Committee members in attendance: Donald Corey (DC); Joseph Piantedosi (JP); Jim Shea (JS)

Ex-officio committee members in attendance: Angelo Colao (AC), Selectman liaison to Depot Park; Richard Jones (RJ), Facilities Director; Rick Reed (RR), Town Manager; Richard Warrington (RW), DPW Director;


Chairman JP called the meeting to order at 3:36 P.M. at Bedford Town Hall.

JP invited representatives of Menders, Torrey & Spencer (MTS) to give a presentation on their Depot architectural study. Lynne Spencer said that their company has two objectives at today’s meeting: (1) to review the draft architectural study, and (2) discuss reuse options for the building. RR noted that the Selectmen wish to discuss future building uses with the Committee. JP proposed doing this after Annual Town Meeting.

Lynne Spencer complimented JS and DC for furnishing historical information used in the architectural study. The 1916 I.C.C. Valuation Survey was especially helpful, she said.

Ms. Spencer outlined the modifications that were made to Bedford Depot over the years. The original skin of the building appears to exist behind the current wallboard walls. The building needs some maintenance, but nothing drastic. MTS proposes that the roof be replaced, support for the first floor be stabilized, and deteriorating brick piers on the perimeter foundation be replaced. How the building is used in the future will determine whether additional support is required for the second floor.

Ms. Spencer said that DC helped edit the draft assessment. RJ will distribute new sections of the Phase One report to the Committee members.
Ms. Spencer believes that it is possible to restore the original tall windows while preserving the second floor. She suggests that the building’s facade be renovated regardless of how the building is ultimately used.

Valentin Pilyavskiy displayed schematics to illustrate renovation options to accommodate a range of possible building uses. These are summarized below.

1. Restore the building’s interior to its circa 1900 appearance. Part of the second floor would be saved. This configuration would be conducive to assembly use.
2. Retail or restaurant use: The interior would not conform to its original railroad layout. Part of the second floor would be kept for mechanicals systems.
3. Office space: Most of the interior would be restored to its circa 1900 configuration, and a portion of the second floor would be maintained for an office tenant.
4. Retail space plus one office unit
5. Mixed-use retail and residential
6. Duplex residential

RW commented that parking requirements ought to be taken into consideration if the building’s use is altered from the status quo. RR asked whether the proposed deck shown in the schematics would encroach on other property owners. He suggested that we examine the feasibility of a connection between the Minuteman Bikeway and Narrow-Gauge Rail-Trail via the original railroad right-of-way that is on the eastern side of the Depot. This property is today owned by a commercial abutter.

JS asked whether keeping the Depot’s interior in its current form is an option. The Committee discussed the relative merits of keeping the interior as-is versus removing the second floor and changing the layout.

JP noted that once a significant amount of work has been done to the building’s exterior, it might become necessary to bring the rest of the building up to current code. This might lead to making the second floor handicap-accessible. LS said the Depot is probably too small for an elevator. JP asked Arthur Vogt to check on the thresholds that might trigger current building code requirements.

JP showed a draft of a spreadsheet that was prepared by JS. Its purpose is to estimate Depot Park income and expenses over a 20-year period. JP asked RJ and RW to provide input on the spreadsheet. The information will be used to prepare a Depot Park financial model for the Finance Committee.
JP asked MTS to create a matrix that analyzes the different renovation and usage options for the Depot. The firm agreed to meet again with the Committee on March 8 at 3:30 P.M. to present this information.

RJ asked the Committee to accept the Phase One report so that he may pay the architect for work they have performed to-date. JP made a motion to accept the Phase One report provided that it has been updated to reflect prior discussions with the architect, including the substitution of “Bedford Historical Society” with “assembly use” in the Use Options and Schematic Design sections. The Committee agreed to accept Phase One of the architect’s work.

RJ said that the architect’s cost estimate to replace the Depot’s roof and perform first floor stabilization is $130,000. MTS would be hired to prepare the plans and supervise the work. It may be possible to accomplish some additional recommended work if the contractor bids are lower than the estimates. RJ submitted a matching grant application to the Massachusetts Historical Commission for $66,350. Since this grant would not pay for architect’s fees, he said we might need to draw upon the Revolving Fund.

DC made a motion to accept the minutes of the January 17 meeting. JP seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

At 6:03 P.M., JS made a motion to adjourn the meeting. JP seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Submitted by

Jim Shea, Clerk

These minutes were accepted by unanimous vote of the Committee at its meeting of March 8, 2007.