

**MINUTES
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
March 14, 2018 Meeting
Town Council Chambers - 6:00 p.m.**

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair, Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Gregory Maxwell, Lauren Drury, Erinn Calise, and Andrew Barkley.

Absent: Kristen Carron

Staff: Lisa Bourbonnais, Planning Director; Andrew Teitz, Legal Counsel.

The Chair convened the meeting at 6:04 PM. She read the meeting procedures into the record and introduced the membership.

Historic District Commission Hearings - 6:00 PM

1. Ashley Vingi for retail business Ascension NXT
176 Main Street; Map 85, Plat 1, Lot 65
Signage - FINAL

The applicant was on hand to represent her petition. She explained the proposed sign will be 3' X 4' and will not be illuminated. It will hang from an existing bracket projection. The Commission clarified the location of the bracket in the photos and verified the sign will provide adequate clearance to the sidewalk.

Motion by Ms. Calise, second by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application as discussed. VOTE: 6 - 0 - 0 in favor of the motion. The projecting sign was approved. In support of the motion, it was noted that the building is a significant albeit altered late Victorian structure with character defining features as described in the staff report. The work proposed will be consistent with Standard of Review #5 regarding new work that will replace a previously existing feature. The installation will not impact the character of the property and will be completely removable without affecting the historic fabric.

2. Adam Vanacore for owner Ann Metzger

100 Crompton Ave; Map 75, Plat 3, Lot 244
Minor Modification/Alteration for Chimney and Deck; Replace and
Modify Windows - FINAL

Mr. Vanacore was on hand to represent the petition. He noted the petition is multi-fold. Windows being replaced in place will be Woodwright windows consistent with the standard. There is some window movement as well, however, and the floorplan was referenced to explain. In addition, a new mahogany wrap-around deck with painted railing system will be constructed. The Commission questioned the space under the deck and expressed a desire to not leave it open and accessible. A brick pier and square lattice system has been designed but will likely not be installed right away due to costs.

A question was raised regarding the first floor east elevation and why new windows will be both taller than existing windows and sitting higher in terms of sill bottom than other windows on that face. Mr. Vanacore noted the great room windows are not on the same wall plane as the other so the difference should not be as visible in reality as it is on the two dimensional plan. The trim is being removed and replaced in kind anyway due to extensive rot which provides an opportunity to re-align window openings.

Most Commissioners agreed the first floor window proportions are actually pleasing but questions were raised regarding the upstairs windows as the introduction of a new style there may not be appropriate. The plan calls for a large fixed pane unit which seems overly modern given the existing language of the house calls for double hung windows. Mr. Vanacore noted this alteration is at the back of the house and the owners seek to maximize their view of the water. The Commission suggested this element of the plan be treated as a conceptual review and the applicant should return with some options for final approval of upper-story, east-face windows.

Returning to their discussion of the new deck, the Commission noted the grade is awkward and changeable and some retaining wall may be required. They asked about the details of the square lattice and balustrade. It was agreed that the final deck construction could be refereed as some of the finer details may evolve on the ground. This would include the size of the piers and the extent of the lattice screen. Messrs. Maxwell and Barkley agreed to act as referees. Except for the second story east elevation

windows as discussed, the balance of the project was eligible for final approval. Motion by Mr. MacGeorge, second by Mr. Maxwell to approve the project with the condition that the referenced members act as referees during construction of the deck and the approval for the upper story windows as discussed is conceptual only. VOTE: 6 - 0 - 0 in favor of the motion. In support of the motion, it was noted that the building is a significant late Victorian structure with character defining features as described in the staff report. The property contributes to the significance of the District by means of its age, style, siting, and details. The work proposed will be consistent with Standards of Review # 4, 5 and 8 regarding alterations and new work. The project will not negatively impact the character of the property and will improve the condition of some deteriorated elements of the historic fabric.

3. Tim Grenier for owner Elaine Currie
32 Exchange Street; Map 85, Plat 1, Lots 87 & 382
Complete Demolition; New Construction - FINAL

Paul Attemann of Union Studio, the project architect, was on hand to represent the plan. The last time the project was before the group (two hearings are required for demolition approval), additional info was requested regarding history and ownership of the property and that has now been provided. Photos of all faces were also required and have been provided.

Elevations drawings for each new face were presented and it was agreed the new construction plan definitely pays homage to the historic house. The Commission took a few minutes to comment on the proposed new construction but noted a final hearing will need to be scheduled for final plan review and approval of the new construction. The consensus of the group was that the new building will be an asset to the site and will add quality and character back to the deteriorated property in an appropriate way. The Commission also spent a few minutes discussing the history of the site noting that the existing house was moved to this location from somewhere else in town. Because the building was relocated, its real history is unclear. Most members felt that the way the structure is put together thus becomes especially important for purposes of understanding its true age. They asked that in addition to the exterior photos provided, if

the applicant could also photo-document the inside of the house and extant structural features because it probably tells an interesting story. The applicants agreed.

The Commission discussed the pros and cons of the demolition request at some length. It was emphasized that the property has been uninhabitable for a number of years and it would certainly be of value to have the property productively used once more. The Commissioners agreed the Engineer's report is credible and compelling and there is no benefit in leaving the derelict structure in place. Restoring the site to its intended residential land use is desirable. While the existing structure is non-contributing due to its altered state and poor condition, it is significant due to its age which may date back to the 1780's. Although the home may represent a vernacular tenement style that was common at the time, given that no more information about the property seems to be available and there are no comparable structures nearby to judge from, the isolated structure on its own doesn't seem to add much to the character of the historic district.

With the conclusion of the discussion, there was a motion by Mr. Barkley, second by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application as discussed. In support of the motion, the foregoing was noted and in summary, the Commission concluded the demolition request is worthy of approval as the subject structure is beyond repair and, given its current lack of utility, its removal will not result in any significant loss to the Town or State. The project is consistent with Commission Standard of Review Number 9. VOTE: 6 - 0 - 0 in favor of the motion.

4. Bethany & Michael Verret
64 Long Street; Map 85, Plat 1, Lot 345
Two-Story Addition - FINAL

Mr. Maxwell recused himself on this matter as he is the project architect. He presented his recusal form and an ethics opinion regarding making presentations before a local board of which the designer is a member.

Making a case for the significant addition project, Mr. Maxwell noted the small size of the existing home and stated the design intent was to get as much "bang for the buck" as possible - so to speak - in terms of gaining functional area that will augment the quality of life here without proposing

such a sizable addition that it will overwhelm the existing structure or detract from its quaint character. Currently a family of four lives in this home that has only one bathroom and it is on the second floor. The goal is to add a first floor bath with mudroom and storage and improve the layout of the second floor, gaining living area there as well, as part of that project.

The two story addition proposed does not cut into the existing home much at all and minimizes impacts of the existing footprint, mass and form. The Commission praised the design and wondered if it wasn't "too" successful - i.e. so in keeping with the character of the home that it might someday not be easily discernable from the original. Following some discussion, however, the Commission agreed the original rectangular form is so distinctive that the bump out at the back will definitely read as later work. Also the original foundation is stone and the new work will sit on a concrete.

The new back door will not be visible from the street and will be fiberglass but the design replicates an existing side door. The new windows will be Anderson 400 series which are approvable but the applicants do not plan to replace existing lower quality vinyl windows that currently exist in the house any time soon. Some details like window casings and trim boards were discussed in detail and while spec sheets for each feature were not presented, Mr. Maxwell represented that the work will be constructed consistent with the drawings.

The entry canopy over the back door was discussed at some length. The Commission ultimately agreed this feature is a nice amenity to provide a protected entry and added that it definitely reads as a non-original, newer addition.

With conclusion of the discussion, Mr. McGeorge made a motion to approve the project as shown - seconded by Mr. Barkley. VOTE: 5 - 0 - 0 in favor of the motion. In support of the motion, it was noted that the building is a significant and contributing Colonial structure with character defining features as described in the staff report. The work proposed will be consistent with Standards of Review # 4 and 5 regarding new work. The addition will not substantially or negatively impact the character of the property and will add value and quality in a manner consistent with the expected evolution of the dwelling.

5. Brad Horsfield
17 Bridge Street; Map 75, Plat 3, Lot 168
Extension of Previous Approval; Deck Construction - FINAL

No one was present to represent the application. Mr. Teitz provided a brief update regarding the outstanding violation at the property noting the applicant had not shown up a scheduled municipal court hearing either. The matter was continued by the court until the April hearing date and should thus be continued to the April HDC docket as well. Motion by Ms. Calise, second by Mr. Maxwell to continue this application to the April 11, 2018 meeting date. VOTE: 6 - 0 - 0 in favor.

6. Jerry Zarrella, Jr. for Union Street, LLC
9 Union Street; Map 75, Plat 3, Lots 88 & 89
New Construction for a Two-family Dwelling - FINAL

Mr. McGeorge noted he remains recused on this project as an abutter.

Mr. Zarrella was on hand to represent his plan and noted the new construction project had gained a conceptual approval and he was back tonight with details on materials and other features to gain final approval. The old sheds - already approved for demolition - have been removed and some site work has started. Board members noted they have already given positive feedback about the proposal but added that there seem to be some discrepancies between the drawings provided - floor plans and elevations versus perspective renderings.

The Commission spent a substantial amount of time reviewing and confirming details and in general, it was noted that where a discrepancy might exist, the black line elevation drawings should be referred to for accuracy. Ultimately, the following was agreed to. For siding, Hardiproduct or similar with a 4" exposure is approved but the upper near the gable roof will be dipped eastern white cedar shingles. The overhead garage doors will be either 5283 or 5300 series doors per the spec provided. The roofing shingles will also be per the spec provided - architectural asphalt shingles. Dwelling doors will be ThermaTru painted fiberglass doors in a Shaker 2-lite and panel configuration. The decking will be Meranti natural mahogany look product with painted railing and spindle system and a square privacy lattice is approved for the small area at the front as necessary.

Referring to the elevation drawings as referenced, the Commission specified that window casings will be 1" X 4" boards and the rake trim will be 10". Corner boards will be 6" wide. The porch columns will be square painted wood 6" X 6". Smooth textured Harditrim was approved for eaves and soffits as it is durable and low maintenance. A louvered "opening" is shown on the south side in the gable end and this will be single Brosco 2020 louvered panel per the spec attached to the application.

With conclusion of the discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Maxwell, second by Ms. Drury to approve the new construction project as outlined with the condition that if, as the project proceeds, changes to any approved materials are required or desired, the applicant shall contact the Planning Department and a referee will be appointed to authorize plan modifications. In support of the motion, it was noted that the site is currently vacant and thus is not historically or architecturally significant and it does not contribute to the overall character of the historic district. The new work will create appropriate character for the site and will be consistent with Commission Standard of Review #5. VOTE: 5- 0 - 0 in favor of the motion.

7. Joseph Yammine for Yamdon Properties, LLC
5 Church Street; Map 85, Plat 1, Lot 222
Roof Replacement, Siding - CONCEPTUAL

The applicant was on hand to represent the plan. He noted that work is proposed on both structures on the subject property. Staff clarified that the lot known as 85-1-222 contains the buildings at 5 Church Street and 155 Main Street. The large, multi-unit dwelling structure at 5 Church Street is covered in asbestos shingle siding. The applicant hoped to re-side the building with vinyl but was persuaded not to. Because of the structure's age, size and location, it is assigned a great deal of significance in the state survey and deserves a more authentic treatment. The applicant will investigate options including real wood shingles or perhaps a cementitious fiber product like Hardi-shingle and will return for final approval of that element at a later date. The application also specified that re-roofing is proposed but because the asphalt shingles are being replaced in kind, the described work is actually exempt from review. The applicant was advised that he is eligible to pull a permit for that work element at will.

Window replacements for both buildings were also discussed. The brick mixed-use building at 155 Main Street should keep its storefront appearance on the first floor as a priority and thus the opening sizes, configuration, arrangement of panes, etc. should be respected and continued. Wood windows are always preferred but an aluminum option is approvable given the correct muntin pattern and installation. Looking at pictures of the property, the Commission agreed that the many windows are rotted and replacement is likely necessary. They also noted that given the depth and other sash details, a vinyl replacement unit would likely not be easily inserted here without a lot of extra work. An aluminum clad wood sash, however, should fit the openings very well. If the applicant opts for anodized aluminum, a darker finish like bronze would be preferred. Beyond the first floor of the brick building, it was noted that the residential units on the property require operable windows and any change at this point would likely be viewed as apposite from a tenant perspective.

The group returned to the discussion of the siding and it was noted that there is a lot of expense associated with removal/disposal of siding containing asbestos. The applicant noted he has pulled some of it away already and there are intact clapboards underneath and what appears to be cedar shingles in the upper areas at and above the eave line. The Commission noted the Hardi products have been approved around the District and likely would be here but they would need to see a real plan for how corner-boards, window trim, casings and other details will appear and come together. The applicant explained he would at least start to strip the old siding off the building at 5 Church Street as soon as the weather permits. If the Commission will allow him to perform that work, he will return for final approval of a real exterior siding and window plan. The Commission agreed by consensus that the removal work can begin and a final approval of new exterior plans will take place at a later date.

8. Andrew Stone for owners Michael Sherer & Tiffany Mabee
16 Somerset Street; Map 75, Plat 3, Lot 7
Replacement of Front Door - FINAL

No one was on hand to represent the application. Mr. Teitz provided a brief update on the status of an outstanding violation regarding the door. Municipal Court required that \$3,500 be deposited to the Town to cover the cost of installing an appropriate door which can be refunded upon the applicant's installation of said appropriate door. The applicant provided a catalogue cut of a door which he proposed to install as a corrective action. The Commission by consensus agreement found the door to be substantially dissimilar to the original front door. It was agreed that the door proposed is an improvement over what has been installed but there are important differences in the general vertical orientation of the glazing and panels that give the proposed door a very different character from the original.

As the property's violation persists and new owners have recently taken possession of the property, the HDC felt compelled to help the applicant solve the problem in a timely way. Instead of entering an endless cycle of inappropriate proposals and subsequent failure to gain approval, it was suggested that the designers and architects on the board try to come up with a solution pro-actively. Mr. Maxwell volunteered to find a spec for a door that would be suitable and forward the info to this applicant with the hope that he will use that resource to propose an appropriate substitute. Motion by Ms. Calise, second by Ms. Drury to continue the matter again to the April 11, 2018 docket. VOTE: 6 - 0 - 0 in favor.

Historic District Commission Business - After Hearings

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the February 14, 2018 Meeting Minutes. No action.
2. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/OTHER: Commission members are invited to comment on any observations they have made within the District, ask questions about past approvals, request updates on violations, etc. It was noted that an appeal has been filed challenging a fence approval granted last month by the HDC. Mr. McGeorge had chaired that hearing and asked to have the full record transmitted to him a.s.a.p. so he can prepare. Mr. Teitz noted he would be at that ZBA appeal hearing representing the HDC and supporting their decision and the Town's other legal counsel Mr. D'Agostino would

need to be on hand that night to serve as the zoning board's legal counsel.

With all business concluded, there was a motion to adjourn at 8:45 PM. Motion by Mr. Maxwell, second by Mr. McGeorge and unanimously supported.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Planning Staff - for further information, please contact the Department.