

City of Keene
New Hampshire

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, December 16, 2015

4:30 PM

2nd Floor Commission Room

Members Present:

Hanspeter Weber, Chair
James Duffy, Councilor
Anita Carroll-Weldon
Jan Brehm
David Bergeron, Alternate

Staff Present:

Tara Kessler, Planner
Rhett Lamb, Planning Director

Others Present:

Members Not Present:

Dan Bartlett, Vice-Chair
Joslin Kimball Frank

4:00 PM Site Visit: Commission members conducted a site visit at 61 Court Street at 4:00 p.m. before the meeting.

1) Call to Order and Roll Call -

Chair Weber called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM. Roll call was conducted.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting - November 18, 2015

Councilor Duffy made a motion to adopt the minutes of November 18, 2015 as submitted. Ms. Brehm seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

3) Public Hearings -

a) COA-2015-10- 61 Court Street - Applicant and owner, Beauregard Family Revocable

Trust, is proposing to replace the existing roof, remove two chimneys, and replace windows at 61 Court Street. This building is ranked as a Primary Resource (Tax Parcel #003-03-002).

Chair Weber read the public hearing notice and asked for staff's recommendation on completeness. Ms. Kessler recommended that the application be accepted as complete.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon moved to accept application COA-2015-10 as complete. Councilor Duffy seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Chair Weber opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward.

William Beauregard, the applicant, provided the Commission with background information on the proposed project. He explained that the Beauregard Family Revocable Trust owns other properties in the neighborhood of 61 Court Street and that the existing condition of the building and the activities that had occurred in it have impacted their ability to rent other properties in the area.

The applicant purchased the property in September of 2015 and is seeking to make repairs to the building including the replacement of a section of slate roof with asphalt shingles and the removal of two chimneys. The applicant is also seeking approval to replace some of the windows over time as tenant

space turns over or as funding becomes available. The primary reasons for these repairs are to address water damage caused by the poor condition of the roof and to provide a more uniform appearance to the building.

Mr. Beauregard addressed the estimate provided in the project application (page 21 of 35 of the meeting packet) for the replacement of the roof, which is \$50,800. He noted that he has already invested in a number of building improvements including upgrading the heat and hot water systems for an approximate cost of \$25,000, installing smoke and heat detectors for an approximate cost of \$15,000, and refurbishing three of the apartment units for an approximate cost of \$9,200. Mr. Beauregard indicated that the total estimated costs for the work they anticipate putting into this building, including the proposed roof and window replacements, is between \$200,000 and \$225,000.

Mr. Beauregard noted that approximately 82% of the existing roof is asphalt shingles. He described the two sections of the roof that are slate and in a state of failure. He noted that the slate portion of the roof comprises approximately 18% of the total roof area. Mr. Beauregard is proposing to replace the entire roof in asphalt shingles with no change to the pitch or the roofline. Mr. Beauregard referred to the builder's comments provided in the cost estimate for the roof, which can be found on Page 21 of 35 of the meeting packet. He noted that the estimated cost to replace the slate roof portion is \$22,330. He stated that this amount increases the price of the roof by \$13,000, which is a significant amount. Mr. Beauregard noted that he intends to use architectural grade shingles with dark metal flashing (not aluminum).

Addressing the four chimneys in the building, Mr. Beauregard noted that he proposed to remove two non-functioning chimneys. These chimneys were identified on the site visit.

Mr. Beauregard explained that there are 66 windows in the building, and that he is proposing to replace 10. He noted that many of the windows have already been replaced with vinyl windows that are not representative of the historic character of the building. Mr. Beauregard is proposing to install white vinyl windows that are 2 over 2 with the grid in between the glass. He also added that he plans to paint all of the trim white in either the spring or summer of 2016. He noted that they are not planning to change to the existing window openings and will be retaining the granite lintels. Mr. Beauregard noted the Commission's preference for the muntin grid to be exterior affixed. He referred them to windows in the buildings surrounding 61 Court Street, photos of which are included on Pages 19 and 20 of the meeting packet. Mr. Beauregard noted that he conducted research at the Historical Society and spoke with Alan Rumrill to identify what the historic windows looked like on the building. Mr. Rumrill had suggested that 2 over 2 panel arrangement would be consistent with what was common in that area during the late 1800s and early 1900s.

Chair Weber thanked Mr. Beauregard for a very thorough presentation, and asked for questions/comments from the Commission.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon confirmed that the original windows would be retained along with the bay window, which faces Court Street. She asked if the arched windows on the second floor would be repointed and repaired. Mr. Beauregard noted that the bay windows will be retained and the trim will be repainted. He noted that he might replace the storm windows with a more energy efficient type. He confirmed that the three arched windows on the building and all of the trim work will be retained.

Continuing, Ms. Carroll-Weldon addressed the 2 over 2 muntin arrangement proposed and asked if the cost would be the same to do a 6 over 1 arrangement, which would be similar to some of the existing, older windows on the building. Mr. Beauregard explained that those windows were replacement windows. He reiterated Alan Rumrill's recommendation that a 2 over 2 style would be more representative of the era of the building. Mr. Beauregard also noted that he could do a 4 over 4 if that was the Commission's preference. Chair Weber provided some history on glass making in the early days and

noted that they were not yet able to make large panes of glass, hence the prevalence of historic windows that are smaller with lots of dividers. Chair Weber also noted his agreement with Alan Rumrill that the 2 over 2 windows would be appropriate. Mr. Beauregard distributed a handout depicting the arched windows and the historical significance of the 2 over 2 panel arrangement.

Chair Weber asked about the porches and railings. Mr. Beauregard noted that he has not yet developed a plan to address these features. He suggested that he would probably use a square baluster with a code compliant rail height that is painted white.

Chair Weber asked if the two chimneys proposed for removal are connected to fireplaces. Mr. Beauregard replied in the negative and noted that there are no fireplaces in the units.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon commended Mr. Beauregard for taking on this project and being sensitive to the historic character of the building. Councilor Duffy concurred with Ms. Carroll-Weldon's comments. Chair Weber asked for staff comments.

Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant did a thorough job reviewing the proposed project and how it meets the District's regulations and standards. She reviewed the relevant standards in relation to this project as analyzed in the Staff Report beginning on Page 11 of 35 of the meeting packet.

Section XV.B.4.b) 1)

"The original or historic roofline shall not be altered..."

Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant does not propose to alter the roofline or the pitch of the roof.

Section XV.B.4.b) 2)

"Slate shall be retained, whenever economically feasible."

Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant has provided the cost estimates for replacing the slate portions of the roof. The applicant has already addressed this concern in his presentation. She added that the applicant proposes that shingling the entire roof would create a more uniform appearance and would address the drainage issues caused by the poor condition of the roof.

Section XV.B.4.b) 3)

"Character-defining chimneys shall not be removed, unless determined a safety hazard by the Code Inspector, and repair constitutes an economic hardship..."

Ms. Kessler noted that the chimneys proposed for removal are not identified as character-defining features on the Area Inventory Form and are no longer in use.

Section XV.B.4.b) 7)

"Unpainted, mill-finished aluminum shall not be used for replacement flashing, gutters, or downspouts."

Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant proposes to use a painted flashing material and it will not be unfinished aluminum.

Section XV.B.5.b) 3)

"If the historic window to be replaced is wood, the replacement window shall also be wood, or wood clad with aluminum or a material of equal quality and approved by the Historic District Commission."

Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant will not be replacing any of the architecturally significant arched windows on the north, south and west facing elevations of the building, or any of the original wood windows in the bay window on the Court Street side of the building.

Section XV.B.5.b) 2)

“Any windows which are approved for replacement shall convey the same visual appearance in terms of overall dimensions and shape, size of glazed areas, muntin arrangement, and other design details as the historic windows. In addition, they shall have:

- *Clear-paned, non-tinted glass (except to replace historic stained or other types of translucent or opaque glass); and*
- *True divided lights or a permanently affixed muntin grid on the exterior of the window. In either instance, the muntin shall have a raised trapezoidal profile. Snap-in or between-glass Muntin grids are not allowed.”*

Ms. Kessler reiterated that the windows on the building do not share a consistent pattern in terms of overall dimension, muntin arrangement, shape, etc. She noted that the applicant proposes to use a 2 over 2 style window with clear glass and flat grids between the glass. The applicant has noted that the cost to use the exterior affixed grid is significantly greater than to have the grid mounted between the glass (approximately \$270 per window compared to \$208 per window for the grid between glass).

She noted that the applicant has requested a waiver from this standard. The reasons provided by the applicant for this waiver are listed below:

- A. “Strict application of the standard does not make sense where so many of the windows (approximately 84%) have already been replaced. We will preserve and retain the bay window and windows facing Court Street and all the arched windows.”
- B. “The alternative material will meet the design objections of the standard and is in use in all of the buildings surrounding ours.”
- C. “As indicated in the attached pictures, the styles of windows in buildings surrounding our building vary widely. We are trying to return the look of the building to what it may have been historically.”

Section XV.B.5.b) 4)

“If the size or location of the original window opening has been altered, owners shall be encouraged to restore these openings if replacing windows.”

Ms. Kessler noted that at least one of the original window openings has been altered. The applicant has not noted at this time whether they will be restoring this opening.

Section XV.B.5.b) 1)

“Enlarging or reducing the window rough opening to fit new stock windows shall generally be prohibited.”

Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant has not proposed to enlarge or reduce the window opening to fit new windows.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon noted that the existing stone lintels should not be painted, and Mr. Beauregard agreed that they would not be.

Chair Weber referred to the piece of plywood in a window opening on the Mechanic Street side of the building. Mr. Beauregard indicated this would not change until that apartment becomes unoccupied.

There being no public comments or further questions from the Commission/public Chair Weber closed the public hearing for deliberation.

Commission members expressed their support for this project. No objections were posed.

Mr. Bergeron motioned for the Historic District Commission to approve COA-2015-10 for the replacement of the slate roof with asphalt shingles, windows, and the removal of two chimneys at 61 Court Street as described in the application dated November 25, 2015, and submitted to the Planning Department on November 30, 2015 by the Beauregard Family Revocable Trust.

Councilor Duffy seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

4) Notices and Communications

Ms. Kessler reported on the following items noting they are informational only.

a. Court Street Culvert Replacement – Ms. Kessler noted that the Planning Department received copy of a “Request for Project Review by the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources for Transportation Projects” notice from the Cultural Resources Staff of the NH Department of Transportation for the replacement of a culvert on Court Street by the City of Keene. The Division of Historical Resources found that no historic properties would be affected by this project.

b. Hillside Village – Ms. Kessler noted that the Planning Department received a copy of a “Request for Project Review by the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources” notice for the proposed Hillside Village project on Wyman Road. She noted that this project is a proposed institutional residential care facility similar to Rivermead in Peterborough. She noted that Jim Phippard gave a presentation to the Heritage Commission in November to address the demolition of historic structures (large carriage barn, residential structure, and a smaller barn). The owners are seeking someone to relocate the buildings off-site. If this is not possible the materials will be salvaged and used in certain features throughout the proposed facility. Councilor Duffy provided further information noting the Zoning Board of Adjustment did approve a change in use, and that the City Zoning Ordinance was amended to allow for institutional uses on this area of Wyman Road. Councilor Duffy noted that he was one of three Councilors voting against the change.

5) Other Business-

a) 2016 Meeting Schedule –

Councilor Duffy motioned to approve the 2016 meeting schedule as presented. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

b. HDC Ordinance Review Sub-committee Update-

Ms. Kessler reported that this Sub-committee met on December 10, 2015 and is nearing a final draft of the Main Street Historic District Ordinance. Specifically, the Subcommittee is working on edits to sections of Chapter 102 and Chapter 18 of the City Code to incorporate a Main Street Historic District. They have also reviewed draft Regulations for the proposed Main Street Historic District. The Subcommittee will meet again on January 14, 2016 to review the final changes/edits.

c) Other-

1. Ms. Kessler drew attention to the display located in the City Hall lobby sponsored by the Heritage Commission and organized by Rosie Carey. This display depicts the historic evolution of the lower Main Street area of Keene.

2. Councilor Duffy noted that the Mayor has nominated him to continue to serve on the Commission in a civilian capacity. Ms. Kessler reported that the Mayor has reappointed Chair Weber to the Commission and that she will have the current member’s term list for the next meeting. Ms. Kessler also addressed the vacant position on the Commission for a shared member of the HDC and Heritage Commissions. Ms. Carroll-Weldon presented two candidates as potential members. These candidates were shared by Ms. Kimball Frank and include Katie Cassidy Sutherland, a local architect, and Nancy Proctor, a Realtor.

Historic District Commission
December 16, 2015

Discussion continued with Ms. Kessler noting she would verify term requirements with the City Clerk and report back at the next meeting.

6) **Next Meeting** - January 20, 2016

7) **Adjournment** – Chair Weber adjourned the meeting at 5:28 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Mary Lou Sheats-Hall, Minute-taker
December 17, 2015

Respectfully edited by,
Tara Kessler, Planner
January 5, 2016