



Historic District Commission **AGENDA**

Wednesday, April 20, 2022

4:30 PM City Hall, 2nd Floor Council Chambers

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Minutes of March 16, 2022
3. Advice & Comment:

Modifications to Saint Bernard's Rectory, 161-185 Main Street – Rick Cavallero, Lynne Cavallero, & Dan Bartlett, representing St. Bernard Church, seek input from the HDC regarding paint colors for the St. Bernard's Rectory building (historically known as the Appleton House), located at 161-185 Main Street (TMP# 584-006-000). The property is ranked as a Primary Resource and is located in the Downtown Growth District.

4. Staff Updates:
 - a) Update to the HDC "Frequently Asked Questions" page
 - b) Future Education & Outreach Efforts
5. New Business
6. Upcoming Dates of Interest:
 - a) Next HDC Meeting: May 18, 2022 – 4:30 pm, **Parks and Recreation Building, Room 22, 312 Washington Street**
 - b) HDC Site Visit: May 18, 2022 – 3:30 pm (To be confirmed)
7. Adjourn

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

3
4
5 **HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**
6 **MEETING MINUTES**
7

Wednesday, March 16, 2022

4:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Andrew Weglinski, Chair
Russ Fleming, Vice Chair
Councilor Catherine Workman
Hope Benik
Sophia Cunha-Vasconcelos

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
John Rogers, Interim Community
Development Director
Thomas Mullins, City Attorney

Members Not Present:

Hans Porschitz
David Bergeron, Alternate
Peter Poanessa, Alternate
Sam Temple

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

11
12 Mr. Fleming called the meeting to order at 4:32pm. Chair Weglinski arrived at 4:32pm. Roll call
13 was taken.

14
15 **2) Minutes – February 16, 2022**

16
17 Chair Weglinski made a motion to approve the minutes of February 16, 2022 as presented.
18 Councilor Workman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

19
20 **3) Continued Public Hearing:**

21
22 Chair Weglinski announced the continued public hearing for COA-2022-01 – 35-43 & 45-47
23 Main St – T-Mobile Telecommunications Installation. He stated applicant T-Mobile Northeast
24 LLC, on behalf of owner Mitchell H. Greenwald Revocable Trust, proposes to install a
25 telecommunications facility on the roof of the existing building at 45-47 Main St (TMP# 575-
26 025-000-000-000) and a generator on the property located at 35-43 Main St (TMP# 575-026-
27 000-000-000). Both properties are ranked as Primary Resources and are located in the
28 Downtown Core District.
29

30 Chair Weglinski invited the applicant forward for an update.

31

32 Amy White, on behalf of T-Mobile Northeast, stated they are proposing to install a
33 telecommunications facility on the rooftop of 45-47 Main Street. Antennas will be located on the
34 rooftop of that property and supported by ground equipment located in the basement of 35-43
35 Main Street, and the site will be supported by a proposed generator on the exterior of the
36 building at 35-43 Main Street. She went on to state that the facility consists of two enclosures on
37 the rooftop, each of which houses antennas and remote radio heads (RRHs) connected by fiber
38 cabling that will be run in a coaxed chase across the roof and down the building, then into the
39 basement where the equipment is being stored. Ms. White stated the enclosures measure 8ft x 9ft
40 8 inches and are set back 16ft from the roof, and a total of 10ft above the roof. She reminded the
41 commission that at the last hearing they talked about the color of the enclosures and had initially
42 presented black, based on what has been acceptable in other municipalities. The commission
43 sought photo simulations in alternative colors, in particular a greyish/blue and a brick color
44 without the pattern, as well as additional views further south on Main Street. Ms. White referred
45 to four additional sets of photo simulations in their packet, the first being the original black
46 enclosures with two additional views further down on Main Street. She pointed out that the
47 enclosures are not visible from the rotary, which is why there are no photo simulations for that
48 location. She went on to state option B is the brick colored enclosure and option C shows the
49 greyish colored enclosure. They also provided an additional view where the front enclosure
50 matches the tan brick and the rear enclosure matches the traditional brick color.

51

52 There were no questions from the board or the public and no additional staff comments.

53

54 Chair Weglinski closed the public hearing and began HDC deliberations. He thanked the
55 applicant for providing options and for going above and beyond.

56

57 Ms. Benik stated her preference would be option B, the brick colored paint, stating it appears
58 more seamless than the other options and blends in with the other buildings.

59

60 Mr. Fleming agreed, noting that the brick color goes with the overall brick coloring that Main
61 Street has.

62

63 Chair Weglinski stated he could go with either black or the brick color, but does not prefer the
64 greyish color.

65

66 Councilor Workman stated she would go with option B as well.

67

68 Ms. Cunha-Vasconcelos stated she initially leaned towards the greyish color but feels okay about
69 the brick color as well.

70

71 Mr. Fleming made a motion to approve COA-2022-02 for the installation of a
72 telecommunications facility and generator on the properties located at 35-43 and 45-47 Main

73 Street as presented on the plan set identified as “Site Number: 4KN0339A, Site Name: 55 Main
74 St. Keene RT” prepared by AEG Advanced Engineering Group, P.C. on September 7, 2021 and
75 last revised on November 17, 2021, with the condition that the color selection match that of
76 option B, a brick tone without brick seams.

77

78 Chair Weglinski seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

79

80 **4) Discussion about the Role of the HDC with New Construction in the Downtown**
81 **Historic District:**

82

83 Chair Weglinski stated this was added to the agenda due to challenges with previous items which
84 revealed the need to understand what role the HDC is playing moving forward, and what safe
85 measures are in place for new construction in their Historic District.

86

87 Ms. Brunner stated under the old regulations the HDC reviewed all new construction within the
88 downtown Historic District before a building permit could be issued. She explained that starting
89 around 2012, within a short period of time a number of large new construction projects happened
90 within the Historic District. Examples include the Food Co-op, MoCo Arts, the Washington Park
91 Apartments and the Keene Public Library connector. Around that same time staff received a lot
92 of feedback from the HDC that the process of reviewing new construction needed to be
93 improved, noting that the standards/process was too subjective. There were instances where the
94 HDC was not happy with results but felt like they didn’t have anything specific in their
95 regulations to back them up. Ms. Brunner went on to explain that there were previously 5
96 standards for new construction relating to materials, placement, massing and scale of the
97 building. In addition, after the HDC reviews a project within the Downtown Historic District it
98 still has to go to the Planning Board for site plan review; however, the Planning Board did not
99 have the ability to review architecture and visual appearance if the project had to go to the HDC.
100 This caused the Planning Board some frustration, especially when it came to the large
101 aforementioned projects which are prominent buildings in the downtown.

102

103 Ms. Brunner went on to state that when staff were gearing up to work on the Land Development
104 Code (LDC) project, they researched form-based codes as an alternative to conventional zoning
105 regulation in the downtown. She explained that a form-based code is a way of regulating land
106 development to achieve a specific built form and foster predictable results. It does so by using
107 physical form as the organizing principal rather than the separation of uses. In other words, it is
108 less focused on uses and very focused on the built form.

109

110 Ms. Brunner stated the goal of the LDC project was to update the City’s zoning and permitting
111 processes to create a more efficient experience for everyone, while still maintaining thoughtful
112 regulations that would work to achieve the community’s goals. At the March 20, 2019 HDC
113 meeting, staff presented a first draft of the HDC regulations for the LDC project, which was the
114 first time staff brought up the idea of exempting new construction from the HDC’s review. Ms.

115 Brunner stated the proposal was received favorably and noted that it was an almost completely
116 different board than today.

117
118 Ms. Brunner went on to state that there were two reasons behind their recommendations. One
119 being that form-based codes in the downtown regulate the built form of new construction,
120 including placement on the lots. For example, build to lines, build to zones and build to
121 percentage, and height regulations, as well as a category called “building activation” which looks
122 at the maximum blank wall area, maximum building entry spacing, minimum ground floor
123 transparency, etc. Ms. Brunner stated staff felt that with the form-based codes going into place
124 that they duplicated, and were a bit more specific, than what the HDC had before in their
125 standards for new construction. In other words, 3 of the 5 previous standards were essentially
126 replaced by the form-based code. She mentioned that there were two standards which were not
127 replicated in the form-based codes, including the standard on acceptable materials and the
128 standard that prohibited vinyl siding.

129
130 Ms. Brunner stated the second reason behind their recommendations was an effort to improve the
131 process a developer has to go through when building in the downtown. Staff tried to streamline
132 the process and taking the HDC part out of it allowed developers to save a month or more in time
133 and expense. Additionally, this eliminated the potential for conflict between the boards.

134
135 Two years later at the March meeting in 2021, staff brought forward the final version of the HDC
136 regulations and a question was raised about the legality of exempting new construction from
137 HDC review. Ms. Brunner stated staff brought back a revised version at the April 2021 meeting
138 with a memo that summarized the City Attorney’s opinion about the HDC’s authority to exempt
139 new construction. At the same time, an idea was brought up with regards to the removal of the
140 HDC’s role with new construction for issuing certificates of appropriateness, which is under the
141 HDC’s process. It was suggested that they ask the Planning Board to build in a process where,
142 during site plan review for a major project within the Downtown Historic District, the project
143 would get referred to the HDC for input prior to the Planning Board making a decision.

144
145 Ms. Brunner stated at the August 2021 Planning Board meeting the City of Keene Community
146 Development Department proposed to amend the Keene Planning Board regulations related to
147 the review of major site plans. The amendment was to require that any major site plan
148 application for new buildings, or additions to buildings, which are younger than 50 years old and
149 are located in the Downtown Historic District, be reviewed and commented on by the HDC prior
150 to the Planning Board closing the public hearing on the application. She went on to state that the
151 Planning Board opted not to adopt that change to their regulations.

152
153 Ms. Brunner recapped that at the last HDC meeting they had an application for demolition of a
154 contributing resource in the Historic District, making it the first time they are going to be able to
155 test the form based-codes in the downtown. She noted that the LDC is fairly new and went into
156 effect in September, and there hasn’t been an opportunity to test the codes yet. She added that the
157 City Attorney is present for any questions.

158
159 Chair Weglinski stated the history from his perspective was that standards for new construction
160 were vague and very subjective and the commission found themselves taking on the role of
161 designer. He explained that when they received applications they had to pick apart the design and
162 were constantly in that situation because they lacked solid standards. He noted that at the same
163 time the City had been in the process of getting the new form-based code in and towards the end
164 of that long and delayed process the commission sort of felt pressure for the form-based code
165 needing to be done. In turn they felt sort of pushed into voting to approve, with the caveat that
166 they thought they would still have that Planning Board option. When they realized there was no
167 welcome involvement from the Planning Board is when things started to feel wrong, and that's
168 what has led them to the current discussion. He went on to state that a concern with some of the
169 HDC members and some of the community is that they have a special Historic District area, yet
170 they have some data collected code determining what is appropriate for their personal, loved
171 fabric of their downtown. Chair Weglinski stated he sees both sides of the issue and recognizes
172 that it's challenging to come through the HDC and experience delayed development, noting
173 there's a lot more to the issue than just one right answer.

174
175 John Rogers, acting Community Development Director, stated as part of the LDC the City did
176 hire outside consultants that came into Keene and worked on the ground to understand the built
177 environment and the value of the downtown area, and that's how they developed the form-based
178 code. They did this in consultation with staff and a steering committee.

179
180 Mr. Fleming asked if the form-based approach was deemed to eliminate the need for the HDC.
181 Mr. Rogers answered that it was not the intent of the form-based code to not have the HDC
182 involved, because they still are.

183
184 Mr. Fleming referenced the presentation at their last meeting on HDC rules and responsibilities
185 and noted the slide on HDC purposes. He stated the first item read "preserving districts which
186 reflect cultural, social, economic, political, community and architectural history." He stated if
187 there's no role for the HDC in deciding on new construction in the Historic District, how can
188 they possibly live up to the aforementioned responsibility?

189
190 Ms. Brunner stated when they considered the possibility of asking the HDC to exempt new
191 construction from their review, they mentioned that to the consultants who then carefully
192 reviewed HDC regulations and purposely tried to make sure that what they were proposing in the
193 form-based code would be consistent. She added that they never contemplated getting rid of the
194 HDC and mentioned that HDC strengths have historically been with reviewing existing resources
195 in the Historic District. Ms. Brunner added that the only board with the authority to deny
196 demolition of a building within the Historic District is the HDC, so they have that in their power
197 in terms of preserving the historic character of downtown.

198
199 Chair Weglinski stated City Council has the right to dissolve the HDC at any time but if that
200 happens they would lose the Historic District. He added that one of their standards talks about

201 affecting the fabric of the historical area, not necessarily building specific, but how one
202 renovation, building or repair impacts the whole district and surrounding neighborhoods. He
203 stated that is the most powerful part of their standards and he feels it's being ignored by the
204 form-based code that gives them no authority to review new construction.

205
206 Mr. Fleming asked how the Planning Board is selected and if they have to have interest in
207 preserving the Historic District as a criteria. Ms. Brunner stated there are 9 members including
208 the Mayor, a City Council member, and staff person, and the other 6 members are nominated by
209 the Mayor and appointed by City Council, the only requirement being that they must be Keene
210 residents. She went on to state that, for the HDC, there's a section in the ordinance on
211 membership that talks about who should be a part of the HDC. She stated it notes that one
212 member should be a City Council member, one member should be a member of the Heritage
213 Commission, and one member may be a member of the Planning Board. It also encourages a
214 property owner and business owner within the Historic District, and members with background
215 in architecture or construction and an interest in in historic preservation.

216
217 Mr. Fleming stated he heard the form-based rules don't say you can't use vinyl siding so
218 technically, unless the Planning Board is against vinyl siding, someone could build a vinyl sided
219 building within the Historic District. Ms. Brunner stated she will need to double check but she
220 believes that's true.

221
222 Mr. Fleming stated he feels they should approach the planning board and voice that there should
223 be some input from the HDC for new construction in the Historic District. He went on to state
224 that he felt they compromised very well and understood that the extra hearings and approvals
225 were time consuming for the developers. They gave up their right to hear and approve but asked
226 for some official recognition and input into the process, which was denied. He added that the
227 project before them last month was a clear example of the bind they are in. He questioned why
228 they should give demolition permission at all knowing they will have to turn their back to the
229 property and new construction in the Historic District.

230
231 Chair Weglinski asked if this was something that needs to go to City Council instead of the
232 Planning Board. Ms. Brunner stated the Planning Board has authority over their own regulations
233 so they could ask them to include that step in the site plan review process; however, the HDC has
234 authority over their own regulations so they could choose to amend their regulations to remove
235 that exemption for new construction. She pointed out that the process to do so is now different
236 and explained that the LDC put everything into City code so it's a two-step process. You first
237 hold a public hearing and amend the regulations and then it will also have to go to City Council
238 for a vote. She stated they haven't had a chance to test the form-based codes downtown yet so
239 City Council may want to see how the codes play out before making a major amendment to
240 them. Ms. Brunner stated they could ask the Planning Board again and added that it sounds like
241 their main objection was they felt like it was adding an extra step to the process that wasn't
242 necessary.

243

244 Councilor Workman stated, if those are their only two options, it sounds like the easiest path
245 would be to have another conversation with the Planning Board and see if maybe having a
246 concrete example like the Cobblestone project could change their opinion, and then go from
247 there if that doesn't work.

248
249 Mr. Fleming stated he thinks someone from the HDC should be representing if they go to the
250 Planning Board, not staff. He wondered if the Planning Board standards could be tweaked a little
251 to reflect concerns, like the vinyl siding. He highlighted that they will be having a project coming
252 through to test out the form-based code.

253
254 Chair Weglinski stated he is hearing they aren't necessarily looking to have power to approve a
255 building but want to be heard and have input that gets brought up and mentioned so that the
256 people who are approving are able to hear from the HDC.

257
258 Mr. Fleming asked if there was a representative from the Planning Board on the HDC. Short
259 discussion revealed there is not a member from the Planning Board. Ms. Brunner reported that
260 the language states there "may" be a member from the Planning Board and it notes that there
261 should be a member from the Heritage Commission. Mr. Fleming added that they will likely
262 learn a lot from going through the Cobblestone project but the downside is that it may work fine
263 because of the owner; however, the next time around could be different.

264
265 Mr. Fleming asked if they can instruct HDC staff to notify them when any new construction has
266 been submitted in the Historic District. Ms. Brunner stated when an application for a building
267 permit for new construction within the Historic District is submitted, they could probably ask for
268 that to be referred to the HDC, which is how it was before. However, site plan review sometimes
269 happens and the process concludes before a permit is even submitted, so their input would come
270 after the Planning Board has already reviewed the application.

271
272 Mr. Rogers stated the timing might not work because building permit applications go out to a
273 third party. He explained that a lot of larger projects that are over a certain square footage, or
274 very complex projects, will go to a third party plan reviewer who will review the application and
275 make sure it meets codes. That means by the time an application gets to the Planning Board
276 there's potential for a very quick turnaround for the building permit process. Ms. Brunner stated
277 the Planning Board has an architectural and visual appearance standard so with new construction
278 they would require building elevations. She stated members of the HDC could monitor Planning
279 Board agendas and view application materials online; however, as far as referring site plans to
280 the HDC, that wouldn't be appropriate unless it was built into the Planning Board's regulation.
281 Chair Weglinski noted that any members from the HDC could see the items posted online and
282 show up to the public hearing if need be. Ms. Brunner agreed.

283
284 Ms. Cunha-Vasconcelos stated she is brand new to all of this but is hearing that when the HDC
285 did have authority to review new construction there was not a good standard and it became a
286 taste-based situation. She also heard that part of what was happening with the Planning Board

287 was to create a more concrete set of parameters with the form-based codes, and it was done
288 through the Planning Board as a way to streamline the process for developers. In summary, she is
289 hearing that the intent was to put more rigor around the process and put some definition around
290 what forms they wanted downtown. She stated it's not necessarily going through the HDC, but it
291 sounds like the intent of maintaining that aesthetic was intended to be captured in the codes. She
292 concluded by posing the question that if there was something that was supposed to get done, and
293 it is getting done, does it matter how it's getting done? Or whether it's going through the HDC or
294 the Planning Board if it's being achieved, and perhaps more efficiently?
295

296 Chair Weglinski stated, if he remembers correctly, the historical portion of the form-based code
297 is minimal.
298

299 Ms. Brunner reviewed the HDC's old standards for new construction. She explained that there
300 were five and the first one said that "new buildings or construction shall be cited so the existing
301 pattern of the historic streetscape, setbacks, spacing, lot coverage, scale, massing, height and
302 orientation in which they are located is not disrupted." She noted that everything in that standard
303 is regulated through form-based codes and is much more objective now. She reiterated that the
304 professional consultants created the codes by going into downtown and taking very specific
305 measurements and designed the boundaries of sub districts within the downtown. They also
306 identified within the sub districts what the predominant built form was, or that they wanted to
307 see. Standards were then designed to promote that.
308

309 Ms. Brunner stated the second standard said "the shape, scale and fenestration of the new
310 buildings or structures shall respect the established historic architectural character of the
311 surrounding area." She noted that the building activation standards in the form-based codes cover
312 that point. She explained that the building activation standards require a maximum space
313 between entries, maximum amount of blank wall space, minimum amount of transparency on
314 floors, etc.
315

316 Ms. Brunner went on to state that the third standard said "new buildings or structures shall take
317 into account the historic relationship of existing buildings and site features on the site." She
318 stated they felt the form-based code standards addressed that by saying you have to locate your
319 building to match the existing historic built pattern of the surrounding area.
320

321 Ms. Brunner stated standards number 4 and 5 are where the form-based code may not cover.
322 Standard 4 said "exterior cladding shall be of materials that are common in the district.
323 Acceptable materials include brick, stone, terracotta, wood and metal. Wood shingles, wooden
324 clapboards, concrete clapboards, and brick are also acceptable types of siding." Standard number
325 5 said "materials commonly referred to as vinyl siding are inappropriate contemporary materials
326 and are therefore prohibited for use on new construction in the historic district." She stated that
327 those last two standards relate to the materials that are used to construct the building, which
328 would be reviewed by the Planning Board under the new regulations. She noted that the Planning

329 Board standards are more focused on aggressive colors and don't have as much of a focus on
330 materials.

331

332 Chair Weglinski stated the 3rd standard is tough with form-based because it is also somewhat
333 subjective. He stated it's difficult to know what fits the surrounding neighborhood/fabric and
334 they are relying on the applicant's architect to propose and present, and that too is subjective to
335 the Planning Board, which would be subjective to the HDC as well.

336

337 Ms. Brunner stated she interpreted that standard to mean that what you're constructing has to
338 match the built form of what's already there.

339

340 Chair Weglinski stated he doesn't think anyone is opposed to new and modern and also not
341 opposed to more traditional, and so the challenge is to figure out how they get heard by the
342 Planning Board. He reviewed their options of amending standards and getting approval from
343 City Council, presenting concerns to the Planning Board, or reviewing Planning Board packets
344 once they become available to the public and showing up to the meetings if they have an issue.
345 Ms. Brunner stated they could also ask the Planning Board to amend their regulations to include
346 standards around materials, if that's an issue the HDC is really concerned about.

347

348 Mr. Fleming asked for clarification on the form based codes and "aggressive colors." Ms.
349 Brunner stated the form based codes are in zoning and that's something staff reviews. If
350 something doesn't meet the zoning it goes to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance, and
351 it can be a big burden for the applicant to prove that they meet the threshold for getting a
352 variance. She went on to state that the Planning Board's review is more subjective and that's
353 why the review for architecture and visual appearance is with the Planning Board and not with
354 staff.

355

356 Chair Weglinski asked for input on what they want to do as next steps. Mr. Fleming expressed
357 that it feels as if the HDC is not needed at all because they are turning everything over to the
358 Planning Board. He added the downside would be that Keene would lose its Historic District if
359 the HDC no longer existed.

360

361 Ms. Brunner stated that within the HDC they have two levels of projects, one is major, which are
362 the larger projects that always go to the HDC for review. The other is minor, which are smaller
363 projects like replacing windows and entryways. She added that they get way more minor than
364 major projects. Ms. Brunner explained that the cumulative impact of those projects is big
365 because staff can enforce HDC standards, which results in a lot of projects that have preserved
366 historic character. She also reminded them of their power to deny applications to demolish
367 buildings when they are considered contributing or primary buildings.

368

369 Chair Weglinski stated if the Cobblestone building wasn't a safety issue they likely would have
370 turned the request to demolish down. He also brought up that there are other items that the HDC
371 is going to be undertaking in the near future.

372

373 Ms. Brunner gave a quick overview of upcoming projects and started off by stating that there
374 was a lot of background information in the old HDC regulations, which was not included in the
375 LDC because they were hearing from developers that it was confusing. As a result, they took all
376 the background information and guidelines out of the LDC to make it clearer and easier. Their
377 intent was always to create a companion document that includes education and background on
378 the HDC and guidelines, which is a project that has been on the back burner. She stated that is
379 something that the commission could work on. Additionally, another project is an annual mailing
380 to all of the property owners within the Historic District to let them know they are in it and give
381 them the opportunity to ask questions. She stated this would also help with compliance for
382 instances when people need to get permission from the HDC. Also, because new construction is
383 exempted, they'd want to send out a notice annually to any new buildings that will be coming
384 under their purview. Ms. Brunner went on to state that another project is doing an inventory for
385 the properties that are in the extension to the Historic District downtown overlay, which was
386 extended in 2011 and inventory has not yet been completed.

387

388 Ms. Cunha-Vasconcelos stated she doesn't see that many opportunities for new construction in
389 the Historic District and she always thought of new construction as a small portion of what the
390 board does. She stated there still seems to be a lot that can be done without new construction.
391 There was short discussion on options for new construction and how it comes in waves.

392

393 Mr. Fleming asked if someone submits a site plan application, is it a public document right
394 away? Ms. Brunner stated yes. He stated if they pay attention to the Planning Board's website
395 and see when their site plan applications come in, they could then bring it to the attention of the
396 HDC themselves. Ms. Brunner deferred to the City Attorney for this.

397

398 Thomas Mullins, City Attorney stated that there will be a site plan application for the
399 Cobblestone building and individuals from the HDC have the right to go to that hearing and
400 express a position as to what that site should look like. At that point there is a provision in the
401 statute that allows for joint meetings before the two boards, each board has the authority to agree
402 to that or not. He stated his concern with having a board go to a site plan meeting to have this
403 discussion could potentially trigger a meeting of the HDC that wasn't properly noticed, and that
404 could be a problem. Additionally, at the moment the HDC doesn't have any jurisdiction over
405 new construction, so that raises the question of if they would actually be there as a board if they
406 showed up. He suggested, at a minimum, that one or more members of the board go to the site
407 plan review hearing and at least see what happens. He commented that members of the Planning
408 Board are all residents of the City of Keene and have an interest in what the City of Keene looks
409 like, and are not shy in terms of looking at how buildings are constructed. He suggested that it's
410 important to allow the LDC to work at least once and see how it plays out. If the HDC then still
411 feels strongly that it doesn't trust what's happening and wants to move the initiative forward, he
412 suggested they do so and decide if they want to amend regulations and put it in front of City
413 Council. He suggested they follow those two steps first, attend the site plan review meeting and
414 see what the results are, and then if they still feel strongly that they won't protect the Historic

415 District character they could move forward with amending regulations. There was clarification
416 that Mr. Mullins meant for them to go to the site plan hearing, not the site visit.

417
418 Mr. Fleming stated those suggestions sound reasonable. There was general agreement amongst
419 the commission.

420

421

422 5) **Staff Updates**

423 6) **New Business**

424 7) **Upcoming Dates of Interest**

425

426 Chair Weglinski stated the next meeting is April 20th at 4:30pm. The next site visit will be before
427 the meeting and will be confirmed by staff the week prior.

428

429

430 8) **Adjournment**

431

432 Chair Weglinski adjourned the meeting at 5:54pm.

433

434

435 Respectfully submitted by,
436 Nicole Cullinane, Minute Taker

437

438 Reviewed and edited by,
439 Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

440

From: [Rick Cavallero](#)
To: [Mari Brunner](#)
Cc: [Lynne](#)
Subject: Painting St. Bernard's Rectory - 173 Main Street, Keene
Date: Friday, April 1, 2022 7:01:12 PM

Hi Mari,

I hope all has been well.

As a follow up to our conversation earlier today we would like to attend the HDC 4:30pm meeting on Wednesday April 20th to further discuss our color choice for the exterior of the rectory.

Lynne Cavallero is the designer on the project and has been working with Dan Bartlett on this exciting project. I am project manager. All three of us are available for the meeting.

We appreciate your assistance as well as the guidance of the entire HDC and are excited to show you the vision we and our pastor have for the rectory.

Please let me know if there is anything you need from us for the meeting.

Hope you have a glorious weekend.

Warmest regards,

Rick Cavallero
St. Bernard's Church
Parish of the Holy Spirit
c. 516-455-3036
h. 603-446-2306



WINDOWS
DOORS

Exterior **Semi Gloss**

WINDOW TRIM
All other trim

Interior **Pearl Finish**

Benjamin Moore®
1210 LRV: 18
Ten Gallon Hat
Sombbrero Tejano
Chapeau de Cowboy

Benjamin Moore®
1210 LRV: 18
Ten Gallon Hat
Sombbrero Tejano
Chapeau de Cowboy

Benjamin Moore®
912 LRV: 81
Linen White
Blanco Lino
Blanc Lin

Benjamin Moore®
912 LRV: 81
Linen White
Blanco Lino
Blanc Lin

