

City of Keene
New Hampshire

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, July 20, 2016

4:30 PM

2nd Floor Committee Room

Members Present:

Hanspeter Weber, Chair
Dan Bartlett, Vice-Chair
Thomas Powers, Councilor
Jim Duffy
Anita Carroll-Weldon
Joslin Kimball Frank

Staff Present:

Tara Kessler, Planner
Rhett Lamb, ACM/Planning Director

Members Not Present:

Dave Bergeron, Alternate

3:30 PM SITE VISIT – The Commission conducted a site visit of 12 Eagle Court and 17 Washington Street in advance of the meeting. Commission members present included Chair Weber, Mr. Bartlett, Ms. Kimball Frank, Mr. Duffy and Councilor Powers.

1) Call to Order and Roll Call-

Chair Weber called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM. Roll call was conducted.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting – June 15, 2016

Ms. Kimball Frank made a motion to adopt the minutes of June 15, 2016 with the following changes/corrections: Page 1, last paragraph change “132 units” to “134 units”, and on Page 4 of 6, last paragraph, last sentence add the word “not” after “are”. Mr. Bartlett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

3) Public Hearings –

a) **COA-2014-03 Mod. 2 – 12 Eagle Court – Eversource Transformer** – Applicant, Eversource Energy, on behalf of owner, Ellis Robertson Corporation, requests the installation of a pad-mounted transformer and concrete pad adjacent to the parking lot at 12 Eagle Court. The property is Tax Map Parcel #023-02-007.

Chair Weber read the notice and asked for staff’s recommendation on completeness. Ms. Kessler recommended the application be accepted as complete.

Mr. Bartlett made a motion to accept application COA-2014-03 Modification 2 as complete. Mr. Duffy seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Chair Weber opened the public hearing and invited Mark Fraser and Laurel Boivin to address the request on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Fraser noted that as part of its improvements to the electric distribution system in the Central Business District, Eversource is proposing to install a pad-mounted transformer in the southeast corner of the parking lot at 12 Eagle Court. The applicant notes that the need for the proposed pad-mounted transformer is to improve electric service to several existing commercial businesses on Eagle Court and Main Street, and will allow for future commercial growth and increases in electric demand in this area. This project is one of many similar investments that Eversource is prepared to make to its electric transmission and distribution system in Keene’s downtown to increase reliability, minimize outages and improve outage response and restoration. The existing building located on the

property at 12 Eagle Court is currently used by the Monadnock Makerspace and is a Noncontributing Resource. Mr. Fraser discussed the photo depicting the location, which can be found on Page 10 of 39 in the packet. Mr. Fraser noted the cooperation of those property owners he has been working with. Mr. Fraser displayed a rendering of what the site will look like when complete and described the landscaping to be installed, which includes holly plants and bark mulch.

Mr. Fraser reported that staff requested information on electromagnetic field (EMF) levels of the proposed transformer. He noted that he took readings in various locations and distributed copies of that data to the Commission; discussion ensued. Ms. Kessler reported the request for data came from a citizen, but is not relevant to the Historic District Commission review of this application.

Ms. Kimball Frank asked if this was radiation as she is unfamiliar with what this is. Mr. Fraser and Ms. Boivin explained electromagnetic fields (EMF) noting they are all around us and the readings drop quickly the further you go from the source.

Chair Weber asked if there were any government studies available relating to safety. Ms. Boivin noted information can be found on the World Health Organization and the EPA websites. It was also noted that no safe or unsafe levels have been determined.

Ms. Kimball Frank asked if the data presented is in a safe range. Mr. Fraser replied he could take more measurements and noted that they do not give advice to people on what is a safe level.

In response to Ms. Carroll-Weldon and Ms. Kimball Frank, Mr. Fraser reiterated previous testimony that there are seven underground transformers that they plan to discontinue and replace with 10 or 11 new above ground equipment in the downtown as part of a larger project. Ms. Boivin also noted a comprehensive presentation was provided to City Council in 2015 on the project.

Chair Weber asked if this would mean removal of poles or overhead equipment. Ms. Boivin replied in the negative noting the underground equipment is being replaced; there is nothing above ground on Main Street.

Ms. Kimball Frank asked if leaning against a transformer was dangerous and if there should be warnings on them regarding the EMF. Mr. Fraser replied in the negative.

Mr. Bartlett asked Mr. Fraser to describe the clearance requirements and access to the transformer dimensionally. Mr. Fraser noted the required 10 feet in front of the doors (room to pull plugs) with 3-5 feet on the back and sides. The doors also will not be opening into a parking space. Ms. Boivin added the goal is to have the opening unobstructed. In response to Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Fraser noted they could not have a 12-foot hedge as reasonable air flow is needed.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon asked if there were any other location options. Mr. Fraser outlined the efforts they underwent to identify the location, and added they need to be close to the load.

Chair Weber asked for staff comments.

Ms. Kessler noted the Staff Report included in the packet (Pages 10-11 of 39) covers staff's assessment of the application with respect to the HDC Regulations.

Section XV.A.5.b) 1)

"On commercial and industrial buildings, mechanical equipment...shall be...ground-mounted toward the rear of the building, with appropriate screening or landscaping to minimize visibility."

The proposed transformer would be stored in a dark green metal enclosure with cabinet-style doors on one side. The applicant proposes to plant China Blue Holly shrubs, which have dark green foliage,

as screening on three sides of proposed transformer. Additional landscaping/ screening will be provided by the two existing ornamental trees in the landscaped median at the corner of Eagle Court where it bends to meet Cypress Street. Bark mulch will be used as groundcover for the island.

The Applicant has noted that bollards painted yellow will be installed around the transformer. These bollards are required to protect the equipment in areas where there might be possible conflict with vehicles.

The proposed transformers will be of a similar color, material and design as many of the existing pad-mounted transformers in the downtown area, including a transformer located near the front entrance of the Monadnock Food Coop on Cypress Street.

Section XV.A.5.b) 2)

“Every effort shall be made to position [equipment] as low to the ground as possible, and where they are not readily visible from the public right-of-way.”

The proposed transformer, which will be approximately 76” high x 68” wide, does not appear to be of a size or shape that would detract from the established historic architectural character of the area. While the proposed location is visible from the public right-of-way, the placement of the structure next to an existing landscaped island will help to reduce its visual impact.

Mr. Duffy referred to the tree closer to the bollard and asked if the applicant would have to come back if they wanted to cut that tree down. Ms. Kessler noted this would require City permission; she also noted the tree is not of size to require HDC approval.

Chair Weber asked for public comments.

Johnny Bolster, of 12 Eagle Court displayed a rendering of what will soon be the Zen Garden space via his smartphone. Recognizing it is not the HDC’s purview to consider EMF threats, Mr. Bolster noted the perceived threats by his clients. Mr. Bolster suggested the screening is inadequate and recommends a ferrous metal shielding (gate) be placed in front of the space. Mr. Bolster also suggested the transformer chassis thickness is inadequate to shield magnetic fields. Chair Weber confirmed the HDC does not regulate electromagnetic fields.

Peter Hartz, of 12 Brook Street asked what other close by locations had been considered noting an island across the street by the Co-Op. Mr. Fraser reiterated his previous testimony in response to this question. Mr. Hartz also commented on the holly bushes noting his experience in horticulture. Mr. Hartz indicated the holly would take a long time to grow and suggested perhaps another plant material should be considered.

Ms. Kimball Frank also asked if the applicant could do something with the screening to make the transformer less visible. Mr. Fraser replied they could look at putting in taller hollies; he noted they tried to stay away from arborvitae that would be damaged by snow.

In response to Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Fraser noted he had no information he could provide regarding the effects of EMF’s on plant life.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon asked about turning the access door so it isn’t facing the proposed garden. Mr. Fraser reiterated earlier comments regarding access noting they need to ensure there is access in times of emergency.

Mr. Bolster suggested the requirements for screening the transformer should be the same as for screening a dumpster. Mr. Bolster also addressed the proposed holly when grown could cause an

additional traffic hazard as there is a blind corner there. Mr. Bolster made reference to comments regarding this being the back of the building; he noted this is quickly becoming a major gathering place. Chair Weber reiterated the Commission has no purview over the EMFs and also pointed out traffic is not the purview of this Commission; he thanks Mr. Bolster for his input.

Eugene Cleveland, of 17 Lamson Street noted his concerns with sound pollution, aesthetics, and safety. Mr. Cleveland suggested the hum coming from the transformer would be upsetting to the Makerspace clients. His perception is the transformer would make it look like an industrial space. Mr. Cleveland suggested placing a faraday shield around the transformer.

Chair Weber closed the public hearing for deliberation.

Mr. Duffy, Mr. Bartlett, and Ms. Kimball Frank agreed the project meets the threshold set by the HDC Regulations; EMFs and traffic concerns are out of the Commission's purview. Ms. Kimball Frank would like to see more screening in the future. Mr. Duffy raised the issue from a previous meeting regarding public art as a way to camouflage the transformer. Ms. Carroll-Weldon suggested there needs to be a lot more screening (looks industrial) and some type of contract requiring replacement as plants die. Councilor Powers commented Eversource has done a good job trying to improve the services it provides to this community. Councilor Powers also noted this will increase Eversource's capability of providing electrical distribution to more in the area and eliminate some overhead services.

Councilor Powers motioned to approve COA-2014-03 Modification 2 for the installation of a pad-mounted transformer and concrete pad adjacent to the parking lot at 12 Eagle Court as described in the project narrative and as shown on the plan, "Eagle Court Site Plan, Proposed Site Conditions" dated June 13, 2016 and prepared by Mark Fraser. Mr. Duffy seconded the motion which carried on a 4-1 vote. Ms. Carroll-Weldon voted in opposition.

b) **COA-2016-06 - 17 Washington Street – Washington Park Apartments of Keene** - Applicant and owner, Washington Park of Keene LLC, proposes renovations to the former Keene Middle School building at 17 Washington Street, and to build a new 112,000 square foot, 134 unit apartment building and adjacent parking lot on the site. The parcels are TMP #s 017-07-007 and 017-07-30. The existing building is ranked as a Primary Resource.

Chair Weber read the notice asked for completeness recommendation from staff. Ms. Kessler recommended the application be accepted as complete.

Mr. Bartlett motioned to approve the application for COA-2016-06 - 17 Washington Street. Mr. Duffy seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Chair Weber invited Tony Marcotte and Alan Yeaton to address the application.

Mr. Marcotte advised he is a Professional Engineer working directly for the owner who is acting as the owner, developer, and contractor for this project. Mr. Marcotte noted the intent was always to utilize the entire 4.8 acre site for a mixed use project (residential and commercial). The existing building will have multi-commercial uses including performance space in the auditorium, bistro and bar within the building, residential condominiums and gym space.

Mr. Marcotte noted the first proposed window has been installed; the color is grayish-tan not red which better suits the existing building. The intent is to replace 100% of the windows, 100% of the roof, new HVAC systems, and electrical. Mr. Marcotte noted they are working with Eversource as they will be allowing them to locate transformers on the property.

The Applicant is also proposing to construct a new 112,000 square foot, 134-unit apartment building on the site. The proposed structure would be separated from the existing building by a paved parking area. Two-thirds of the proposed apartments units would be 1-bedroom and the remaining units would be 2-bedroom. Mr. Marcotte discussed the building and the materials.

At a previous meeting the Commission asked Mr. Marcotte to investigate sharing a driveway with the adjacent site at 38 Roxbury Street, where MoCo Arts is proposing a new development. Mr. Marcotte reported MoCo Arts declined the offer to share a driveway. Mr. Marcotte displayed the site plan for discussion regarding the driveway and the building. Mr. Marcotte noted he anticipates the Planning staff will ask the driveway be relocated to the east; discussion ensued. Mr. Marcotte commented he feels the building is appropriate and the height matches the height of the existing building. Parking between the two buildings makes the most sense as they have tried to maximize the amount of parking while maintaining some greenspace. Mr. Marcotte noted he feels the proposal is appropriate for the property as a whole, and maximizes the use of the lot while still providing a buffer (20 feet away from property line) between adjacent properties. At this point Mr. Marcotte turned the floor over to Mr. Yeaton to discuss some of the architectural details.

Alan Yeaton, Architect/Planner for the project addressed the existing building noting they are currently working with a couple of tenants on the development of the interior space. Mr. Yeaton reiterated Mr. Marcotte's comments regarding changes noting the proposed windows are more energy efficient than the existing windows, and improve the thermal performance of the building. Mr. Yeaton also noted the requirement to alarm the entire building and that there will be a separate permitting process for each tenant. The search for tenants continues.

Mr. Yeaton noted the intent to offset the proposed building visually with different details while maintaining security for the residents. Mr. Yeaton discussed the materials for the proposed building, which will be factory finished hardy plank cement board with manufactured brick on the lower portion. Mr. Yeaton distributed a sample of the brick noting it allows them to address the foundation challenges they have on the site. Mr. Yeaton reiterated both materials on the building are composites.

Chair Weber asked for Commission questions.

Mr. Duffy referred to the comments regarding moving the driveway further east and the illustration displayed (different than the packet) and asked if there will be more landscaping than is depicted. Mr. Marcotte pointed out the location of the driveway and the landscaping on the site plan displayed.

Ms. Kimball Frank asked if the parking lot landscaping is included on the plan. Mr. Marcotte noted the islands will have more landscaping than is depicted, and there will be trees in each island. Ms. Kessler noted there are three islands in the interior of the parking lot.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon noted her concern for the existing building and suggested the main tenant has a venue similar to the Colonial Theatre. Mr. Marcotte noted the venue is different than the Colonial, as the tenant is part of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and will bring in different types of bands. Mr. Marcotte noted why the residential portion of the project is so important. He explained the cost of renovations is 10 times more than the costs for construction of the new building.

Councilor Powers asked for some clarification on the proposal for the front of the existing building. Referring to the displayed site plan Mr. Marcotte explained there is no existing landscaping on the right side of the building, but there is some on the left. He noted the addition of landscaping along

the front of the building and moving the curbing back about six feet. All of the existing trees will remain. Mr. Marcotte also asked if anyone had information on the stolen granite marker dedicating the trees in this area to the veterans. Mr. Marcotte pointed to a piece of paving that will be kept for the time being as it is the intent of the tenant to possibly have a bus turnaround for events (remote parking).

Ms. Kimball Frank noted her concern for the parking and read from the HDC Regulations (Page 12, XV.4.b) pointing out that parking should be behind the building. She noted when this building was put up it was all grass and trees and there was no parking in the front. She asked if there wasn't a way to return more of this space to what it was originally. Mr. Marcotte replied it's there now (parking) and there is landscaping that will be added. He commented that Ms. Kimball Frank is asking them to remove what was put there long ago and they are trying to provide some parking for handicapped accessibility. Mr. Marcotte noted he does not think it appropriate that they should be removing pavement that is there now because there was not any there in 1912. He also noted they are not adding any new pavement. Ms. Kimball Frank asked if they had considered moving the parking behind the building. Mr. Marcotte said he didn't think it was the intent of the regulations to return areas of the site to what they once were.

Chair Weber noted he is concerned about the parking area and view from Roxbury Street of the proposed new building. The size of the building concerns him. He noted this was discussed during the Advice and Comment session and that he is not satisfied with the answers provided thus far. Chair Weber asked if an L-shape was considered, as this would accomplish two things 1) reduce the view from Roxbury Street, and 2) hide the parking. Mr. Marcotte noted the traffic study completed found that access from Roxbury and Spring Streets minimized the impact to intersections. With now having to move the driveway on the Roxbury Street side due to the new MoCo Arts proposed driveway there is no room for an L shaped building. Mr. Marcotte used the site plan to further explain his response.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon initiated a discussion regarding the mass of the proposed new building that will impact the nearby residential buildings. Mr. Marcotte noted the goal of the Central Business District is to get as much use out of the property as possible and indicated they are doing better than what the zoning allows. Ms. Kessler clarified the underlying zoning sets the dimensional requirements and the HDC Regulations have standards that address massing, scale, size, dimension, and screening etc. that the applicant must comply with. Mr. Bartlett agreed with Ms. Kessler's comments.

Ms. Kimball Frank noted she is concerned with the proposed windows on the former Middle School building and read from the HDC Regulations (Page 21). Ms. Kimball Frank discussed the original windows to the building noting what is there now is certainly not historic. She also read from the Design Standards. Mr. Marcotte noted that when they looked around the area they were unable to identify any buildings with windows similar to the historic windows once on the former Middle School. He added the type of windows Ms. Kimball Frank is talking about would not meet the wind loading requirements, and they would not be able to be opened. In response to Ms. Kimball Frank, Mr. Marcotte said they could probably get the windows discussed but they would risk losing the current tenant and would have to stop all work. Councilor Powers clarified it is the sheer mass of the window opening that is glass that is creating the problem. Mr. Marcotte agreed and explained they can't get a manufacturer to commit to making the window. Mr. Marcotte explained this is why they went with something that is better than what is there now and is functional. The cost of mullions/grids was discussed. Mr. Marcotte noted this would cause them to keep the windows that are there. He noted in the past they have used interior grids. Mr. Marcotte noted he didn't think going back to the original standard was required and they tried to choose something that was functional and met the design standards.

Chair Weber asked for staff comments.

Ms. Kessler noted this is a big project and her staff report is lengthy. She added she would walk the Commission through it via the meeting packet (Pages 17- 37). Ms. Kessler noted she would begin with the modifications to the existing building, the former Middle School. She noted the applicant is proposing to replace the windows, repoint the exterior masonry, and to reconfigure the paved parking lot in front of the building. Ms. Kessler noted a revised site plan has been requested of the applicant that does not display the proposed deck in the front of the building. The applicant is not seeking approval for this deck structure at this time.

Ms. Kessler discussed the proposed masonry repointing (Page 17 of 37) and noted that the applicant has agreed to adhere to the standards. They are currently working to find a mason that can match the existing mortar. As with other projects, staff have recommended that if this project is approved a condition be placed that either staff reviews a mockup of the work to be done.

With regards to the windows (Page 18 of 37) Ms. Kessler noted the staff report reflects the standards Ms. Kimball Frank mentioned. She continued, noting that while the applicant is not proposing to replace the windows to what was original to the building in the early 1900s, it is staff's opinion that the proposed windows are an improvement over the existing windows. The applicant is not proposing to impact the size of the window openings.

Ms. Kessler referred to Page 19 of 37 and the photo with arrows depicting what is being proposed for that site. She noted that staff has encouraged the applicant to consider additional landscaping to screen the vehicles in the parking adjacent to Washington Street. She addressed the paved area towards the north end of the building (previously used for trailers at the school) and asked the Commission to consider requesting this pavement be replaced with greenspace (the proposed use is a bus turnaround). Ms. Kessler suggested she could take questions on the Staff Report thus far before moving onto the proposed new building.

Mr. Duffy asked for an explanation of the proposed windows with the bottom 1/3 being an awning. Ms. Kessler provided an explanation (2/3 fixed pane with bottom divided into 2 vertical lights). Mr. Marcotte noted the reason for this is so it's a fixed window instead of a sliding window (opens out).

Ms. Kessler continued onto the proposed new building starting on Page 20 of 37. She noted the purpose of the HDC design standards for new buildings and structures is to ensure that new construction respects, preserves and complements the historic architecture and character of downtown Keene, while allowing for high caliber new design and uses that will enable the downtown to maintain its economic vitality and pedestrian-friendly scale. The primary standard used in staff's review was Section XV.D.2.b)1) "*New buildings or structures shall be sited so that the existing pattern of the historic streetscape –setbacks, spacing, lot coverage, scale, massing, height, orientation – in which they are located is not disrupted.*" The Applicant proposes to construct a new four-story, 112,000 square feet (in gross floor area) apartment building that would run continuously along the eastern boundary of the parcels located at 17 Washington Street and 41 Spring Street. The proposed building would be 46' at its highest point, 450' long, and 58' wide at either end of the building, which will face Roxbury and Spring Streets. With the exception of three towers and a parapet wall that project from the roof of the building's west-facing elevation, the building would be 40'8" tall along its entire length with a continuous eave line. This building would be separated from the existing former Middle School building by a parking lot that is approximately 155' at its widest location (the area adjacent to Roxbury Street) and approximately 40' wide at the location nearest its entrance onto Spring Street.

Ms. Kessler discussed staff's analysis of the compatibility of the proposed project with the existing streetscape and architecture in the historic district. Ms. Kessler referred to Page 20 of 37 depicting

the footprint of the building imposed on an aerial image of the existing conditions. Ms. Kessler discussed the scale and massing of other buildings within the Historic District.

Ms. Kessler addressed materials noting that one of the standards requires materials be common to what is in the District. She noted that the combination of proposed materials does help to break up the west facing façade. Ms. Kessler suggested the proposed treatment of clapboard and faux brick might be an appropriate treatment for transitioning from the downtown into the residential zone. However, the proposed scale, orientation, and massing of the building is unique to the District. She noted that she is unsure of whether the proposal meets the HDC standard for massing and scale that is compatible with the historic streetscape and development. She noted this would be the second longest building in the district next to the Center at Colony Mill, which is greater than 700 feet long. Yet, the Center at Colony Mill is two levels and have significant variation in the façade and shape of the building. Also, the proposed building would not have a main entrance facing a right-of-way, or a well-defined façade along a right of way. She noted most of the buildings in the district are oriented towards the street and have an entrance or primary façade facing the street. Ms. Kessler noted the items for consideration in the Staff Report.

Ms. Kessler addressed the location of the proposed parking lot. She noted that staff asked the applicant to consider alternatives for the site to try to locate parking behind the building. Ms. Kessler noted what has been proposed is the preference of the applicant. Ms. Kessler discussed screening and landscaping of the parking area.

Ms. Kessler addressed site details noting that the applicant proposes to install a 4' high metal fence, in the style of wrought iron, along Roxbury Street (image included in the packet). There will also be a black painted chain link fence along the retaining wall.

Ms. Kessler reported the applicant has submitted lighting cut sheets and the proposed lighting does meet the standards. Addressing storage containers, Ms. Kessler noted there are two dumpsters proposed for the site. She suggested the Commission consider asking for additional screening or a different material for the dumpster along Spring Street.

Chair Weber asked for questions relating to this portion of the Staff Report.

Mr. Duffy asked if the applicant has agreed or would consider adding more landscaping. Mr. Marcotte replied they would add more landscaping to the grassed area to shield the dumpster, and they would consider bumping out the towers, and creating a covered entryway to break up the first parapet. They would also consider changing the color or material for that section, and go larger at the first entrance. Mr. Duffy clarified the applicant was talking about the proposed building when he commented on the parapets, etc. Mr. Duffy excused himself noting he had to leave (6:48 PM), he commented on the windows noting he felt the applicant made a good effort. Mr. Duffy said the applicant's proposal for the windows is satisfactory. A quorum was still present.

Discussion continued with Commission members providing guidance to the applicant regarding what might help them become more aligned with the HDC standards.

Chair Weber asked for public comments.

William Beauregard, an abutter and property owner noted his concern that this housing project will materially destroy the neighborhood. He urged the Commission to take no action until an updated site plan has been submitted. Mr. Beauregard noted the retaining wall as a significant concern; he added his opposition to the design materials. Mr. Beauregard is excited about the renovations to the Middle School.

Peter Hartz, of 12 Brook Street, noted his opposition to the proposed new building citing it is all wrong for the property. Mr. Hartz said this is a flawed design and noted his opposition to the materials. He suggested a tall, cubic building might be better for this site. Mr. Hartz recommended this item be placed on more time and the projects be separated out. He concluded his comments noting this building is not a good neighbor to the abutting buildings.

Robert Beauregard, of 47 Spring Street, suggested that his building on Spring Street would incur the most impact from this proposal. Mr. Beauregard noted his opposition pointing out the building doesn't fit in with the historical value. He also noted there has been no discussion regarding the east side of the project. Mr. Beauregard is also excited about the renovations to the Middle School and to have it back on the tax rolls.

Peter Bradshaw, of Greenbrier Road, noted his opposition to the proposed new building. He cited it lacks architectural detail and is massive. He suggested it might work a little better if the building was oriented towards the west.

Chair Weber closed the public hearing for deliberation.

Councilor Powers asked what it would take to separate these projects. Ms. Kessler noted the prepared motion for consideration does propose separating the renovations from the new construction; the public hearing could be continued until the next meeting. The Commission has 45 days to reach a decision once the public hearing is opened. Ms. Kessler shared the prepared motion (recommendation):

That the Historic District Commission:

1. Approve the applicant's request to replace the windows on and repoint the exterior brick masonry of the existing building at 17 Washington Street as described in the project application, which was submitted to the Planning Department on June 29, 2016, with the following condition:
 - a. Approval of the Planning Department and HDC Chair of a mock-up of the mortar color, thickness, and type prior to conducting any masonry repointing.
2. Continue the public hearing for COA-2016-06, specifically with respect to the request for new construction, installation of new pavement, and other proposed site improvements to the Historic District Commission meeting on August 17, 2016.

Chair Weber indicated he feels he could approve the renovations to the Middle School, but cannot support the new structure at this time. Councilor Powers agreed with Chair Weber and noted he would like to see the paved area where the trailers once were become landscaping. Councilor Powers approves of the proposed windows.

Ms. Kessler explained the bifurcation allows the applicant to move forward with the windows and repointing.

Ms. Kimball Frank and Mr. Bartlett agreed they are opposed to the proposed windows. Ms. Kimball Frank suggested the applicant needs more time to come up with something more in line with the historic nature of the building and the HDC Regulations.

Chair Weber noted the applicant could choose to keep the windows as they are and he does not think it is fair to ask them to return to a condition that was in place 50 years prior, especially since they are making an improvement to what is there now. Chair Weber noted he is in favor of the applicant's request regarding the windows. Mr. Bartlett noted he can see that but doesn't know how to reconcile that with our Regulations.

Councilor Powers made the following motion, which was seconded by Ms. Kimball Frank.

1. Approve the applicant's request to replace the windows on and repoint the exterior brick masonry of the existing building at 17 Washington Street as described in the project application, which was submitted to the Planning Department on June 29, 2016, with the following condition:
 - a. Approval of the Planning Department and HDC Chair of a mock-up of the mortar color, thickness, and type prior to conducting any masonry repointing.
2. Continue the public hearing for COA-2016-06, specifically with respect to the request for new construction, installation of new pavement, and other proposed site improvements to the Historic District Commission meeting on August 17, 2016.

There was a vote of 2-2 with Mr. Bartlett failing to vote.

Mr. Lamb recommended a recall of the vote on the motion that was made.

Mr. Bartlett asked if it was possible to see another arrangement on the windows before the next meeting. Chair Weber reopened the public hearing at 7:25 PM to bring the applicant back to answer Mr. Bartlett's question.

Mr. Marcotte commented that they can try five different windows, but he is not sure what the Commission is looking for. If they are looking for a window that resembles the original from 1912, he could show this in about four months. He continued, stating that if they are looking for some modifications with interior grids they could probably have this by the next meeting. Mr. Marcotte noted he would have to check with the manufacturer and get back to Ms. Kessler. He reiterated he doesn't know what the Commission is looking for and is looking for some guidance. Ms. Kimball Frank reiterated her previous comments noting she is looking for something closer to what the windows looked like before (originally). Mr. Marcotte reiterated his previous testimony regarding the windows.

Mr. Bartlett asked if there was another arrangement that would simulate a divided light- a hybrid of what is proposed and what was original. Mr. Marcotte suggested he could come back with something different and put the project on hold for another month. Mr. Lamb provided his take on the standards noting that the intent of the Regulations was never to turn back time. It was to address a situation where an applicant is seeking to replace historic windows on a building. Mr. Lamb also noted the possibility of taking a step too far on the standard itself (windows).

Chair Weber asked that the motion be reread which Councilor Powers did. The motion failed on a vote of 3-2 with Ms. Carroll-Weldon, Ms. Kimball Frank, and Mr. Bartlett voting in opposition.

Ms. Kessler reiterated that action needs to be taken on this application; hence another motion is needed.

Councilor Powers made the following motion which was seconded by Ms. Kimball Frank.

On a vote of 5-0, the Historic District Commission recommends continuing the public hearing for COA-2016-06, to the Historic District Commission meeting on August 17, 2016.

4) Other Business-

Ms. Kessler reported the first reading of the proposed Main Street Historic District Ordinance will be at the July 21, 2016 City Council meeting. She noted a public workshop date will be set for August 11, 2016.

5) **Next Meeting**- August 17, 2016.

6) **Adjourn**- There being no additional business before the Commission Chair Weber adjourned the meeting at 7:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Mary Lou Sheats Hall
July 24, 2016

Reviewed and edited by,
Tara Kessler, Planner
August 8, 2016