

Asst.
ORLEANS TOWN CLERK
S.C. 3888
22 JUN 3 12:40PM

**COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Agenda
March 10, 2022, 4:30 p.m.**

An online meeting of the Community Preservation Committee was held via Zoom beginning at 4.30pm on March 10, 2022. Real-time public access was provided by Orleans Channel 18 on the Town website and cable television.

In attendance for the meeting was the full committee: Mr. North, Mr. Alper, Ms. Christie, Mr. Crabtree, Mr. Lipton, Mr. Ellis, Ms. Francolini, Mr. Galligan, and Ms. Gaskill

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4.32. The Chair made a statement of recognition for the time and effort made by the volunteers from various organizations, committees, and the CPC, to take on projects that do not go so far as to freeze the town in amber historically but still create some "sparkle" for the Orleans Community. He commended the diversity and scope of the projects that had been approved so far for FY23. He also reminded the committee of the Finance Committee meeting on March 17. He also advised that the committee had the ability to fix the term of the bond in the warrant article for the 107 Main Street development.

Public Comment: There was no one with Public Comment.

Review Grant Application and updated plans for the Old Firehouse renovation. The Chair acknowledged Mr. McClennen from the Community Renovation Task Force and the time and effort he had expended to answer questions regarding the grant application for the renovation of the Old Firehouse.

Mr. McClennen reviewed the history of the town's commitment to the Old Firehouse and the investment of CPC funds to date. He described that approximately \$193,000 had been spent through three funding cycles to investigate ways to restore 44 Main Street (the old Firehouse). He noted that the building was not listed on the MA Historical registry or listed locally but had been declared "historic" in 2013 by the town. An historic preservation architect had been hired in the fall of 2018 and found there were historic features to the building which could be restored. The grant application in November 2021 was submitted but also included compliance with public bid laws, i.e., upgrades to ventilation, roofing, wiring, etc. to meet code requirements. Several rounds of feasibility studies, drawings, plans, schematics, and final plans have been rendered thus far for the renovation. Some specifics will not be firmed up until the project goes to bid. Mr. McClennen itemized five details of the renovation that were not yet completely finalized on the plans. These included:

1. Two east side windows, currently aluminum, which are not the original size or shape. Material and style are still to be determined.
2. The historic chimney is not needed in the building but can be retained for the historic character. Repointing and new flashing will be needed to retain this.
3. The cover shingle has not been finalized. It is expected that it will be five inch cedar cover according to historic photos of the building but still needs to be confirmed.

4. The details of the former firehouse garage door and the renovated door are not yet available. A variety of solutions are being investigated to match the historic "look" of the building but also provide functionality.
5. The specifics to meet the energy code of compliance which may necessitate the removal of some walls or shingles in order to install insulation and sheetrock. Mr. McClennen said the Orleans Historical Commission indicated at their meeting this week that this represented a "significant change." Mr. McClennen said that the CPC was bound to adhere to code, so these changes were necessary.

Mr. Galligan thanked Mr. McClennen for the recap and mentioned the need for CPA projects to comply with the Secretary of the Interiors standards for renovation. Mr. Ellis said it was the responsibility of CPC to ensure these standards are met, not the applicant. He mentioned that he personally had no recollection of discussions about how complying with code would impact the ability to meet historical standards. He also said that comments made by Joan Nix of the Historical Commission about project specifics were representative but not inclusive.

Mr. Ellis summarized the meeting of the Historical Commission on March 9th and its vote regarding the Secretary of the Interior's standards as follows:

Motion Orleans Historical Commission- 3/9/22:

Motion that the information presented to the Orleans Historical Commission on the proposed CPC funding project for the (Old) Firehouse does not have enough detail or specificity to allow this commission to affirmatively declare that this project is in adherence to CPC guidelines that any approved project must meet SOI defined standards. In order to make an affirmative declaration there needs to be sufficient detail on how the work will be completed for each historical element in the building including windows, siding, roof, heating and cooling, flooring, and interior layout. Given this lack of specificity the Orleans Historic Commission votes that the Old Firehouse project, from the information provided, does not clearly meet SOI standards. The Commission will be happy to reconvene and consider amendments, modifications, and budgets at any point in time that can show adherence to SOI defined standards.

Mr. Ellis stated that the Historical Commission only deliberated aspects of the project related to historical rehabilitation, and nothing on overall costing, project goals, or bonding. He said there was meaningful concern by the Historical Commission as to whether the project meets the requirements of enabling CPA Legislation related to adherence to Secretary of Interior standards, or even spirit of the legislation. Mr. Ellis said there was an opinion that if the old Firehouse rehabilitation was a genuine historical preservation project, the proposal would have been done with a robust review of the historic features/items listed as priority. Then there would have been discussion on how the Secretary of Interior Standard applies to those elements. Mr. Ellis said some people felt the project was designed and detailed, then a historical preservation wrapper was slapped around it.

Mr. Ellis clarified three issues that had elicited a variety of opinions at the meeting of the Historic Commission. He said he thought the replacement of the two aluminum windows was technically a "replacement of a missing feature" per the Secretary of Interior Standards Number 6.

The second example that was raised was the garage doors. Mr. Ellis said these are an “exterior alteration (per the Secretary of Interior standards, Number 9), and they need to be compatible with the historical materials, the features, size, scale, and proportion and massing. So, the discussion with the Historic Commission should have been whether or not they are compatible.

The third example was one Mr. Ellis described as “high priority”: the cedar siding. He said 2014 documents said the siding could be replaced in kind. But the Historic Commission was not given information about what the current siding is, nor what has been proposed. He said there was some mention about special treatments of the siding which would weather more slowly. Mr. Ellis said it appears that the siding is not proposed to be replaced, but he was inclined to believe, based on this lack information, that the siding will be replaced.

Mr. Ellis also stated that it was his opinion based on his review of the “enabling legislation” that the CPC has to feel the Secretary of the Interior’s standard are being met by a project plan.

The Chair said that while the standards had not yet been met, he felt they could be worked out as the project developed. Meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s standards could be a condition of the grant. Mr. Alper said he relied on the Historic Commissions expertise and analysis regarding the project and their unanimous vote was that it didn’t meet the standards.

Ms. Francolini turned consideration to the subject of bonding. She expressed concern that the use of a bond for the project would leave little or no money for other projects in the future. Mr. Lipman questioned the use of CPC funds for the old Firehouse project. He agreed it is a “great project” but would like the town to find other ways to fund it. Ms. Christie also agreed the bond sum was greater than what the CPC should handle. Mr. Alper said he agreed that the building could use improvement and that it was well utilized but was not the “ideal” size for CPC funding. He noted many other projects that are in the works around town will also need funding. He said he felt now was not the time for CPC to proceed with this project.

Mr. North invited Mr. McClennen and the representatives from ICON to address the condition of the existing building and its usage. Mr. McClennen confirmed the site was heavily used and extremely dated. The toilets are in particularly poor condition. Furthermore, he said, because the building is in the center of the village, it merits attention. He stated that the Chamber of Commerce reports a greater number of visits to 44 Main Street than to the Information site on Eldredge Parkway.

(Ms. Gaskill joined the meeting by video although she had previously been listening as an audience attendee).

Mr. Galligan thought it wise to return to the governing documents for CPC to evaluate the project and noted that it was supported by other boards and committees, notably the Select Board. Mr. Ellis said he would like to see more time spent to resolve some of the issues and a robust attempt to find other sources of funding for the old Firehouse. Mr. Alper said the CPC guidelines address how to allocate CPC money received, NOT bonding.

Mr. Crabtree said the project had been in development for a long time. He said had a bias toward projects that improve the center of Orleans. He said he was disappointed some felt that further specificity was needed or that someone else should pay for the project. He said it was an opportunity (for CPC) to “stand up and be counted” and that he hoped the project would proceed.

Mr. North summarized that the project met CPC criteria. He said that money may be tight in 2025-26 for new CPC projects but he felt the bond could be “survivable”. He suggested the committee needed to be nimble enough to see the benefit of the project. He suggested that the Committee could support a longer term bond and a requirement that the project meet the Secretary of the Interior’s standards.

Mr. North moved the accept the grant application for the Old Firehouse for a \$2million bond with work to continue the effort to comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards and flexibility about extending the duration of the bond. Mr. Galligan seconded the motion. Vote was by roll call. Mr. Lipman, Ms. Christie, Mr. Alper, Mr. Ellis, and Ms. Francolini voted NO. Ms. Gaskill voted AYE as representative of the Open Space Committee. Mr. Crabtree, Mr. Galligan and Mr. North voted AYE. The vote failed: 4-5-0.

Review of budget/debt projection figures

Ms. Francolini moved to amend the draft warrant article regarding CPC’s request for a bond for HAC’s development of 107 Main Street to include a bond term limit of 20 years. Motion was seconded by Mr. Galligan. All committee members voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed: 9-0-0.

Matters arising: Mr. North advised the next CPC meeting would be an in-person meeting. Minutes would be reviewed at a later meeting.

Mr. McClennen asked to provide an update regarding the bonding timeline for HAC’s project at 107 Main Street per Ms. Francolini’s previous request. He listed the following dates:

Feb 24, 2022 – Land Disposition Agreement with HAC signed by Town

March 10, 2022 – CPC requests the warrant for the bond

April 6, 2022 – Last date before the town meeting by which the Select Board can remove the warrant if it is not needed.

April 7, 2022 – Warrant articles go to the printer.

Approximately April 21, 2022 – Voters receive a copy of the warrant for the upcoming town meeting.

May 9, 2022 – Town meeting. Select Board can still tell meeting no action is needed on the warrant if it is decided not to proceed with bonding. A 2/3 vote is required to pass the bond request.

May onward – HAC applies for other funding.

Prior to fall Town Meeting – HAC notifies the AHTB and Select Board if funds are NOT needed. At which time, the Select Board could recommend rescinding the warrant.

Adjourn.

**Ms. Christie moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Lipman seconded the motion. All voted in favor.
The motion passed: 9-0-0.**

The meeting adjourned.

*Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer W Fountain*