AUG 2 1 2002

NORTH COVE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING- AUGUST 19, 2002

The Special Meeting of the North Cove Historic District Commission was called to order at 3:10pm on Monday, August 19, 2002 at the Pashbeshauke Pavilion by chairman Janet Foisie. Chairman Foisie noted that the meeting was not a public hearing and that those attending would not be allowed to speak. Commissioners present were Janet Foisie, Chairman, Donna D. DiBella, Clerk, Robert Welsh, and Patricia Osborne, Alternate. Attorneys present were Michael Cronin and William Childress representing the applicant. The minutes of the previous Special Meeting of July 30, 2002 were read and accepted.

At the opening of the meeting, Arty. Cronin handed out the Structural Condition Assessment Survey and Report prepared by Gibble Norden Champion Brown Consulting Engineers, Inc of Old Saybrook. He noted that the report had just been delivered to town hall at 12:30pm on August 19. At the July 30, 2002 meeting, the Commission requested that the report be back in their hands on or before August 15 to give them time to study the findings. Jim Norden from the above noted firm, who performed the structural review was introduced by Chairman Foisie and summarized his report to the Commission. He stated that the Tully House was in generally sound condition considering its age and location. He stated that nine eight percent of the framing is usable. He feels for a "reasonable effort" or dollar amount the owner can bring the home back to a safe and usable property. He worked from the bottom up and his view was not impaired since much of the interior was removed. Some damage from powder posts beetle and termite was discovered. Most termite damage was in the South West portion of the home and the Eastern corner post had been replaced perhaps from termite damage. He could not determine if termites were still active. His plan would be to sister the rafters and beams where necessary. He feels all restoration work can be done from the inside. A question and answer period followed. How much of an original home needs to remain in order to deem it restored? What is a reasonable amount of money to place on this restoration? How long would a project like this take? These last two questions were specifically asked to be included in the report however Mr. Norden did not include these two requests since his firm does not estimate projects such as this. Contrasting results between the previous structural engineer's report and the Old Saybrook Town Planner, Don Lucas' walk through vs. Mr. Norden's results were puzzling and noted by Commissioners DiBella and Osborne. Mr. Norden stated that he could justify 1.3 or 1.4 million-dollar project from a personal standpoint but perhaps not from an economic standpoint. He explained the difference between preservation and restoration. The latter being one step below totally preserving a home. He recommends underpinning to stabilize and a plan for restoration in place. According to him, very little dismantling has to take place. Much of the finishes have already been removed. Finishes being interior walls, ceilings or plaster.

Atty. Cronin spoke to "reasonable" amount. Concern was noted by Commissioner Osborne for future sales in North Cove in that the expectation would be exorbitant when restoring other old homes. She feels this may discourage any future potential homebuyers. Commissioner Welsh suggested giving the applicant tax abatement while he restores the existing house should the demolition not be voted for. This will help give the homeowner some monetary compensation for his trouble in restoring the home. The Connecticut State statute noted by Commissioner Welsh is 711 section 6.2. Atty. Cronin stated he would look into that if the Commission vote were such that it denied the demolition permit.

The vote was taken. Commissioner Welsh voted not to accept the certificate of appropriateness for demolition and new construction. His reason cited was the report from James Norden, P.E. Commissioner DiBella voted yes to accept the certificate of appropriateness for demolition and new construction. Commissioner Osborne voted yes to accept the certificate of appropriateness for demolition and new construction. Chairman Foisie voted yes to accept the certificate of appropriateness for demolition and new

applicant had waited long enough and based on the information received she made her decision. She stated that she looks forward to the applicant moving into the neighborhood. Commissioner DiBella stated that Mr. Manafort had been nothing but patient and willing to work with the Commission from the get go. He deserves a chance to retain what he has stated he can retain. Despite spending \$800,000 for a few items, he has held steadfast. Commissioner Osborne concurred and she stated again that reasonableness must prevail and the report presented today did not help her define that.

Atty. Cronin was asked about the ninety-day demolition period. He had stated that had today's report come in concurring with the previous structural engineer and building inspector's report, he would recommend to the Commission that the ninety days be waved. Since it did not, he would contact the State Historical Commission and share the Norden report with Jack Shannahan. Whatever the State Historical Commission may suggest, they must work with the homeowner. He agreed to do this on behalf of the Commission. The meeting was adjourned at 4:25pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Donna D. DiBella, Clerk

Donna D. Di Bella