



HISTORICAL COMMISSION

**Orleans Historical Commission
Town Hall, 19 School Road, Orleans, MA 02653
Minutes
January 11, 2023, 4:30PM
Skaket Room/Hybrid Virtual**

ORLEANS TOWN CLERK

Janet Higgins
'23 MAY 15 9:18 AM

Present: Ron Petersen, Joan Nix, Charles Ellis, Edmund Marcarelli, Charles Ellis

Present electronically: Eric Dray (part-time) Preservation consultant

Also present: Andrea Read of the Select Board and Ned Collier from ICON Architecture were present for the Old Firehouse Rehabilitation project.

Brian Sosner, President of Veterans' Memorial Park at Academy Place Inc.; Russ Kleekamp, GHD, consultant advancing conceptual design to final design; and Kevin Higgins were present for the Veterans Park CPC discussions.

Absent: Bill Wibel, John Harter, Kelly Clifford (student liaison)

Ron Petersen called the meeting to order at 3:43 pm.

1. Public Comment

None

2. CPC application for the Old Firehouse Rehabilitation

Ms. Read and Mr. Collier presented. Mr. Collier made a PowerPoint presentation including proposed changes to the Old Firehouse plans and elevations beyond the drawings that the Commission had received. He explained that he'd received Mr. Dray's review of the CPC application, dated 12-13-22 and his addendum dated 1-9-2023. Mr. Collier had also received the comments from the Select Board memo dated 1-3-2023, addressed to the CPC and the Orleans Historical Commission. Based upon a review of all these, he described how the plans presented on this day showed changes from all the previously submitted drawings. These were:

- Alterations of the Theresa's Way side elevation to return that side to the window/door arrangement that seems to have been original to the ambulance bay end of the side.
- The cedar siding would not be painted.

In his presentation, he showed slides of other 1920s era fire stations with swinging carriage type doors. The original doors on the 1926 side of the Orleans firehouse may have had doors similar to these. By 1946/7, the doors were overhead wood doors. He explained that it was appropriate to return the doors to the doors for which documentary evidence exists.

The Historical Commission members and the applicants had long discussions. Items of discussion included:



HISTORICAL COMMISSION

- a. Local historians - Ms. Nix asked who were the local historians referred to in the Select Board memo. Ms. Read stated that she couldn't give exact names, but she'd found a book by a local historian and had talked to Bonnie Snow.
- b. Drawing dates and revisions – Mr. Ellis and Ms. Nix expressed that it was difficult to follow what was being proposed when so many drawings had been issued, including multiple versions with the same dates like (minutes had “link”) two different sets of drawings dated 3-11-22 and three sets dated 11-8-22. Mr. Collier didn't know why the Commission had received so many sets.
- c. Windows - Request of Ms. Nix for details of the double hung windows, including the dimensions and profiles of the sills, the muntins, and the check rail. Mr. Dray said a sample should be provided. Ms. Nix noted that a similar request for details had been made by the Commission in the application considered in March of 2022.
- d. Garage doors (the single wide ambulance bay door and the double wide fire station door) – The drawings were missing most dimensions, but based upon the drawings presented, the doors did not match the profile of the 1946 era wood doors. Mr. Dray and Ms. Nix concurred that the doors did not need to function in the same way as the 1946-era doors, but needed to look as similar as possible. Ms. Nix found aluminum acceptable; Mr. Dray asked why wood was rejected. His argument was based upon SOI Standard 6 that describes that the materials should be matched when possible. Ms. Nix and Mr. Dray concurred that the profile of the doors should match what was original, and that if aluminum is used instead of wood, that the shape of the profiles recall the original door. Mr. Dray requested a convincing argument for non-wood doors. Ms. Nix pointed out that the door as drawn has a contemporary 90 degree shape vs. an angled cove or putty molding shape. Mr. Collier said that the “debate continues” on the doors. Discussion of the function of the doors ensued; perhaps the single wide door should also be an operable door similar to the wide door so that both doors in the open position would recall the old doors they replace. Mr. Dray stated a sample of the doors should be provided in addition to details and dimensions. Mr. Collier said it would be difficult to get a sample quickly.
- e. Sign – Ms. Nix asked why the sign was only shown in the Main Street elevation, and not in the other elevations and why it was not detailed. She asked if it is in the project or not, as the memo from the Select Board included this:

“The Select Board and the Fire Chief will have to determine if there would be any confusion to the public by placing this wording on the sign at this location.”

Mr. Collier said that he didn't have an explanation for why the sign was not detailed. He said that the sign is included in the project, and that his firm was having difficulty finding a font that matched what was shown on photos. Ms. Read stated that sometimes people bring a heart attack victim to the fire station and that the sign needs to not confuse people. She said that more discussion with the Select Board and Fire Chief needs to happen to determine how to eliminate confusion with the sign. Mr. Marcarelli stated that he sympathizes with the worry about confusing the public. Mr.



HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Dray said that there are other instances of buildings maintaining their original name even when the function has changed.

- f. Painted cedar shingles – Ms. Nix asked whether the shingles were to be painted as shown on details 1 and 2 on sheet A-803, received 12/29/22 by the Commission, but with an issue date of 11/8/22. Mr. Collier explained that the revised drawing was in error and the siding was not to be painted, as the period of significance for the firehouse did not include the time when it was painted white.
- g. Window layout along Theresa’s Way and the space allocated within the original ambulance bay – The early photos clearly show a long narrow open ambulance bay with double hung windows and a door along the Theresa’s Way side. Mr. Dray’s memo determined that the interior space of the ambulance bay and the fire truck bay were both significant. Therefore, the renovations should maintain, to the degree possible, a way to perceive the space that was the ambulance bay as one space. Mr. Collier suggested either demountable partitions or partitions that were not full height. Ms. Nix said that any way that would allow the space to be perceived as one long space would be acceptable.
- h. Changes/ alterations during construction as demolition proceeds – Mr. Ellis said that he’d noticed that certain parts of the project – like the original size of the double hung windows and the garage doors – were to be altered from the drawings based upon the revealed original conditions during construction. As such, the drawings should have some sort of explanation of this.

A long discussion followed on the next steps. Mr. Collier needed some time to alter the drawings and solicit samples. Mr. Ellis thought that the deadline for a recommendation from the Commission to the CPC was likely early to mid-February, but he needed to check with the CPC. It was decided that the next Commission meeting on January 18, 2023 would not discuss the Old Firehouse, but review other CPC applications. A future meeting would review the project again.

3. CPC Application for renovations and upgrades to Veterans Memorial Park

Mr. Ellis provided the applicants with the memo from Mr. Michael Ford, Town Attorney, and explained that the memo said, in part, that the town should be the applicant and not the 501c group.

Mr. Sosner presented. Mr. Ellis explained that the application checked both recreation and historic preservation categories. He asked that it be split into what was recreation and what was historic preservation. Mr. Sosner explained that conceptually, recreation and historic preservation would bring the significance of the site and the monuments together, like the proposed new display about the War of 1812. He also explained that the Korean and Vietnam War monument includes four bronze plaques set in brick wall. The brick wall is failing. He explained that the Vietnam War veterans were simply added to an existing monument and that they deserve and desire a separate monument.



HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Mr. Dray noted that the Commission needs to determine if the whole park is significant and if so, define what are the character-defining features are. Any alterations would then be assessed in terms of their impact on the site. If the monuments are historically significant (three have Form Cs), then the work to those monuments needs to comply with the SOI Standards.

The Historical Commission asked the applicants to return to the next OHC meeting with information specifying which parts of the project were historic preservation and which were recreation.

4. Review/Approve minutes

Ms. Nix moved that the minutes of Nov. 30, 2022 be approved. Mr. Marcarelli seconded. Vote of 4-0-0 to approve.

Mr. Marcarelli moved that the minutes of Dec. 14, 2022 be approved. Ms. Nix seconded. Vote 4-0-0 to approve.

Ms. Nix moved the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Petersen seconded. Vote 4-0-0 to adjourn.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:55.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joan Nix, acting as clerk