTE PARKING

- Does **NOT** accommodate all programmatic needs
 - Accessibility in the existing auditorium is a concern
 - Reduced spaces (Exercise, Fitness, Multi-Purpose Room, Art Rooms, Classroom)
 - No teaching kitchen or makerspace
- Has the potential to reach parking requirements with parking near Haley field
- Modification of front lawn
- Multi-level facility and only one elevator
- Major operational disruption during construction



RENOVATION OPTION WITH MAX ONSITE PARKING

- PROS:**
- Reuse of existing town hall amenities can save budget
- CONS:**
- Parking deficit without remote lots
 - Renovation will create disturbance to existing facilities
 - Multi-level facility is not preferred
 - Will likely require underground stormwater management for parking lot expansion




SENIOR CENTER AT HALEY FIELD

- PROS:**
- 1-story facility
 - Connection to track and other opportunities in the park
 - Parking well within target program
- CONS:**
- Need to relocate little league field
 - Potential neighborhood pushback

TOWN HALL

options studied



RENOVATE EXISTING FACILITIES WITH ADDITION AND REMOTE PARKING

PROS:

- Reuse of existing town hall amenities can save budget

CONS:

- Over half the parking is outside preferred distance from entry for users
- Renovation will create disturbance to existing facilities
- 2-story facility is not preferred
- Will likely require underground stormwater management for parking lot expansion



ADDITION PLUS REMOTE PARKING – NO DISTURBANCE TO CIRCLE

PROS:

- Reuse of existing town hall amenities can save budget

CONS:

- Over half the parking is outside preferred distance from entry for users
- Renovation will create disturbance to existing facilities
- 2-story facility is not preferred
- Will likely require underground stormwater management for parking lot expansion

SITE ANALYSIS

town hall – new build at cronin field

ADVANTAGES

- Proximity to Town Hall
- Access to utilities is readily available
- Topography across the site is very flat
- Area from parking lot to the front door is accessible


CHALLENGES

- 2-story facility is not preferred
- Parking does not meet program
- New curb cut and entry road from Central Street could face public opposition
- Lack of visibility from road to entry point can be confusing
- Circulation integrated with town hall could cause congestion
- Loss of a highly coveted public ballfield




SITE ANALYSIS

bare cove park



SITE ANALYSIS

proposed viable sites – bare cove park



45 BARE COVE
PARK DRIVE
NORTH
(4.8 ACRES)

2

25 BARE COVE
PARK DRIVE
(2.3 ACRES)

1

0 FORT HILL
STREET
(2.2 ACRES)

4

45 BARE COVE
PARK DRIVE
SOUTH
(2.9 ACRES)

3


Vertical

Wed Apr 10 2024

50m

SITE ANALYSIS

proposed viable sites – bare cove park



SITE 1

Does **NOT** accommodate all programmatic needs.

PROS:

- Proximity to Park

CONS:

- 2-story building
- Parking does not meet program
- Wetland restrictions
- 2 entry points on split floors (upper/lower levels)
- Environmental remediation considerations

SITE 2

Accommodates all programmatic needs.

PROS:

- Outdoor amenity space potential
- Room for growth
- Parking program is accommodated

CONS:

- Environmental remediation considerations

SITE ANALYSIS

proposed viable sites – bare cove park



SITE 3

Accommodates all programmatic needs.

PROS:

- Outdoor amenity space potential
- Room for growth
- Parking program is accommodated

CONS:

- Environmental remediation considerations
- Neighborhood support in question due to proximity
- Additional travel distance from back of parking lot



SITE 4

Does **NOT** accommodate all programmatic needs.

PROS:

- Proximity to park
- Proximity to entrance at Fort Hill Street

CONS:

- 2-story building
- Parking does not meet program
- Environmental remediation considerations
- Additional travel distance from back of parking lot

SITE ANALYSIS

selected viable site – bare cove park

ADVANTAGES

- Accommodates all programmatic needs, including ample parking
- 1-story building fits on site
- Ample outdoor space with connection to existing walking trails
- Topography across the site is very flat
- Parking program + overflow can be accommodated
- Central, visible location near other public resources and senior housing
- Improves quality of adjacent parking lot
- Opportunity to design a fully accessible/ADA-compliant site


CHALLENGES

- Demolition of an existing building and site-clearing needed
-  Extra coordination required with regulatory bodies
- Increased environmental clean-up



SITE ANALYSIS

site location comparisons



Bare Cove and Town Hall sites are two miles apart with similar distances from **multiple points of interest**.


Points of Interest	Distance from Bare Cove	Distance from Town Hall
Public Safety Facility	2.2 miles	2.8 miles
Derby Shops	4.8 miles	4.4 miles
South Shore Hospital	5.9 miles	6.7 miles
North St. Post Office	1.4 miles	1 mile
Hingham Recreation Department	2.1 miles	On site
South Shore Country Club	.5 miles	1.7 miles
Bare Cove Trails	800 feet	2.1 miles
Carlson Fields	800 feet	1.9 miles

02

TOWN HALL
CONCEPT DESIGN

TOWN HALL

existing building expansion – site layout



EVALUATION CRITERIA	TARGET	PROVIDED
Adequate Building Area	1-Story	2-Story
Town Hall Parking	--	117
Senior Center Parking	200 Spaces	59
Staff Remote Parking		122

PROS:


- Maintain current location
- Reuse of existing town hall amenities can save budget

CONS:

- Over half the parking is outside preferred distance from entry for users
- Renovation will create disturbance to existing facilities
- 2-story facility is not preferred
- Will likely require underground stormwater management for parking lot expansion


TOWN HALL

existing building expansion – additional parking studies



NOTES:

- Still didn't meet program needs
- Long distance to overflow
- Removal of historic half-circle entry drive
- Difficult connection between overflow and main parking area



NOTES:

- Only gained around 28 total parking spaces doing this
- Urban solution in a suburban environment
- Costs outweigh the benefit

TOWN HALL

existing building expansion – first floor



LEGEND

- ACTIVITY/ASSEMBLY
- ADMINISTRATION
- ATHLETIC
- SUPPORT
- FOODSERVICE
- CIRCULATION

MAIN ENTRY

TOWN HALL

existing building expansion – second floor



LEGEND

- ACTIVITY/ASSEMBLY
- ADMINISTRATION
- ATHLETIC
- SUPPORT
- FOODSERVICE
- CIRCULATION


TOWN HALL

existing building expansion – key factors

1. Maintains the existing location for continuity.
2. Leaves area near the Police Dept. open for other municipal use.
3. Expands the existing footprint to fit programmatic needs.
4. Incorporates existing auditorium into the program.
 - Accessibility is a concern in the existing auditorium.
5. Demolition of a portion of the existing structure is required.
6. Insufficient parking, with remote parking not being accessible.
7. Modification of the front lawn is needed to increase parking.
8. Multi-level facility.
9. Second elevator added.
10. Major operational disruption during construction.
11. Long travel distances from the front door.
12. Limited outdoor space adjacent to building.

TOWN HALL

conceptual site diagram – cronin field location



EVALUATION CRITERIA	TARGET	PROVIDED
Adequate Building Area	1-Story	2-Story
Adequate Parking Capacity	200 spaces	170 spaces

PROS:

- Parking could be used by park and other facilities in a shared parking scenario (Hockey Rink, Track, Playground)

CONS:


- Proximity to entrance and ease of access is not ideal
- New road and curb cut required
- Traffic patterns at front door & loop could be congested

TOWN HALL

conceptual plan diagram – cronin field location

LEGEND

- ACTIVITY/ASSEMBLY
- SUPPORT
- ADMINISTRATION
- FOODSERVICE
- ATHLETIC
- CIRCULATION





TOWN HALL

design inspiration



TOWN HALL

conceptual massing study



TOWN HALL

conceptual exterior perspective



TOWN HALL

new building on cronin field option – key factors

1. Accommodates all programmatic needs.
2. Meets parking needs.
3. Open stair to enhance connection to the upper floor.
4. Connection to existing functions within Town Hall.
5. Building navigation is easy to understand.
6. Offices have a view of parking lot for increased safety.
7. One secure entry point.
8. Some recreation spaces will share the parking lot.
9. Clear and designated drop-off area under porte-cochère.
10. Loss of Cronin Field and legal factors affecting land availability.
11. Large amount of construction near residential area.
12. 2-story option reduces accessibility of functions.
13. Major operations disruption during construction.
14. Limited outdoor space adjacent to the building.

TOWN HALL – CRONIN FIELD

estimated construction costs

Component	Est. Costs
Center for Active Living Building	\$19,800,000
Center for Active Living Related Sitework	\$3,500,000
Entry Road Off Central	\$800,000
CONSTRUCTION COST - TOTAL ¹	\$24,100,000
Soft Costs (25% of Construction Costs)	\$6,000,000
PROJECT COST - TOTAL ²	\$30,100,000

1. Includes escalation of 6% for start of summer 2026 construction and a design contingency of 12%.

2. Soft costs include design fees, OPM fees, moving fees, legal fees, FFE, etc.

03

BARE COVE PARK

CONCEPT DESIGN

BARE COVE PARK

conceptual site diagram



EVALUATION CRITERIA	TARGET	PROVIDED
Adequate Building Area	1-Story	1-Story
Senior Center Parking	185-200 spaces	204 spaces
Other Parking		51

UPDATES:


- Provide paved parking for fire museum
- Create a pedestrian-only walkway from the ball fields and sport courts to the Bare Cove Park entry gate

BARE COVE PARK

conceptual plan diagram

LEGEND

- ACTIVITY/ASSEMBLY
- ADMINISTRATION
- ATHLETIC
- SUPPORT
- FOODSERVICE
- CIRCULATION




BARE COVE PARK

design inspiration



BARE COVE PARK

conceptual massing study



BARE COVE PARK

conceptual exterior perspective



BARE COVE PARK

estimated construction costs

Component	Est. Costs
Center for Active Living Building	\$19,300,000
Center for Active Living Related Sitework	\$6,000,000
Unsuitable/Hazardous Materials Disposal ¹	\$100,000
Non-Center Related Sitework (Park Upgrades)	\$2,000,000
CONSTRUCTION COST - TOTAL ²	\$27,400,000
Soft Costs (25% of Construction Costs)	\$6,800,000
PROJECT COST - TOTAL ³	\$34,100,000

1. This is an estimate based on initial environmental review and will need more investigation during design.

2. Includes escalation of 6% for start of summer 2026 construction and a design contingency of 12%.

3. Soft costs include design fees, OPM fees, moving fees, legal fees, FFE, etc.

BARE COVE PARK

key factors

1. Accommodates all programmatic needs.
2. All spaces are on one level.
3. Building navigation is easy to understand.
4. Offices have a view of the parking lot for increased safety.
5. One secure entry point.
6. Entry is in the middle of the building for reduced “steps to space.”
7. Clear and designated drop-off area under porte-cochère.
8. Art rooms have northern exposure.
9. Meets parking needs.
10. Ample outdoor space with connection to existing walking trails.
11. Improves quality of adjacent parking lot.
12. Increased environmental clean-up.
13. Demolition of an existing building and site clearing needed.
14. Extra coordination required with regulatory bodies.

04

SITE COMPARISON
CRITERIA SCORING

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Wetlands Restrictions
- Water Service
- Sewer Service
- Gas Service
- Electrical Storm Service
- Storm Service
- Adequate Buildable Area
- Adequate Parking Capacity
- Quality of Outdoor Activity Space
- Site Configuration + Layout
- Use Appropriate
- Proximity to Public Institutions/Resources
- Site Visibility
- Vehicular Access/Traffic
- Public Safety/Security
- Future Expansion Potential
- Environmental Impact
- Project Sequencing Impact
- Topography
- Relative Site Development Cost/Complexity
- Potential Neighborhood Support

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

November 19, 2024

Site 1

Site 2

Site 3

Scoring Criteria			210 CENTRAL STREET (TOWN HALL)	45 BARE COVE PARK DR	1-49 BURR ROAD (CRONIN FIELD)	Scoring 2 = very positive, 1 = positive, 0 = neutral, 1 = negative, -2 = very negative (see multiplier when applicable for significance)
Town Ownership			Owned	Owned	Owned	
Item	Criteria	Multiplier	4.3 Acres	4.8 Acres**	3.9 Acres**	Description
A	Adequate Buildable Area	2	-2	4	4	Is the buildable area adequate after applying site constraints?
B	Adequate Parking Capacity	2	-4	4	0	Is there available land area to support required parking facilities?
C	Quality of Outdoor Activity Space	1.5	-1.5	3	0	Will the outdoor amenity area support the goals of the facility?
D	Site Configuration + Layout	2	-4	4	4	Do the site components fit together in an effective/efficient way?
E	Permitting Complexity + Appropriate Use		0	-2	-2	Is the site zoning appropriate for the intended use? Will additional permitting be required
F	Proximity to Public Institutions/Resources		2	1	2	Is the site close proximity to other town institutions?
G	Site Visibility		2	1	1	Does the site have a desirable site presence in town? Ease of wayfinding to the site?
H	Vehicular Access/Traffic	1.5	-3	3	1.5	Is there suitable and appropriate road access (sight lines, turning lanes, traffic flow, etc.)? If road work is needed, does the town have authority or would coordination with the others be necessary for curb cuts and paving?
I	Public Safety/Security		1	0	0	Is there a level of safety to the site. Is the frequency of localized calls for service to law enforcement more prevalent?
J	Future Expansion Potential		-2	2	-1	Does the site have adequate space for expansion in the future?
K	Environmental Impacts		0	-1	0	Are there existing environmental challenges to development on the site ?
L	Construction Phase Facility Impacts	2	-4	2	-2	Are there existing building or site programs that would be relocated or affected by an ongoing construction project. Will the project require swing space to temporarily accommodate the existing use?
M	Topography		0	-1	1	Does the topography of the site compromise the buildable area or present other challenges?
N	Relative Site Development Cost/Complexity	2	0	0	1	Relative estimated expense of site development
O	Potential Neighborhood Support	1.5	-1.5	3	-3	Will abutters to the property likely support the proposed use?
P	Wetlands Restrictions		0	-1	0	Does the site have wetland restrictions that impact the buildable area? Is there known flooding on the property?
Q	Water Service		1	1	1	Ready water utility access
R	Sewer Service		1	0	1	Ready sewer utility access
S	Gas Service		1	0	1	Ready gas utility access
T	Electric Service		1	1	1	Ready electric utility access
U	Storm Service		1	0	1	Ready storm utility access
GRAND TOTAL			-12	24	12	

** SF base on approximate project limits (Final acreage T.B.D.)

PROGRAM SIZING FRAMEWORK:

BUILDING
SENIOR CENTER = 28,000 SF

PARKING
SR CENTER = 185-200 SPACES

OUTDOOR PROGRAMMING SPACE
SR CENTER = 10,000 SF

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

final design team score

Bare Cove Park

+24

Town Hall – Cronin Field

+12

Town Hall – Expansion

-12

DECISION MAKING FACTORS

KEY CRITERIA	BARE COVE PARK	TOWN HALL – CRONIN FIELD
Site Development Complexity	Regulatory hurdles with National Park Services	Legal hurdles with the rights to Cronin Field
Site Configuration + Layout	Optimal	Inadequate
Quality of Outdoor Activity Space	Optimal	Inadequate
Vehicular Access/Traffic	Optimal	Acceptable
Dedicated On-Site Parking Capacity	200 Spaces	170 Spaces
Environmental Factors	Typical building demo + low level contaminant site remediation	None
Construction Phase Impacts	No concerns	Field relocation required – Noise/proximity to Town Hall
Sustainability Opportunities	Optimal	Acceptable
Projected Project Cost	\$33 Million	\$29 Million

DECISION MAKING FACTORS

KEY CRITERIA	BARE COVE PARK	TOWN HALL – CRONIN FIELD
Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Space is available to accommodate 1-story building • Offers expansion potential • Site development, wetlands, utilities to be evaluated further during design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations: square footage, features, and accessibility with 2-story design • Lacks expansion potential • Utilities on site • Less site development
Outdoor Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available space for CAL <i>indoor to outdoor features</i> • Adjacent to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bare Cove Park trails • Fields with walking track • Future pickleball 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks space for <i>indoor to outdoor features</i> • Adjacent to Town Hall and recreation fields
Access/ Traffic Flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access road (Bare Cove Dr.) is not shared with residential neighborhood • Access to CAL building from Bare Cove Drive is not shared for other uses • DPW, bus activity being evaluated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access road is residential • Traffic flow is congested due to existing road infrastructure and other uses at Town Hall • EMS and service access considerations • Construction activities will be disruptive
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate parking that is not shared for other uses • Chance to upgrade access/parking for Bare Cove Park entry point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking is shared among Town departments and those accessing several recreational features including camp, playground, fields, and courts.
Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not abutting residential neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood • Historic use and setting • Disruption to longtime recreational uses elimination of baseball field; relocation of baseball field

COMMENTS | QUESTIONS

TOWN HALL

existing conditions



TOWN HALL

existing conditions



TOWN HALL

existing conditions



BARE COVE PARK

existing conditions



BARE COVE PARK

existing conditions

