

**CITY OF LAURINBURG
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 16, 2017
MUNICIPAL BUILDING
303 WEST CHURCH ST.
5:00 p.m.**

Minutes

The City Council of the City of Laurinburg held a special meeting on Thursday, March 16, 2017 in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building at 5:00 p.m. with the Honorable Mary Jo Adams, Mayor Pro Tem, presiding. The following Councilmembers were present: Dolores A. Hammond, Andrew G. Williamson, Jr. and J.D. Willis. Councilmember Curtis B. Leak was absent due to recent surgery. Mayor Matthew Block was absent.

Also present were Charles D. Nichols III, City Manager, and Jennifer A. Tippett, City Clerk.

Mayor Pro Tem Adams called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m.

Councilmember Hammond gave the invocation.

DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION CONCERNING MOVING FROM THE DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE LEADING INTO PHASE III OF THE PROPOSED NEW CITY HALL AND POLICE STATION

Mr. Brent Green of Creech & Associates thanked Council for having a special meeting to discuss tangible discussions about design for the proposed City Hall and Police Station. He added that Mr. Mike Carlisto of Edifice, Inc. was running late due to traffic. He explained that a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to and incorporated herein, had been prepared but that the main focus of the meeting was to hear feedback from Council.

Mr. Green explained that the site plan was the same as it has been. He added that he has been working with City Zoning staff and the Department of Insurance on permitting requirements. He further added that the floor plan is basically the same as previously submitted. He briefly reviewed the floor plans.

Upon question by Councilmember Hammond, Mr. Green explained that all restrooms met Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

Upon question by Councilmember Williamson, Mr. Creech explained that the public would access the Police Department only through the front door and lobby, and not from the rear of the building. He discussed various areas within the Police Department.

Discussion ensued concerning security measures in the Consumer Billing area and throughout the building.

Upon question by Councilmember Adams, Mr. Green explained that the Administrative space had been reconfigured on the second floor, and there was an office labeled Council/Mayor which is intended to be a workstation for the Mayor and Councilmembers to utilize. He added that there was another office adjacent to this for future growth.

Councilmember Hammond suggested that perhaps a conference room could be designated and named for former Mayor Charles Barrett, and she suggested that a room could be named for the City's first female mayor, Mayor Ann B. Slaughter.

The City Manager explained that the two (2) offices discussed by Mr. Green were to allow for future growth on the second floor. He added that the executive conference room was dedicated for Council's use and the administrative conference room beside the City Manager's office could be also be used.

The City Manager explained that the IT Department and the server room would be moving from the Public Works facility to the new City Hall and Police Station. He requested that Mr. Green explain the analysis conducted on file storage.

Mr. Green explained that several surveys of the filing cabinets had been conducted, and that given the space available, staff has done well with filing. He discussed filing in the City Clerk's office, Finance and Human Resources. He added that one (1) consultant that Creech & Associates has worked with offers a free service where they will come work with staff, take an inventory of records and make recommendations on filing processes.

Mr. John Crawford of Creech & Associates explained that by consulting in this manner, the vendor does not get the bid on filing and storage as the bid will be open and competitive.

Mr. Green explained that all file rooms will be two-hour fire rated, as will the stairways and elevators. He added that the file room for the City Clerk will be high density storage. He discussed the difficulty in file room planning due to the need to keep some records in perpetuity and to plan for the future.

Upon question by Councilmember Williamson, Mr. Green explained that the high density storage is similar to what is seen in a medical office. He added that it will allow for three (3) times storage capacity than filing cabinets.

Mr. Green reviewed the exterior rendering of the building and provided three (3) options for the quoins – buff colored brick as originally shown, matching brick and similar brick in order to address Councilmember Leak's comment in a prior meeting about the corner quoins being colonial.

Discussion ensued concerning the quoin bricks including the aesthetics, upfront cost, and maintenance requirements and about other exterior features and maintenance. There was no decision made on the color of brick for the quoins.

Mr. Creech discussed the options of using a pitched roof or a Mansard roof where the roof goes up to a certain height and then a flat roof section is located on either side of the Mansard roof. He explained that this roof is not perceivable from the pedestrian perspective and allows for heating and air conditioning (hvac) units to be placed on the roof and remain unseen.

Upon question by Councilmember Williamson, Mr. John Crawford of Creech & Associates, explained that if the flat roof portion is maintained properly, there should not be any problems. He added that technology with membrane roofs is much greater than it was years ago, and that membrane roofs last as long as shingle roofs. He added that the membrane roofs are warranted for 20-30 years. He further added that if there is a leak, it generally occurs when the building is first occupied. He further explained that this roof system allows for the mechanicals to be located off the ground and this is more visually appealing also.

Upon question by the City Manager, Mr. Crawford explained that some of the mechanicals and hvac would be located on the west end of the building facing the adjoining residence and another on the southeast corner of the building facing the parking lot.

Discussion ensued concerning screening and possibly a retainer wall between the City Hall and Police Station and the adjoining residence. Mr. Crawford explained that it had been discussed with the City Manager that there would need to be some sort of screening installed between the City Hall and Police Station and the adjoining residence.

Councilmember Willis discussed the need to visually screen the mechanicals and hvac from the adjoining residence. Mr. Creech explained that since the residence is two-story, if the Mansard and Low Slope roof was built, the hvac and other mechanicals on the roof could be seen from the second floor of the residence.

Discussion ensued concerning the proposed brick fence on the east side of the building. Mr. Green explained that one of the items to be discussed was the elimination of this brick fence and providing screening with landscaping instead in order to reduce costs.

Upon question by Councilmember Williamson, Mr. Carlisto explained that a black iron fence would cost less than a brick fence but is still somewhat expensive.

Mr. Green suggested that perhaps Council felt it more important to have the brick fence located between the City Hall and Police Station building and the residence, rather than on the east side of the City Hall and Police Station to screen the parking lot from Church Street.

Further discussion ensued concerning the roof. Mr. Crawford explained that the flat roof area of the Mansard and Low Slope roof has a slope which can be felt, and is therefore not truly a flat roof.

Upon question by Councilmember Williamson, Mr. Carlisto explained that the cost saving for going with the Mansard and Low Slope roof was \$104,000.00.

Further discussion ensued concerning flat roofs and the concern for leaks. Mr. Carlisto explained that the technology of flat roofs had improved, Building Codes had changed and the current flat roofs were much more durable, and much attention would be given during construction to flashing and other potential water penetration spots.

Upon questions by Councilmember Adams, Mr. Carlisto explained that the Mint Hall Town Hall had the Mansard and Low Slope roof and was built in 2007. He added that there had not been any leak problems.

Mr. Carlisto explained that the emergency generator, transformer and some other electric items will be located on the ground.

Mr. Crawford explained that the emergency generator, transformer and the other electric items would be screened, but not totally as they would need to be accessed.

A discussion ensued concerning solar panels on the roof, the cost of solar panels and orientation to the sun. Mr. Green explained that he could discuss solar panels with the engineers about the possibility of solar panels.

Following further discussion, motion was made by Councilmember Williamson, seconded by Councilmember Willis, and unanimously carried to select the Mansard and Low Slope Roof with the hvac units to be located on the roof.

Mr. Green explained that he wanted to discuss the interior finishes. He added that there are usually three (3) levels of finishes:

- Level 1 areas have the highest level and most durable of finishes and are the public areas such as the lobby, council chambers, consumer billing lobby, main stairway and foyer outside the council chambers.
- Level 2 areas are the median level of finishes and include restrooms and such type facilities.
- Level 3 areas are the lowest level of finishes and include staff areas.

Mr. Green reviewed several lobby designs in the Kannapolis, Mint Hill, Huntersville and Albemarle City/Town Halls as shown in the PowerPoint presentation. He discussed the wood trim versus the applied painted wood trim, the flooring and the color palettes in each of the slides. He explained that later in the process, Council would be presented with boards with tile, carpet and paint options and other details of design that need to be decided for the interior.

Following discussion, it was consensus of Council to select the following for the lobby: the granite floor due to its durability, arches as shown in the Huntersville Town Hall, the applied painted wood trim and warm color palette as shown in the Mint Hill Town Hall.

Mr. Green then discussed the Lobby Sequence slide in the PowerPoint and the possibility of reducing some of the glass features. He pointed out that the slide shows the Police Department

lobby, but that the glass is also on the Customer Service Lobby area, and that the glass provides visual control over the lobby from both sides.

The City Manager explained that he had been contacted by Joel Hartwell of Pilkington Glass and that Pilkington Glass would be interested in helping the City by providing some of the glass. He added that the details had not been determined.

Mr. Green discussed the council chamber design and discussed the differences between the Sullivan's Island Town Hall, Mint Hill Town Hall, Huntersville Town Hall, and the Albemarle City Hall as shown in the PowerPoint presentation.

Upon question by Councilmember Williamson, Mr. Creech explained that in most city/town hall council chambers, technology includes shared convenience monitors on the dais that are live-wired through the audio-visual system, a retractable projector and a retractable screen behind the dais. He added that because of the ceiling height, council would not have to move in order for the audience to see the screen.

Upon question by Councilmember Willis, Mr. Green stated that the total seating capacity in the council chambers would be around 100 comfortably.

Discussion ensued concerning the features of the council chambers. It was consensus of Council to have simple white painted applied wood trim, arches similar to the Huntersville Town Hall, warm color palette and dais similar to Huntersville Town Hall.

Mr. Green then discussed floor pattern for the second floor lobby. It was consensus of Council for the flooring to be three-color neutral palette granite.

Mr. Green discussed the second floor public restrooms and the need to use durable tile surfaces on the floor and wet walls (walls where there is plumbing). He explained that one cost saving option to consider is to take the file walls up 7-feet versus 9-feet from the floor.

Upon question from Councilmember Williamson, Mr. Green explained that the ceiling heights in the building range from nine (9) feet to 12 feet in the council chambers.

Mr. Carlisto presented a PowerPoint on possible cost savings for consideration, a copy of which is attached to and incorporated herein. The table below reviews the items discussed, the potential savings and the discussion/decision on each item from the list:

POTENTIAL COST SAVING ITEM	POTENTIAL SAVINGS	DISCUSSION/DECISION
Fence and gates, end fence at right side of evidence storage	\$13,200	Discussion held previously in meeting. Accepted by Council
Site brick walls, delete on left side, use fence on right	\$124,796	Discussion held previously in meeting. Accepted by Council.

Landscaping – number of trees/shrubs	To be determined	To be determined at a later date.
Concrete in lieu of pavers at front entry walk and building entry	\$6,884	Council is fine with concrete walks. Accepted by Council.
Limit sidewalks make sidewalks 5' wide in lieu of 7'	\$4,500	Look at surrounding sidewalks as wells as for necessity. Eliminate the sidewalk through the middle of the parking lot. Accepted by Council.
Delete street entrance feature (police entrance)	\$5,000	Need for only one (1) gate on the police Accepted by Council.
Benches, trashcans, bike racks	\$8,000	City will purchase.
Dumpster enclosure – fence in lieu of masonry enclosure	\$20,610	Use of a fence instead of a masonry enclosure around the dumpster area will be less and with required landscaping added, the dumpster would not be visible. Discussion also ensued concerning removing the recycling dumpsters since they are often left unsightly by the public and have only a cardboard and waste dumpster for use by the City. Accepted by Council.
ADDED DURING DISCUSSION: Delete remaining fence around the Police Parking area	To be determined	
ADDED DURING DISCUSSION: Delete the sidewalk going through the parking lot and then the walks at the back of the property along McLean Street and Everett Street	To be determined	
Use furniture in lieu of built in casework (300 linear feet total) workstations	\$23,800	Accepted by Council.
Workstations, 56 linear feet	\$23,800	Accepted by Council.
Wood base in other areas outside lobby and council chambers	\$10,000	Previously discussed and accepted by Council.
Wood trim at 1 st and 2 nd floor lobbies, target 14%	\$15,000	Previously discussed and accepted by Council.
Ceiling detailing at lobby and or chamber	\$5,000	Accepted by Council.
Acoustical wall panels as alternate, interview rooms or chamber	\$5,000	Leave in the Chamber and lobby areas and remove in some of the other areas.

Metal shelving by owner (is this soft cost?)	\$29,400	Council wants this included as part of construction in file rooms. Rejected by Council.
Mobile storage shelving by owner (is this soft cost?)	\$37,500	Council wants this included as part of construction in file rooms. Rejected by Council.
Signage by owner (is this soft cost?)	\$28,400	Code required signs will be included in construction cost. City will purchase the rest.
Projection screen in council chamber	\$4,000	Audio-visual package will be integrated into construction. Rejected by Council. Council recommended coordination with Cable Access Channel personnel.
Residential appliances (is this soft cost?)	\$10,000	Creech and Associates will provide contact for vendor.
Glass wall at interior - \$31,000 total, target \$10,000	\$10,000	City Manager reported that Pilkington may donate glass. Council accepted.
Wall tile at wet wall only to 9' in restrooms (tile on all walls to 9' height)	\$25,000	7' tile instead of 9', but still wrap around restrooms. Accepted by Council.
Limit granite tile flooring, use carpet in council chambers	\$5,000	Due to durability, Council rejected this option.
Mansard and Low Slope Roof	\$104,739	Previously discussed and accepted by Council.

Mr. Carlisto reviewed a summary of the Construction Budget as follows:

Design Development Budget – Cost of Work	\$7,473,261
Accepted Value Engineering Items	(\$423,729)
Design Contingency (3%)	\$211,486
Construction Contingency (3%)	\$211,486
General liability	\$43,566
Builders risk	\$25,414
Building permit (not included)	
Project Fee (5%)	\$377,074
Payment and Performance Bonds	\$79,186
Total Revised Construction Budget	\$7,997,743

Upon question by Councilmember Adams, Mr. Carlisto estimated the cost per square foot of the building to be \$386.00.

Discussion ensued concerning demolition of the Barrett Building and the possibility of salvaging some of the materials such as the fireplace mantels, floors and window sills.

Mr. Carlisto explained that the current goal is to have the employees out of the Barrett Building by August 1, 2017.

The City Manager explained that if Council wants to continue with the process, then a budget amendment would need to be presented at the March 21, 2017 Council meeting to renovate the Sanford Building for staff to relocate during construction of the new building.

Following discussion, motion was made by Councilmember Hammond, seconded by Councilmember Willis, and unanimously carried for the City Manager and staff to get estimates for relocation of the Barrett Building staff to the Sanford Building and to present Council with a budget amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Willis, seconded by Councilmember Hammond, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:19 p.m.

Matthew Block, MD, Mayor

Jennifer A. Tippett, City Clerk