Heritage Commission

**Tuesday, November 10, 2020, 4:00 PM**
Zoom Meeting: [https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81211640566](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81211640566)

**AGENDA**

- This meeting will be conducted remotely.*
- The public may view/listen to the meeting by any of the following options:
  - Go to [www.zoom.us/join](https://www.zoom.us/join) and enter the Meeting ID: 812 1164 0566
  - (646) 558-8656 and enter the Meeting ID: 812 1164 0566
- If you encounter any issues accessing this meeting, please call 603-209-4697 during the meeting.

I. **Call to Order** – Roll Call

II. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** – August 19, 2020, September 15, 2020, October 14, 2020 Meeting

III. **Discussion on Neighborhood Heritage Project / Website**

IV. **Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Letter of Intent**

V. **Updates**

VI. **Next Meeting**

VII. **Adjourn**

*In Emergency Order #12, issued by the Governor pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04, which declared a COVID-19 State of Emergency, the requirement that a quorum of a public body be physically present at the meeting location under RSA 91-A:2, III(b), and the requirement that each part of a meeting of a public body be audible or otherwise discernible to the public at the meeting location under RSA 91-A:2, III(c), have been waived. Public participation may be provided through telephonic and other electronic means.*
City of Keene
New Hampshire

JOINT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION & HERITAGE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, August 19, 2020 5:00 PM Remote Meeting via Zoom

Historic District Commission Members
Present: Andrew Weglinski, Chair
Councilor Catherine Workman
Hope Benik
Tia Hockett, Alternate (Voting)

Heritage Commission Members Present:
Rose Carey, Chair
Councilor Gladys Johnsen
Susan DeGidio
Cauley Powell
Louise Zerba, Alternate (Voting)

Historic District Commission Members
Not Present:
Nancy Proctor
Sam Temple
Hans Porchitz
Hanspeter Weber, Alternate
Joslin Kimball Frank, Alternate
Dave Bergeron, Alternate
Peter Poanessa, Alternate

Heritage Commission Members Not Present:
Charlotte Schuerman
Erin Benik
Kelly Ballard

Staff Present:
Tara Kessler, Senior Planner
Mari Brunner, Planner

1) Call to Order and Roll Call
Chair Weglinski called the meeting to order at 5:03 PM and read the executive order authorizing a remote meeting: Emergency Order #12, issued by the Governor of the State of New Hampshire pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04. Pursuant to this order the members present, all of whom called alone, stated their locations. Chair Weglinski, Councilor Workman, Ms. Hockett, Chair Carey, Ms. Powell, Councilor Johnsen, and Ms. Zerba called from their home addresses. Ms. Benik called from 34 Court Street.

2) NH Certified Local Government Program Discussion – Staff from the NH Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) will facilitate a discussion regarding the City’s involvement in the Certified Local Government Program, which is a partnership between municipal governments and the state historic preservation program to encourage and expand local involvement in preservation-related activities.
Ms. Kessler introduced Staff from the NH Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR), Amy Dixon (calling alone from Warner, NH) and Nadine Miller (calling alone from Nashua, NH), who tour Certified Local Government Program communities every few years to check-in.

Ms. Miller explained that the Certified Local Government (CLG) program is a partnership between the National Park Service, the NHDHR, and the 25 current local NH communities participating, which must have a Historic District regulated locally. Keene has been a CLG community for approximately 12 years and has done great work, particularly due to the joint roles of the Historic District and Heritage Commissions fostering the CLG's responsibility to the whole town, not just the Historic District. Ms. Miller said that the greatest benefit of the CLG program is two-year grants awarded annually for various programming such as surveying historic properties anywhere in town, master plan development, ordinance review, and education. Ms. Miller said that the NHDHR promotes Keene to other CLG communities as an example of popular community engagement to determine whether/how to expand their Historic District. Every four years, NHDHR staff check-in with CLG communities and at this meeting, Ms. Miller went through a series of questions for Staff and Commission members’ reply.

1. How does the community enforce State and local legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties?

Ms. Kessler confirmed that Keene follows the US Secretary of Interior standards for Historic Preservation. Ms. Miller asked if there had been any controversial projects of note in the City for discussion moving forward. Chair Weglinski noted the common Historic District Commission theme of retroactive approvals – applicants doing work and asking forgiveness later – that the Commission is trying to limit but must address case-by-case during public hearings. Ms. Brunner added that in some instances, people were unaware they were in the Downtown Historic District and therefore needed approval; however, there have also been instances where people who should have known that they needed permission did not seek approval until the City asked them to after-the-fact. Ms. Miller suggested a possible future CLG grant could be used for education and promotion to Historic District residents.

2. Are Commission memberships adequate and qualified?

Ms. Kessler confirmed that the City requests resumes or background information and initial interest letters for all Commission members, which are kept on file as a requirement for nominating and appointing new members.

3. Do the Commissions meet at minimum four times annually?

Ms. Kessler confirmed that the Heritage Commission meets bi-monthly and the Historic District Commission meets at minimum four times annually, and often more than four times (pending applications). Commission meetings are currently proceeding virtually during the Covid-19 State of Emergency.

4. Is there a system for survey and inventory of historic properties?
Ms. Kessler said the City is currently under contract with a historic preservation firm to conduct a historic resource inventory of carriage houses, barns, and agricultural buildings near to the City's downtown to understand what resources exist between Court and Washington Streets, to identify properties most at risk of potential demolition, and to work with those property owners by helping them to seek resources to preserve historic features. Chair Weglinski noted that a carriage house on Main Street came to the Historic District Commission several times for rehabilitation. He added that due to the Historic District expansion in 2011, a section of the District remains unranked, and a subcommittee of these two Commissions formed but could not continue work during the Covid-19 State of Emergency. Ms. Miller suggested such a ranking effort could be a CLG grant opportunity, similar to CLG initiatives in Lebanon, Sanbornton, and Amherst, the latter of which integrated GIS into their ranking for their website.

5. Does the community participate in the NHDHR’s program to recommend buildings to the National Register?

Ms. Kessler said that a local property owner chose to be on the State Register in 2019 and the Heritage Commission was helpful in that process. Ms. Miller said that a CLG grant could fund listing a property on the Register.

6. Are there public hearings and minutes for all Commission decisions and actions?

Ms. Kessler said that per the Right to Know Law (RSA 91-A), meeting agendas and minutes are posted to the City website and elsewhere within the Law’s terms. Ms. Miller asked about posting historic resource inventories/surveys, etc. on the website. Ms. Kessler said that the City applied unsuccessfully for a CLG grant in the last round to better consolidate that historical resource survey information for the public, but there is insufficient Staff time for the effort despite seeing the great advantage. Ms. Miller referenced an inventory database that can help in this effort without having to visit the NHDHR office; Ms. Kessler and Chair Carey have access to the database.

Having concluded the formal questionnaire, Ms. Miller noted that she reviews Federal and State projects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and she asks applicants in the Keene Historic District to check-in with the Historic District Commission; she knew the Commission was very responsive on cell tower projects. Ms. Miller asked how the Section 106 review process is working for the City. Ms. Kessler said that review is effective generally and if an applicant does not come to the City directly, the NHDHR notifies the City of the application and encourages the applicant to visit the Heritage Commission, which can provide feedback to assist in State review. Chair Carey thought the Section 106 review process works well to allow the City to work with applicants trying to modify historic areas; there have been several instances in the last two years. Ms. Miller appreciated the comments and added that when an application is in the Historic District, the NHDHR tries to condition their comments on following local guidelines as well.

The conversation continued on cell towers and Ms. Miller said that the NHDHR sometimes reviews those applications within the programmatic agreements that telecommunications companies sign, which can sometimes limit the NHDHR review. Ms. Miller cited a project on
Water Street that NHDHR was not allowed to review. Ms. Kessler said the City was informed by that applicant that they were exempt from Section 106 and the City informed Ms. Miller, who said that if there were significant local concerns, the NHDHR could investigate further. Ms. Brunner explained that Staff were concerned because under the City's Telecommunications Ordinance, the proposal to expand that array would require a Conditional Use Permit but State law preempted local authority. Staff was concerned because that array was placed on a historic building outside the Historic District and prior to its establishment and creation of the local Telecommunications Ordinance. The applicant subsequently reduced the array size but now wants to increase it again and the proposal does not follow local regulations. Ms. Kessler said that Staff ultimately felt it was impossible to require a review process due to State law and opted to not seek NHDHR support to go directly to the FCC because the array was preempted at State level. Ms. Miller cited another small cell collocation downtown and Ms. Kessler said that applicant contacted the City and in consultation with Chair Carey, Staff determined that because it was located on a State right-of-way farther from downtown and with no historic buildings in a reasonable radius, the decision was to not bring it to the Heritage Commission. Ms. Miller said to never hesitate contacting NHDHR for projects of concern.

Commissioners cited the following ideas with which NHDHR could potentially help the City:

- Emerald Street resource inventory – part of the 2011 Historic District expansion. Ms. Brunner will consult with Ms. Miller.
- Stone Arch Bridge – final work pends a grant application that the City needs assistance writing. Ms. Dixon would determine whether grant writing is an eligible expense. Because the bridge is a part of the Transportation Heritage Trail, there could be other types of funding available, such as for additional research on the bridge or rail line because it was never formally evaluated historically, or for sign concepts and design development (not installation). Ms. Miller said that NHDHR encourages NH Department of Transportation to work with the City and to have confidence in the Heritage Commissions ability to excel with that bridge. The Heritage Commission would discuss.
- Heritage Commission grant application deferred to this fall – this is a major project for the Commission to best digitize their resources for the public. Ms. Dixon would revisit the original submission but thought funds ran out last time, agreed it was a worthwhile effort, and said the City should contact NHDHR in the fall or closer to beginning of 2021 with an updated cost quote from the vendor.
- Historic District Commission support – Ms. Miller and Ms. Dixon can help the Keene Commission collaborate with other Historic District Commissions through the State. Additionally, the NHDHR can provide resources to best support new Commission members learning their roles; to begin, Commissioners can refer to the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions website, including their CAMP program that the State has been trying to replicate.

3) Other Business

Chair Carey welcomed Councilor Johnsen to the Heritage Commission and Ms. Kessler would work with the Councilor via email on the Commission's history. There should be a
Commissioner on both the Heritage and Historic District Commissions, but is lacking at this time.

The Commissions would like to hold joint meetings more often to check-in and collaborate, perhaps annually. Ms. Kessler added that CLG grants are available annually, with the application due in November, and so it might be good to have that annual joint meeting toward the end of summer or early fall to determine if the Commissions want to apply for a collaborative grant. The City can submit multiple applications at the same time, currently has one active grant for the carriage barn project, and one application moving forward this fall for web developer support to create a public database of historic property inventories. The downside of the grants is that only research projects are funded 100% and other programs like education require a 40% community match, which can include Staff and volunteer time.

Both Commissions would discuss at their next meetings ways to better collaborate and consider a replacement liaison member for both Commissions. Carey would send status updates to Ms. Brunner to determine when both sides want the next joint meeting.

4) Adjourn

There being no further business, Chair Weglinski adjourned the meeting at 5:59 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Katryna Kibler, Minute Taker
August 26, 2020

Reviewed and edited by Mari Brunner, Planner
City of Keene
New Hampshire

HERITAGE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020 4:00 PM Remotely via Zoom

Members Present:
Susan D’Egidio, Vice Chair
Rose Carey, Co-Chair
Charlotte Schuerman, Co-Chair
Cauley Powell
Gladys Johnsen, Councilor
Louise Zerba, Alternate

Staff Present:
Tara Kessler, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:
Kelly Ballard
Erin Benik

1) Call to Order and Roll Call
Roll call was conducted. Co-Chair Carey noted that Ms. Zerba is a voting member today.

Co-Chair Carey read a prepared statement explaining how the Emergency Order #12, pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04 issued by the Governor of New Hampshire, waives certain provisions of RSA 91-A (which regulates the operation of public body meetings) during the declared COVID-19 State of Emergency. She called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting – March 11, 2020
Co-Chair Schuerman made a motion to adopt the minutes of March 11, 2020. Ms. Zerba seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

3) Presentation on Transportation Heritage Trail
Charles (Chuck) Redfern stated that he is with the Bicycle Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee (BPPAC) and also the co-founder with John Summers of Pathways for Keene (PFK), which is the fundraising arm for the rail trail system in Keene. PFK has been in existence since 1994. The BPPAC was formed shortly after that to implement the City of Keene’s Bicycle Master Plan. The Cheshire Rail Trail is perhaps the most substantial of the trails in Keene, in that it takes up the most amount of geography. The Ashuelot Rail Trail is shown on the map in grey. That is
much shorter in Keene than the actual Cheshire Rail Trail, which is shown in green, and the next phase proposed is shown in yellow. They will talk about the latter today. It is an extension of Eastern Ave to Rt. 101. There is a trailhead on Eastern Ave. for cars to park and unload bicycles and go onto the trails. With that extension they are also looking at crossing the Stone Arch Bridge (SAB), which is heavily used even though it is technically closed to the public. There was even a wedding on the bridge last Saturday, and the wedding party arrived and departed by bicycles. There are safety improvements that need to be made to the SAB.

He continued that then the Prouse Bridge would come next. The SAB is historically significant. The city developed around the railroad. The Prouse Bridge is significant in the eyes of NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT). It was the first bridge that used a certain type of steel used to create the bridges on the US interstate system started by President Eisenhower. It was also adopted for other highway uses. The Prouse Bridge had been in existence on I-93 in Londonderry and has been purchased by the City of Keene for $1 and is in a sandpit in Londonderry for its eventual relocation to Keene. Hopefully they will be able to negotiate for the NHDOT to pay the cost of transport. It would be nice for the NHDOT to support its own history to do that. The bridge is broken up into pieces, showing exactly how to reassemble it so it retains its historical significance. What will also be important with the SAB is the safety improvements being proposed, along with the other stone cap box, is that it remain safe but also that they do not lose the historical significance of the bridge.

He continued that the yellow portion of the map is the last phase from the green area to the City line. Then the trail goes into Swanzey. The Town of Swanzey will be looking to make improvements at about the same time as Keene. On the left side going up toward North Bridge and Whitcomb Mill Rd, the trail will go much further.

Lynne Monroe stated that the company she works for (Preservation Company), as part of preparing for the removal of the Prouse Bridge from its original location, is preparing an interpretive sign to accompany it to Keene and its new location. Mr. Redfern asked when that is happening. Ms. Monroe replied probably the spring. She continued that she would be interested in talking with Mr. Redfern about the location they wish it to be installed in, at some point as they move toward fabrication. Mr. Redfern replied that he may contact her later to talk.

Continuing his presentation, Mr. Redfern stated that the goal of PFK and the City’s Master Plan is to create over 20 miles of the rail trails. They want to improve them for use by runners, walkers, and bicyclists. He continued that the trails are also used by people on inline skates and now people using ADA-approved carts. The routes connect to places of work, schools, shopping, and recreation. Also the trails increase safety for all pedestrians and bicyclists. PFK is also here to help revitalize the downtown, which was important back in 1995 when there were a lot of empty storefronts. They were trying to promote tourism and recreation for citizens and the use of shops and restaurants, many of which are located within half a mile of the trail system, which goes through the middle of the downtown.
He continued that the project serves a dual purpose: use by citizens and visitors. The Boston Globe just named the Cheshire Rail Trail the 5th most friendly place to bike with families in New England. The Transportation Heritage Trail will be the next phase of the ongoing development of the existing Cheshire Rail Trail system. This section will begin at the terminus of the Keene Industrial Heritage Trail.

Mr. Redfern continued that construction will be in three major segments: the extension of the trail from Eastern Ave., the improvements of the SAB, and the installation of the Prouse Bridge. For budget purposes it will be broken out into four components, possibly five. The State is doing an economic impact study for the rail trails in the state. They have UNH and the Nelson Rockefeller Center at Dartmouth involved, and hired GPI Consulting.

Mr. Redfern continued that he has three asks for this committee, and one is: he is asking for letters of support as he goes about applying for grants. He will be asking for those to be signed by the committee chairs. He can give a template of what he has used with others and the chairs could customize it to meet the Heritage Commission’s needs. There was a discussion of a subcommittee during the Heritage Commission’s meeting minutes of March 11. Those minutes say that Co-Chair Carey attended the BPPAC meeting and the BPPAC was seeking two Heritage Commission members to join BPPAC members in forming a subcommittee to do help do historical research, public outreach, promotional work, and that type of activity. There are administrative issues to consider with this, to follow the City’s protocol for subcommittees (for example, agendas and meeting minutes), but the protocol for subcommittees is not as extensive as the protocol for formal committees. The subcommittee could meet every other month instead of monthly. Then the Heritage Commission members on the subcommittee could report back to the Heritage Commission about what is going on.

Ms. Monroe stated that (Preservation Company) is working on the Winchester Street Reconstruction Project, of which the Baily Bridge is a component, and it would be great to have his help. She continued that they will be writing the historical documentation for that area.

Mr. Redfern stated that the next slide is the potential for the budget, with costs for the four phases. He continued that they have always worked building the trail systems with the help of federal money. That federal money has been called different programs over the years as administrations and Congress has changed, but basically it is Transportation Alternatives funding, and Recreational Trails grants. They all come from the Federal Highway Administration. Where they are getting the grant from will determine the size of the match. There are two tables, one showing what the costs would be if it was 50% Federal funds, 25%
City funds, and 25% PFK funds; and one showing what the costs would be if it was 80% Federal funds, 10% City funds, and 10% PFK funds. The Cheshire Rail Trail Extension will be crushed stone dust. PFK has already paid for 100% of the preliminary design cost. The SAB safety improvements would be $123,000. The trailhead at the end of Eastern Ave would be $30,475. Some parts of the project are relatively cheap. The extension will require logging, survey work, water work/drainage improvements, and so on and so forth.

Ms. Kessler stated that Mr. Redfern has a draft letter of support to share. She showed it on the screen. Mr. Redfern stated that it is an example of what he would be seeking from the Heritage Commission in the future. He has received letters of support so far from the BPPAC, Keene Chamber of Commerce, and Cheshire Medical Center’s public health group.

Mr. Redfern asked if Ms. Kessler can facilitate communication between the Heritage Commission and the BPPAC to form this subcommittee and help him navigate whatever administrative needs there might be, regarding the City’s protocol. Ms. Kessler replied that she might defer to Mr. Schoefmann to be the staff support for the subcommittee; she will talk with him. Mr. Redfern stated that the draft minutes of the March 11 meeting said there was talk about creating this subcommittee, particularly for the SAB improvements portion of the project. They could start that subcommittee through Zoom, since COVID-19 will likely last through the spring. He asked if anyone had questions.

Co-Chair Carey asked if he is looking for subcommittee members now. Mr. Redfern replied that he would need them by a month from now. Co-Chair Carey asked if anyone who is present right now would like to be a member. Ms. D’Egidio replied that she would be interested but is hesitant due to COVID-19. She asked if they would be able to do the research online instead of in person. Co-Chair Carey replied yes. Mr. Redfern replied that he compiled research on the Prouse Bridge that he got from the NHDOT. He continued that the NHDOT was very helpful. He thinks someone could get ahold of the material that was used to get the SAB designated as a historical infrastructure. Co-Chair Carey replied yes, they could get into the details of that.

Ms. Powell stated that she will join the subcommittee as well. Ms. Kessler stated that she will share the names with Mr. Schoefmann so she and he can start reaching out to people to set up a subcommittee meeting.

Ms. Monroe stated that all the research on both the Prouse Bridge and SAB are enormous files at the Division of Historical Research and that is available online for folks. Ms. Kessler replied that the City has some of those files on its server, too, and has other tools to use to access that research.

Co-Chair Carey asked if they should take a vote on the letter of support. Ms. Kessler offered suggested wording for a motion.
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Ms. Zerba made a motion to allow the Heritage Commission Chair to draft and sign a letter of support for the Transportation Heritage Trail Project. Ms. D’Egidio seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Redfern asked that it be addressed “To Whom it May Concern” and be printed on letterhead.

4) **Overview of Urban Barn and Carriage House Inventory**

Ms. Kessler stated that three members are here from Preservation Company, the team that has been hired to work on this project. She asked them to introduce themselves.

Lynne Monroe introduced herself, Reagan Baydoun Ruedig, and Laura Driemeyer. Ms. Monroe stated that they are eager to get going with the field work before it gets too late in the year. She continued that Ms. Kessler asked them to come today to talk with the Heritage Commission about how the Heritage Commission might support their work.

Ms. Kessler stated that the City received a CLG grant to hire a consultant to conduct an urban barn and carriage house inventory in the area between Court and Washington Streets. Soon after hiring a consultant, COVID-19 occurred. They received an extension from the State and Federal government for this project until September of next year. A lot of it is field work, and a component is engaging the public. As a team they decided to postpone the original schedule, and there is more work to do between the City and the team to determine the revised timeframe. They are just starting to pick up work on the project. To briefly recap: they are inventorying an area of the City to the north of Central Square between Court St. and Washington St. and just south of North St. It is the triangle between Court and Washington Streets. They brought on a historic resource consultant to help do inventories of those properties to better understand the historic significance of barns and outbuildings and to help the City understand which properties are most significant in those areas, and which are most at risk, and and give information they can share with the property owners about the significance of the structures. They have seen a number of barns and outbuildings be demolished over the years. Even though the City has a Demolition Review Committee sometimes it is hard to know the significance of a building when they only have a five day turnaround to make a determination of historical significance. Some of them are not in great condition so it may seem easy to sign off on demolition. But if they have this information it would help the Demolition Review Committee evaluate the significance of a structure before signing off on whether it is clear that it can be demolished.

Ms. Kessler stated that the Heritage Commission’s co-chairs asked for staff to bring the consultants in to learn more about what the expectations would be of the Heritage Commission in providing support and research to their team as they are going into this area and doing inventoring. Today they can meet and discuss how the Heritage Commission can help and discuss timeframes and expectations for how to work together.
Ms. Monroe stated that the Preservation Company is being asked by the Division of Historical Resources to use the survey form that Concord used to conduct its urban barn survey. However, they were under the impression when signing the contract with the City that the form to be used was the Barn Form. The Concord survey form involves more work that was not anticipated in the development of the budget for the project. She asked Ms. Driemeyer if there are parts of the form the City could fill in, such as information from tax research. She is concerned because the budget on this is exceedingly tight and they very much want to do it and they could give the City so much information if they did not have to put it into this format. In terms of research, they could use the support of the Commission to find historical photographs, and to research any historical photos that has a carriage barn in it. Also, the Commission could support interaction with the public on the project, such as mailing notices, contacting property owners, issuing press releases, etc. Ms. Kessler noted that they will need property owners’ permission to enter private property and to take photographs.

Co-Chair Carey replied that the Heritage Commission is very happy to help with all of those things that Ms. Monroe mentioned. She continued that these are things the Heritage Commission had talked about as being in the scope of the grant, and they are ways that they could support the work. Ms. Monroe thanked her.

Ms. Ruedig stated that Ms. Kessler has given them information from the Assessor’s database, so that helps them begin to compile a list of every property that has a carriage barn. She continued that this data has to be refined some, since some of those buildings are just garages. They have to go through and really make a complete list of all the properties they will be making a survey form for. That will be double-checked when they are out in the field, to make sure something qualifies as a carriage barn. Ms. Monroe stated that in the best possible world they would be surveying every garage, barn, and shed on the property, but this project started out as “carriage barns.” Ms. Ruedig noted that the list Ms. Kessler sent her has every building that the Assessor sees, whether garage, shed, barn, and so on and so forth. She has been flagging and taking out sheds and garages. They need to figure out the line. Ms. Kessler stated that the reason the Assessor database is that way is because there could be a carriage barn called a “garage,” since the Assessor is not applying a historical lens to how they assess properties. It is a starting place and she can work with Ms. Ruedig to drill down into this database.

Ms. Ruedig stated that as she looks at other maps and sources, she sees there are also attached carriage barns that did not make the Assessor’s list. Hopefully soon, they will give the Heritage Commission an actual list of the properties they are looking at, so they can help the Heritage Commission narrow down what historic photographs they are looking for, and maybe some basic history/information about the well-known buildings, that the Heritage Commission can give them. Co-Chair Carey replied that that sounds great, and when the list comes through, Heritage Commission members can do some “windshield surveys” to see if the buildings are actually worthy of the work.
Ms. Monroe stated that she is worried about the numbers. Ms. Ruedig stated that the numbers are still to be determined. They had originally estimated about 65. Ms. Kessler replied that the original grant application said 60. She continued that as Ms. Monroe was saying earlier, they assumed that they were using one form and then after they received the grant they learned that there is a totally different form that the consultants would have to use, that brings in much more detail than was anticipated. It affects the budget and time, so the number may have to go down. Ms. Monroe stated that maybe they could work with the Division of Historical Resources (DHR) about which fields of the form need to be filled out. It is worth conversation. Ms. Kessler replied yes, they can do that. She continued that once they have a sense of the number/starting place, the City can inquire with DHR. She is happy to work with Ms. Ruedig regarding the Assessor’s data. And the Assessor can be pulled in, too, if needed, if there are questions.

Ms. Zerba asked if the Heritage Commission will be walking the neighborhoods. Co-Chair Carey replied that walking would not be necessary; they can drive. Ms. Monroe replied that she needs to walk and be on the properties. Ms. Carey replied yes, and the Heritage Commission can help with that, by getting the word out via press or letters, when Ms. Monroe knows when she will be doing that. Ms. Monroe replied that it should be soon, because the weather is getting cold. Ms. Kessler stated that they will need to get direct permission from the property owners, if Ms. Monroe is going to walk on their properties. Ms. Monroe replied that she can try to do it from the right-of-way but the survey involves buildings on the back of the properties. Ms. Monroe stated that spring survey work is much better. Co-Chair Carey asked if they want to work the list and then do the survey work in the spring. Ms. Kessler replied that that would give them time to send direct letters to the property owners to let them know that this project is happening. Ms. Monroe stated that the letters could tell the property owners the day and timeframe to expect her. Ms. Kessler replied that they will have to work the details out. But if they shift to spring it will give everyone more time to prepare and also let the neighborhoods know that this will be happening. She foresees that the City would send letters directly to all the property owners that will be part of the survey, letting them know that the City may be reaching out to them again to seek permission for access to their property and being really clear about what would happen. They will have to come up with a way to confirm that access has been granted. The City and Commission will work with the three consultants, and do their due diligence in working with the property owners to help get the needed access.

Co-Chair Carey asked what else the three of them would like help with. She continued that the Commission can do research, and photos, and they will put this public outreach on the back burner until spring and when they have that list. Ms. Monroe stated that they will not be doing a full-fledged inventory form on every one of these properties. It is a huge amount and they do not have the budget for it. As much as they would like to, it is just not possible. Co-Chair Carey stated that they can use the next few months to work together on what is going to be researched and how. Ms. Diemeyer and Ms. Monroe showed the Heritage Commission a slide of an example barn survey form that they used in Concord and all of the information it contains, compared to the form the DHR is requiring them to use for the Keene project. Ms. Kessler stated that the work that the three of them do will be focused on the carriage houses – describing the
architectural features and history. Ms. Monroe replied yes, they want to give the City a really good understanding of how carriage barns were used in Keene and in general and the importance of them. Ms. Driemeyer stated that a context document accompanies the survey form, addressing those points, so they understand the evolution of carriage barns, urban barns, and carriage houses, in the context of Keene. Ms. Monroe replied that that is what Ms. Driemeyer will be writing and that is the exciting part of the survey. Ms. Kessler stated that the form that the DHR has provided for the project brings in more information about the main building, not just the carriage barn, and that is what Ms. Monroe, Ms. Driemeyer, and Ms. Ruedig are looking for support with – understanding the other aspects of the property, since originally it was proposed that they just be focusing on the carriage barns, not the main building or property. Ms. Monroe agreed. Ms. Kessler stated that she wants it to be clear for the Commission that there is a distinction between what the City contracted with the consultant for and what the DHR is asking for. That is why the consultants are looking for more volunteer support from the Commission, because it goes beyond the scope that the consultants signed onto, and that the City sought. Ms. Monroe agreed. Co-Chair Carey replied that the Commission appreciates that, and they will help the consultants and support this project however they can. Ms. Kessler stated that she will follow-up with the consultants on what the next steps are, and in finalizing that list of properties so the Heritage Commission can look at that and have time to do that research collection.

Councilor Johnsen stated that can go to the City Attorney and make sure they are doing it right, so they can take pictures. She continued that she is sure he would be able to handle this. Ms. Kessler replied that he can tell them what the legal parameters are, but she is almost certain they cannot go on anyone’s property without permission. She continued that the State statute is pretty clear on that. Councilor Johnsen stated that she would be happy to meet with the City Attorney about that. Ms. Kessler replied that the City Attorney would be protecting the City from any legal issues and they can consult with him about what the parameters are. He would tell them what kind of confirmation they need from the property owners to ensure the consultants were indeed granted access. She will work with him directly on that.

Ms. Zerba asked if she heard Ms. Kessler say she has a list of all the carriage houses they will be looking at in that section of the city. Ms. Kessler replied that she has a list of all of the properties in the study area, and the consultants are looking at that list and narrowing it down to those properties with historic barn or carriage house structures. Ms. Zerba asked if the consultants would be doing that first step, not the Commission members. Ms. Kessler replied that the project they applied for the grant for would not have required much volunteer work to support the work of the consultants; it is just that now the scope has been expanded beyond the City’s/Heritage Commission’s consultants’ control. Therefore the consultants will need support in order to meet the numbers. Ms. Zerba replied that if they are doing it in the spring there is plenty of time to do that.

5) Discussion on Neighborhood Heritage Projects
Co-Chair Carey stated that they had talked about working with the Mayor on his interest in neighborhood improvement projects for the city. She continued that it is her understanding that he is interested in working with an area near the proposed Heritage Trail. She asked Ms. Kessler to talk about that. Ms. Kessler stated that the Mayor has an interest in neighborhood work, as he had mentioned to the Commission in January. She continued that since that time, a project that is still in the works/being explored is something called “21 in 21.” It is an effort to identify sources of funding that would invested into rehabilitating residential structures in a specific geographic area. The intent is to try to target an area of housing that is on the verge of decline and needs some investment of resources. Another element of this would be looking at the different types of funding resources to identify what would be possible for the types of investments. There has been talk about energy improvements or exterior improvements. And then using it as a tool not only for supporting those specific properties, but also to support neighborhood revitalization and to show that there is a commitment to investing in a specific area. There is currently not a lot out there about that program and there is not a geographic area that has been selected. It is very much in the early stages of trying to figure out what this program could look like; then it would be about finding the funding to support it and identifying a location in the city.

However, Ms. Kessler continued, she noted to Co-Chair Carey that there is a project happening at Pat Russell Park (formerly Carpenter Field). The City’s Capital Improvement Plan had money set aside to design and implement capital improvements to that park. That is now in the design phase. A consultant is putting together a conceptual plan for the park, including a destination playground, improvements to the athletic field, a walking trail, and a connection to downtown. There are compelling statistics that make this an area of interest to focus on, since this park redesign will really engage the neighborhoods surrounding it and there are so many people living within walking distance of the park, of all ages. It is a real focal point. There has not been any commitment publicly saying this is the area 21 in 21 will focus on, but this is the area that Southwest Community Services (SCS) is focused on and they are trying to find projects that will support the park redesign project, from a housing perspective. She mentioned this area to Co-Chair Carey because it might be a place to start. Efforts could be quite compatible with other things that are happening, in terms of getting people excited about the history or heritage of this place and the neighborhood and how it evolved. There will be a lot of outreach through this park planning process. Another element is that there are a lot of renters in the area, so having another project that is going to have targeted outreach means that the Commission could potentially combine efforts in trying to reach out to people that would otherwise be a little more difficult to reach. It seemed like this could be a place for the Heritage Commission to join their efforts with the efforts of another project, if they are interested. She knows the Heritage Commission has mentioned other locations in the city, like the Island St. area and Maple Acres. She is not trying to steer them into one area; she just wanted to let them know there could be a good opportunity through this current project to tie in their efforts.

Co-Chair Carey suggested they put a meeting on the schedule for next month so they would have the time to really get into a discussion about this – about what the expectations are and how they
might support the Mayor in his neighborhoods projects. Other members agreed. Ms. Kessler stated that the Commission typically meets every other month but they could have a meeting in October. She continued that the map on the screen is something she came up with after Co-Chair Carey had asked for a map to help guide these conversations. She showed what the map has and stated that it has been more difficult than anticipated to link the age of properties to the map. She is still working on it, to color code all the properties 50 years or older, or 100 years or older. Co-Chair Carey replied that that would be very helpful. Ms. Kessler replied that once she has the age of the properties, she will send the map out to the Commission members. They can use the map as a beginning planning tool. Co-Chair Carey thanked her. Ms. Kessler stated that she will get this map out to them enough in advance of the October meeting so they can come to that meeting with some sense of areas they want to focus on. Co-Chair Schuerman thanked her for her wonderful work on this.

6) Commission Membership

Ms. Kessler stated that to give a brief update on membership, the Commission currently has a full roster. Some members (Rose Carey and Susan D’Egidio) have terms that have expired but have generously continued on. They had talked with the Mayor about this and he was okay with them continuing to serve until they were able to find new members who were qualified and interested in serving on the Commission. Co-Chair Carey stated that they have serious considerations for the beginning of 2021, because it looks like everyone’s term will expire in 2021. Ms. Kessler replied that most of those are first terms, and those people could serve second terms if they want to. She continued that there are no term limits for alternates. As a reminder, they did ask the Mayor about waiving term limits, and he was wary of doing that because other boards and committees would ask for that, too. He was clear that he was willing to let Heritage Commission members with expired terms continue to serve until they could find interested and qualified replacements.

7) Updates

Ms. D’Egidio stated that she (the Demolition Review Subcommittee) had two demolitions from earlier in the summer. She continued that a demolition application just came in yesterday, for a red barn on Marlboro St. She has left a message for Alan Rumrill and he is supposed to get back to her. The person she spoke with at City Hall did not know the age of the barn, but there was some talk that it was moved from a different property to Marlboro St. and that there was some connection with the Colony family. Because of that, she is trying to find out more about it. The buyers are a couple from Connecticut and they want to build a house on it. She is working on this application now. She has not had a chance to go by the property yet but she has pictures of it. Kathy Harper has offered to take pictures inside. The buyers approached the Historical Society to ask about the barn. They do not want it to be torn down but that is where they want to build their house in a couple years. She is pleased that they want to try and save it, but the application says they have a contractor to disassemble it for no cost, which she thinks means he
will repurpose the wood. She would like to know the Colony connection before anything else happens, so she is working on it. She hopes Mr. Rumrill can help figure out the barn’s age.

Ms. Powell stated that this used to be a farm; she read about it in one of Mr. Rumrill’s books.

Ms. Kessler stated that the property was subdivided in 2004, if that helps. The barn was attached with the house prior to that. Brief discussion ensued. Ms. D’Egidio stated that she may try and talk with the contractor about his plans. She asked if it is okay if Kathy Harper takes pictures inside and out – the property owners said she could. Ms. Kessler replied as long as she does it on her own accord. If she were doing it on behalf of the City in some way the City would need confirmation from the property owners. Ms. D’Egidio replied that she can get that. Ms. Kessler replied that Ms. Harper can share the photos with the Heritage Commission to have on file.

8) **Next Meeting**

9) **Adjourn**

There being no further business, Co-Chair Carey adjourned the meeting at 5:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by Tara Kessler, Senior Planner.
Ms. Kessler read a prepared statement explaining how the Emergency Order #12, pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04 issued by the Governor of New Hampshire, waives certain provisions of RSA 91-A (which regulates the operation of public body meetings) during the declared COVID-19 State of Emergency.

1) Call to Order

Co-Chair Carey called the meeting to order at 4:03 PM. Roll call was conducted.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting – August 19, 2020 and September 15, 2020

Ms. Kessler stated that the draft minutes might not have reached everyone, because there have been technical difficulties, so the Commission can postpone adopting the meeting minutes if they want to. Discussion ensued and Co-Chair Carey stated that they will postpone this until the next meeting. Ms. Kessler clarified that if any member of the public asks to see the minutes, Staff would provide them with the draft minutes, as they are public. But the minutes will not be posted on the City’s website until the Commission adopts them.
3) Discussion on Neighborhood Heritage Projects

Ms. Kessler stated that this is a continuation from last month’s meeting – the topic of different neighborhoods to consider exploring for doing neighborhood engagement projects. She created a map for the Commission to use.

Co-Chair Carey stated that they talked about supporting the Mayor’s “21 in 21” project, which is rehabilitating 21 houses in this coming year, by aligning any neighborhood heritage project with this effort. She continued that part of that project focuses on specific neighborhoods. The Commission talked earlier about helping to identify historic neighborhoods in Keene and maybe doing a pictorial essay and research on these neighborhoods or documenting their unique development and stories. They can talk about other ways to support the Mayor in his drive to bring public awareness to the neighborhoods. The neighborhood surrounding Patricia Russell Park is of potential interest as there is a City project underway to design and redevelop the park and it is in close proximity to a diverse population of residents with respect to age and income. The Commission has the opportunity now to talk among themselves and share ideas about how to move forward, or not, with this project. She would like to hear people’s thoughts. The Commission will also be supporting the Urban Barn & Carriage House research project this year.

Ms. D’Egidio asked what the question for the Commission is, regarding Patricia Russell Park. Ms. Ballard asked where the park is. Ms. Kessler replied that it is downtown, near Church St., across from Beaver Brook. She showed it on a map on the screen. Brief discussion ensued about the location. Ms. Kessler stated that it is mostly it is used for recreational programming now, but there is a design project happening right now to reimagine and development a design and construction plan for the park. Currently the plan shows a destination playground, increased access to the park, a new walking trail along Beaver Brook, and upgrading the recreation field. COVID-19 has changed plans but it was intended to be a pretty significant outreach project in that neighborhood. Discussion continued about the location of the Park.

Ms. Powell asked, with regards to the neighborhoods in general and this Pat Russell Park area, what they are calling the boundaries and how the boundaries are being decided, and is that the project the Commission is being asked to do? Are they being asked to find cultural delineations for the various parts of Keene that would justify it as a unique, separate neighborhood? Co-Chair Carey replied that that was part of her understanding – helping pull together what they can find about the histories and timeframes of when the neighborhoods were developed. She asked Ms. Kessler if that is her understanding.

Ms. Kessler replied that in the early months of this year, when the Mayor talked with the Commission, he had an idea about neighborhood engagement but not yet a defined project and was supportive of what the Commission might undertake with respect to neighborhood planning as it relates to the mission of the Commission. She noted that this proposed project has not yet been defined and there are important questions to consider. For example, narrowing in on a general geographic area is important, but what happens once a neighborhood area is picked?
What is the project, what is the task? Keene does not have clearly-defined neighborhoods. Part of it would be trying to delineate what the area of the neighborhood is, based on certain criteria that the Commission would come up with. However, the focus would be on the history of the neighborhood and on its heritage. She continued that if part of the project’s focus is trying to brand the historic identity of the neighborhood area then there would need to be criteria to determine the boundaries or what makes the neighborhood unique, what are some themes they see in the development of the neighborhood, and so on and so forth.

Ms. Zerba asked if the Mayor is asking the Commission to determine the neighborhoods, instead of the City Council or Staff. She asked if all of the 21 homes in the project would be in the same neighborhood. She is unclear.

Ms. Kessler replied that she does not think the Mayor was expecting anything in particular from the Commission with respect to “21 in 21”. She continued that when he came in February it was to introduce himself and get to know the Commission better and express the types of projects he wanted to explore. There seemed to be a link between his interests and the Commission’s work and interests, but he did not have a direct ask for the Commission to take on any specific projects. The “21 in 21” project is related in that it addresses a project at the neighborhood scale, but, at the moment, it does have a geographic focus and the program details have not been decided on yet. It is her understanding that this project is in its early stages, and the focus is on identifying a geographic area to invest grant dollars or other dollars into properties that are on the decline, to bring them back, through exterior modifications, energy efficiency retrofits, interior modifications, etc. That project is early in its development and is a partnership with Southwestern Community Services (SCS).

Ms. Zerba asked if this conversation is premature then. Ms. Kessler replied the Commission has talked about the fact that the “21 in 21” project is happening and there may be benefits to tying into it, if possible. The Commission has talked about neighborhood planning prior to the conversation with the Mayor. What she took from the conversations was that if there is an opportunity to work together, great, and it seems like the Mayor would be supportive of the Commission’s work in neighborhood planning. Furthermore, if there would be an opportunity to connect the neighborhood planning to another project that is already out there, even better, because there is more synergy that could happen. But it is up to the Commission. No one from the City is currently relying on the Commission to take on this work, but it is good work and exciting to think about. No one else is currently talking about identifying the history or heritage of neighborhoods or defining neighborhoods that way.

Ms. D’Egidio asked: Regarding 21 in 21, once the neighborhoods are identified, are the 21 properties exclusive to one neighborhood or can they be in different neighborhoods? Ms. Kessler replied that she is not sure, but she thinks there is an interest in containing it in one geographic area for the impact it would have to the neighborhood. But depending on the funding obtained, it might end up being a very different project from the current proposal.
Co-Chair Carey stated that Patricia Russell Park is also close to the rail trail. She continued that the Commission had talked with the Bicycle Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee (BPPAC) and Charles (Chuck) Redfern at their last meeting about how the Commission’s research would also help his project, by having the heritage documented. She needs to work with him some more about the letter of support the Commission said they would give to him for that project. Ms. Kessler stated that she has a draft for Co-Chair Carey and will email it to her.

Ms. Ballard stated that one positive about the COVID-19 is that it has forced everyone online. She continued that this could be thus more inclusive and accessible, because everyone is online now. She has researched her own house and street. She wonders if there is information out there, about Keene neighborhoods’ history, that this small group of people just does not know. They could ask the Historical Society and others who are keenly interested in local history. There has been a lot of remodeling going on lately and people might have more of this information than the Commission knows.

Co-Chair Carey replied that there are many residents who know the history and they might come forward with it if the Commission does a campaign to let people know they are researching neighborhoods and would like to talk or email with people who are knowledgeable about where they are living. Ms. Ballard replied that there are people who live and die in Keene. There is a lot of history here that is accessible. People like to be asked, so there might be a way to ask. Co-Chair Carey replied that maybe they could do that through the local TV station - maybe they could have a program, or bulletins. And yes, the Historical Society. She asked if Ms. Kessler knows another way. Ms. Kessler replied that The Shopper goes in all local mailboxes. Co-Chair Carey replied that she is still writing for The Shopper so she could ask if she could write a guest article there.

Ms. Kessler stated that they could do a press release/some kind of language to be shared in many places, if the Commission had a plan for how to collect stories and information and put it into an article, they could put it in the Chamber of Commerce newsletter, share it the with neighborhood groups on Facebook, and so on and so forth. She continued that the City has about 1,000 subscribers to their email list. They could send it out to multiple platforms. They do not need to pay to do this; it can be free. Co-Chair Carey replied that she will start working on the verbiage. She asked if Ms. Ballard wants to help with that. Ms. Ballard replied yes. There is a lot of information the Commission is missing, that other people have, so there is no need to do all the legwork themselves. Co-Chair Carey replied yes, it sounds like a very practical way to begin. She asked if everyone agrees with moving forward in this direction.

Ms. Powell stated that she is still confused about the project. She asked, is the Commission drawing these preliminary lines on the map of Keene and then defining the neighborhoods themselves? Would they be inadvertently affecting people’s property values if people are defined as not being part of a specific region that they wanted to be a part of or thought they were a part of? Should the Commission coordinate with anyone else, like another committee, to determine how to define neighborhoods, or is this based just on heritage? Are they doing this for...
all of Keene or just one area? Co-Chair Carey replied that she agrees that they have to look at
the full scope – when they start in on this, where does it take them, and what impact does it have
for everyone?

Ms. Zerba asked if Co-Chair Carey was thinking of sending letters to mostly people in the
Church St. neighborhood, or all over Keene. Co-Chair Carey replied that she had not thought to
mail any letters. Ms. Zerba replied that she was thinking about the article in the paper. Co-Chair
Carey replied it would talk about ideas and give people a way to respond. She continued that
people could respond even to the whole concept of identifying neighborhoods, and whether they
want to look at it more comprehensively, and if they really have the ability and right to define the
neighborhoods, and whether it will impact real estate values. That is a good question that she
had not thought about. Maybe it is about loosely drawing an area or circle, not necessarily a line.

Co-Chair Carey asked Ms. Kessler where they go with this, if it is now becoming a political
question to some extent. Ms. Kessler replied that those are all important questions. When the
Commission talks about neighborhood planning she always assumed that since it is the Heritage
Commission, it was about trying to identify historic neighborhoods and understand the history of
neighborhoods. People talk about “East Keene” and “North Central Keene,” neighborhoods just
based on cardinal directions, and there is the Maple Acres subdivision, for example. When the
Commission has talked about neighborhood planning and projects she assumed it would be, for
example, exploring the history of the Island St. neighborhood, how it became developed, what it
looked like when it was developed, who lived there, and what the heritage of the place is. That is
a more benign project than creating more broadly focused neighborhood plans, which should be
more bottom-up, planned by what the neighborhoods themselves see and want for their future
and what their goals are. The Commission’s neighborhood planning is more about history. She
stated she thought Ms. Ballard’s idea of reaching out to people and starting there is a great step.
It gets engagement from the neighborhoods instead coming in with a predetermined proposal.
Sometimes people get concerned when they start reaching out, thinking there might be a historic
district coming and regulations to follow. But reaching out and getting people interested in
sharing what they know about their homes and neighborhoods is something that has fewer issues;
it is not like picking a place and drawing lines around a place. But even if they were to do that, if
they did it from the historical perspective it is within the Commission’s roles and responsibilities
as written in the City Code to do this research. That is how the Historic District was formed.
That is what they did in the Lower Main St. area. They have done similar projects on
Washington St. and Court St.

Ms. Zerba replied that she likes that a lot. She continued that she likes the idea of writing
articles to get people excited about sharing the history of their properties that they have done the
research on. Maybe they can do something similar to what Phil Falkner did, and have a picture
of the home along with the history that has been discovered. She continued that she thinks they
should wait on proposing involvement with “21 in 21” until they are asked.
Co-Chair Carey stated that she agrees very much. She continued that another way she had envisioned this project is: the Commission has been working with barns and the agricultural development of Keene, and tracking that agricultural development into how the workers began to cluster in certain areas, and the factories and factory workers, and that began to define areas. She would like to see it as a progression of how the city as a whole developed, and how the agriculture moved further and further out. This would allow them to tie it to the barn and carriage house research they have been doing. It would allow them to look at the city as a whole, rather than single out any particular area, but it would also allow them to research given areas as they developed. It is a broader way to go, and more time-consuming, but less political and accomplishes the same goal.

Ms. Ballard stated that she does not think they have enough information to even think about defining neighborhoods. She continued that maybe it is because she has not lived in Keene very long, but she does not know which neighborhoods were “all factory workers” or “all Italian” or so on and so forth. She learned about the history of her own street, and people on her street and their occupations and it was fascinating. She feels like that information is out there and she is sure other people are excited about it, too. There are lots of historical directories to learn from, which were published every two years. People love to be asked about what they know. And yes, she agrees with Ms. Zerba about not seeking involvement in “21 in 21”.

Co-Chair Carey replied that she was not intending for the Commission to be a part of “21 in 21”; she meant for them to be in support of that project. She continued that researching neighborhoods would help bring in the interest. And this is another way to engage residents.

Ms. Kessler stated that she thinks the best method would be for the Commission to have a website that people can upload photos to and use to share their information. She continued that the City has had more project-oriented websites in recent years. She gave examples of others. She continued that a website might be a great tool for this. She offered to help with this task. Co-Chair Carey replied that she would love a website. Ms. Ballard replied that she loves the idea, too. Ms. Zerba agreed. Brief discussion continued and Co-Chair Carey stated that she would be glad to help with colors and font/the aesthetics of the website.

Ms. Zerba asked if Co-Chair Carey could, before the next meeting, think about what she wants to write in the article and then the Commission could discuss that, along with Ms. Kessler’s research about the website. Co-Chair Carey replied that she and Ms. Ballard can get together and talk about that. Ms. Kessler stated that she will get a website started and Co-Chair Carey and anyone else who wants to give input can, and at the next meeting, they can talk about what features they want to see. Discussion ensued about website features and maps. Ms. Ballard shared ideas for what an interactive map could be like, allowing people to upload their information to share on the map. Co-Chair Carey stated that the Commission has done a lot of work on the Washington St. and School St. areas and thus have some data they could load into the map. Discussion continued. Co-Chair Carey stated that it would be a wonderful way to be able to collect information, if it could be done. Ms. Kessler stated that the grant the Commission
applied for last fall, which she will resubmit for them, was for funding to build a more professional website/a content management system. It was less about collecting information but would have been about the walking tours and disseminating the information the Commission has collected over the past 20 years.

Ms. Zerba asked if they would need permission from the property owners whose information they will be sharing. Co-Chair Carey replied that the permission was given at the time of information collection. Ms. Kessler stated that if information was collected from public records it would be legal for the Commission to share it, although it would be good for them to let the property owners know.

Co-Chair Carey stated that there are things for them to work on between now and the next meeting. She asked if there was anything they needed to vote on. Ms. Zerba replied that she does not think so, because they are gathering information.

Ms. Powell stated that it almost sounds like two different projects. She continued that they do not want to guide people too much; they want to hear their stories and hear what information they have about their homes and properties, and receive whatever they want to share. But then maybe there should also be, thinking about the website, a more formal/structured database that they are creating an interactive element to. For that they would want to have specific categories of information. Should they be delineating those elements they want to be asking for or receiving? For example, build date, builder, owners, sellers, events like fires, cultural happenings, important people living there, and so on and so forth.

Ms. Zerba replied that they have quite a few items on the inventory forms; maybe they could just use those. Co-Chair Carey replied yes, those inventory forms have many items, but they also want to get more personal and find out about not just the houses, but the people who lived in them. Some ‘founding fathers’ lived in the early houses. Ms. Ballard replied that maybe that is the piece that helps them tell more stories about the houses, if they are going back further. She continued that she is also thinking structurally, about how houses have transformed over time; it would be fascinating to have that information.

Ms. Kessler stated that in response to Ms. Powell’s thoughts about categories, when a person is applying to have a property listed on a national register of historic places, there are categories for the applicant to address. She showed a list on the screen, and stated that they may not be the exact categories to use, but they cover a lot of what Ms. Powell was mentioning, such as setting, materials, design, location, workmanship, and so on and so forth. These are the types of information that might lead to the characterization of the history of a property, including the stories of people who lived there before. This might be a place to start.

Ms. Powell stated that it gets her thinking that maybe a future project would be an oral history project, if they are able to get information from people and they have the beginnings of a database or reference tool for the properties themselves, then they start associating people
recording and filming the stories. She does not know if Keene has an archive of oral histories. Ms. Zerba replied that they have a few oral histories, such as of the railroads, and those are housed at the Historical Society and the Library, and there are others that she cannot remember at the moment. Ms. Powell replied that maybe they could make it a goal to start collecting stories from older residents. Ms. Ballard suggested they reach out to residents in local nursing homes, and talk with people who used to live in these houses. She continued that nursing homes are another place to let people know the Commission is looking for this information. Ms. Kessler stated that the Library used to host “Story Circles” but she cannot remember the details, so she will look into it and ask other Staff how that worked.

4) Updates

Ms. D’Egidio stated that at the last meeting they were talking about the barn on Marlboro St. She continued that she has 20 good pictures of the interior and exterior. She asked if she should send them to Ms. Kessler. Ms. Kessler replied yes, she will be able to receive them at her work email address. Ms. D’Egidio stated that there was no Colony family connection, but the pictures are great and she will forward them.

5) Next Meeting

Co-Chair Carey asked if they should meet again in one month or two. After brief discussion, the group decided to meet in November, on the second Wednesday. There being no further business, Co-Chair Carey adjourned the meeting at 4:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted by, Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by Tara Kessler, Senior Planner.
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