

**City of Keene**  
**New Hampshire**

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, April 15, 2020**

**4:30 PM**

**Remote Meeting via Zoom**

**Members Present:**

Andrew Weglinski, Chair  
Councilor Catherine Workman  
Nancy Proctor  
Hans Porchitz  
Tia Hockett, Alternate

**Staff Present:**

Mari Brunner, Planner  
Tara Kessler, Senior Planner  
Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

**Members Not Present:**

Erin Benik  
Sam Temple  
Hanspeter Weber, Alternate  
Peter Poanessa, Alternate  
Dave Bergeron, Alternate  
Joslin Kimball Frank, Alternate

**1) Call to Order & Roll Call**

Chair Weglinski called the Zoom meeting to order at 4:32 PM and Ms. Brunner conducted roll call. All members reported that they were calling alone and from their home addresses.

Chair Weglinski read the authority to hold a remote meeting:

*“In Emergency Order #12, issued by the Governor of the State of New Hampshire pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04, certain provision of RSA 91-A regulating the operation of public body meetings have been waived during the declared COVID-19 State of Emergency.*

*Specifically:*

- *The requirement that a quorum of a public body be physically present except in an emergency requiring immediate action under RSA 91-A:2, III(b);*
- *The requirement that each part of a meeting of a public body be audible or otherwise discernible to the public at the location specified in the meeting notice as the location of the meeting under RSA 91-A:2, III(c).*
- *Provided, however that the public body must:*

- *Provide access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means;*
- *Provide public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting;*
- *Provide a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access; and*
- *Adjourn the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.*
- *All votes are to be taken by roll call.*
- *All Commission participants shall identify the location from where they are participating and who is present in the room with them.”*

The Chairman shared the rules of procedure for public participation in remote meetings.

2) **Minutes of Previous Meeting – January 15, 2020**

Ms. Proctor moved to approve the minutes of January 15, 2020, which Mr. Porchitz seconded. Chair Weglinski called for a roll call vote, and members announced their unanimous passage of this motion.

3) **Public Hearings**

- a. **COA-2018-02, Modification #1 - 143 Main Street, Wright House Renovations – Applicant Tim Sampson, on behalf of owner 143 Main LLC, proposes modifications to the HDC approval that was granted for this property in August 2018, including rehabilitation of the existing 676 sq. ft. barn, renovations to the primary structure, and paving the existing gravel parking lot. The property is ranked as a Primary Resource and is located at 143 Main Street and 0 Davis Street (TMP#s 584-061-000 & 584-059- 000) in the Central Business Limited District.**

Chair Weglinski introduced the application and Ms. Brunner recommended accepting the application as complete. Ms. Proctor moved to accept application COA-2018-02, Modification #1 as complete, which Councilor Workman seconded. Chair Weglinski called for a roll call vote and members announced their unanimous passage of this motion.

Chair Weglinski welcomed the applicant, Tim Sampson, who was calling from 103 Roxbury Street (suite 206), Keene. The property owner and developer, Michael Pappas, was also on the call and present with Mr. Sampson at 103 Roxbury Street.

Mr. Sampson reported that this request is to modify application COA-2018-02, which was approved previously by the HDC in 2018. He said that in lieu of demolishing the barn, the owner wanted to rehabilitate it with the same footprint, for which the new foundation is halfway complete with City approval (due to the necessity of the work to keep the barn from collapsing). The applicant proposed no changes to mortar and repointing of the primary structure from what was previously approved. The size and height of the rehabilitated barn would be the same as the

original. Mr. Sampson said that in 2018, an engineer recommended demolishing the barn because of rotting and structural failure and thus as a part of rehabilitating the barn, the owners must reframe the exterior first floor walls entirely. The applicant still intends to use slate shingles from the rehabilitated barn to replace slate on the roof of the main residence. Mr. Sampson said they were originally approved to roof the new addition with faux slate shingles, which is cost prohibitive, and now they hope instead to use an architectural shingle to match the roofing on the structure that connects the main building and barn. Mr. Sampson said that the owner was open to various choices for barn siding based on this Commission's preference.

Mr. Porchitz was unsure whether the discussion in 2018 was of faux slate, but he said there are asphalt shingles on the market that mimic slate at a lower cost than actual faux slate. In 2018, Mr. Porchitz thought the Commission was amenable to a CertainTeed Manor style asphalt shingle and less so to architectural style asphalt shingles. Mr. Sampson also preferred a shingle that mimics the appearance of slate and recalled that regardless, a condition of the 2018 approval was administrative authorization of the final roof material. Chair Weglinski agreed that this warranted further discussion.

Chair Weglinski requested staff comments and Ms. Brunner used photos and site plans to demonstrate that this property has two parcels technically, with the building structures at 143 Main Street and the associated parking at 0 Davis Street. Ms. Brunner recalled that this application first came to the HDC in 2018, when the Commission approved COA-2018-02 for the following work on this property:

- Demolition of the existing barn.
- Construction of a new addition attached to the rear of the primary structure.
- Replacement of all existing windows with Andersen 400 Series Double-hung windows.
- Repair and painting of existing wood trim.
- Repointing and cleaning of brick masonry where necessary.
- Installation of a new paved walkway to connect the parking area behind the building to the existing porch entrance on the south façade of the building and the proposed accessible entrance on the east façade of the building (facing Main Street).
- Addition of concrete wheel stops in the gravel parking lot to delineate 10 parking spaces and installation of a concrete slab to provide a suitable surface for a van-accessible parking space.
- Replacement of the existing door on the east façade of the porch on the south side of the house.
- Installation a dumpster in the northwest corner of the parking area with a fence for screening.

This work was approved with the following conditions, none of which had been met at the date of this meeting:

1. Staff approval of a mockup of mortar color, thickness, and type prior to conducting masonry repair.
2. Staff approval of a shingle product to mimic slate shingles for the new addition.

3. Staff approval of a PVC roofing product to mimic the appearance of the current roofing material on the roof above the porch area.

Ms. Brunner explained how the modified request is different. She shared the HDC standards relevant to the proposed modifications and explained the changes after each.

Ms. Brunner read HDC standards §XV.A.4.b.3 & 4 – Walkways, Driveways, Alleys, & Parking Areas – which state that, “3) Curb cuts for driveways on sites with residences or converted residences shall be the width of a single travel lane. 4) New onsite parking, if required, shall be unobtrusive, with appropriate screening and landscaping, and shall preserve any character-defining features of the site. Grading shall not dramatically alter the topography of the site or increase water runoff onto adjoining properties.”

Ms. Brunner stated that this project would subsequently require Planning Board Site Plan Review, for which the applicant is aware that they must submit drainage calculations from an engineer. Because the parking is on a separate lot from the residence in this instance, the applicant proposed to narrow the curb cut width from the existing 40’ to about 25’. Instead of a gravel parking area with curb stops, the applicant wanted to pave the whole parking area at 0 Davis Street and to paint 10 parking spaces.

Ms. Brunner read HDC standards §XV.B.1.a.3 & 4 – Building Rehabilitation: Primary and Contributing Resources, General Standards – which state that, “3) The removal of historic materials or alteration of features that characterize a building or structure shall be avoided. 4) Deteriorated historic features significant to the building or structure shall be repaired, rather than replaced. If replacement is necessary due to extreme deterioration, the new feature shall match the historic in size, design, texture, color and, where possible, materials. The new feature shall maintain the same visual appearance as the historic feature.”

Ms. Brunner stated that the applicant received approval from the HDC in August 2018 to rehabilitate the primary brick structure on the property at 143 Main Street, including repair and repainting of existing wood trim, replacement of all windows, repointing and cleaning of brick masonry where necessary, and the replacement of the existing door on the east façade of the porch on the south side of the house. Additionally, the applicant received approval to demolish the existing barn, which was severely damaged at some point in its history by a fire. The current proposal was to save the existing barn, which would require major structural repairs including pouring a new foundation, installing steel framing to hold up the structure, and replacing existing damaged vinyl siding with new clapboard siding. In addition, the applicant requested the installation of an egress door in a pre-existing door opening on the south façade of the barn and a garage door on the west façade of the barn. The applicant also proposed to replace the existing slate roof with an asphalt roof, and use the slate from the barn to repair the slate on the roof of the primary building. Ms. Brunner shared a photo of the existing barn before it was clad in vinyl siding in 2018 and after the siding was added, which covers up several architectural features, including round openings in gable peaks and several window and door openings. Additionally,

the applicant proposed to remove an un-original wall from the porch on the south side of the building in order to expose the original porch railing and woodwork.

Ms. Brunner read HDC standards § XV.B.3.b.1-4 – Wood (siding and architectural trim) – which state that, “1) Character-defining architectural trim shall be retained and repaired when technically and economically feasible. If the trim is sufficiently deteriorated that replacement is warranted, the new trim shall match the original in size, scale, placement, detailing, and ideally material. If substitute material is used, it shall convey the same visual appearance as the historic trim. 2) If replacing missing architectural trim, the appearance and material of the new trim shall be based on physical, documentary, or pictorial evidence. 3) Wood surfaces shall not be sandblasted or high-pressure washed. 4) Vinyl and aluminum siding are prohibited.”

Ms. Brunner said that in 2018, the applicant received approval from the HDC to repair existing wood trim where possible and repaint all woodwork a dark green color to match the existing trim. In areas where the wood trim or siding is deteriorated beyond repair, it would be rebuilt to match the existing trim or siding. The applicant also received approval to replace the wood fascia on the east elevation of the building (facing Main Street) with a metal material and paint it green to match the trim, and to repair the porch area on the south side of the building. In addition to the work that was previously approved, the applicant now proposes to replace the existing vinyl siding on the barn with clapboard siding that would be painted white. Historically, the barn was clad in wood clapboard siding. Staff believed that this request appeared to meet the HDC standards for wood siding.

Ms. Brunner read HDC standards § XV.B.4.b.1, 2, & 5 – Roofs and roof structures – which state that, “1) The original or historic roofline shall not be altered. Raising or lowering the existing roofline shall only be allowed for the purpose of restoring the roof to its original profile. 2) Slate shall be retained, whenever economically feasible. 5) Historic dormers and cupolas on roofs shall be retained.”

Ms. Brunner said that the applicant received approval from the HDC in 2018 to demolish the existing barn, construct a new addition with an asphalt shingle roof, and salvage the slate from the existing barn to use for repairs to the roof of the primary brick building. In addition, the applicant received approval to replace the historic cupola on the barn with a new cupola. During the public hearing for this application (COA-2018-02), the Commission requested that the roof on the new addition mimic the appearance of slate, to which the applicant agreed. A condition of approval was added stating, “Staff approval of a shingle product to mimic slate shingles for the new addition.” Ms. Brunner said the current request was to save the existing barn and cupola and replace the slate roof with an asphalt shingle roof. The slate from the barn would be salvaged and used to repair the roof on the primary structure. No changes to the historic roofline were proposed. Staff said that the Commission might wish to ask the applicant to demonstrate whether retaining slate on the existing barn is economically feasible. If the Commission determined that it is not economically feasible to retain slate on the existing barn, staff recommended that a

condition of approval be added stating, “Staff approval of a shingle product to mimic slate shingles for the existing barn.”

Ms. Brunner read HDC standards § XV.B.5.b.4-6 – Windows – which state that, “4) If the size or location of the original window opening has been altered, owners shall be encouraged to restore those openings if replacing windows. 5) Introducing new window openings into the primary elevations shall generally be prohibited. 6) Enlarging or reducing the window rough opening to fit new stock windows shall generally be prohibited.”

Ms. Brunner stated that the applicant previously received approval from the HDC to replace all existing windows on the primary structure with Andersen 400 Series Woodwright® Double-hung windows with a 2/2 grid arrangement. These windows would be wood clad with PVC and would match the existing windows in terms of size, placement, and general appearance. During construction, it was discovered that seven window openings had been filled at some point in the past, including four windows on the south side of the house and three windows on the north side of the house. The applicant now proposes to open up the three window openings on the north side of the house and install the approved Andersen 400 Series Woodwright® Double-hung windows in the existing window openings. The applicant noted that the four window openings on the south side of the house could not be reopened due to the location of interior features that conflict with the window locations, including a stairway and a bathroom wall. From the outside, these window openings appear to be shuttered. No new window openings were proposed, and the original window openings would not be enlarged or reduced in size. Staff believed that this standard appeared to be met.

Ms. Brunner read HDC standard § XV B.6.b.2 – Entrances, Doors, & Porches – which states that, “2) Introducing new door openings onto the primary elevations, or enlarging or reducing door openings to fit new stock doors, is generally prohibited.”

Ms. Brunner stated that the applicant received approval from the HDC in 2018 to replace the existing door on the east façade of the porch on the south side of the building to provide an accessible entrance to the proposed office space. The applicant now additionally proposed to install two doors on the existing barn: one door would be installed in an existing door opening on the south façade that was covered 10-12 years ago when the vinyl siding was added; and the other would be a garage door installed in a new opening on the west façade. The applicant noted that a garage door in this location is required to provide access to the barn from the parking lot area. The proposed garage door, while not historic to the barn, is not on a primary elevation. Staff believed that this standard appeared to be met.

Ms. Proctor asked whether the windows that are boarded currently and not to be opened would be covered with shutters or another material. Ms. Brunner said those windows are covered with green shutters currently and her understanding was that those would remain in place.

Chair Weglinski referred to the south elevation of the barn, where the wall is recessed and is less blank/flush than appears in the application, and he asked if there is an opportunity to mimic what was once there. Mr. Sampson agreed that there is a 3-4" recess on part of that wall, where there was likely a door at one point, and which he thinks can be mimicked with 2" by 4" wood boards. He added that there is also a usable door currently planned elsewhere that the applicant would be likely willing to move back to that original location. Chair Weglinski asked whether slate shingles from the barn roof would still be used to replace those missing on the main building. Mr. Sampson said yes.

Regarding roofing, Mr. Porchitz and others recalled possible misinterpretation in the adopted meeting minutes for COA-2018-02, in which the Commission seemed to request actual faux slate shingles that are expensive compared to asphalt shingles that mimic slate visually. He thought the Commission was amenable to the asphalt shingles in 2018 and he asked if the applicant was also amenable to the option. Mr. Sampson said the only issue then would be adding a third roofing material on the property (residence, connector porch, and barn), which was not ideal. Mr. Porchitz asked if the existing roof on the connector porch is near the age of replacement. Mr. Pappas said the connector roof still has 10 years of usable life.

With no public comments, Chair Weglinski closed the public hearing for Commission deliberation. Regarding a window product, Mr. Porchitz thought that the Commission approved a window product at the 2018 meeting that would match closely what is there now and he imagined that new windows would be installed in a similar manner. Commissioners agreed there were no concerns with the windows.

Commissioners discussed roof materials. Mr. Porchitz said that if the connector roof were older, he would suggest replacing it with asphalt shingles as well to continue the slate appearance. If rehabilitating the barn, Chair Weglinski questioned the desire to remove the slate instead of continuing to patch it. Ms. Proctor asked what exactly is on the connector roof. Ms. Brunner believed it was a rolled asphalt material but she could not confirm.

Due to questions remaining for the applicant, Chair Weglinski re-opened the public hearing.

Mr. Sampson said that the connector roof is currently a light grey asphalt architectural shingle and the rolled roofing product is on the lower slope roof over the porch. Many slates on the main building roof need replacing. Mr. Sampson said that the barn is losing 15-20 slates each winter, which is excessive, and the barn roof needs re-sheathing. Thus, many conditions prompted deciding to reroof the barn.

Chair Weglinski said he was hearing that the barn roof would be replaced regardless because there is rot and damage. Chair Weglinski recalled that a structural engineer previously recommended demolishing the barn from a safety and cost perspective, which was part of the impetus of COA-2018-02. While not necessarily the HDC's purview, he wanted to ensure the barn would remain a safe environment. Mr. Sampson noted that HDC approval comes after

Zoning Board approval and before Planning Board oversight. The Zoning Board approved the non-conforming use of the site; the Planning Board would ensure that all safety considerations are in place. Structural concerns would be addressed with a building permit. Chair Weglinski stated appreciation for the applicant trying to salvage the barn rather than demolishing it.

Ms. Proctor asked if the new barn roof would be the same color as the connector roof. Mr. Sampson said that was open for discussion with the Commission but stated that he did not like the current connector roof color and would prefer darker shingles. He wanted the main house to remain as pristine as possible with slates and said the only way to do so is removing them from the barn. Mr. Sampson said that when he re-sheaths the barn he wants to do the connector as well so that there are only two roofing materials overall instead of three. Ms. Proctor thinks a darker roof material is fine.

Mr. Porchitz said he now heard a contradiction with the earlier discussion of 10 years usable life left on the connector roof. He now heard that the applicant was open to replacing the connector roof as a part of the overall project, in which case Mr. Porchitz said he preferred an overall replacement of the barn and connector roofs to mimic a slate aesthetic. Chair Weglinski asked the material of preference and Mr. Porchitz said it did not need to be as expensive as faux slate when asphalt products that mimic slate appearance would be suitable.

Chair Weglinski closed the public hearing.

Commissioners agreed that two roofing materials overall were preferable to three and they were pleased that the applicant was willing to replace the connector at the same time. Commissioners discussed whether cost would be an issue in requesting that the applicant use a specific roof material. Mr. Porchitz thought the cost was more significant when discussing faux slate and he imagined an asphalt alternative would be less expensive. Commissioners agreed that they were comfortable with administrative approval of the final roofing material because staff knows that the Commission seeks a multifaceted asphalt alternative that mimics slate as best as possible versus a standard architectural shingle. The Commissioners were also comfortable with staff approving final plans/materials for the south barn elevation. Mr. Porchitz did quick research that showed rough cost differentials of the roofing materials in question and found that asphalt with a slate style aesthetic is almost two times the cost of a low/mid cost architectural shingle. While the asphalt material may be higher cost, he imagined the installation would be the same. Commissioners agreed with a recommended motion indicating preference that the connector roof should be matched with the new barn roof.

Ms. Proctor made the following motion, which Mr. Porchitz seconded. Chair Weglinski called for a roll call vote and members announced their unanimous passage of this motion.

With a vote of 5-0, the Historic District Commission approved COA-2018-02 Modification #1 for rehabilitation of the existing barn and modifications to the primary building and site, as presented in the plan set identified as “Renovations to 143 Main Street Keene, NH 03431,”

prepared by Sampson Architects at varying scales on July 25, 2018 and last revised on March 18, 2020, with the following conditions:

1. Staff approval of a mockup of mortar color, thickness, and type prior to conducting masonry repair.
2. Staff approval of a shingle product to mimic slate shingles for the existing barn and the connector roof.
3. If replacement of the porch roof is required, staff approval of the roofing product.

**4) Staff Updates**

**a. Committee Membership**

Ms. Brunner shared an updated Commission roster, which listed term expiration dates. She also reported that Erin Benik tendered her resignation, which City Council would accept officially on April 16. If Commissioners have ideas for new members, they should share those with Chair Weglinski and Ms. Brunner.

**5) New Business**

**6) Next Meeting Date – May 20, 2020**

**7) Adjourn**

There being no further business, Chair Weglinski adjourned the meeting at 5:43 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Katryna Kibler, Minute Taker  
April 22, 2020

Reviewed and edited by Mari Brunner, Planner