

**Town of Southborough, MA  
Meeting of the Community Preservation Committee  
Remote Meeting via Zoom Conference Call  
December 22, 2022  
7:00 PM**

Committee Members in Attendance: Andrew Mills (Chair), Benjamin Smith (Vice-Chair), Mark Murphy, David Joyner, Kristin LaVault  
Committee Members Absent: Anne Pfaff  
Non-Committee in Attendance: Freddie Gillespie (CPC Consultant), Lynn Spencer (Architect, Spencer Preservation Group), John Parent (Facilities Manager, Kevin Miller (Chair, Southborough Historical Commission)

---

A. Mills (Chair) read aloud the following statement:

*Pursuant to Chapter 20 of Acts of 2021, An Act Relative to Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency, signed into law on June 16, 2021, this meeting will be conducted via remote participation. No in person attendance by members of the public will be permitted.*

Andrew Mills (Chair) opened the meeting at 7:24 PM  
Quorum present

**Change of Scope to Original Project for the Southborough Town House Restoration**

A Mills explained that John Parent and Lynn Spencer are submitting an augmented scope of the Southborough Town House Restoration Project. Instead of replacing the existing windows they would like to restore the windows that are presently there. Due to the anticipated estimate costs that are coming in, this would be more palatable if we were to restore the windows as opposed to replacing them.

A Mills turned the meeting over to Lynn Spencer and John Parent.

L. Spencer explained that she started the work on the Town House in 2019 with an exterior condition assessment which was published in the beginning of 2020. As part of this assessment, they worked closely with John Parent and his team to look at exterior masonry, roofing, and windows and the architectural woodwork associated with it. Town employees expressed the necessity of having functional windows. With this requirement in mind, they looked into what it meant to replicate new windows versus restoring the old windows. She has recently discovered through working on the Easton town offices that window restoration can result in functionality and can retain historic fabric. Historic value is a strong desire by both the Historical Commission and Community Preservation. Another project in Boston required windows to be replaced. The cost was twice what had been budgeted for in 2020. Costs are escalating due to material shortages and labor challenges. It will be more cost effective to restore the Town House windows and provide them with a suitable storm window. The added benefit is retaining the historic fabric of the current windows. She believes that the project was written broadly enough that a return to town meeting will not be required for approval but felt compelled to return to the CPC to explain why they are making this request. L. Spencer asked if there were any

questions. She pointed out that the Southborough Public Library is a good example of a low profile storm window. These panels can be changed out from the interior and a screen panel can be installed.

*A Mills asked J. Parent if the Selectmen have been approached regarding this option?* J. Parent has not asked for an opinion from the Selectmen. Not something they would normally do.

*D. Joyner asked why the replacement was chosen originally as opposed to restoration?* There was a real concern about functionality for natural ventilation. The thought was the original windows were big and heavy. These are weighted windows and will require a skilled craftsman. The weights will most likely need to be changed as in the case of another project. The lifting mechanisms will be refurbished so they will move more easily. J. Parent added that he wants to make sure that these windows will be protected once they are refurbished and that's where the low-profile storm windows come in.

Benjamin Smith thinks this will be a win for the Town. Massachusetts Historical strongly encourages preservation of windows. They have a protocol for this type of thing. Having good functionality and energy efficiency with the storm windows is great news.

*Kristin LaVault asked if there is a longevity to future costs in restoration versus replacement?* L. Spencer said that the paint coating will need to be maintained. The storm panel will help protect the window and the paint coating. No real significant difference between the two options in regards to a maintenance aspect.

Freddie Gillespie emailed photos of the windows sent by J. Parent. She took a few photos as well. She is impressed by what she saw.

*M. Murphy asked if the useful life of the windows is appreciably different than replacing them?* L. Spencer explained that these are 100-year-old windows. They can be repaired. A new window would require thermal glazing and this can often get moisture in it and the glazing would need replacement.

*He asked if it is possible that more problems will be discovered once you begin to remove the windows for restorative work?* L. Spencer said that it is possible but they will be doing a window by window assessment of elements that have to be restored or fixed. In her recent large window projects she has not seen unforeseen problems. They did test the windows for hazardous materials. There is no asbestos in the glazing but there is lead paint which the contractor will be required to adhere to lead paint practices. There is a bit of asbestos in the area where the wood meets the masonry which will need to be properly abated. This has already been taken into account.

*B. Smith wanted to know if facilities will be able to keep on top the maintenance of the windows through the years?* J. Parent would like to pay for good paint up front. He will probably put in a capital plan for next year.

A Mills asked if there were any further questions from the Committee. As there were none, he opened questions from the gallery.

A Mills asked if Kevin Miller (Chair, Historical Commission) would speak as a representative from the Historical Commission.

K. Miller had heard from Anne Pfaff (CPC Historical Commission representative). She alerted him to some concerns about this project. He's been on the Historical Commission for the last year and a half as Chair. This is the first that he has heard of this project and is playing catch up. As the Historical Commission has not had a meeting on this, he is speaking on his own behalf this evening. His committee next meets on January 5<sup>th</sup>. He would like to hear what the cost will be. He doesn't think putting storm windows on is a very attractive or appealing solution. He also has concerns regarding functionality for the people who work in the Town House. He thinks the replacement with mahogany double paned window would be easier to open and close. No one will be opening these refabricated windows on a warm day in March. He noticed that the library's windows have some screens in and some storm windows. Also, storm windows tend to get very dirty as are the library windows. He projects there to be cleaning issues and swapping out the windows could be an issue.

L. Spencer said the cost differential works out to about \$300,000. J. Parent mentioned that opening the windows will be about the same as replacing them. If they are properly weighted, they will be easy to open. The replacement of the storm windows to put in screens would be done once a year. There shouldn't be any difference in operating the refurbished windows. L. Spencer also pointed out that a mahogany double-glazed window is going to be heavier than the current windows with single glazing. There will be more challenges with weighting the new windows. They've done a lot of window restorations and replacements. Costs have increased a lot and there is a good justification to retain the original windows. She suggested committee members from the CPC and Historical Commission visit the Easton project. There are around 80 windows that have just been restored. It used to be a private mansion and is now the town offices.

A Mills was not an advocate of replacing the windows at the beginning of this project. He suggests that if the CPC votes to restore the windows, then this change of scope should be added to the MOU. The MOU will state the windows will be restored and operable by people in the building who are of normal size and ability. Wants to make sure it won't require a maintenance person to go around and open the windows. J. Parent agreed to this addition to the MOU.

A Mills is in favor of restoring the windows as the windows are the soul of the building and should be preserved. The windows are approximately 30 percent of the building and restoring them will benefit the look of the building.

A Mills asked for a motion to approve restore the windows.

*Motion by B. Smith to approve the change order request as discussed with an updated MOU. M. Murphy seconded with the understanding that this is approximately a \$300,000 differential.*

*Vote: David Joyner - Yes, Benjamin Smith - Yes, Mark Murphy - Yes, Andrew Mills - Yes Kristin LaVault dropped from the meeting. Committee waited to continue the vote until she came back on-line.*

K. Miller is confused why rehabbing the original windows and putting on storm windows is a better solution than what was originally spec'd. He would like to see hard numbers. He is concerned that people can't open the windows when the storm windows are in. J. Parent explained that down at the South Union building they did a window restoration and it was done a different way that J. Parent did not like. This is why he originally pushed to replace the Town House windows. Mahogany was spec'd out because today's pine is not like old growth pine. Would need to go to mahogany to get something as strong as what is currently there. Now that he has seen what the library looks like with attractive storm windows and how well they work along with the cost it is a good thing to change course and

retain the original windows in a CPC funded historic restoration. This is a win win for the Town and the historic integrity of the building. It's also good that the employees won't be able to open the windows during the time of year when we don't want them to. If the heat is still on the windows should not be opened randomly. L. Spencer also pointed out that the contractors are capable of doing this project that includes window restoration and other elements.

K. LaVault returned to the meeting. She asked about clarification about opening the windows. She doesn't think opening the windows is an important factor. J. Parent agrees that nothing beats fresh air and saves the town from using air conditioning. This is one of the goals to have windows that open.

K. Miller said that the Historical Commission isn't advocating anything right now or taking a position this evening. As Chair of the Historical Commission, he is only speaking for himself. He thanked J. Parent and L. Spencer for their clarifications.

F. Gillespie clarified for Kevin Miller that J. Parent came to the last CPC meeting greatly concerned that they would not make budget for what was approved at town meeting. The CPC approved adding a warrant article for this year's town meeting if needed when it goes out to bid if it comes in too high with no guarantee there would be funds in the CPA account or that the CPC would vote to do so but they were willing to put a place holder in case if was necessary after it went out to bid. J. Parent came to the CPC with great concern over how high the bid was going to come in compared to what they came up with in the application well over a year ago. This was one of the concerns that assisted the CPC with the cost lowering situation. Also, during the CPC review of it they along with the Historical Representative at the time wanted to preserve the windows.

A Mills asked to retake a vote on the previous motion before the Committee.

*Motion by Benjamin Smith to approve the change order request as discussed, this evening. Seconded by Benjamin Smith*

*Vote: Kristin LaVault – Yes, Mark Murphy - Yes, Benjamin Smith – Yes, David Joyner – Yes, Andrew Mills – Yes*

*Motion approved: 5 yeas*

A Mills will work with J. Parent on the new MOU.

A Mills thanked everyone for attending this evening.

Minutes tabled to next meeting.

*Motion by Benjamin Smith to adjourn. Seconded by David Joyner*

*Vote: Kristin LaVault - Yes, Mark Murphy - Yes, Benjamin Smith - Yes, David Joyner - Yes, Andrew Mills – Yes*

*Motion approved: 5 yeas*

Meeting Adjourned