

TOWN HALL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
TOWN OF HOOKSETT



MINUTES OF MEETING
November 3, 2014

Members present: Kathie Northrup, Jim Sullivan. Absent: Tom Walsh. Staff present: Katie Rosengren, Leo Lessard. Matt Lavoie excused. C. Kennedy and A. Lornitzo from UK Architects (UKA), M. Bruss, cost estimator.

Meeting called to order at 1:05 p.m. in admin conference room to review preliminary schematics.

Reviewed existing conditions and Options A-C for interior. See detailed notes prepared by UKA. Much discussion focused on proposals for exterior changes (maintain exterior envelope of both original and addition, vault removed/roof on addition converted to low pitch, and addition setback) as well as handicap accessibility to stage (lift vs. ramp), location of kitchen, configuration of restrooms.

Group preferred no changes to exterior footprint/envelope, liked the kitchen towards the front of the building rather than the back, lift rather than the ramp for stage access, and perhaps use of risers for additional stage space. Also talked about 2-occupancy restrooms rather than singles. There was no “interior perspective” graphic available of the hall without the ramp or of the loft area facing west.

Also discussed viewing a model showing theater-type seating; UKA will furnish.

As we anticipate phasing the project, cost estimates will be segmented so we can prioritize. We should give some thought as to how we want to prioritize, how we will present plans, etc.

Talked again about possible uses: wedding/reception, holiday parties, business conferences/training, movie screenings, school/family reunions.

Members should comment by Monday, 11/10/14. Schematics will be updated and presented at a subsequent meeting (online).

Chris feels that a wave of alterations (windows, stage, tin ceiling) were done in the 1910-1930 time period.

Around 2:45 p.m., Chris, Adam, and Michael left the meeting.

REGULAR MEETING

Acceptance of minutes of Special meeting 10/24/14 moved by Jim, seconded by Kathie. Unanimously approved.

PUBLIC INPUT None

COMMUNICATIONS, CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEOUS:

None

REVIEW ASSIGNMENTS:

1. At our last meeting Jim advised he had contacted Fairpoint re fire/security/phone lines. We had decided to defer further action because Fairpoint is now on strike but will revisit. Jim will ask Matt to call Fairpoint and explain what needs to be done so we can make a determination sooner rather than later.

NEW BUSINESS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

Old Home Day

Matt and Kathie covered the combined Heritage Commission and Town Hall Preservation Committee table for the event. Very successful day. Opportunity to talk with a lot of residents about the building, future plans, etc. Good response to photo displays. Also very good merchandise sales.

Funding/Fund Raising

Moose Plate grant has been awarded for \$10,000 for restoration of the tin ceiling. Accepted by Council 8/27/14. We had been awaiting official publicity pending approval by the Governor and Council. Kathie was recently advised, however, that the Governor and Council no longer have to do approval for grants under \$25,000, so we can go ahead and do a press release.

F/y/i, Heritage Commission merchandise is no longer at Robie's. Refer people to Clerk's Office or Kathie.

Donations for acceptance at next council meeting: Heritage Commission – \$238 – proceeds from sales of initial order of Cat's Meow Mt St Mary's collectible; Kathie Northrup – \$190 – donation from sales of old town hall preservation t-shirts. Another \$250 in t-shirt sales is due from a vendor. Balance in account now: \$2,996

PRIOR DISCUSSION: Question re reinvestment of proceeds from sale of scrap materials. Katie found it's not permissible to transfer those funds in that manner, even with permission of council. Finance advised, however, that a warrant article could be fashioned which would allow it. --We'll include this in future discussions about funding.

Deconstruction

No progress.

Engineering

Kathie contacted engineer about our question re ceiling/blown-in insulation at 8/4/14 meeting. Answer received 10/6; emailed to members 10/8.

We had the insulation removed in one location to review the member sizes during our evaluation. The framing appeared to be in sound condition and adequate to support the load of the ceiling and insulation. We did not perform a comprehensive review of each member and connection as it is not practical to do so because of the amount of removal/demolition that would be required. Nevertheless, the framing appears to be sound and is currently independently supporting the ceiling and insulation in some of the larger rooms on the second floor. Just to be careful, we suggest that the ceiling be monitored during and after the removal of walls below for any sagging or signs of distress as a precautionary measure. If any issues are seen during demolition/construction then they should be addressed.

Architect

Purchase order was signed on 9/29/14. Architects and cost estimator (M. Bruss) visited the building on October 2, 2014.

First invoice for the period 9/15/14-10/12/14 was approved for \$4,248.10.

Kathie distributed to members copies of Q&A by Leo and UKA before Leo signed the requisition.

Kathie questioned whether "Agreement" contained in proposal had been signed or needed to be. Katie will follow up with Dean.

ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Kathie, contact tin ceiling contractors
2. Jim, follow up re Fairpoint
3. Members comment on plans
4. Kathie, PR re Moose Plate
5. Katie, follow up signing of "agreement"

Meeting adjourned 3 p.m.

Kathleen Northrup, Chair
November 16, 2014

NEXT MEETING - PENDING DATE AND TIME



MEETING MINUTES

14102.02-151.002

ATTENDING

Kathie Northrup - **Town Hall Preservation Committee**
Jim Sullivan - **Council Rep**
Leo Lessard - DPW Director
Katie Rosengren - Town of Hooksett
Chris Kennedy - UK Architects
Adam Lornitzo - UK Architects
Michael Bruss - UK Architects

DISTRIBUTE TO

Attendees

PROJECT

Hooksett Old Town Hall

DATE

11.03.2014

PURPOSE

The purpose of this meeting is to review the existing conditions of the Hooksett Old Town Hall building, review the programmatic requirements, and establish what will be required for the schematic design.

MTG/IT	ACTION	ITEM
001.001	Review of Existing Conditions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was determined that the front wall of the stage bisected the windows at the vertical mullion. This is corroborated by the location of the transition in the tin ceiling and its alignment with the windows based off of photos provided by the Town Hall Preservation Committee. 2. The exterior windows had rounded arches and were changed to windows with a lower spring height of the arch sometime around 1900.
001.002	General Design	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design Option A maintains the exterior envelope of both the original structure and the 1937 addition. 2. Handicap accessibility to the stage is preferred to be by lift as this saves space as compared to a ramp. 3. It was presumed by the Heritage Commission that the original balcony was closed based off of an oral report from a librarian open with a railing. An open balcony with a railing This would be the preferred arrangement for functional purposes as it would allow the balcony to function as a sound/lighting booth for musical and drama presentations. 4. The Town Hall Preservation Committee Heritage Commission is willing to entertain relocating the existing basement access to clean up the back of the building.



5. When considering occupancy in the Main Hall to be concentrated chairs (7 SF/person) the occupant load for the building is 255 persons, which requires 1.012 toilets per sex (code requires this to round up to 2 toilets per sex). This calculation is probably excessive for the intended use of the space, however building capacity would have to be limited to 250 persons. When considering occupancy in the Main Hall to be standing room only (5SF/Person) the occupant load required 2 toilets per sex. If there is never intended to be more than 250 persons in the building one toilet per sex is acceptable by code. The **Town Hall Preservation Committee Heritage Commission** may want to consider double occupancy restrooms to meet demand during larger events, however it wouldn't be a requirement. Budget numbers will be provided to determine an increase in cost for double occupancy restrooms in lieu of single occupancy restrooms.

Design
Options

1. Design Option **A** maintains the exterior envelope of both the original structure and the **1937** addition.
 - a. The kitchen is located in the rear of the addition.
 - b. Layout provided for two handicap accessible restrooms, one per gender.
 - c. The stage is flanked by platforms at the stage level.
 - d. Balcony access is provided by a spiral staircase (counterclockwise).
 - e. Existing porch at accessible entrance encroaches on clear floor area required for the entry door. **This may require the existing porch to be re-configured.**
2. Design Option **B** removes the old vault on the addition.
 - a. The kitchen is located near reception at accessible entrance and includes a service window.
 - b. Layout provided for two handicap accessible restrooms, one per gender at the rear of the addition.
 - c. The stage is flanked by platforms; one at stage level and one at finish floor level with an access door. Providing backstage access is not feasible without modifying the original load-bearing masonry structure.
 - d. Balcony access is provided by a spiral staircase (clockwise).
 - e. Existing porch at accessible entrance encroaches on clear floor area required for the entry door. **This may require the existing porch to be re-configured.**
 - f. The roof in this option has been converted to a low-pitch roof to allow the addition of clerestory windows on the south side of the main hall. This adds cost.



3. Design Option C removes the portion of the addition that extends over the original elevation. This option would be the approach if it was a desire to restore the historic character of the original structure.
 - a. The kitchen is located near reception at accessible entrance and includes a service window that includes a partition to screen visibility into the kitchen.
 - b. Layout provided for two handicap accessible restrooms, one per gender at the rear of the addition.
 - c. The stage is flanked by one platform at stage level. Storage is provided on the opposite side at finish floor level.
 - d. Balcony access is provided by a spiral staircase (clockwise).
 - e. The roof in this option has been converted to a low-pitch roof to allow the addition of clerestory windows on the south side of the main hall. This adds cost.
 - f. Reducing the size of the addition adds cost and reduces storage space.

Concept
Pricing

1. Cost analysis will be provided based off of the final scheme that the **Town Hall Preservation Committee** ~~Heritage Commission~~ chooses to pursue.
2. Pricing analysis will include breakdown of cost for items to allow project phasing and value consideration by the **Town Hall Preservation Committee** ~~Heritage Commission~~.
3. Concept design and concept pricing needs to be ready for submission for town hall meeting by early January.

Schedule

1. This project is currently on week 5 of the schedule outlined in the proposal.
2. Final concept design and pricing is intended to be complete by mid-December.

Issued by Adam Lornitzo, UK Architects

*** END OF MEETING MINUTES ***

These minutes are intended to be a fair and accurate summary of the items discussed. If this is not your complete understanding of what we discussed, please contact this office within seven days as no response shall indicate compliance.

Thank you.