

PETERBOROUGH HERITAGE COMMISSION

The Heritage Commission's mission is to identify, preserve and protect the architectural, historical, cultural, and social heritage, including historical landscapes, view sheds, building in their landscapes, the natural resources and the ecological diversity formed by the rivers, valley, and mountains, in order to sustain the spirit of the community and its economic vitality, for the benefit of future generations.

The commission proposes to do this by educating the public, working with private citizens, other local boards and committees, state agencies, assembling an inventory of those resources, for the proper recognition, use and protection of these special historical features to achieve our goals.

Minutes of meeting, August 11, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 pm

In Attendance: Sheila Kirkpatrick (chair), Duffy Monahon, Debby Kaiser, Dick Estes, Mose Olenik, David Simpson

1. The minutes of the July 1st meeting accepted as corrected.

2. GAR Building: conditions for easement

Duffy reported that there have been many interested in the building for use as a residence and one who would use it as an office. We do not have the details but should be proactive in setting down our recommendations for criteria for the preservation easement before any concrete steps are taken. She will obtain the text of the easement terms provided by Rick to Rodney and ask for the boilerplate easement text of the Preservation Alliance. The group discussed elements to be protected.

Exterior: We felt that Liz Thomas' suggestion to move the cannons and monument were ill advised: they have been a part of the structure as a whole for almost 100 years, since Mrs. Cheney first created the Legion Post and should be considered as a single unit of our heritage if possible. We would like to have any future landscaping reflect the historic aspect (no big hedges etc.) A potential driveway easement should be defined along the southern side of the house and be constructed appropriately (reusing old stones, maintain railing). The three exterior facades and tower should be protected (paint color for trim, the windows and doors should have the same panes...)

Interior: the configuration could be changed but if the town rents the building the bathrooms, kitchen and lift should be retained to protect the town's investment for later uses or sale. Duffy explained her concerns that the proper insulation and heating be chosen, because some options would be detrimental to the historic substance.

3. Frye House: incremental demolition problems

Sheila reported on her walk about the property with Dario Carrera and Peter Gosline and posed the question just when a demolition permit is required (are windows internal? No, part of the façade) and why the hospital has allowed the previous owners to begin this incremental demolition. Duffy has written a letter to Peter Gosline outlining our arguments.

4. Grove St. Barn Demolition-

Peg Shaunessey contacted Duffy recently asking for help to find a way to save the barn. She said that Heather Peterson believes that the barn problem is the reason the house has

not been sold. We sited statistics of the many homes for sale in Peterborough at the moment and theorized that the barn and difficulties in obtaining a mortgage is clearly not the only obstacle. Moreover, the permit has already been issued, so future buyers would have options. Duffy suggested that Peg talk directly to the bank about a future owner's possibility of taking a construction loan to stabilize the structure before the mortgage is finalized.

5. Civil War Book Gift

We would like to use Muffy Ames's family history of the Civil War (currently in loose-leaf binder at the library) to self-publish nicer bound copies to be given to the high school, etc. David S. inquired about the cost of professional binding and was told that it would be quite expensive per copy and that we must be sure that parts of that text are not under copyright. David will consult with Brian at the library. Duffy offered to either scan in or digitally photograph each page, so that we could have them informally bound.

5. Bridge Demolition update

We reviewed our impressions and facts gleaned at the meeting in Concord and concluded that the Federal Highway people are primarily interested in expediting the flow of traffic along 202 through town. This is already insured since they have priority. Blockages due to left turning vehicles could be solved by a turning lane just as well as a roundabout without encroaching on historic properties. Our own traffic counts at the bridge intersection have shown that there is little delay for traffic leaving town, even during peak traffic hours. The question is: who will they believe, the actual observations or the computer projections based on a couple of samplings?

It is our view that the 101/202 intersection functions so smoothly that the detour imposed should the bridge be closed down entirely for the duration of construction (thus allowing for absolutely smooth flow of traffic on 202 while reducing costs and opening options for a more historically appropriate bridge—with out the useless apron) would lead to greater ease and speed in getting into downtown. A creative and concentrated campaign to "market" the detour as a way of showing our respect for the historic town center as an invaluable asset (also in terms of \$) and solidarity with our local merchants must be planned. We should put our efforts into concentrating on the parking issues arising from staging the construction site and the 40by 40 by 40 gaping hole right in front of the library. We have almost 500 signatures on the roundabout and should plan some newsworthy activities to demonstrate dramatically and plastically what the roundabout and the construction phase would look like.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05.

The next meeting will be on September 5th at 5pm

dsk/