

Feb 16 2022 joint meeting of Community Preservation Committee and the Historical Commission 6:00 pm held remotely via Zoom

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88360647716?pwd=dmZydkFRV1q5S055N2Z5dU9QekJOZz09>

Community Preservation Committee: Joan Simmons, Alan Chaney, Anne Davis, Carol Bacon, Catherine Irzyk, Jean Haight

Historical Commission: Anne Davis, Ray Sullivan, Carol Bacon, Catherine Irzyk

Guests presenting Spencer, Sullivan, and Vogt Group, Inc.

Spencer Sullivan and Vogt Group, Inc. (SSV) were present to provide a PowerPoint presentation on the draft Exterior Envelope Restoration Assessment they did for the Union school exterior restoration. They went through the sections of the report which includes the history of building, evaluation of the current exterior, recommendations for restoration with drawings and cost.

SSV determined that the paint is at the end of its life and is not protecting the building. There are many layers and can see older colors, which is good for historic chronology of colors. At one time had 2-tone paint theme. Original color was a cream color. They also observed that corner boards and some of the fascia boards are deteriorating, but overall, the clapboards are still in good condition. Aluminum clad window in very good shape, and for most part wood components of windows are in good shape. The foundation is made of large granite blocks. There are spaces between the blocks that may need some repointing.

Treatment recommendations are in a series of drawings which can be found in the full report.

Their opinion of probable costs is in a spreadsheet, though the grand total is estimated at approximately \$820,000. The majority of this is to strip and dispose of the lead paint and then the repainting of the building. There is an added sensitivity of the process because of the proximity to the Swallow School. Considerable paint build-up so recommending stripping to bare wood which would "reset the clock" for the life of the wood boards.

Stripping will be the most important component to discuss due to cost. They recommend Peel Away chemical process though there are other methods to consider i.e. scaling, wet scraping, heat removal. Chemical produces little dust. CPC expressed concern about applying any chemical so close to a school, but it was stated that chemicals used today, some of which are citrus based, are much more environmentally friendly. Scraping can possibly damage the pine clapboards. Methane chloride stripper can raise the grain and therefore damage wood too but this chemical is not really used anymore.

The work space around the building would have to be secured during removal process. Encapsulating the building is not be recommended though. Concern was expressed about lead in the ground surrounding the building, and questioned whether it should be tested.

The CPC questioned why replacing the clapboards is not an option? There are several reasons for not replacing the boards. First, it is not cheaper to replace the wood. Lumber is very expensive today. Secondly, pine is not as good as it used to be so the life of it may be shorter. Third, the existing boards are saturated with lead and disposal of it is very expensive and difficult. Finally, the goal is to historically restore the building, not replace it.

It was noted that the flagpole has been removed from the building at one point. Full restoration of the building would include replacing that.

There was clarification that the back addition of the building, the connection between Swallow and Union schools, is not part of the Union building restoration.

A question about the design cost line item in the estimate was asked. SSV explained that this refers not to specifically designing or engineering anything because it is restoration project, but to hiring a company to prepare bid documents and then overseeing of the preservation work.

The Palladian window cost was questioned as being too low. SSV stated that market is volatile so it is important to carry at least 10% contingency on the whole project.

Discussion turned to ADA compliance and whether this project would need to comply. SSV stated there are thresholds that trigger the requirements for compliance. This is something that will need to be navigated but exterior restoration and painting should not trigger this. If there is going to be a change of use in the future, interior work may need to be done and require ADA compliance. But there are several town boards that would have input. The focus now however is on the exterior preservation and appearance. Tearing down the building is not an option.

SSV explained that the work should take place in the warmer months and when school is not session. The project will likely take more than 3 months so timing is crucial.

Potential funding sources for the project were discussed including CPC money from both Dunstable and Groton, School district money, MHC grants, etc. Perhaps certain parts of the project could be pulled out, i.e., roof, windows, or Palladian window, preservation restriction, and apply for grants for those rather than applying for a grant for the whole project. CPC funds can be used for the matching fund grants.

Everyone very happy with the assessment and having that is a very important document to have. The Assessment document title will be revised to be Final.

Spencer Sullivan and Vogt Group Inc. has formed a new group called Spencer Preservation Group.

No motions made; meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm

Minutes prepared by Leah Basbanes