



Heritage Commission

Wednesday, November 10, 2021, 4:00 PM

2nd Floor Conference Room, City Hall
3 Washington St, Keene, NH 03431

AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order – Roll Call**
- II. **Minutes of Previous Meeting – September 8, 2021**
- III. **Discussion on Neighborhood Heritage Project / Website**
- IV. **Next Meeting – January 12, 2021**
- V. **Adjourn**

1 **City of Keene**
2 **New Hampshire**

3
4
5 **HERITAGE COMMISSION**
6 **MEETING MINUTES**
7

Wednesday, September 8, 2021

4:00 PM

**2nd Floor Conference Room,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Cauley Powell, Chair
Susan DeGidio, Vice Chair
Councilor Gladys Johnsen
Rose Carey
Marilyn Huston
Brian Lee

Staff Present:

Tara Kessler, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:

Louise Zerba, Alternate
Erin Benik

8
9
10 **1) Call to Order – Roll Call**

11
12 Chair Powell called the meeting to order at 4:02 PM. Roll call was taken.

13
14 **2) Minutes of Previous Meeting – July 14, 2021**

15
16 Ms. Huston stated it should be added to the minutes that she offered to go to the Historical
17 Society for information on the Italian neighborhood. She made a motion to accept the minutes as
18 amended. Ms. DeGidio, who participated remotely as a precautionary measure related to
19 COVID, seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

20
21 **3) Urban Barn Inventory Project Discussion**

22
23 Mrs. Kessler introduced the Urban Barn Inventory Project Consultants from Preservation
24 Company and referenced the completed report shared with the commission prior to the
25 meeting. The report included an overview of the neighborhood and the completed inventory
26 forms for the identified properties. Present from Preservation Company was Lynne Monroe,
27 Reagan Reudig and Laura Driemeyer.
28

29 Ms. Monroe began by showing a map of the neighborhood they worked on, stating that they
30 started off by exploring the area and collecting data by taking pictures and notes. The orange
31 dots on the map represent every property they considered in the survey, and the blue dots
32 represent the properties they chose to go further into detail with.
33

34 Ms. Reudig went on to state that their original survey of the area came up with around 150
35 properties that had either a carriage house, an urban barn, or a historic garage. She first went
36 over the property located at 73 High Street, noting that the interactive map consisted of pins,
37 which when clicked on could be populated with photos and information. She then showed the
38 commission a database of all the properties that had been photographed and surveyed, with the
39 following categories: Tax Map/Parcel Number, Street Name and Number, Outbuilding Type,
40 and Description. She noted that the photographs are organized by address and consist of
41 various shots from the right of way of the properties. She then showed an example of the
42 individual inventory forms, stating that they each have a photo of the house and information,
43 historical background, architectural description focused mainly on the outbuildings, statement
44 of integrity, and additional photos at the end.
45

46 Ms. Driemeyer stated that most of the urban barns in the neighborhood are attached to the
47 houses. The few that are freestanding are chosen if they have a high degree of integrity. For
48 example, the freestanding 73 High Street building has most of its original footprint, massing,
49 exterior siding, sliding doors, a window in the gable end, hayloft door, and limited decorative
50 detailing.
51

52 Ms. Reudig then showed 143 High Street, an example of a property they did not choose to do a
53 survey form on. She referenced the database and pointed out that it does have character
54 defining features but there was an addition at some point. Ms. Driemeyer added that the
55 relationship between the barn and the building had been changed, which impacts its integrity
56 and thus caused them not to choose it.
57

58 Ms. Monroe added that choosing properties wasn't a contest, but rather them showing
59 examples that demonstrate various elements. She made note that all the buildings are worth
60 looking at and added that the 14 criteria are there to help clearly illustrate the big picture and
61 not to diminish the outbuildings that weren't chosen for a form.
62

63 Ms. Driemeyer added that the map, database, photographs and individual forms all work
64 together to provide different types of information that help us understand all of the outbuildings
65 in the neighborhood.
66

67 Ms. Reudig then showed the commission the 25 Howard Street property. She noted that a loft
68 door is present but it has been glazed, a window has been put in and it has very clearly been
69 converted to a garage unit.
70

71 Ms. Driemeyer added that a lot of the buildings in the neighborhood had been converted to
72 garages with the introduction of the automobile in the 20th century, which often meant an
73 additional door being added. Ms. Monroe stated it's a good property to showcase the evolution
74 from stables to garages.

75

76 Ms. Reudig then showed the property located at 67 High Street, which is an example of a
77 freestanding garage with a lot of its original characteristics intact.

78

79 Ms. Driemeyer then took the commission through the overview report stating that the initial
80 part lays out the methodology of their fieldwork process and identification of properties. She
81 stated the purpose of the document was to try and overview the resources (urban barns, carriage
82 houses and garages) present in the neighborhood and the different elements about them. Ms.
83 Driemeyer stated that to increase the understanding of the buildings they would need to take a
84 look around the inside. Other information included was a background on how the buildings
85 were used in the past, the 4 main types of urban barns, and examples like 43 Cross Street which
86 highlight changes and elimination to the historic features. She pointed out that they didn't
87 include a photo of carriage houses in the document because they tend to be individually
88 distinctive, meaning there is no common look. Ms. Driemeyer went on to state that the
89 information gives the commission questions to ask about the character-defining features that
90 are important to maintain when looking at these buildings.

91

92 Ms. Carey thanked them for the information and suggestions and stated they could possibly
93 integrate them into demolition work they do or grants they may give for restorative
94 consideration.

95

96 Ms. Kessler stated the demolition review is an option to work with the owner to find resources
97 to preserve or salvage a structure or reconsider demolition, and they could possibly institute a
98 review process with standards related to the urban barns and carriage houses. Ms. Monroe
99 added that prior to a historic district there is public education and their reports give the
100 commission a wonderful ability to do all kinds of education.

101

102 As an example, Ms. Reudig showed the commission Rochester Historic Commission's Google
103 Earth with scanned historic photos for particular locations and some write-up.

104

105 Chair Powell stated the plan is to do an event on Tuesday the 21st at 7pm and mentioned it
106 should be discussed whether it will be fully remote or hybrid. She added that the consultants
107 will be there remotely running the event for them. Additionally, she stated they need to discuss
108 what the event will look like.

109

110 Chair Powell was inclined to do it remotely. Ms. Carey stated she'd agree with doing it
111 remotely and it could help make it more educational for people. She also asked if they could air
112 the event again on something like Cheshire TV. Ms. Huston agreed and stated the owners of the

113 barns would probably love to hear the small details and it would be a wonderful educational
114 tool.

115
116 Ms. Carey brought up that there wasn't much said about the at-risk barns in the project. Ms.
117 Kessler stated the consultants tabled that aspect of the project due to budgetary limits; however,
118 the tools they provided are there to help the commission narrow down which properties are at
119 risk. Ms. Huston asked what would then be done once properties were identified as at-risk. Ms.
120 Kessler answered that the intent was to have the at-risk list and prioritize the properties by
121 highest risk, and then work with individual property owners to help them with preservation.
122 She added they could package the information from the consultants and give it to the 150
123 property owners so they could be aware of what they have.

124
125 There was short discussion about making walking tours and information public and whether or
126 not property owners should give permission first. One idea was to invite owners to a virtual
127 event or utilize Facebook groups, and ask the City Council to announce the event if possible.
128 Chair Powell mentioned that the website they are building might be where the material ends up
129 and wondered if there had been negative feedback in the past about historical information being
130 publicized. Ms. Kessler stated all historic district properties have an inventory form and they
131 are all public; however, a publicized walking tour of a neighborhood may require consent from
132 the owners. She added that she will talk to the city manager on what would be required to
133 demonstrate consent.

134
135 Chair Powell stated that Ms. Carey completed some posters that will be on display in the lobby
136 of City Hall next week. They are waiting on official confirmation for use of the library space
137 for posters and displays as well.

138
139 Ms. Kessler stated the consultants could take people on a tour of the neighborhood based on the
140 work they've done and will give a brief overview of their methods and neighborhood context,
141 as well as explain the difference between urban barns and carriage houses along with any other
142 educational components. There was short discussion on whether the tour should focus on the 14
143 properties or a general overview of the neighborhood and focus in on examples. General
144 consensus was to do a more general overview with examples from the 150 properties to educate
145 on retaining historical significance.

146
147 Mr. Lee suggested they could display some posters during the DeMar Marathon when people
148 will be passing through that neighborhood, or possibly even having their own event, like a 5k,
149 with the information displayed.

150
151 Ms. Kessler reviewed that she would touch base with the consultants on doing a presentation
152 that involves a description of urban barns and carriage houses, the neighborhood itself,
153 examples of what those resources and important features look like, and then tips and tools for
154 owners of properties to understand why they are so special.

155

156 Chair Powell felt the 43 Cross Street property could be excluded from the report so as not to
157 glaringly point out the architectural features that were lost, out of respect for the property
158 owner. Ms. Carey also mentioned that it implies the Keene Heritage Commission had power to
159 change that property circumstance and that would be false. Short discussion ensued about how
160 the heritage commission's work is about public education and they are not trying to create
161 standards or rules about what people do with their houses, only trying to help them understand
162 what is historical significant and what helps a neighborhood retain its character.

163

164 **4) Continued Discussion on Neighborhood Heritage Project/Website**

165 **A) Grant Update** – Ms. Kessler stated the grant funds were confirmed about 3
166 weeks ago, but because it took so long their paperwork is outdated, so they need new
167 signatures. Their consultant Ray Corson is aware of the timeline and has sent Ms. Kessler
168 work samples, which she will send to the commission.

169

170 **B) Review of Consultant Work Samples**

171 **C) Project Design**

172 **D) Next Steps**

173

174 **5) Next Meeting** – Ms. Kessler stated the next meeting is November 10, 2021 at 4pm.

175

176 **6) Adjournment**

177

178 Due to being over time, Chair Powell adjourned the meeting at 5:25 pm.

179

180 Respectfully submitted by,
181 Nicole Cullinane, Minute Taker

182

183 Reviewed and edited by,
184 Tara Kessler, Senior Planner

185