

**Town of Center Harbor
Heritage Commission Meeting
May 19, 2016
Minutes**

Corrected & Approved-6/16/16

- I. **Call to Order:** Meeting called to order at 4:30pm. Present: Chairperson Kim Baker, Roland Garland, Richard Hanson, Karen Ponton, Dave Reilly; Guests: Christopher Williams & Norman Larson (CPWA) until 5:26pm, Mary Kate Ryan (NHDHR) from 5:15-6:25pm. Absent: David Hughes (alternate)

- II. **Approval of Minutes:** Motion by K. Ponton, seconded by D. Reilly that: The Minutes of April 21, 2016 be approved as written. Passed with R. Hanson abstaining.

- III. **Order of Agenda & Additional Items:** K. Ponton asked that “Staggered Terms for Commission Members” be added to the Agenda.

- IV. **Unfinished/Continuing Business**
 - A. **Town House Rehabilitation**
 1. **Building Assessment & Rehab Plan w/CPW Architects (4:30 PM):** Chris Williams and Norman Larson met with the Commission to discuss their *Building Assessment & Feasibility Study (revised May 18, 201)* and to answer any remaining questions. They also addressed comments raised by the NHPA about the initial draft, their responses and subsequent edits. Some of the main points discussed follow:
 - Some of the construction techniques (framing) seem too new to have been in use in the mid-1800s, but Town records support the build date and indicate no other major construction. It is possible that since the saw mills in “Slab City” made materials for this type of construction, they might have pushed these new techniques. N. Larson mentioned that Perley O. York, a carpenter who worked on the Town House, built other buildings in the area. It might be worth looking at them to see if the construction techniques are the same as in the Town House.
 - A topographical survey, which was beyond the scope of contracted work for the *Building Assessment*, is needed to look at the easiest ways to solve the parking, water supply and septic issues. N. Larson recommended the Commission consider what is their goal for parking: providing parking for maximum building capacity or for how the building is going to be used most often (small group meetings). He also suggested that Warren Perkins or Penny Pitou be asked if there was ever a well on the property.

- Much of the discussion focused on the front porch repair, which the Commission is considering for a community volunteer project. As many of the questions were “how to....” ones, C. Williams suggested that the Commission tell the contractor what needs to be done and let the contractor figure it out. CPWA could offer assistance in terms of the design of the porch, i.e. measured drawings, code requirements, moldings, trim, etc. The main problem is that the porch is moving more than the rest of the building. It should be left open underneath, supported by new concrete footings. The Commission has permission from the Select Board to remove the handicap ramp, which is not up to code and is adding to the deterioration of the porch, as well as some of the floor boards to see what is underneath. Because it is a public building, some sort of temporary ramp may be acceptable until a new second entrance is added at the rear of the building. C. Williams offered to put together a proposal for the design of the Town House porch. He also recommended that the Code Enforcement Officer be involved early in the project; the current porch configuration may be grandfathered in terms of code requirements.
- CPWA is not recommending that the light fixtures be restored. The Town House is a public building and UL-tested fixtures are required. It is very expensive to retrofit fixtures to UL-tested standards.
- CPWA recommends that oil-based paint be used on the Town House exterior, if it is available. Oil-based paint is what was used on the Town House, and it is better to use similar paint. Paint will peel and fail quicker when dissimilar products are used.
- Three-tab asphalt roof shingles would be appropriate to use, as these are appropriate to the period of significance (1907). Original shingles would have been wood.
- The need for structural repairs to the attic framing does not pose an imminent threat to the building.
- Insulation is recommended at the unsupported, northwest corner to address frost action.
- N. Larson reported that, regrettably, NHPA does not have an historic restoration brief related to archeological concerns, which must be addressed when soil is disturbed. Mary Kate Ryan offered to see what NHDHR may have.

- In response to a question D. Reilly asked, yes, the recommendations from the structural engineer were taken into consideration when the cost estimates were prepared. D. Reilly also made the point that additional rotten clapboard, building sill, sheathing, etc. may be uncovered as the work progresses. N. Larson noted that the Commission will have to make those decisions as new problems are uncovered.

2. Timeframe to Revise & Submit Final Report to NHPA: N. Larson electronically submitted the revised Final Report to NHPA earlier today. The Commission expects that all NHPA grant requirements and the evaluation will be completed by the end of June.

3. Public Hearing at 7 PM: Notice was published in the *Laconia Sun* and *Meredith News*, and posted on the website and reader board. In preparation for tonight's Public Hearing, the Commission reviewed the purpose of the Hearing and the main points to be addressed.

4. RFP for Exterior Painting of the Town House: RFP has been issued, published in the *Laconia Sun* and the *Meredith News*, and posted on the website. Due date for sealed bids is June 15, 2016.

5. Prioritized Work/Tasks for 2016: K. Baker distributed a draft *Task List for 2016* that she had prepared. (See attached). Given the time, Commission members were asked to review and ammend the draft in preparation for the June meeting.

6. Town House Porch, Building Permits, Project Oversight & Possible Volunteers: K. Baker distributed a timeline for the *Town House Porch Replacement*, which the Commission may pursue as a volunteer project. (See attached). K. Baker has had some preliminary discussion with Glen Copatch about involving his Interlakes High School shop class. R. Hanson thought Plymouth Regional High School might be a resource, as it has a vocational program. He also suggested Lakes Region Community College, which might have a construction program. R. Garland will be contacting Huot Technical School in Laconia. K. Ponton reported that the Select Board has given permission to remove some of the porch floor boards to see what is underneath, as well as the handicap ramp. A building permit will be required to replace the porch. Given time constraints, further discussion was postponed until the June meeting. Commission members were asked to review and edit the draft in light of the earlier discussion with CPWA about repairing/replacing the front porch.

B. Heritage Fund: The Commission reviewed the *Fund Report* dated April 29, 2016 (see attached) and the MVSB statement for April, which they initialed. The current Fund balance is \$20,044.83.

C. Fundraising

1. **Update on Donations:** To date, \$7,512 has been received.

2. **Fundraising Plans for 2016**

a. **Table Outside Heath's Friday, June 24 & Saturday, June 25:**

Commission members will sign up at the June meeting to staff the table. K. Ponton submitted a request on April 26, 2016 to The Common Man to participate in their *Give \$10-Get \$10 Off Coupon* program. No response yet.

b. **2016 LobsterFest:** K. Baker plans to attend a meeting of the CHCDA to formally request that this fundraising event help support the Town House rehabilitation.

D. Grants Update

1. **Conservation License Plate/Mooseplate Grant:** K. Baker hand-delivered the grant application to NHDHR on April 25, 2016. Grants are awarded in July.

2. **LCHIP Grant:** K. Ponton attended the LCHIP grant-writing workshop on May 3, which is required of grant applicants. She will write an LCHIP grant proposal to address the Town House crawlspace excavation and foundation work recommended in the *Building Conditions Assessment Report*. The proposal is due June 24, 2016 by noon. LCHIP requires that all applicants adopt applicable sections of the Land Trust Alliance's *Standards and Practices*, which the Town Selectmen did at last night's Select Board meeting. (See attached). LCHIP also expects there to be planning for the stewardship of historic properties, and prefers a dedicated fund for this purpose.

E. Heritage & Cultural Resources Inventory (5:30 PM): Mary Kate Ryan, NHDHR State Survey Coordinator, was asked by the Commission for guidance and advice to address its charge "...to develop and maintain an inventory of the Town's cultural and historic resources." M. K. Ryan explained the different types of inventories: an individual property (the Town House inventory for the *NH State Register of Historic Places*), a district (the Center Harbor Village Historic District inventory for the *National Register of Historic Places*), and planning level surveys. She focused her discussion on developing a comprehensive, historic resources survey and inventory. The goal is to have a useful document for town planning, preservation and hazard mitigation purposes and to increase community awareness, respect and appreciation of its history. However, these surveys are expensive and require professional architectural historians. NHDHR has applied

for Federal grant funding that is available from the National Park Service, subsequent to Superstorm Sandy, for a *Community Planning Historic Resources Survey Model Project*. (See attached). NHDHR is looking for a test case. NHHR would hire the professional consultant; the Heritage Commisison would provide meeting space and help get the public involved. After further discussion, motion by D. Reilly, seconded by R. Garland that: The Heritage Commission participate with the NHDHR in their *Community Planning Historic Resources Survey Model Project*. Passed unanimously. M. K. Ryan expects to hear whether or not the NHDHR is awarded grant mones by June 1. In the interim, Commision members are asked to think about how to get people involved ("engagement" events), i.e. what's worked and what hasn't worked in the past. Also, she will need to know how our GIS system was done and who did it, as mapping and map overlays to show how property has changed over time are part of the project.

(As an aside: The UNH Granit System has been working to scale old maps to current GIS maps. The Commission might want to find out if white pine blister rust mapping was done for West Center Harbor).

V. Other Business

A. ILHS Student Project: K. Baker reported that she has not heard anything further from the student, and recommended this item be taken off the Agenda.

B. Reminder: The June 16, 2016 Heritage Commission meeting will take place at the Schoolhouse Museum, Route 25B in Center Harbor.

VI. New Business: Staggered Terms for Commission Members: Due to time constraints, postponed to June meeting.

VII. Adjournment: Motion by D. Reilly, seconded by K. Ponton to adjourn at 6:56pm. Passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Ponton
Secretary
att (5)

Center Harbor Heritage Commission
Heritage Fund Report (4/29/16)

I. Town Appropriation

Appropriation 2015	\$ 500.00	Expenses	
		2015	(\$467.16)
		GoFundMe.com	
		Service Fees	(8.20)
Appropriation 2016	\$15,000.00		
Remaining Appropriation Balance			<u>\$15,024.64</u>

II. Donations

2015 Donations	\$4,017.67	
<u>2016 Donations</u>	2,875.00	
Donation Jar	19.52	
	8.00	
GoFundMe	<u>100.00</u>	
	\$7,020.19	<u>\$7,020.19</u>

III. Christopher Williams Architects (Retainer) (\$2,000.00)

IV. Heritage Fund Balance (I + II - III) \$20,044.83

V. MVSB Account

(\$100 min daily balance; otherwise \$5/month service fee. \$0.50/item processed over 100/cycle)

3/31/16	Statement Balance	\$20,036.83
4/28	Deposit	8.00
4/29/16	Statement Balance	<u>\$20,044.83</u>

Reconciliation \$20,044.83

VI. Operating Budget 2016 \$1,000.00

Expenses:

Reimburse K. Ponton (Stamps,
envelopes, paper) (46.98)

Balance \$ 953.11

(* Pending)

Heritage Commission Task List for 2016

1. Arrange for Painting Project for Town House, including sealed bid process.
2. Site Survey with SB
3. Inventory Update ...more to follow
4. Schoolhouse Inventory with Mae Williams funded by SB
5. Volunteer Project for the front Stoop/Town House
6. Field Day for the Commission to look at sites for inventory
7. Grant opportunities in the fall...Meredith Village
8. Boy Scouts to rake property/ Eagle scout project
9. Town House window replaced in rear of building
10. Replace utility line from street
11. Get Town House roof inspected and repaired, as necessary

Volunteer Project: Town House Porch Replacement

May: Confirm Date of work weekend in September 24/25 or October 15/16

Speak with Glen Copatch re: ILHS shop class participation.

June: Meet with Contractors/ Make decision by 6.16.16

July: Get list of materials needed from Contractor 7.15.16

Confirm with Uncle Hilde's about list of supplies/delivery/misc. 7.31.16

Start list of Volunteers, times, food supplies...promote heavily at
Lobsterfest, website, SB meetings, list by town clerk's office.

List of tools necessary.

August: Confirm with SB plans

Pull any permits necessary

Confirm helpers with tools.

Liability Release forms.

September: Arrange for delivery of supplies from Uncle Hilde's/storage in
building.

Collect all liability release forms.

October: Follow up thank you letters.

"Although designed for land trusts, these standards provide an excellent framework for preservation organizations as well, because of the many similarities between the two types of organizations" (p. 2, 2008 NTHP).

The Land Trust Alliance's *Land Trust Standards and Practices* and its Applicability within the Framework of Historic Preservation Projects: An Overview

LCHIP requires *all* applicants to adopt the applicable sections of the *Land Trust Standards and Practices*. As of yet, the preservation community has not adopted a universally understood and accepted set of standards and practices like the conservation community. However, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has studied, adapted and interpreted the LTA's *Land Trust Standards and Practices* for historic preservation projects in their 2008 publication entitled: *Best Practices for Preservation Organizations Involved in Easement and Land Stewardship: An Introduction to Using **Land Trust Standards and Practices** as a Benchmark for Historic Preservation Organizations*

The publication in its entirety is available for purchase from the National Trust's website:
<http://www.preservationbooks.org/Bookstore.asp?Type=epolicy&Item=1323>

The Land Trust Alliance's *Land Trust Standards and Practices* are available as a free download from their website:
<http://www.landtrustalliance.org/learning/sp/lt-standards-practices07.pdf>

The following is adapted from the National Trust's Publication:

Tips for reading the Land Trust Alliance's *Land Trust Standards and Practices*:

- ✓ Substitute the word "organization" for "land trust," so that the text reads as encompassing the broad range of conservation and preservation organizations.
- ✓ Although the *Land Trust Standards and Practices* uses terminology specific to **conservation** projects, the standards and practices apply equally to **preservation** projects.

The *Land Trust Standards and Practices* generally cover:

- ✓ Good organizational governance
- ✓ Effective preservation practices and stewardship
- ✓ Ethical and technical guidelines
- ✓ Standards 1-7 focus on organizational strength
- ✓ Standards 8-12 focus on land transactions & stewardship

The information contained with the *Land Trust Standards and Practices* is important guidance for any nonprofit organization and may also be useful for governmental organizations.

Which Standards Apply to my Organization?

Part 1: Organizational Strength

Standard 1 – Mission: This is overall common sense practice for any organization

Practice 1.B. Ask yourself whether you are effectively protecting the resources for which you have accepted stewardship responsibility?

Standard 2 – Compliance with Laws: Again, this standard sets out basic organizational guidance that is sound practice for *any* organization.

Practice 2.D. Does your organization have a formally adopted, written records policy?

- √ Good recordkeeping policies foster documentation of organizational history and promote public accountability and confidence.
- √ Helps ensure records are maintained despite high turnover of staff or heavy reliance on volunteers.

Standard 3 – Board Accountability: Board accountability is just one of the essential governance principles that any organization should follow.

- √ Assess your own organizations internal control and risk management systems.

Standard 4 – Conflicts of Interest: A basic tenant of good corporate governance – Steps should be taken to identify and avoid conflicts of interest by board members, staff members, and other individuals with special influence.

Standard 5 – Fundraising: Organizations engaged in property stewardship must engage in legal and ethical practices at all times in conducting their fundraising activities.

Standard 6 – Financial and Asset Management:

This standard is a restatement of good governance principles in the area of financial and asset management. One particular area of note is the matter of securing necessary funds for future stewardship costs. Be attentive to the need of addressing future costs.

Practice 6G. Organizations should have a “secure and lasting source” of dedicated or operating funds sufficient to cover the costs of stewardship “over the long term.” If the funding is not secure, the organization’s board should work towards committing the organization to raising the necessary funds.

Standard 7 – Volunteers, Staff and Consultants: Preservation organizations must ensure that they have both the capacity and competence to carry out their charitable mission. This obligation entails maintaining adequate staff, consultants, or volunteers to implement and operate the organization's programs.

Part 2: Land Transactions

Many of the standards in this section are not specifically pertinent to preservation organizations; however, there are some that are applicable particularly if the steward of a building or structure is applying to and is successful in receiving LCHIP funding.

Standard 11 – Conservation Easement Stewardship: All projects receiving an LCHIP grant for restoration or rehabilitation are subject to a Term Stewardship Agreement, which is much like a term preservation easement in that it states that during the term of the agreement the grantee/applicant is required to keep the building in the same or better condition as it was when the project was completed and that LCHIP has oversight over future changes to ensure they meet the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* during the term of the agreement, among other things.

Practice 11A. Funding Stewardship – stewardship expenses may be covered either with dedicated or operating funds. A stewardship fund that is held separately from the organization's operating budget is preferred.

Practice 11B. Baseline Documentation – this document is required to receive LCHIP funding. It is completed at the conclusion of the project to provide a narrative description with photos of the state of the building at the time the Term Stewardship Agreement is placed on the building. It aids in annual monitoring over the term of the agreement.

Practice 11C. Monitoring – LCHIP requires annual monitoring of all easement/Stewardship Agreement properties. A report is submitted to LCHIP on an annual basis, and occasionally LCHIP staff will make field visits to verify the reports. This is an important communication tool between the grantee and LCHIP to notify LCHIP of any areas of concern for the building and to give LCHIP an idea of what projects are anticipated in the coming year and whether those projects will need prior written approval from LCHIP.

Practice 11G. Contingency Plans/Backups – What will happen to the resource if the organization owning it or managing it on behalf of another entity dissolves?

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Draft Outline of Community Planning Survey Model project

ISSUE: In order to make practical, meaningful, and useful planning decisions about historic resources, New Hampshire's towns and cities need survey and inventory information. Comprehensive survey and inventory has been completed for no single municipality in New Hampshire at this time (2016). Of the 221 municipalities in New Hampshire, only 35 have a town-wide area form, a comprehensive overview of the development of the area which includes enough information to help make decisions about intensive survey and inventory. Of these, only 4 town-wide area forms post-date 2000. Additionally, many towns had a large amount of reconnaissance survey (which provides basic information on a property, but not enough information to evaluate historic significance), but most are at least 20 years old now and no longer useful for planning purposes.

Without adequate information on historic resources, town commissions face challenges including historic resources in larger planning efforts, including hazard mitigation plans, historic preservation master plan chapters (optional in NH), land use and development decisions. Additionally, town-wide information on the historic resources potential in town could inform heritage district commission and heritage commission collaboration with other town commissions as well as promoting reuse of buildings and areas in town that may benefit from reinvestment.

Town-wide area forms are an expensive type of survey because they are comprehensive, require a professional architectural history consultant to do all the work, and may not be well-used by the town. Reconnaissance survey does not provide enough information to make planning decisions. Intensive survey would be cost-prohibitive for an entire town, as well as needless and wasteful.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: New Hampshire needs a new type of survey for community planning purposes. A model survey type that involved both structured community participation and professional preservation analysis to increase engagement and reduce some costs could increase the usefulness of the resulting document in New Hampshire communities.

Ideally, this survey type would, like the town-wide area form, provide an overview and recommendations for areas worthy of additional survey and inventory, but unlike the town-wide area form, would involve more community input and research, which would help reduce costs and increase engagement. A survey format that would allow research and community input, mapping (modern and historic), and evaluation assistance from a professional consultant, would help communities struggling with how to incorporate information on historic resources in master planning and hazard mitigation planning. Community involvement will help identify needs and threats to historic resources.

Because of staff time constraints, the assistance of a qualified architectural history consultant will be required to review the possible survey modalities, set up a protocol, outline deliverable

survey documents, and, with the assistance of the DHR survey coordinator, test this new model with a willing municipality.

Project Outline:

The proposed project would proceed in three phases after hiring a consultant to head the project:

1. Information gathering and review.

a. Consultant will, with input from DHR, review existing survey projects that may inform the current project.

i. Suggested surveys to review:

- Manchester City-Wide Survey
- Exeter Mapping Survey
- Newington Mapping Survey
- Keene Town-wide Survey

b. Consultant will meet with a selected group of professionals to review findings, discuss survey needs, and gather input. Group

ii. Group to include preservation planning consultant, hazard mitigation staff member from state office HSEM, GIS mapping consultant (preferably from an RPC, as many towns get their GIS services through their RPC), chosen town staff members including planner/town manager, local library, and member of a heritage commission, an RPC representative and others identified as having useful information.

2. Product proposal. Consultant will lay out community engagement protocol (suggest using FEMA protocol for incorporating cultural resources into hazard mitigation planning and Maine CoSTEP protocols as models), research plan, and format of final resulting survey product. Feedback from selected members of study committee group proposed in 1, b, ii should be incorporated into final proposal.

3. Case study with chosen community. Working with a community identified by DHR, consultant will conduct the community engagement process and produce the final product. A short evaluation of the entire process, with recommendations and amendments to the process, should also be done.

Explicit Goals:

--Create a replicable, first-step survey model process that provides enough information on cultural resources that a community can incorporate the information into planning documents including hazard mitigation plans and master plans.

--Use community engagement to increase awareness about historic resources, but also to gather information and reduce the overall cost of a survey. With participation, awareness and usefulness of the survey should also rise as the survey information will reflect local community values.