

**Community Preservation Meeting
August 15, 2019
Dennis Town Hall
Nickerson Conference Room**

RECEIVED JCO
AUG 30 AM 8:58
TOWN CLERK

Attendees: Frank Dahlstrom, Chris Foley, Bill Clark, Dorria DiManno, Chris Flanagan, Henry Kelley, Diane Rochelle, Jeff Treiber,

Absent: Regina White

Guests: Bob Poskitt (Project Manager for Dennis Historical Society), Dawn Dellner (Director of Jericho Historical Society), Pat Corcoran DHS, Phil Ketchings Maria Raber (architectural firm); Terri Fox, Dave Talbott (Vice President of Dennis Historical Society), and Richard Roy (Chair of the Manse Committee)

Meeting called to order by Frank Dahlstrom, 5:01 PM.

**1. Exterior Restoration of the Captain Baker House at the Jericho Historical Center
Applicant Interview (Jericho House Committee, Dennis Historical Society)**

Project Manager for the Dennis Historical Society, Bob Poskitt, provided the history and use of previous grant to assess their needs. The initial amount they requested was quite large, so they split the projects off into phases: the house, then the barn, then the landscape and site work. He noted that he was discussing the application specific to the Captain Baker house only at the Jericho site. Member Kelley had suggested at the last meeting that they look at the project in total, so Architect Maria Raber and members of the Dennis Historical Society team came up with a different scenario and budget, incorporating all of the work.

The Director of the Jericho House Society, Dawn Dellner, began with the history of the building, back to origins in 1801. She informed the members that the building was donated to Town of Dennis in 1962. The deed stipulated that it should be a historical center, and thus the need to preserve the building as well as story/lore of Dennis. She also stated that all artifacts are property of Dennis Historical Society because they curate and protect the house, land, artifacts. She said that the organization that oversees it directly is the Jericho House Committee, and they are the CPC applicants.

Architect Maria Raber began a PowerPoint presentation for members to learn of the updates needed. She began by discussing the house project. She indicated that the windows do not work, but need repair, and should be replaced. They also needed to repair exterior trim; and would use a Marvin product that is aluminum but looks like wood. Member Kelley noted that per MASS Historic, replacing windows with historically incorrect windows (or doors, etc.) is appropriate as long as at some point the real historically correct material could be restored. Ms. Raber discussed the rear public entry, and the proposal to replace and simplify. She also noted the front door in need of updates, and other deficiencies of the building such as a cracked chimney, replacement of shingles, and cleaning of the roof.

Ms. Raber moved on to explain updates needed to the barn. She described some staining on wall shingles that needed to be cleaned, corner board replacement, cleaning of roof, new

operable windows, brick masonry patching, and crawl space vent replacement. She concluded with landscaping updates necessary, the need for ADA accessibility, and the budget summary of each project totaling \$353,561.

Members of the committee had various questions. They were concerned with the life expectancy of the project and were informed that the updates will last for many years, but that there had been no structural engineering done. They discussed the foot traffic that occurs with school field trips and special events at no fee, but rather suggest an at will donation. A suggestion was made that they charge admission. Further discussion continued about maintenance versus the restoration. Member Kelley suggested a five-year plan be discussed with the capital outlay committee.

Members began a discussion on who would be signing the grant. The Jericho Committee indicated that they would be the signatory because they are a standing town committee. They discussed the maintenance level of care for the structures and how much the town is willing to undertake. Member Kelley noted that it is a legal obligation found in the towns deed that the town must understand and address, and we should keep that in mind as we evaluate the application further.

Mr. Poskitt concluded the interview by informing the CPC about putting a marker/sign out in front of the building indicating that the "Community Preservation Dollars were hard at work."

2. West Schoolhouse Stabilization – Phase 2 Applicant Interview

Chairman of Manse Committee Richard Roy began by following up from the last meeting with CPC; they revised budgets to look at the one-time building of the project, incorporating all three phases into one. Vice President Talbot expressed how he hoped for economies by borrowing all the money to do everything that needs to be done, through low interest loans, maintaining construction costs. He indicated that the figure was originally thought to be \$200 - \$250,000 but discussed the challenges and difficulties of requirements for doing work on a building that is on the historic register. He went on to describe the highly detailed, meticulous process. He noted that the schoolhouse is part of the museum structure of the town and should be preserved, both from educational perspective and general museum attendance.

Mr. Roy and Talbot explained that they sought advice from a structural engineer who had informed them that it's okay to maintain the current foundation while the other work is being done, but he will not sign off on the project unless he knows a new foundation is going to be built later. Members had some questions as to whether or not the foundation needs to be replaced now. Member Kelley recommended that the CPC receive confirmation from a structural engineer that it would last for quite some time, and suggested that the CPC consider this project without the new foundation currently until we get further information.

Member Treiber asked if the building would be ADA compliant after the construction. Mr. Talbot responded no, but that would not be necessary. He explained that the Manse is not totally compliant but is acceptable because they have video available, which they will also do with the schoolhouse. It would be historically destroyed if full accessibility were added. He added that Member Rochelle is working with the town and the architect on a letter to the Architectural Access Board to get approval for the plan without full compliance. Member Treiber also suggested that they start charging for admission.

Co-Chair Foley joined in the discussion and noted that CPC has received six budgets so far for this project, and the figures CPC received the day prior to the meeting were from 2017. He also questioned if the 10% contingency is the escalator from the budget from two years ago. Mr. Talbot clarified that, and Co-Chair Foley asked that they confirm that. Member Kelley asked about other contingencies beyond the 10%. Ms. Rochelle confirmed that there were other contingencies.

Co-Chair Foley concluded by addressing his concern that the project may be under funded. He also noted that there is still a \$10,000 cost for putting the building back on the foundation in the budget, which shouldn't be there if a new foundation is not being built. It's possible that there are items in the budget that should not be there, so he asked that they review the budget.

3. Discussion of possible consolidation of funding requests for borrowing

Members began a brief discussion examining the question of how long will something last after restoration. They are concerned about the longevity of each historic project and what criteria would the CPC use to determine this. Member Rochelle suggested the possibility of fifty years. Member Kelley noted that projects should be expected to last a generation to benefit the public in the long run.

Members moved onto discuss the rates and length/years of loan period and how much the added cost would be. They indicated that \$500,000 for 10 years would cost \$571,000 and that the CPC debt is dropping drastically in the next two years. If it's truly a valuable project and we don't have the money to do it, borrowing is an economical way to do it.

4. Discussion on requesting repeat appearances from applicants and further questions for them to review:

Members went through an itemized list of questions for applicants.

- Scargo Tower: Need a budget and plan for dealing with vandalism.
- Recreation: Need to have the consultant come to discuss the playground and questions about revenues from Dennis.
- West Schoolhouse: Review updated figures; confirmation on escalator; confirmation about the foundation.
- DMAHT: Will be attending CPC meeting on August 29; will bring quarterly report of financials re: rental properties.

5. Updates on Open Space Plan

Members discussed that the Administration is still on target and the Planning Board hopes to have it on their Sept. 9 meeting agenda for public comment. Following that date, administration will submit it to state and CC Commission for simultaneous review.

6. Review minutes from 8.01.19.

Members unanimously approved following three edits, good to post.

7. Next CPC meeting scheduled 8.29.19

Meeting Adjourned at 7:34

Community Preservation Meeting
August 15, 2019
Dennis Town Hall
Nickerson Conference Room

Attendees: Frank Dahlstrom, Chris Foley, Bill Clark, Dorria DiManno, Chris Flanagan, Henry Kelley, Diane Rochelle, Jeff Treiber,

Absent: Regina White

Guests: Bob Poskitt (Project Manager for Dennis Historical Society), Dawn Dellner (Director of Jericho Historical Society), Pat Corcoran DHS, Phil Ketchings Maria Raber (architectural firm); Terri Fox, Dave Talbott (Vice President of Dennis Historical Society), and Richard Roy (Chair of the Manse Committee)

Meeting called to order by Frank Dahlstrom, 5:01 PM.

1. Exterior Restoration of the Captain Baker House at the Jericho Historical Center Applicant Interview (Jericho House Committee, Dennis Historical Society)

Project Manager for the Dennis Historical Society, Bob Poskitt, provided the history and use of previous grant to assess their needs. The initial amount they requested was quite large, so they split the projects off into phases: the house, then the barn, then the landscape and site work. He noted that he was discussing the application specific to the Captain Baker house only at the Jericho site. Member Kelley had suggested at the last meeting that they look at the project in total, so Architect Maria Raber and members of the Dennis Historical Society team came up with a different scenario and budget, incorporating all of the work.

The Director of the Jericho House Society, Dawn Dellner, began with the history of the building, back to origins in 1801. She informed the members that the building was donated to Town of Dennis in 1962. The deed stipulated that it should be a historical center, and thus the need to preserve the building as well as story/lore of Dennis. She also stated that all artifacts are property of Dennis Historical Society because they curate and protect the house, land, artifacts. She said that the organization that oversees it directly is the Jericho House Committee, and they are the CPC applicants.

Architect Maria Raber began a PowerPoint presentation for members to learn of the updates needed. She began by discussing the house project. She indicated that the windows do not work, but need repair, and should be replaced. They also needed to repair exterior trim; and would use a Marvin product that is aluminum but looks like wood. Member Kelley noted that per MASS Historic, replacing windows with historically incorrect windows (or doors, etc.) is appropriate as long as at some point the real historically correct material could be restored. Ms. Raber discussed the rear public entry, and the proposal to replace and simplify. She also noted the front door in need of updates, and other deficiencies of the building such as a cracked chimney, replacement of shingles, and cleaning of the roof.

Ms. Raber moved on to explain updates needed to the barn. She described some staining on wall shingles that needed to be cleaned, corner board replacement, cleaning of roof, new

operable windows, brick masonry patching, and crawl space vent replacement. She concluded with landscaping updates necessary, the need for ADA accessibility, and the budget summary of each project totaling \$353,561.

Members of the committee had various questions. They were concerned with the life expectancy of the project and were informed that the updates will last for many years, but that there had been no structural engineering done. They discussed the foot traffic that occurs with school field trips and special events at no fee, but rather suggest an at will donation. A suggestion was made that they charge admission. Further discussion continued about maintenance versus the restoration. Member Kelley suggested a five-year plan be discussed with the capital outlay committee.

Members began a discussion on who would be signing the grant. The Jericho Committee indicated that they would be the signatory because they are a standing town committee. They discussed the maintenance level of care for the structures and how much the town is willing to undertake. Member Kelley noted that it is a legal obligation found in the towns deed that the town must understand and address, and we should keep that in mind as we evaluate the application further.

Mr. Poskitt concluded the interview by informing the CPC about putting a marker/sign out in front of the building indicating that the "Community Preservation Dollars were hard at work."

2. West Schoolhouse Stabilization – Phase 2 Applicant Interview

Chairman of Manse Committee Richard Roy began by following up from the last meeting with CPC; they revised budgets to look at the one-time building of the project, incorporating all three phases into one. Vice President Talbot expressed how he hoped for economies by borrowing all the money to do everything that needs to be done, through low interest loans, maintaining construction costs. He indicated that the figure was originally thought to be \$200 - \$250,000 but discussed the challenges and difficulties of requirements for doing work on a building that is on the historic register. He went on to describe the highly detailed, meticulous process. He noted that the schoolhouse is part of the museum structure of the town and should be preserved, both from educational perspective and general museum attendance.

Mr. Roy and Talbot explained that they sought advice from a structural engineer who had informed them that it's okay to maintain the current foundation while the other work is being done, but he will not sign off on the project unless he knows a new foundation is going to be built later. Members had some questions as to whether or not the foundation needs to be replaced now. Member Kelley recommended that the CPC receive confirmation from a structural engineer that it would last for quite some time, and suggested that the CPC consider this project without the new foundation currently until we get further information.

Member Treiber asked if the building would be ADA compliant after the construction. Mr. Talbot responded no, but that would not be necessary. He explained that the Manse is not totally compliant but is acceptable because they have video available, which they will also do with the schoolhouse. It would be historically destroyed if full accessibility were added. He added that Member Rochelle is working with the town and the architect on a letter to the Architectural Access Board to get approval for the plan without full compliance. Member Treiber also suggested that they start charging for admission.

Co-Chair Foley joined in the discussion and noted that CPC has received six budgets so far for this project, and the figures CPC received the day prior to the meeting were from 2017. He also questioned if the 10% contingency is the escalator from the budget from two years ago. Mr. Talbot clarified that, and Co-Chair Foley asked that they confirm that. Member Kelley asked about other contingencies beyond the 10%. Ms. Rochelle confirmed that there were other contingencies.

Co-Chair Foley concluded by addressing his concern that the project may be under funded. He also noted that there is still a \$10,000 cost for putting the building back on the foundation in the budget, which shouldn't be there if a new foundation is not being built. It's possible that there are items in the budget that should not be there, so he asked that they review the budget.

3. Discussion of possible consolidation of funding requests for borrowing

Members began a brief discussion examining the question of how long will something last after restoration. They are concerned about the longevity of each historic project and what criteria would the CPC use to determine this. Member Rochelle suggested the possibility of fifty years. Member Kelley noted that projects should be expected to last a generation to benefit the public in the long run.

Members moved onto discuss the rates and length/years of loan period and how much the added cost would be. They indicated that \$500,000 for 10 years would cost \$571,000 and that the CPC debt is dropping drastically in the next two years. If it's truly a valuable project and we don't have the money to do it, borrowing is an economical way to do it.

4. Discussion on requesting repeat appearances from applicants and further questions for them to review:

Members went through an itemized list of questions for applicants.

- Scargo Tower: Need a budget and plan for dealing with vandalism.
- Recreation: Need to have the consultant come to discuss the playground and questions about revenues from Dennis.
- West Schoolhouse: Review updated figures; confirmation on escalator; confirmation about the foundation.
- DMAHT: Will be attending CPC meeting on August 29; will bring quarterly report of financials re: rental properties.

5. Updates on Open Space Plan

Members discussed that the Administration is still on target and the Planning Board hopes to have it on their Sept. 9 meeting agenda for public comment. Following that date, administration will submit it to state and CC Commission for simultaneous review.

6. Review minutes from 8.01.19.

Members unanimously approved following three edits, good to post.

7. Next CPC meeting scheduled 8.29.19

Meeting Adjourned at 7:34