

New Hope Borough

July 6, 2021

Workshop minutes

Council President Gering called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

Present: Council Members, Connie Gering, Dan Dougherty, Tina Rettig, Laurie McHugh, Louise Feder, Peter Meyer, Ken Maisel. Also present were Mayor Keller, Michele Fountain, Borough Engineer, Borough Manager Peter Gray, Chief Cummings.

Ms. Gering – Welcome Everybody. I would like to call the meeting to order. This is a work session, so there's no business being voted on. It is to hear public comment and discussion from Council. First on the agenda is the Citra Mansion.

Discussion on the 2016 General Obligation Bond

Ms. Gering – This is a little change in the discussion. Our Chair of the Finance Committee has to leave, so Peter, we're going to have the discussion of the Bond first, so if we could put that presentation on. Mr. Dougherty – First of all, I just want to thank Pete Gray and the members of the Finance Committee who looked at our existing bond debt and saw some opportunities and his staff have come forth with a great presentation and without further ado, Mr. Gray – Thank you very much. Discussion on the 2016 General Obligation Bond. With us today, representing First National Bank, is Connie Furman and Bucky Closser from Curtin and Heefner to present the proposal. Mr. Closser - I'm from Curtin and Heefner. We submitted a proposal to serve as Bond Council on this refinancing and debt modification on the 2016 bond. We are certainly happy to answer any questions on the proposal or my experience on the matter, start to finish and I will leave at that and let Connie introduce herself. Ms. Furman - Hi, I'm Connie Furman from First National Bank and we currently have held the bond since 2016 and Pete had contacted us about our current rate and we were actually able modify the rate down to 1.4% over a five year period and then it would amortize out from there so, it is pretty much a straight issue. After the 5 years it would adjust to 65% of prime and then a maximum of 3.75%. Ms. Gering – Any questions from Council? Mr. Dougherty – Council has a presentation that they've had a chance to review. I think the part that really is part of the modification process is the current existing debt of 1.77 million, roughly, had been 2.5 million. It was also the recommendation of staff that part of an additional principal payment, be made against that 1.77 million of outstanding debt, simultaneous with the modification, the refinance and modification. The rationale is it would bring the 1.77 million down to approximately 1.2. The rationale behind that, is that we had received a, through, a sale or lease of the cell tower, we received a payment of approximately \$550,000, which is basically an acceleration on future rents that we have been receiving, because the Finance Committee asked the staff to evaluate the best way to put to use some of that, I don't want to call it windfall, but some of that accelerated income because after all the accelerated income does have with it the rent for those 20 years would now no longer be coming in. So, we used some of that, plus some other monies that have been coming in, so they came back with the recommendation that we simultaneously reduce the debt. Also reduce the interest rate, and also accelerate the payoff period. Currently, the existing bond has 13 years on it. The new bond would have 9. So it's a lower rate base, accelerated payment, much quicker payoff and with very, very few, very little money spent on the front end with regard to fees and all that. So it pretty much, Council has, I think the second page here, it sort of tells the story, so that's were, I don't think I am speaking for the Finance Committee, but the Finance Committee doesn't deliberate, it you will, this is something that I feel strongly about to get a lower rate, tightening up, the Borough's books, reducing the amount of debt outstanding and also having the debt paid off much earlier than what would happen under the previous bond. So, the next steps are at the next meeting we have to make a decision we have is to hire a Bond Counsel and then, in August we have to advertise to say that we're doing this and then September we have to approve the Ordinance, by which the new smaller bond, smaller, shorter duration bond would be adopted and then, sometime in October we would "retire" I guess would be the

right word and then the new bond would start. That's the soup to nuts. Mayor Keller - So, Connie can I ask a question? Ms. Gering - oh absolutely, go ahead. Mayor Keller - So Connie, would the adjustment in the basis points that you provided to us, mean that there would be no fee from your end for us changing this loan and modifying down, from the First National point of view. Ms. Furman - No. We don't have a fee for the modification or refinance. The only fee is for our counsel to have the documents that are done. Mayor Keller - For five years fixed? Ms. Furman - for five years fixed. Mayor Keller - And the last 4 years, that is our exposure, if prime went north. Ms. Furman - yes. Mayor Keller - hopefully, we will have 5 years worth of knocking this down. Ms. Furman - well, that's the amortization is staying with the current amortization. The current amortization matches the proposal, so that is what is being offered. Mayor Keller - that is all I have. Mr. Dougherty - the current bond is fixed to 2026 as well. This will also go to 2026 and the maximum will have a rate that is lower than the current bond's maximum. So our exposure, based on prevailing rates and all else equal, net of the very minor expenses related to the fees would be attorney's fees and what not, and the issuance and advertising, expect that to be \$18,000 worth. Netting that out of our savings it would expect us to save approximately, just under \$200,00, so it's a significant savings for us. Ms. Gering - Any other questions? Mr. Maisel - is there a prepayment penalty? Ms. Furman - no. Ms. Gering - Any questions from Council? Any questions from the Public? Thank you.

Discussion on Cintra Mansion, 181 West Bridge Street

Ms. Gering - Ok, next is the Citra Mansion. Thank you for being patient. If you want to give your presentation? Mr. Hillier - My name is Bob Hillier and I am the owner of the Citra property and we are planning to build 29 units there and I don't know anything about My name is Bob Hillier, I'm an architect. I've been in practice for more years than I'm willing to admit and I love what I do. We've owned the property Cintra that is directly across from the high school. And we are hoping to build 29 condominiums, some of them townhouses, some are flats. And we are here today to talk about is the Mansion, itself. And, so, what I'd like to do is take you briefly through the project so you can understand the scope and the character, then talk about the Mansion. We have Steve Krumenacker, who is a historic and engineer, who is an expert in historic structures and he's going to talk about the condition of the building and how it got to be that way. So, what we'll start with is just a brief overview of the overall project. Before I get into the project, itself, this is not a commercial, but it is to show you our expertise in projects that we've done, historically. We completely renovated the interior of the Supreme Court building. It took us ten years to do it. It was finished about five years ago. (That's the interior. That's the Library where all the justices do their work for you.) And the next slide is the Virginia State Capitol. This is a building that Thomas Jefferson did. The Governor and the government decided that there wasn't enough storage space and so they built this beautiful temple on top of a brick basement and, when Jefferson came back, he insisted they build a hill to hide that basement. And so, we were then hired to remove the hill and build whole comfort center, museum and convention space underneath it and restore the entire State Capitol. And so, this is what it looks like today and the next slide shows you the new entrance that we did, so people don't have to climb that hill, they can go into this entrance, which is the street level. And, on the right is a legislative chamber and this is where the movie Lincoln was filmed. This is, speaking of Lincoln, the Lincoln summer cottage, which we are also restoring. It is just outside of Arlington, a horseback ride, basically. And this is a building in Princeton, designed by Stafford White, who is a very famous architectural firm. And this building is where the President of Princeton and it was moved from the campus to Prospect Street, where a club and then decided to build their own clubhouse and it got moved, again, to Nassau Street. And though, you may not be able to see it that well, if you look at the window where the stairwell was and on the next slide here, you'll see our illustration of it. We went back to the original Stafford drawings and actually found a drawing for that window and put that window into the property. It cost us \$9,000. The other thing that is interesting is that the columns were all wood holding up the porch over here and the portico to the right and those are cast aluminum columns that absolutely match the original columns, here. This is the kind of restoration that we've been doing over the years. The next slide, and this is a really the developers long time home and the reason that we moved it on the property, we had to move it 26 feet, was to enable us to build twelve townhouses. The next slide is the old auto repair shop that had been in Princeton for about one hundred years and we bought that and put in sixteen condominiums in to it. And the next slide shows you the smaller garages that were there and on the side of the building and there's sixteen units in this whole complex. And this is the first school in America to be integrated. It was a noted as the Witherspoon School for Colored Children. It was the school built in 1906 and added to it in 1930 and it just became old and obsolete and we bought it and completely restored it by putting 34 condominiums in it and we also got on the National Register as the first school to be integrated in the Country and we, on the next slide you can see the

dormers up on the top of the back of the building, we got permission from the Historic Commission to put those dormers on so that the attic space became two story apartments. What's interesting about this building is that the ceilings are 12 feet which makes them wonderful apartments and the windows were an absolute imitation of the original windows and they were designed from thorofane and that was the biggest contract that we had. Next slide, this is a plaque. It's called the history of the Waxwood. And the reason it's called the Waxwood instead of the First Colored Children's School, is that Waxwood was the principal of the school when desegregation came. And so we did a plaque to explain the whole history of the building and, frankly, we are able to do what we would like to do with the Mansion, we would want to do the same type of thing on the sidewalk. The new sidewalk that goes by in front of the Mansion. Next slide. This is our overall project. As you can see, the Mansion is in the center. There's a ... over to the right, is a barn, which some of you may know is a building, and then to the left of that are two clusters and these clusters will be the townhomes and then there are two little one bedroom houses. One is the old icehouse and the other is the old kitchen. And then, up on the right is a building that has nine apartments in it. Parking is set up so that it's all out in front of the units and they all face out into greenspace and, in agreement with the neighborhood, we put in a 45-foot no disturb bumper along the back property. So all the people behind would be undisturbed by the project. The next slide is cluster one, which is a set townhouses and what we've done here is the residents in these basically articulated them so the break down into a smaller scale building and, as townhomes, they're even more distinctive. Next slide is very much like it and then, cluster three is the building with the nine apartments in it. Three per floor. Next is the barn. I'm sorry, this is the ice house, which will be a one bedroom little house and kitchen will also be a one bedroom house. And this the barn as it looks today. It's a handsome old building with beat up old stucco on the front and we're going to restore it and, basically, keep it this way and we're going to put more apartments in here. The next slide is the back view perspective and this is exactly the same form as it is today. It's just all going to be new walls and, basically, completely new inside. I should have mentioned with the sustainability going on and the climate warming issues, everything that we do is going to be in the green category. The next slide is Cintra about 1880. This is a photograph of the original building and you can't see it that well, but you'll see there's some arches there that are not on the Mansion today and haven't been on it for as long as I've been in New Hope, which is 35 years. Our intention here is to completely renovate the house the way it looked in 1809, when it was built. And so, we're asking, and we're going to get into why the building is not safe and, in fact, we've had two major failings with the walls just collapsing and the stone decaying. And we've already invested \$146,000 in this time frame just to maintain the place. The next slide is what we propose it will look like, which is the way it looked back then. As you can see we put in the balcony and the arched porch on the front and the stairway leading up to it. We also made it so that the windows over on the left wing are accessible into the apartments. The two apartments on the ground floor and two three-story apartments above them. So there's a couple of floor units in there. This is a view of the front of it as you would see it as you'd be parking on Bridge Street tomorrow or in a year, let's say. The intention here frontal stucco, the brick corners, every and all copper gutters would be absolutely done in the authentic way the original building was designed. This is why I have shown you the early history, because this is what would like to do as the building as it was originally done. The next slide shows the back of the building. And you can see there's a heavily trellised porch there with latticework and it sits up on brick piers and the people who owned the building before us built an addition on this and put bathrooms on it, because the house did not have bathrooms. So, our intention here is to rebuild it as the back view, with the porch and the porch upstairs also. And then, along the back, this is the only real revision we're doing to the building is a copper clad dormer, which is the bedrooms for the upper apartments. That's basically attic space and all we've done, we have not changed it from the front at all. Part of doing historical work is you cannot change the view of the building from the right of way. And so, this will never be seen from the right of way. But that's the only real revision we're doing. Next slide. This is a comparison of where we were, on the left with our original design and where we might be today with the new building. You see there's a little tail hanging out of the building and that houses an elevator and the fire stair. Really what we're proposing is the building in its existing envelope and not have to deal with the walls that are crumbling we can put all that, the elevators, separate elevators in each apartment and the stairways inside the building. So, that way we would be able to make the original building as it was. Our intention is, windows identical to what they are today. Probably done by the same company we used in New Hampshire. And the building will be completely, from the sustainable standpoint and a of safety standpoint and a fire code standpoint - we'll have sprinklers - it's going to be inside of our building. But outside, when you look at it, it's going to be a total restoration of the original design of the building. And now, I'm going to turn it over to Steve, who is an engineer and he's going to show you some of the issues concerning the house and why we think

it's unsafe. And I can't emphasize it enough that we want it to be safe. Ms. Gering – Mr. Hillier, can I ask you a question, not to interrupt you, so everyone is clear, you are not renovating this building, but you are planning on tearing it down. Is that correct? I just wanted let everyone know that you are planning on tearing it down. Go ahead. Mr. Hillier – Related to that, the intended use is to use what stone we can and use it on all of the retaining walls as decorative, we are going to have concrete retaining walls. Part of the whole history of the project still Ms. McHugh – Your original approval included bringing it back to life, not knocking it down. Mr. Hillier – Big changes have been found, which Steve is going to, Basically a hundred year or more, the stone has been disintegrating, Ms. Gering – Can I ask you a question? How long have you owned the property? Mr. Hillier - Eight years. Ms. Gering - I know that you had gotten approval on two different occasions thru the Zoning Department for redevelopment, correct? Mr. Hillier - No. I got one approval. I had a developer that was going to do it and I did not, number one, they walked away from the deal and number two, I did not like what they were doing, so we decided we were going to do it ourselves. Ms. Gering - So you got that approval eight years ago, correct? Mr. Hillier – that's correct. Ms. Gering - so, in the past eight years you allowed this property to deteriorate and now you're coming in front of us and you're saying you want to tear it down. Is that what I'm hearing you say? Mr. Hillier – I don't want to tear it down. It's a matter of we have to tear it down to make it safe. But, at the end of the day we're going to get a better building and your going to get the original built, not the original that was changed over the years, but the original building. Ms. Gering – have you heard the term, definition by neglect? Mr. Hillier – Pardon? Ms. Gering – Have you heard the term demolition by neglect? Mr. Hillier – I've heard of it. Ms. Gering – This is exactly what you've done with this project and now you want to tear it down. Mr. Hillier – I'm sorry. We have spent a lot money putting in measures to keep it up. So, at this point, we haven't. Ms. Gering – and you have because our Zoning Officer came in the building and you were cited to fix it. That's the only reason you're fixing it. Mr. Hillier – You'll see them. There are two pieces of wall that have fallen and that wasn't from,... It wasn't. We have had a handyman all this time maintaining it. And we have invested \$146,000 trying to hold it up. I appreciate what you're saying about, what is it? Abandon by Neglect? Ms. Gering – It is called Demolition by Neglect. According to our Zoning Officer who is not here, it is a legal term. It is very common for people who buy properties and then running them down so badly and then start saying you have to tear them down. And I that is an example of this today. Mr. Hillier – Well, I'm sorry that you feel that way. Mr. Meyer – The additional views, for the record, this is from the approval that was granted on February 19, 2013 which requires mandated preservation and restoration of the Cintra Mansion, for the record. By the way, that is from a report from the engineer. Mr. Krumenacker – As Bob mentioned, my name is Steve Krumenacker. I'm a principal at MacIntosh and we're a structural engineering firm and, just by way of background, the existing building the primary walls are all stone, randomly layed, mortar set stone walls. The stone is a combination of various types of stone. Some of it is what is known as a diatomaceous stone, which is a denser, kind of harder stone. And then sedimentary stone, which a softer stone. It has plates, striations. The interior of the structure is heavy timber wood frame. Both the floors and the roof and all of that frame is supported by being pocketed into the exterior stone walls. As Bob mentioned the finish on the walls is a like a stucco pebble-dash finish, which is like a stucco finish with a pebble finish to it. And the corners there are roughly 8 inch by 8 inch square columns of brick added to the east and west frames of the building. So, this is a historic image from 1917 of the mansion, looking from Bridge Street and, what I want to point out to you is the two areas to the right, on there, you can kind of see that there are some inconsistencies in that pebble-dash finish. Those types of finishes are very susceptible to moisture. They're susceptible to cracking. And the building was built in 1809 with the rain, snow, the freezing, the thawing, back in 18-1900 there wasn't any different than it is now, so the finish would be susceptible to those temperature changes. And, I think what we're seeing in these images, is some clear inconsistencies in the finish. Now, whether they were repaired or whether they were an existing deterioration in the finish, we don't know. In the image, the box on the right side is corresponding to where the existing addition is now. That box on the right in the previous image was, sort of the left hand front corner that you see there. And what's happening is the stone is basically bulging out towards the left hand side of that image. I just want to point out that the two windows that are on the left hand side – the first and second floor windows – you can see in this image there's a, I'm sorry I didn't mention before, the pebble dash finish was the original finish on the wall. But in prior ownership, there was a cement scratch coat applied to portions of the wall, which indicates to us that the pebble dash finish wasn't there and they basically coated some areas that – put that scratch coat finish, kind of cement finish. In the Same corner, where you can see that brick that I mentioned, separated in that brick in the image on the right kind of close in view of the maximum amount of separation which you can see is almost two inches of separation. Next slide. So, what you can see here is an interior view of those two windows that I mentioned before. The one on the

left is on the first floor. The one in the middle is on the second floor and the one on the right hand side is a blown up image of the second floor. So, what you can see there is a gap between the sill of the window and the sash. And it is a clear indication to us, that there's been some settlement, I'll comment on that in a minute, but some clear settlement of the wall, so that basically, it looks like the wall is settling towards that corner that has the braces on it that you saw in the previous image. So, this is an image of the back of the mansion. This is an image from, we think, in the 1930's and the 1950's and you can see it looks very similar to the image at the bottom shown earlier, proposed back. The box that you see there is to point out some of the piers that are supporting that porch appear to be a little bit askew and you can see that the wood frame porch element and then the roof of that porch is also wooden frame and it was supported very similarly the way all the interior structure was. Pocketed from the outside – pocketed into the stone walls. This is an image from 1983, so almost 40 years ago. The same image. Same porch that been changed a bit. They actually took a pier out at some point and appear to be, we think maybe, fixing some of those piers that were a little bit askew. But what I want to point out here is on the porch and to the right, outlined in the red box, which is, again is very similar to that one, which is an inconsistency in the stucco finish and, what I think, is some deterioration of the stucco above the where the pebble dash finish, above the roof and to the left of the roof. Or rather to the left of the porch in this image. Again, on the next slide, this is one of the areas that Bob had mentioned before. The same exact area of the roof or of the rear wall of the building, where you can see it corresponds exactly with where that inconsistency or deterioration and problematic image was and we can kind of see on the image on the left hand side, there, where the lowest part of the roof of the porch, you can see that there's some deterioration on the wood there. Which tells me that there was moisture that had been getting into the wall, into that open pocket and into the wall and the wood actually failed from that condition. But, more than that it allowed moisture to enter into the wall and, in our mind, a big factor of causing the stone to fail the way that it did. You can see right above the porch, on the right hand right side above the roof of the porch, there where that arch-looking thing is actually a window. That was situated in the back there. In the next image you'll see those exact same conditions on the right hand side of the porch. This one is from just July of last year. So the right hand side there's the other opening there. There was a window in that location and over it there was another window and then the top opening where the porch pocketed into the right hand side of that center location. The left images here is from the center one the same thing before the wall sort of failed, of the window that was still in place in both locations. Mr. Meyer – I have a question about the middle picture there. Am I seeing a hole in the roof? Mr. Krumenacker – No, I think that's a hole. I think that is the hole right where the failure I circled. I think it's above the second floor. Mr. Meyer Thank you. Mr. Krumenacker – What we're seeing here, these are some images inside the mansion on the third floor of what is the east wing, so if you're looking from Bridge Street, on the left hand wing. These are images taken of the ceiling. It's a little deceiving, but the ceiling in there is sloped. It's sort of a third floor attic, So the ceiling is plaster slope and what you can see in the image is a lot of diagonal cracks in the plaster that are coming up from the floor and then running diagonal. Just for a point of reference, the east exterior wall is to the left on this image. What this is indicating, pretty clear to us, is that that eastern wing is sort of settling toward the east. And it is indicative... the cracks are indicative that the roof's, like I said, sort of settling toward the east or toward that eastern exterior wall. The image on the right, there, is that same room's northeast corner. Again, the near corner on the left when you're looking out onto Bridge Street and, what you can see pretty clearly there, is the original double dash finish towards the bottom of that deteriorated. That's the finish in the top left hand corner is the same kind of scratch coat that was applied prior to Bob's ownership. Ms. Gering – I'm going to stop you. I think, we are well aware the cracks and holes in the building have caused this building to deteriorate. And I'm going to say something – one person – If you had a hole in your house in the wall and you didn't take care of it, won't your walls fall apart? Mr. Krumenacker – Not like this. It would be... in two minutes I'll tell you why I think this is happening. Ms. Gering – I am going to summarize it quickly. I think we've heard enough about how it's falling apart, ok? I'm only one voice on Council. As far as I'm concerned the building has not been maintained. I don't know if you've had tenants in there for the last years, but if you've got broken windows and you've got holes in the walls and they have not been maintained, so I know for a fact the building is falling apart, so you don't have to go into any more detail telling us how the building is falling apart. We are well aware of that. So, let's move on. Mr. Krumenacker – So, now I'll tell you why it's falling apart. The building is falling apart, not because it's been neglected, but because it was neglected long before Bob bought it. The type of stone, as I mentioned before, that the mansion was built out of is a combination of stone types and it's a little difficult to see. The more reddish stone you can see right there and at the bottom right hand corner of that image, those are more of what I mentioned before the diatomaceous stone, the more dense stone. Much of the wall around the building is built from shale. Which is more

of sedimentary stone. A more kind of striated stone, which doesn't have a hard, sort of base finish, like a brick or a diatomaceous stone. It is more susceptible to moisture and so, when the pebble dash finish is cracked or when in the 1800's when they put a window in they didn't seal around the openings now moisture will enter that stone and, over time, the stone will actually deteriorate. And like I said, it's a little difficult to see in that image, but we actually have a video of some of the stone, here. So, this is an image, this is a video of an actual piece of stone in the wall. And you can see up towards the top of that, those were originally solid pieces of stone and you can see the way they're deteriorating. And that's not something that's going to occur over ten years or over seven years. That's something that's going to occur over long term exposure to the moisture behind the original finish on that wall. So play the video. Ms. Gering – I'm going to stop you. I think Council has heard enough about the function of the stone and why it's crumbling. So if you guys can move on please? Mr. Krumenacker – Well this is an effort to indicate to you that that type of degeneration of stone like that, as I said, is not because it was neglected, it's because it was neglected for hundreds of years before Bob bought the building. That type of deterioration, it doesn't occur ... the penetration of the moisture that causes that level of deterioration, doesn't occur in 10 years. It just doesn't. So, it was a function of the type of stone that they used in the mansion. It was a function of the finish on the wall and it was a function of the penetration of the moisture through the finish over decades that caused the level of deterioration and my biggest concern, quite frankly as an engineer, we see what we can see. We have no idea what's going on, on the interior of that wall. Like I said, it's a multi-layer stone wall. So there might be two or three layers of stone in various locations there. We don't know what's happening within that stone. And there's no way of knowing what's happening in that stone throughout the entire mansion. So, you can fix the inside of it and the inside six inches-that wall and what its sitting on, could be deteriorating. There's no way of knowing. Ms. McHugh – I have a question. So why weren't these arguments made eight years ago when you came before Council? What has changed in the last eight years? Mr. Krumenacker – I can't really speak to that. I think the level of deterioration of the stone has gotten worse in the three of four years that I looked at it.... but, again, it's not because the stone was exposed the prior six or seven years prior to that. Ms. McHugh – So how many years has it been happening? I mean eight years ago you agreed to restore its original condition. So the last eight years have been so bad that now you can't do that? Mr. Meyer – I would ask the same question. Mr. Maisel – I think what, respectfully, your portrayal of the building, to a lay person is pretty typical, look, this is the slam dunk, get rid of the building and it's gone. Your illustrations are strong and you have great photographs of it and left to our own devices with two acceptances of the repurposing of the mansion and also the knowledge of, you know it's probably not the most expedient thing to try to resurrect this building, as it exists, that's falling apart, from a cost standpoint and from the efficiency standpoint, that brings us to this moment in time. So certainly you can appreciate where we're coming from as a Council. At least I'm trying to articulate what we're experiencing. I think that's the difficulty. Maybe this building can be preserved there are ways of doing these things. This isn't something that can't be difficult and with the economic feasibility factor and there was a way to get this building to a functioning profitability standpoint. Certainly there's a lot of activity as part of this project and this is the absolute centerpiece even though it is the centerpiece. So I think that that's what we're all grappling with right now. In terms of all the disconnects with the agreements and sentences and now things changed. Clearly there's been an acceleration of the deterioration of the building. Maybe more intensely than the previous 20 or 30 years. So, that's the difficulty that we're struggling with. Ms. Gering – I think if we are being a little hard nose, we went through this with the historic Odette's building. And we spent years with that building, the builder, the River House at Odette's, was going to tear the building down and Council heard the same argument you are giving now, it would be torn down and the stone would be repurposed. Well, surprise, surprise, the building has been saved and moved. That's why we're a little reluctant to, all the arguments as to why you need to tear the building down. Mr. Krumenacker – I can only speak to the current condition of it and the condition in the last few years. And, like I said, based on a lot of work on a lot of buildings, we worked on a lot of stone building like this. This building, in my mind, is unique in the fact that the type of stone that is used in it and they type of shale and the degrees in which the shale that's used on the perimeter walls on the walls. And the degrees in which that shale will deteriorate when it's exposed to moisture. I can't speak for Odette's. I don't know anything about it. I don't know what the condition of it was. I don't know what the stone was. Mr. Meyer – Accepting the statement, the statement is which you made about you can't tell what the interior walls look like. That the timbers that are, in fact, resting on it are built on... Is it not possible, that the shale was used in the exterior shell, and you have solid stone inside it. You told us that you can't tell me that it's not solid and you can't tell me if it is solid. We don't know. So, right now we are receiving a request to demolish something based on exterior surface of the standing walls. Emphasis on exterior surface. Now, I know stone is not shingle, not something

like that, but again, doesn't necessarily mean the building is falling down. I'm got a bigger issue, in terms of the description of the severity of the condition of the building, in terms of the structural soundness. You're saying it's not structurally sound. But what I'm hearing you say is you tell me that you don't know what's inside of those exterior walls – is that you don't know, you suspect that it's not structurally sound, based on the assumption the stone used on the interior is the same as the stone on the exterior and it's suffering the same kind of damage. I might add, by the way it is on the interior, means that the water might not penetrate quite as well, that seems fairly obvious. So, again, you haven't to convince me that it's not structurally sound. Mr. Krumenacker – But it's indicative of just on the interior. The settlement that we've seen on Eastern wing of the building. We're seeing the deterioration of the exterior stone on that wing, but we're also seeing settling that's in the roof structure that shows. We worked on a lot of building that were 8" multi-level 8" brick walls that support stories and stories and levels of construction. So, if the exterior on those walls is deteriorated and not the interior, we still may have six inches of stone on the interior that's solid and able to support. But it's not. What we're seeing is that its settling. And in our minds, it's a combination of the mortar and stone deteriorating in the walls, that's causing the structure to settle and not in the provisional sense of the settlement on the foundation of a building, but within the whole structure, itself, is settling. And it's the same thing on the Northwest wing. You don't see the same separation in between the sash and the sill of the window that we showed the interior, that shows separation. You don't see that same separation in the basement. Well, it's not a function of the building settling, it's a function in our mind of the stone and, again, there, in particular, the interior of the structure is shored up, right now. The wall, itself 's actually settled to the point where it's necessary to shore up that structure. But it's not just the exterior walls around and we're working with the information that we can see and the information that we have and it seems pretty clear to us that it's not just the exterior stone that's experiencing that deterioration. We're certainly seeing the signs... I mean the walls have failed. There's deterioration of the interior of that stone. The whole wall could come down. We would have seen pieces of the exterior come down, you wouldn't see the whole wall coming down. Ms. Feder - I want to ask you this. Thank you for all the clarification. I certainly understand that the building was in a state for a long time. I'm curious, I know you have been working on the building for the last three of four years. But if there had been an intervention eight years there has been a way to see if parts of the building or all of the building could have been saved? Or is that hard to extrapolate based on what your seeing? Mr. Krumenacker - Its hard to extrapolate because you just don't know the level of moisture levels in the walls and what penetrated to the interior walls at that time. Ms. Feder – This may not be a question for you, but for our engineer, where was an engineering report when we went thru this? Ms. Fountain – I don't know, all we have is the 2018 approval resolution. Ms. Feder – ok, just the root of the question at a party back 8 years ago it was said, we are doing what we can to save the building and all the videos and pictures, I understand this is a dire need, I am just trying to figure out what that gap means for us, with the history of the building. A separate question, I am curious if the building is torn down how would it affect the historic register of historic places, what do we do? Ms. Gering – in your design, how many units were you approved for 8 years ago? Mr. Hillier – 29. Ms. Gering - and that is what you are staying with? Mr Hillier- When we bought the property, we intended to restore the building. This is not something that we're trying to get away with something. And that's why we're offering to completely replicate the original building with all of the porches and the trim. This isn't to save money. This is to meet an obligation which was to keep that building there. And that's all we're trying to do. And, I'm just concerned, as is Steve, that we don't know about the wall. If we tore the walls down and built them up in concrete block, we would know they were safe. But we don't know that. Ms.Gering – Mr. Hillier, we heard the same thing from Odette's when they were trying to tear the building down. We are all a little skeptical, please understand that. Mr. Hillier – I understand that, but please don't think that I'm trying to get away with something, because I'm not. Ms. Gering – Any other questions from Council? Mr. Meyer – I have a question of the condition of the building, in the absence of all of the tarps trying to cover the holes I am seeing in the photographs. I just want clarification. Mr. Hillier-the roof is in good shape. These are not roof leaks. This is not water coming in from the roof. This is water coming in through the walls. Mr. Meyer – Thank you. Ms. Gering – Anyone else from Council? From the Public? Ms. Feder – I'm sorry, just one quick question. As the newest member of Council, just for clarification, why wasn't this started eight years ago? Eight years is such a long time. Mr. Hillier – It was a matter of the economy and getting it done, plus other obligations, but we have a handyman there full-time, taking care of the building and he maintains it. He has been maintaining it. He's still doing it, but these problems started to develop as we were getting into, let's renovate it. We started out renovating it and, probably seven years and he said, Bob, this place is really in bad shape. And just for a for instance, and we didn't do this, when we got our approval there was an argument with the Board on whether we should leave the

stucco on or put it back to the original stone. The decision was to stucco the whole building...re-stucco. So, all we're trying to do is meet the obligation of preserving that piece of architecture, in the way it was originally done and you see in the pictures, a lot of what was done, because in the old pictures is not there today and haven't been there for the last 75 years. Ms. Feder – I understand that, I think the plans make sense and the demo. If I can go back for clarification, it was just wasn't done because, Mr. Hillier – there was a developer came and offered to buy and get the approval for the building. He said he was going to restore the building and then he walked. Ms. Feder - When did he walk? Mr. Hillier – He walked about a year and a half, two years ago? 2019. Ms. Feder – that's ok, that still does not, that was eight years ago. Six years is still such a long time. Mr. Hillier he was on the contract for two years and he got approvals. Ms. Feder – when were those approvals? Mr. Meyer – 2018. Mr. Hillier – I appreciate all your input, but what I'd like to know is what do you expect us to do with it? Ms. Gering – my thinking is, now you want to come in and out of here and say let me tear it down and if we have every developer that comes in this town and gives us a story for every historic building to tear it down, Mr. Hillier- I don't want to tear it down, but I am concerned about the safety aspect of the wall. Ms. Gering – We have heard the same scenario from the Odette's, that they had to tear it down, it wasn't safe and it was falling apart, and here you are coming back and, listen, I'm only one voice on Council. I'm really opposed to tearing it down, and today we're not voting. It's just a workshop. Is there any comments from the public? Can you come up here and identify yourself? Alice – My name is Alice and I was wondering the building itself is going to becoming apartments? Mr. Hillier – Yes. Alice- the original building, the Mansion is becoming apartments, as part of the development, two three story? Mr. Hillier – There were three in it before and there will be four in it now. The difference is that the apartment in the basement lower level, was on one side and on the other side was a long empty space and we're bringing that space in another apartment. Upstairs is the same. Alice – Structurally to redo the building itself, the mansion itself, does it need to be that many floors? Mr. Hillier – Yes, because that's what it is. The mansion is that. Alice – And my other question is years ago, I don't know, it heard from me that any changes that it was going to be the Library. Mr. Hillier – No. As part of our whole thinking for the project, we donated an acre and a half for the Library site. And decided to move the Library. But that is strictly ... it was not going to be a Library. The question was, was it going to be a Library and there's some confusion on that. What we did with the site was agree to give the library an acre and a half of land to build on and it was designed a preliminary design for the library, and they had ten years, after we get our final approval, they had ten years in which to exercise that. It is a free option, basically, if they want it. Alice – where on the site is that? Mr. Hillier– One and a half acres. If you go back to that slide – keep going – you see this big tract here on the left side? That's where the Library was going. Right there. And the excess parking that you see, there, was also for the Library. Ms. Gering – Any other questions from the public? David – My question is, years ago the Library used one of the buildings where we had that party. And we were inside. The beauty of that building was the interior. This isn't preserving that building and you're going to tear it down and rebuild it, I don't understand why you are pretending like it's that building, you know? It's like tearing this down and building it back, it's not like saying this is the original church. It looks to me, very institutional, with some of the other buildings and I just ... it upsets me to see that happening. I'm a long time presence here and it seems like historical issues. Ms. Feder – sir, when was the library party? In Cintra? David – Larry, you where there? Mayor Keller – 2012? Ms. Rettig- In 2012 you were hosting a party inside. And you're going to tell us, then, that which, prior to ten years ago, because 2012 was only 9-10 years ago. I did not know that there was a party inside the building in 2012. So, that does not jive, at all, with a building falling apart over hundreds of years ...a hundred years...and then throw a party inside the building and not concerned about what could happen to people inside that party? Mr. Krumenacker – the building had been falling apart over the years. It's the manifestation of a hundred years of moisture that causing the amount. Ms. Rettig- I understand what you're saying, but you cannot with a straight face tell me, over the last ten years that that's not the reason why the building has to be torn down. If they can have a party inside that building in 2012, then it stands to reason in some fashion at least in my brain, that we now have to tear the building down because it was neglected between 2012 to 2021. Mr. Krumenacker – I don't think that's the case. I really don't. And I think that the exposure you've seen, the finish that is on the building, the finish was put on the building for, prior to our ownership, the building was exposed to moisture. The pebble dash finish that I mentioned, that was all done prior to Bob owning it. Mr. Hillier – when we bought it, about 30% of the stone was exposed. The stucco was all falling off. And they had the party inside the building was a sponsored. Ms. Rettig – you did not own the building in 2012? Mr. Hillier-We owned it in, Ms. Rettig – I'm still, I am having a hard time with this. Ms. McHugh - Can I ask a question? Is there any tenants on this property? Do you rent it to tenants on the property? How many tenants do you have? Mr. Hillier – there are four in the barn. Mr. Meyer – there are four tenants in the barn. Ms. McHugh –

So, do they stay away from this property, if this property is falling apart? Falling down? The mansion. Is it an unsafe issue for your tenants? Mr. Hillier – The icehouse and the kitchen are going to be rebuilt inside and so we're putting a new roof on them. They're not part of this. Ms. McHugh – How old is the barn? The same as the Mansion? Mr. Hillier – the Mansion house was built in 1824. Ms. McHugh – and when was the barn built? Mr. Hillier – I don't know. Ms. McHugh – So, the barn is fine. There's no damage to the barn, whatsoever? To the point where it has six residential units out of the barn. Ms. Gering - We're going to have another speaker please identify yourself by your name. Ann – Just to respond to Tina what I experienced and what I remember, the Cintra party where people went into the building, was mostly held outside, the thought originally by somebody who talked to me...Library built, it became very apparent that there were holes in places and very soon thereafter I heard that there were too many problems for the library to move into that space. It's not quite what you wanted to hear. Ms. Delevich – Geri Delevich, Old Mill Road. I've been a member of Council. Couple questions I have-- The properties surrounding...have they changed since the original plan? Side views? Mr. Hillier - The footprint is exactly as it was with the first approval. Ms. Delevich – one of the things that strikes me about tearing this building down, as I recall another example is Odette's. They got their engineer to say this is not viable. We got our engineer to say to them say, Yes, this could be ok. Another example is a barn that was torn down. We were promised... we were promised the wood in the barn could be put somewhere else. And in that process, the property was sold and no one could find the wood to the barn. It was gone. So, I guess my concern is, once you tear that down, first of all, the property becomes an exponentially... I live in a house that is two hundred years old and we had it fixed, the builder said I could build you a new house for the cost of what it is to fix the old house. When you live in an old house, that's the case. It is easier to tear it down that replace it. So, my concern really is on this project is, the building is gone and, for whatever possible reason, the company or organization decides they want to sell it. Then where are we? Ms. Gering – thank you Geri. Any questions or comments from the public? Mr. Krumenacker – If I could just, I do take a little bit of offense that you made a comment about Odette's that they got their engineer to say the building needed to be demolished. That's not at all what's happening here. A structural engineer is a very humbling ... very, very humbling occupation. As you can tell what happened with the Florida, recently, there was somebody that had to stand there and say to everybody, it is safe for all you search and rescue people to stand next to this building that is standing here and rescue these people, trying to rescue these people. Somebody had to put their reputation, their profession on the line, to say yes, you may try and rescue these people. So, the insinuation that Bob got me to say that the building needs to be torn down, I understand that that may not be your insinuation, but just so you understand, that is not the case. So, if that's your concern, the shale that's in that building, when it is cut and when its exposed to air, it forms like a hard surface. When the original pebble dash finish was removed and the scratch coat finish was put on, I have no idea what was done with it, but they may have cleaned it, they may have sandblasted it, they may have pressure washed it. That cased-in hard finish is off and it helped open the stones up to all that moisture that was coming in and that stone will literally suck the moisture right in and it will freeze and it will thaw and the stone will start to deteriorate. So, I don't know what happened, prior to Bob owning the building. I know that there was a scratch coat finish at minimum, was on there. I know that the moisture was getting into that building from the back roof and the top roof and the stucco deteriorating. And I don't think it was from any neglect, over the last eight years, that would cause that degree of deterioration. I just don't. And I cannot say that if I didn't honestly believe it, because my reputation is on the line. Ms. Gering – Ok, thank you. Mr. Maisel – there is no one on this board that is insinuating that you have done something as it relates to your findings. Mr. Hillier asked what it is we want him to do. And I think the takeaway from this would be – We know why the building should come down. At least from your vantage point and you know why we would like see it stand? What could be done to see it stand? I mean you say it's not money. Well, it's always the money. I mean, respectfully can that be restored to, we know the reasons that are a mess and have to be addressed but you throw money at it and really for me...and still make it profitable. And I think that's the takeaway. What I would take away from here. At least that is the consideration as to what...you're not going to be able to create what you would if you tore it down, in terms of lead certification and utilization and it won't be as functional. You would have to determine that. If we hold steadfast regarding our discomfort tearing it down. Ms. Gering – That's a great summary Ken, thank you. That is the message. If you come back with a way to save the building from demolition, I don't think you would have the opposition. Mr. Hillier – Steve, if we were able to save the three front walls that face, excuse me, the five front walls that face the street. And we were able to keep the stone walls, and build a steel structure inside, to hold them up, and, if we were able to do that, then the back wall, the way we intended, could still be the same... But, you would have the original frontal of the building and we would put the porch on, the way I promised, by the way, this isn't about the

money, it really isn't. Mr. Maisel – I was out of line. Mr. Hillier - no, no, most developers are like that, not mine. Ms. Gering – so what happens to the historic building and reconstructed it is no longer a historic building? Mr. Hillier – No, it isn't. We did that on a hospital in Rhode Island where we saved the front and built a completely new modern piece on the back. They allowed us to do that because we were restoring it in the front.. Ms. Rettig – Are you able to keep the historic designation with only keeping part of the building? If you can find that out and submit it to us and come back, that would go a long way into letting us know what we are dealing with, maybe getting less opposition or changing people's minds. I know that I would certainly be open to something like that. Here's the historic part, here's what we propose to do and keep the historic designation. Mr. Hillier – Ok. I will be research that for you. Mr. Meyer – that would be helpful. Ms. Gering – Alright, any other comments from Council. Anyone from the public? Ms. Kerr – I have two comments. I just wanted to discuss the garage that will happen someday across from North Main Street, across from the canal. When the parking lot and the lights went up....and...looked at the plans how they affected those homes. Ms. Gering - we have public meetings and...when they start the public meetings that would be the time. Ms. Kerr – I just wanted to put it out there. The second part is, since I missed all zoom meetings and I was a little surprised about the board passing 2 houses.... I don't want to take up everybody's time. So, if someone could explain how the water is taken care of ...and since my parents bought the property, the water gets over Main Street and the water gets worse all the time, the one house was built...and I was concerned what's going on, I don't know. Ms. Gering – we can't explain this how it started. Send to Pete in an email form and he can explain it to you or we can put in on for Council discussion on an agenda. What you're asking, his office can handle it. Ms. Kerr – ok, will do. Ms. Gering - OK. Anyone else? Ok, we're adjourned. Thank you, everybody.