## Town of Center Harbor Heritage Commission Meeting March 5, 2016

-Corrected & Approved 4/21/16-

## Meeting Minutes

I. Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 8:08am. Present: Chairperson Kim Baker, Roland Garland, Richard Hanson, Karen Ponton, Dave Reilly; Guests: Chris Williams & Norm Larson (CPWA); Public: Harry Viens. Absent: David Hughes (alternate).

## **II. Unfinished/Continuing Business**

## A. Town House Rehabilitation

- 1. **Building Assessment & Rehab Plan**: Chris Williams and Norm Larson from Christopher P. Williams, Architects (CPWA) were invited to the meeting to discuss preliminary findings from the Town House building conditions assessment. They are still working on the draft report, and just received the structural engineer's report this morning. Some of the main points discussed follow:
  - The Town House appears "really sound for a building of its age."

    The stone foundation was dry laid; some mortar was later placed on the exterior in an attempted repair. There has been some movement in the east corner of the building. The foundation needs some structural and cosmetic repairs.
  - Cracks in plaster above windows, especially on the south facade, are due to movement in the foundation, not a technical failure of the windows.
  - The architect and the structural engineer were not able to get underneath the building, as access is only about 7 inches. This crawl space will need to be excavated to 18 inches minimum in order to better assess the underlying structure and shore up the floor.
  - Parking would be accessed from Waukewan Road (not Route 3) by a
    driveway through the woods to reach the primary parking area.
    Some parking would also be available along the sides of the
    driveway. Handicapped access would be at the back of the building
    through a new door (providing a second entrance/exit) and rear
    porch. This scenario would preserve the character of the building.
  - Per fire code, adding this second entrance would increase building standing room capacity from about 50 (with only existing doubledoor) to about 90 standing. With chairs, capacity is about 40.

- The front porch is in terrible condition due, in part, to the handicap ramp. It needs to be repaired very soon.
- An ongoing question has been: To what period of significance should the building be restored? Little remains from its earliest days. Some of what can be dated is: 1903-stage with railing; 1933-served as school so stage panels may have been used to separate the hall into 2 rooms; 1933-privey finishes date to this time and its doors were originally windows; 1939-woodshed addition and woodstove moved to corner of main floor.
- New bathroom (with handicap access) and small prep area would be located in woodshed. Old bathrooms could be used as storage closets.
- Two-zone heating is recommended: 1 zone for bathroom due to plumbing; 1 zone for rest of building.
- The Waterbury stove will not be functional. The Commission would like it moved to the east corner of the room for display.
- N. Larson suggested that the "story of the hanging chimney" be told with displayed photos, since the chimney has already been removed and the attic space will not be accessible to the public.
- Some structural repairs in the attic (with collar ties and gusset plates) are recommended.
- Much discussion focused on the two (2) proposed plans (A1.1 and A1.1b). Each showed different access to the bathroom/prep area/rear entrance area, one of which would impact a blackboard existing from the schoolhouse days. The possibility of a installing a lift for handicap access the stage was also considered, but ruled out primarily due to cost.
- The stage panels and railing were also discussed at some length, including keeping them in place or removing and storing them. If removed, the panels would be stored onsite, perhaps on or under the stage, and one of them could be displayed.
- Estimates are based on industry standards. A 15% contingency should be added for budgetting projections.
- Estimated expenses for scaping and painting exterior do not include cost of capturing and removing lead paint.
- Estimates for window repairs are for straight glass. The Commission asked that estimates for storm windows with lexan, instead of glass, be included with the recommendations.
- Estimates for a topographical survey, site design, driveway, septic, well, landscaping and associated fees are NOT within the scope of this project.

Based on the discussion above, and in order to give further direction to the architects, several motions were proposed and debated by the Commission:

- <u>Motion</u> by K. Ponton, seconded by K. Baker, that: <u>The architect</u> include replacement of the original stone foundation with a new <u>basement</u>. No one voted in favor; all 5 Commission members voted against. Motion defeated.
- <u>Motion</u> by K. Ponton, seconded by R. Hanson, that: <u>the Commission</u> <u>select the proposed Plan A.1.1</u>. <u>Passed</u> unanimously. (See
- <u>Motion</u> by K. Ponton, seconded by R. Hanson, that: <u>The</u> <u>Commission abandon use of the upper panels. Passed unanimously.</u>
- C. Williams added that the Commission could decide at sometime in the future to create a new railing system for the stage, that could be removable, based upon what the original railing (1907) is believed to have done. (Wooden parts found under the stage and thought to possibly be original railing balasters are from wooden chairs).
- 2. Boundary Survey, External Disconnect for Electricity & Security (Motion Detectors, Camera, Fire/Smike Alarms): The Commission was advised that a *topographical survey*, which includes a boundary survey, will need to be done before most of the major site work can be started. This survey and the septic design could be done by the same firm at the same time. The external disconnect at the meter is part of the work to be done when the utility line from the street to the meter is replaced. A fire detection system, a fire alarm control panel and theft prevention measures will be part of the architect's top priority recommendations.
- 3. Future Meetings per Contract Item 1.7: N. Larson will plan to have the draft report ready by April 7. K. Baker can then use this information in preparing the Mooseplate Grant Application (due April 25). The Commission requested that N. Larson and C. Williams attend their April 21 meeting to share and discuss the draft report, as required by the NHPA. The architects will need to check their calendars and get back to the Commission.
- 4. Timeframe to Submit Draft Report, Revise & Submit Final Report to NHPA: On agenda for April meeting.
- 5. Completion of NHPA Grant Requirements & Evaluation: Pending April meeting.

B. **March Town Meeting**: Given the preliminary cost estimates provided by CPWA, it was the consensus of the Commission to request a higher appropriation of \$25,000 in the Warrant Article if discussion at the Town Business Meeting appears to be supportive of an increase.

The Commission was reminded not to discuss the Warrant Article at the display during Town Voting; only information about the Town House may be provided and donations solicited. Anyone asking about the Warrant Article should be referred to Town Moderator Charlie Hanson at the Town Business Meeting on Wednesday evening.

III. Other Business: None.

IV. **Adjournment**: Motion by R. Hanson, seconded by D. Reilly, to adjourn at 10:13am. Passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Ponton Secretary

att(1)

