



## Historic District Commission Meeting

Thursday, April 23, 2015 7:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers

### MINUTES

Approved 6/11/2015

#### I. Roll Call

**Members Present:** Kristin Kenniston, David Messier, James Reed

**Absent:** Richard Wahrlich

#### II. Election of Officers

- Mrs. Kenniston nominated David Messier for Chairperson; seconded by Mr. Reed. Unanimous in favor.
- Mr. Reed nominated Mrs. Kenniston for Vice-Chairperson; seconded by Mr. Messier. Unanimous in favor.

#### III. Review of Minutes from March 26, 2015 and April 10, 2015

##### March 26, 2015:

**Corrections:** None

**Motion:** To accept the minutes of March 26, 2015 as presented.

**Made by:** Mr. Reed

**Second:** Mrs. Kenniston

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

##### April 10, 2015:

**Corrections:** None.

**Motion:** To accept the minutes of April 10, 2015 as presented.

**Made by:** Mrs. Kenniston

**Second:** Mr. Reed

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor.

Mr. Messier informed all applicants that a unanimous vote of the members present would be required for any motion to pass, and gave the applicants the opportunity to continue their applications until there was a full board present. None of the applicants asked to be continued.

#### IV. Old Business

- **HDC 2015-00004 Charles & Georgia O'Brien, 217 Main Street** – for window replacements at 217 Main Street. Tax Map 107, Lot 218. Zone: CB2 (Cont. from 3/23/2015)

Keith Raymond, acting as the O'Brien's representative, presented the application to the Commission. He provided the Commission with new photographs that more clearly delineated the proposed window replacements. He outlined the following changes:

- Front downstairs: Remove existing 3-wide double-hung windows (opening size 73 ½ in. x 57 in.); install new 2-wide double- hung (opening size 73 ½ in x 57 in) – no change in opening size
- Front upstairs: Remove one of the existing double-hung windows and replace with new casement egress, 31 ½ x 47 ½ ; will require altering window width to original (historic) size
- Driveway side of house: Install new casement egress window; 35 ¾ x 45 ¼ ; no alteration to opening
- Left side: Install new casement egress; 35 ¾ x 45 ¼; no alteration to opening
- Casement windows will be vinyl and will look like 6-over-6 double hung sash windows

Mr. Raymond answered questions from the Commission. Mr. Messier opened the public hearing. No comments were received, so the hearing was closed. The Commission turned to addressing their criteria.

There is no architectural inventory available for this building, so the Commission was required to rate the building on their own.

HDC Criteria	
<p><b>1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?</b></p>	<p>The building is typical of the 1830's – 1840's; Greek revival, but drastically altered. The only feature remaining is the massing of it. The window placements have changed; window openings have been altered; siding has changed; no pilasters or trim remain. The consensus was to assign a rating of 1 as it has no outstanding historical, cultural, or architectural value.</p>
<p><b>2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?</b></p>	<p>The applicant is making an effort to make the windows look like what was originally on the building, even though the materials do not match. The new windows are a move in the right direction. Many of the buildings in the neighborhood have vinyl replacement windows that the Commission has approved previously. The consensus was that the proposal was acceptable.</p>
<p><b>3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)</b></p>	<p>Window openings on the front will be changed, but the new openings will be closer to their original size, so the proposal shows improvement over the current design.</p>
<p><b>4. How will the proposed improvements</b></p>	<p>The consensus was that this criterion is not</p>

(signs, lights, yards, off-street parking, screening, fencing, entrance drive, sidewalks, and landscaping) affect the character of any building or structure within the district?	applicable.
5. What impact will the proposal have on the setting? To what extent will the proposal help to preserve and enhance the historic, architectural, and cultural qualities of the district and the community?	With this proposal there will be a mix of window styles on the building. If the remaining windows on the street-facing façade were similarly replaced, it would help to enhance the historic quality of the building. The consensus was the proposal is neither positive nor negative, but moving in the right direction.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	None of the window openings are original. The consensus was that the proposal is in keeping with the guidelines.

**Motion:** To accept the application as presented with the additional approval of replacing the remaining two windows on the street-facing façade with the same style of window as in this application.

**Made by:** Mrs. Kenniston    **Second:** Mr. Reed    **Vote:** Unanimous in favor

#### V. New Business

- **HDC 2015-00007 Verne Brehio, 16 Glidden Street** – for new siding, vinyl and cedar shakes at 16 Glidden Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 92. Zone: MU

Mr. Brehio presented his application to the Commission. He said he wanted to add vinyl siding and trim in similar colors to the existing clapboards and trim to both sides of the front part of the house and put cedar shakes over the clapboards on the rear part of the building. He said he would like to cover the roof, corner, and window trims with painted metal. He said he would not cover the doorway; porch or doorway window trims. He said none of the trim or clapboards would be harmed by this proposal.

Mr. Brehio answered questions from the Commission. Mr. Messier expressed concern that the trim boards are a large part of the character and quality of the building and covering them may diminish them. Covering them can change the proportions and details (e.g. molding) of these important elements. The Commission asked that the roof trim not be covered, and that all other trim that is proposed to be covered, shall be covered in the exact proportion as the original trim.

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed and the Commission turned to addressing their criteria.

Mrs. Kenniston read the architectural inventory sheet for the property.

<b>HDC Criteria</b>	
<b>1. Does the building have historic,</b>	The house is a Greek revival c. 1840's. It has

architectural or cultural value?	been considerably altered, but much of the original detail is still intact. It has a rating of 3 based on architectural merit, which the Commission agreed with. There was no information about historical or cultural value for the building.
<b>2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?</b>	The design is clapboard over clapboard; arrangements will be the same because the Commission will dictate that the applicant retain the proportions of the original trim. The material is not the same as the original wood. Consensus was that the overall appearance will be retained if the conditions are adhered to. The cedar shakes for the back part of the building are inconsequential because the back part of the building is not original and contributes nothing to the main part of the building.
<b>3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)</b>	By keeping the trim proportions the same, the project will be compatible.
<b>4. How will the proposed improvements (signs, lights, yards, off-street parking, screening, fencing, entrance drive, sidewalks, and landscaping) affect the character of any building or structure within the district?</b>	The consensus was that this criterion is not applicable.
<b>5. What impact will the proposal have on the setting? To what extent will the proposal help to preserve and enhance the historic, architectural, and cultural qualities of the district and the community?</b>	The consensus was that the impact will be more positive than negative.
<b>6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?</b>	None of the existing trim will be removed – only covered, so the project will be in keeping with the guidelines.

**Motion:** To approve the application for:

1. vinyl siding (of the front part of the house) and
2. painted metal covering of the trim;
3. with the conditions that all trim retain the same size and proportions as the original (i.e. window frames would remain the same dimensions, corner boards, barge board around the base of the house);
4. the eaves of the house are not approved as a part of this application and need to remain wood; and

5. the entryways shall remain intact.
6. The back of the house can be either vinyl siding or cedar shake per preference of the applicant.

**Made by:** Mr. Messier      **Second:** Mr. Reed      **Vote:** Unanimous in favor

- **HDC 2015-00008 Jacquelyn Dor, 40 Pleasant Street** – for commercial signage at 40 Pleasant Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 79. Zone: MU

Ms. Dor presented her application to the Commission. She is proposing to place a 16 SF vinyl window decal sign in the front display window at 40 Pleasant Street (Rand Block). The sign will not be illuminated. A picture of the sign was included with the application. Ms. Dor addressed questions from the Commission.

There were no comments from the public, so Mr. Messier closed the public hearing. The Commission turned reviewing their criteria. Mr. Reed read the architectural inventory for the building.

HDC Criteria	
<b>1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?</b>	The building has a rating of 3 for historical, cultural, and architectural merit. The Commission agrees with this rating.
<b>2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?</b>	The Commission agreed this criterion is not applicable, because nothing is being done to the building.
<b>3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)</b>	The Commission agreed this criterion is not applicable, because nothing is being done to the building.
<b>4. How will the proposed improvements (signs, lights, yards, off-street parking, screening, fencing, entrance drive, sidewalks, and landscaping) affect the character of any building or structure within the district?</b>	A window decal will not change the character of the district. The sign will indicate the presence of another business on Pleasant Street.
<b>5. What impact will the proposal have on the setting? To what extent will the proposal help to preserve and enhance the historic, architectural, and cultural qualities of the district and the community?</b>	Having a business in the building has a cumulative positive effect by generating rent which in turn allows the building owner to maintain the building.
<b>6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for</b>	The Commission agreed this criterion is not applicable, because nothing is being done to the

Rehabilitation?	building.
-----------------	-----------

**Motion:** To approve the application as presented.

**Made by:** Mrs. Kenniston      **Second:** Mr. Reed      **Vote:** Unanimous in favor.

**VI. Other**

**VII. Correspondence**

**VIII. Adjournment**

**Motion:** To adjourn the meeting.

**Made by:** Mr. Reed      **Second:** Mrs. Kenniston      **Vote:** Unanimous in favor

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 PM

Respectfully submitted by,

*deForest Bearse*

Resource Coordinator