

FRANKLIN HERITAGE COMMISSION

Tuesday, July 11, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

City Hall

Downstairs Meeting Room

MINUTES

❑ **Call to Order 6:02 p.m.**

❑ **Salute to the Flag**

❑ **Roll Call**

Present: George Dzujna, Bob Lucas, Paul Trudel, Mike Mullavey (recused-on the Board of PermaCityLife)

Absent: Glen Feener, Jeff Whitney,

❖ **Seat Alternates** – No alternates present

- ❑ **Approval of Minutes of the May 24, 2017 Public Hearing Meeting of the Board.** Member Trudel / Member Mullavey moved / seconded the minutes as written. By a vote of 3-0-0 the minutes were approved.

New Business

H 17-02: A proposal by PermaCityLife for façade improvements at 366 Central Street [the Buell Block], with the work to involve the masonry repair work on the front façade and masonry repair, roof repair, and the installation of matching doors and windows around the building [excluding Parkside Renovation].

Todd Workman, applicant, addressed the Commission stating that the application presented represents the second phase of work to put the Buell Block back in order. Phase three, coming soon, will address the work to be done on the Marceau Park side of the building. Photos of the building from 2008 and 2009 show boarded up entries and chiseled off keystones. The plan is to cosmetically replicate the keystones with leveling cement and then affixing of 2” deep granite pieces to resemble the original keystones that still exist over the Franklin Studio section of the building. The plan is to also replicate the arches and columns, install new flashing, roof trim and drip edges.

Member Lucas inquired if the method of repairing the keystones has been used before and proven successful and safe. Mr. Workman stated that it is an approved method of repair and that the mason is scheduled to start work the first week of September. Acting Chair Dzujna asked if the columns between the arches are load bearing. Mr. Workman said that when a metal façade was put in years ago, the keystones were chiseled off and a horizontal metal girder installed to take the load. He added that brick has been located that will match the original brick used on the building.

The ‘nook’ (the back of the building) alterations include replacing the tyveked wall on the bump-out with cement board or OSB siding that simulates wood siding, replacing windows and doors that can’t be restored, painting trim green, and repointing the brick where needed. On the horse barn, the windows and missing doors will be replaced. The door will be a French door in fiberglass stained with gel stain. The roof will be repaired along with the flat rooftop deck.

Member Lucas asked about the style of the replacement windows, suggesting that whatever the grid pattern decided upon it be consistent throughout the project. Mr. Workman proposed that the separate sections of the building (doghouse, horse barn, etc.) be treated individually with windows that match in each section. Chair Dzujna asked about any historical requirements that replacement windows replicate the original windows in style and mullion pattern. Director Lewis stated that the ultimate decision is up to the commission. Mr. Workman stated that any of the windows that are able to be restored will have interior storm windows for energy efficiency.

Director Lewis asked about the proposed roof garden and Mr. Workman indicated that the area is better described as a roof deck with railing and that the application will be amended to indicate that.

After applauding Mr. Workman for taking on the front façade work, Mr. Leigh Webb asked that the statement regarding ‘installation of matching doors and windows around the building’ be amended since the previous discussion of windows indicated that different sections of the building might have different style windows. He then asked if the green color on the vinyl windows and the gray on the siding was imbedded or painted on. Mr. Workman said that the windows are factory finished in green but that the siding will be painted gray on site.

Annette Andreozzi expressed concern about the Heritage Commission ruling on a plan that isn’t fully formed. She stated that she understood the need to do work in sections, but felt that the description in the application and the wording in the proposed approval leave openings where there are no decided goals. She noted that the term ‘repair’ means that you will put in exactly what was there. She argued that when the type of repairs/renovations isn’t specified, you leave yourself open to changes which may not be appropriate for the building. She felt that the roof repairs section is particularly vague. Which rooflines will be flattened to accommodate rooftop gardens? She noted that windows replaced by previous owners were not historically accurate; that it is perhaps best, and possibly no more expensive, to restore existing windows instead of replacing them with new windows. Ms. Andreozzi also called for verification that all window openings remain windows and the same for the original doorway openings. Any new cuts or boarding up of openings should be detailed in the application. She also warned that the stone mason repointing bricks needs to be an expert of historical preservation or guided by someone who is; that in the long term using the wrong materials will destroy the building.

Mr. Workman responded to Ms. Andreozzi’s comments stating that there is a long-term, fully-formed plan that has been broken down into three phases. He mentioned that he is working through the list of code repairs he inherited from previous owners. He said he didn’t have a problem specifying which windows will be restored, indicating that the windows in

the bump-out had already been restored by Marty Parichand. The three or four on backside of horse barn will be preserved. As for the rooftop gardens, that is a future plan and will be detailed in the next application. Mr. Workman felt it was unreasonable to demand the mason have historic preservation experience. He said that he didn't think the commission can force contractors to have a certain level of skill.

Member Lucas asked if Mr. Workman had a scope of services that he could share with the commission. Mr. Workman replied that acquiring one would be both onerous and expensive.

It was the general consensus of the commission that having all the windows the same style would be preferable, but if that wasn't feasible then the windows in the separate sections of the building should at least match that section. Chair Dzujna asked if the wording on the decision to approve could be altered to reflect the changes agreed upon during the discussion.

Mr. Workman suggested the following changes to the permit: Masonry work on the front façade and the keystones above the brick arches, make adjustments to the flashing and refinish the wall for waterproofing; In the "nook" at the rear of the building, repoint the brick; fix all openings for, and replacing were needed, the doors and windows; install new roof on the horse barn portion of the nook; undertake all needed repairs for the horse barn roof, and prepare the roof over the 3-bedroom section of the building for the installation of a roof-top garden; install flashing, roof trim and drip edges; and repair and re-side the dog houses and the unfinished second story section. On the back building wall [facing the parking lot] new windows will be installed and the dog house [west side of the back building] will be restored in the same fashion as the dog houses in the nook. The proposed windows will match the existing windows on the front façade with the exception that they will not have the glassed arced radius at the top; this area will be filled in with trim that matches the color of the window trim [dark green].

Ms. Andreozzi stated that she hadn't looked for any historic photos of the building, so she isn't sure if any of the windows are original to the building, although those on the front with the glass arches above the rectangular windows are probably the original design. She added that in Gilmanton they found that restoring the old windows were no more costly than ordering custom windows to fit the old building.

Mr. Workman reminded the commission that a lot of the work is behind the scenes and those projects (wiring, heating and cooling, interior walls, plumbing) are just as important as the façade renovations. Sometimes you have to prioritize as to where and when money will be spent.

Chair Dzujna closed public portion of the meeting and brought it back to the commission. Planner Lewis reiterated the changes in wording in the application.

Member Trudel made a motion to approve with the conditions noted by Planner Lewis. That motion was seconded by Member Lucas. The motion to approve the work with the noted conditions passed by a vote of 3-0-0.

Old Business / Other Business: None

Approved 8/22/2017

Public Comment: None

Adjournment: Chair Dzujna / Member Trudel motioned/seconded for the meeting to adjourn at 7:24 p.m.