



## **Historic District Commission** **AGENDA**

Wednesday, January 18, 2023

4:30 PM City Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Council Chambers

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call**
- 2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair**
- 3. Minutes of November 16, 2022**
- 4. Staff Updates**
  - a) List of 2022 Minor Project Approvals as of December 31, 2022
- 5. Discussion Items**
  - a) Downtown Infrastructure Improvement Project Update
  - b) Neighborhood Heritage Districts
- 6. New Business**
- 7. Upcoming Dates of Interest:**
  - a) Next HDC Meeting: February 15, 2023 – 4:30 pm, City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Council Chambers
  - b) HDC Site Visit: February 15, 2023 – 3:30 pm (To be confirmed)
- 8. Adjourn**

1 City of Keene  
2 New Hampshire

3  
4  
5 HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
6 MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

4:30 PM

Council Chambers,  
City Hall

**Members Present:**

Andrew Weglinski, Chair  
Councilor Catherine Workman  
Hope Benik  
David Bergeron, Alternate (Voting)

**Staff Present:**

Evan Clements, Planner

**Members Not Present:**

Russ Fleming, Vice Chair  
Sam Temple  
Hans Porschitz  
Sophia Cunha-Vasconcelos  
Gregg Kleiner, Alternate  
Peter Poanessa, Alternate

7  
8  
9 **1) Call to Order and Roll Call**

10 Chair Weglinski called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM and Mr. Clements called the roll.  
11  
12

13 **2) Minutes of October 19, 2022**

14  
15 A motion by Ms. Benik to adopt the minutes of October 19, 2022 was duly seconded by  
16 Councilor Workman and the motion carried unanimously.  
17

18 **3) Advice & Comment**

- 19 **A) Renovations to Monadnock Peer Support Agency, 24 Vernon Street –**  
20 **Christine Allen, representing Monadnock Area Peer Support Agency, is**  
21 **seeking input from the HDC regarding proposed renovations to the MPS**  
22 **building located at 24 Vernon St (TMP #568-058-000), including the**  
23 **replacement of windows, creation of rooftop garden seating, and installation**  
24 **of a rooftop solar array, amongst other renovations. The property is ranked**  
25 **as a Primary Resource and is located in the Downtown Core District**  
26

27 Mr. Clements clarified that this was not a public hearing, but an opportunity for Commission  
28 guidance before a formal application is submitted.  
29

30 Chair Weglinski welcomed Christine Allen and Ryan Bogard of the Monadnock Peer Support  
31 (MPS) Agency. Ms. Allen explained that MPS recently received a Community Development  
32 Block Grant for over \$900,000, from which they seek to add a new HVAC system, new window  
33 replacements, a wheelchair ramp and push button accessible doors, and a total of two building  
34 entrances through the renovation. They also seek rooftop access for a garden, seating area, solar  
35 panels, and a perimeter fence. If looking at the building from Vernon Street, they will completely  
36 remove an original exterior stairwell that is in total disrepair, which Mr. Bergeron agreed was in  
37 bad condition. Now there are opportunities for an internal stairway and elevator. It makes sense  
38 to have the Main Entrance to the right of the building with the double doors for wheelchair  
39 accessibility.

40  
41 Chair Weglinski asked what they plan to replace the existing windows with. Ms. Allen said they  
42 would use the same size energy efficient windows because the current ones are old and drafty.  
43 There will be no change to the window sizes. Mr. Bogard was unsure of the current window  
44 material, but Ms. Allen knew they were not original to the building and thought they might be  
45 vinyl. In that case, Mr. Bergeron said it would be ideal for this Commission if the new windows  
46 matched the historic style. Ms. Allen will inquire about the cost of replacing the vinyl siding with  
47 brick or a brick alternative. Even if it meant another grant to do so, she wanted to finish the  
48 exterior of the building to best match the historic area and improve the downtown, depending on  
49 the costs. Mr. Bergeron said that even replacing them with something like wood would be more  
50 appropriate. Ms. Allen agreed that the current ones look silly and out of place. Mr. Bergeron  
51 asked what was under the current windows and Ms. Allen replied it was a 100% cement  
52 building. If unable to do a rooftop fence, she suggested carrying the brick all the way up as a  
53 fence, making it look like a three-story building, which would blend well with the adjacent three-  
54 story Keene Housing Authority and mask the roof activities. Mr. Bergeron asked if the HVAC  
55 would also be on the roof and Ms. Allen replied in the affirmative.

56  
57 Chair Weglinski confirmed that this was only a question-and-answer session but confirmed that  
58 the applicants must submit a specific application at some point. Mr. Clements agreed, stating that  
59 this was an opportunity to present ideas with no prejudice and get candid feedback from the  
60 Commission so there are no surprises when the application is submitted; it is non-binding. Ms.  
61 Allen was open to whatever would make this happen, within cost. When submitting the  
62 application, Chair Weglinski said it would be helpful if the applicants provided the specifications  
63 of the exact materials they plan to use, height of screening, and views from different locations.  
64 He said a rendering of the rooftop fencing would be helpful. He added that it was easy enough to  
65 imagine the staircase demolished.

66  
67 Ms. Benik asked if the elevator would extend above the roofline. Mr. Bogard said yes and that it  
68 would probably extend 12' to accommodate adult use. Chair Weglinski said it would be helpful  
69 to have those roof plans as well to best understand. Ms. Allen said the current elevator would  
70 remain on the Washington Street side inside, because of function and daily work. They are  
71 looking to add another one on the Vernon Street side interior as well. For the rooftop plans,  
72 Chair Weglinski said it was most important for this Commission know exactly what would be

73 visible from the street from different angles, as well as if there is potential for a noise  
74 disturbance. Ms. Allen thought it would make things quieter because clients would congregate  
75 there instead of on Vernon Street, distracting the community less and eliminating potential  
76 issues.

77  
78 Chair Weglinski thought it was a good plan and the Commission looked forward to seeing how it  
79 would develop.

- 80  
81 **4) Public Hearing**  
82 **A) COA-2015-07, Modification #4 – 161-185 Main St – St. Bernard’s Rectory**  
83 **Renovations – Applicant Rick Cavallero, on behalf of owner the Roman**  
84 **Catholic Bishop of Manchester NH, proposes exterior renovations and the**  
85 **installation of condensers at the St. Bernard’s Rectory at 161-185 Main St**  
86 **(TMP #584-006-000). Waivers are requested from Section 21.6.3.A.3 &**  
87 **Section 21.6.3.D.7 of the Land Development Code for the request to infill an**  
88 **existing window opening. The property is ranked as a Primary Resource and**  
89 **is located in the Downtown Growth District.**

90  
91 At the Chair’s request, Mr. Clements said the applicant requested exemptions from submitting  
92 material samples, color renderings, and elevations. After reviewing each request, Staff had  
93 determined that exempting the applicant from submitting this information would have no bearing  
94 on the merits of the application and recommended that the Historic District Commission grant  
95 these exemptions and accept the application as complete. A motion by Chair Weglinski to accept  
96 application COA-2015-07, Modification #4, as complete was duly seconded by Ms. Benik and  
97 the motion carried unanimously.

98  
99 Chair Weglinski welcomed the applicants, Lynn Cavallero, the project signer, and Rick  
100 Cavallero, the liaison with the project manager. Mr. Cavallero said there was a study years ago  
101 on the many aspects of the Parish of the Holy Spirit, which involves three churches, cemeteries,  
102 and other properties. The rectory had gone into disrepair and had not been renovated since the  
103 1960s and 1970s, so they decided to start renovating. He described the exterior work to brick-up  
104 a window, replace the fireplace that was removed in the 1900s, install a new chimney, and to  
105 install and screen a HVAC system and three compressors outside. The applicants submitted how  
106 they would screen the HVAC.

107  
108 Chair Weglinski asked the reason for bricking over the window. Mr. Cavallero said it was partly  
109 for HVAC going through the wall and partly because the kitchen is narrow with two large  
110 windows and they need extra wall space, so they want to close one of the windows. Ms.  
111 Cavallero added that on this side of the rectory a window would be a privacy issue because the  
112 children would have a view of the rectory activities. This was the best option because it would  
113 keep costs the lowest. She hoped that whole section by the window removal would be screened if  
114 the shrubbery were approved. She noted that this part of the building was an addition and not  
115 original to the historic part of the house.

116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158

Mr. Bergeron asked where on the building the window was being replaced. Mr. Cavallero said that it is in the back, facing the parking lot. He added that because the brick installation would be painted with the rest of the building, no installation lines would be visible. The other window is on the side, facing Mercy Academy.

Chair Weglinski asked if most of the application details were covered during previous advice and comment. Ms. Cavallero said that visit was a courtesy to ensure the paint color chosen was appropriate. The colors of the trim and building were not related to bricking this window because the whole existing rectory's brick is already painted.

Mr. Clements provided a Staff report on this application. He reported that in conjunction with an interior renovation, an existing window is proposed to be removed and filled in with brick to facilitate the remodel of the kitchen area. The brick used to fill in the window will be pointed and painted to match the façade of the building. A second window in the kitchen area is proposed to be replaced with a new window of equal size. The new window will be a vinyl clad wooden window with simulated divided aluminum lites and permanently attached muntin grids. There are four windows located on the garage that are proposed to be replaced with fiberglass clad wooden windows with 7/8" simulated divided lite with spacer bar. The door to the garage is also proposed to be replaced with an insulated fiberglass clad wooden door with grills between the glass. Mr. Clements added that the door to the garage was not original to the building and upgrading the door was for energy efficiency.

Mr. Clements continued explaining that a new chimney is proposed to be installed on the southeast corner of the flat roof portion of the building. The applicant has included a historical photo (included in the packet) of the building that shows a chimney used to exist in the proposed location. The chimney will be 3 ft. in height and 16 in. x 16 in. area. It will be constructed with red/brown "St. Louis Used" style brick and gray mortar. The applicant proposes to install three HVAC condensers installed along the northern portion of the building. The applicant states in their narrative that this location is best suited to minimize the amount of tubing and wiring required. The HVAC system is proposed to be screened with four Canadian Hemlock evergreen shrubs at 7 ft. at mature height. Mr. Clements asked if the shrubs would be planted with a starting height of seven feet and the Cavallero's replied in the affirmative. Mr. Clements continued that all pack lighting fixtures are proposed to replace the existing wall packs on the building. The proposed fixtures are bronze in color with a compact, low-profile design, and will be installed as a downlight. The color temperature for the proposed wall packs is 3000k with a color rendering index of 72. Mr. Clements said the proposed wall pack meet the Planning Board site plan requirements. General repair and maintenance work is also proposed as part of this application. This work includes the restoration and repainting of window trim, repair to soffit woodwork, and removal and replacement of a wooden panel. The panel will be replaced with a masonry sill, wood framing, and PVC beadboard. Molded window surrounds will be cleaned, restored, and repainted as needed.

159 Mr. Clements continued on the specifics of the application as they apply to the HDC standards.  
160 Per Section 21.6.2 Specific Standards for Primary and Contributing Resources, the applicant has  
161 requested a waiver from subsection A.3, which states that all architectural changes shall be  
162 appropriate either to the original style or appearance of the building or structure (if it has not  
163 been significantly altered) or to its altered style or appearance (if it has been altered within the  
164 Period of Significance and those alterations have attained significance) and D.7, which states that  
165 enlarging or reducing the window rough opening to fit new stock windows shall be prohibited.  
166 These waivers are required to infill the existing window in the kitchen to accommodate the  
167 remodel. The Commission needed to decide if these changes would not unduly affect the  
168 historical significance of the building.

169  
170 Next, Mr. Clements reported that the applicant states in their narrative that, “This part of the  
171 building was an addition and not part of the original build. And while the window in question  
172 can be viewed from the street it adds nothing to the historic integrity of the property.” The  
173 Commission will need to determine if the proposed removal of the kitchen window would have  
174 significant negative impact to the contributing nature of the building to the District and whether  
175 it would be in keeping with the Commission’s standards. When deliberating the waiver request  
176 the Commission should consider the following waiver criteria: 1) Strict application of these  
177 regulations would result in a particular and exceptional difficulty or undue hardship upon the  
178 owner of the affected property; 2) An alternative design or materials meets the design objectives  
179 stated in the Historic District Regulations of this LDC equally well or better than would strict  
180 compliance with these regulations; and 3.) The waiver may be granted without substantial  
181 detriment to the intent of the Historic District Regulations and the public good.

182  
183 Next, Mr. Clement reviewed the specific HDC standards regarding lighting fixtures that the  
184 Commission needed to consider. In Section 21.6.2.A.3 Specific Standards for Primary and  
185 Contributing Resources (Light Fixtures), the Commission does not have specific standards when  
186 it comes to lighting fixtures, however, as architectural features, the proposed wall packs will  
187 need to be appropriate for the architectural style of the building. Subsection A.3 states, “All  
188 architectural changes shall be appropriate either to the original style or appearance of the  
189 building or structure...” The Commission would need to determine if the proposed wall packs  
190 meet this standard.

191  
192 Mr. Clements continued reviewing the requirements to consider for the chimney work. In  
193 Section 21.6.2.C.1 Roofs and Roof Structures (chimneys), it says the original or historic roofline  
194 shall not be altered. The applicant is proposing to install a chimney in a location where there was  
195 historically a chimney. The Commission will need to determine if the proposed materials and  
196 location of the chimney meets the Commission’s standard, especially subsection A.3 which  
197 states, “All architectural changes shall be appropriate either to the original style or appearance of  
198 the building or structure.”

199  
200 Mr. Clements reviewed the HDC regulations for Section 21.6.2.D.2 Windows, which states that  
201 any historic or architecturally significant window that is proposed for replacement shall be

202 replaced with a window that conveys the same visual appearance in terms of overall dimensions  
203 and shape, size of glazed areas, muntin arrangement, and other design details as the windows to  
204 be replaced. In addition, it shall have: clearpaned, non-tinted glass (except to replace historic  
205 stained or other types of translucent or opaque glass); and true divided lights or a permanently  
206 affixed muntin grid on the exterior of the window. In either instance, the muntin shall have a  
207 raised trapezoidal profile. Snap-in or between-glass muntin grids are not allowed. The applicant  
208 is proposing to replace existing wooden windows on the building with fiberglass clad wooden  
209 frame windows with simulated divided lites and permanently attached muntin grids. The grid  
210 pattern for the replacement windows will match the grid patterns of the existing windows to be  
211 replaced. Mr. Clements said it appeared that this standard had been met.

212  
213 Next, Mr. Clements reviewed the HDC requirements for Section 21.6.2.E.1 Doors, which states  
214 that if replacement is necessary, the new feature shall match the original in size, design, texture,  
215 color, and, where possible, materials. The new feature shall maintain the same visual appearance  
216 as the historic feature. The applicant proposed to replace an existing door that provides access to  
217 the garage. The door to be replaced is not an original historic door but is of a design and  
218 character that matches the existing windows on the garage that are proposed to be replaced as  
219 part of this application. The proposed replacement door is of the same color and grid layout as  
220 the existing door. The Commission would need to decide if this standard has been met.

221  
222 Mr. Clements concluded his report on Section 21.5.4.A & B Utility, Service, and Mechanical  
223 Equipment. The standard for new mechanical units and supply line states, “Mechanical  
224 equipment (e.g. HVAC units) shall be ground mounted toward the rear of the building set as low  
225 to the ground as possible and with appropriate screening or landscaping to minimize visibility,”  
226 and “New mechanical supply lines, pipes, and ductwork shall be placed in inconspicuous  
227 locations and/or concealed with architectural elements, such as downspouts.” The applicant  
228 proposes to provide screening for the proposed HVAC mechanicals with evergreen shrubs. The  
229 applicant states in their narrative that the proposed location for the units will minimize the  
230 amount of wiring and tubing that will be required. The Commission would need to determine if  
231 this standard has been met.

232  
233 Chair Weglinski said one thing that comes up often are the line sets that come from the outdoor  
234 units on the wall and go inside. He said these were not required to be screened before, but the  
235 application said downspouts or other thoughtful placement would be used. He asked what line  
236 sets would attach to the exterior wall. Mr. Cavallero said everything would be running inside the  
237 building, with nothing on the outside; it was costing them to have they sheetrock redone so all  
238 was inside the building.

239  
240 With no public comments, Chair Weglinski closed the hearing for deliberations.

241  
242 Mr. Bergeron said it looked like they had met all requirements and were doing the best they  
243 could with the building type and location to meet the regulations. He said the windows proposed  
244 looked similar to others the HDC had approved and that the chimney materials would blend

245 nicely. Chair Weglinski said the elevations were clear and easy to understand and that concealing  
246 those line sets went above and beyond what the Commission would ask, which he appreciated.

247  
248 The following motion by Councilor Workman was duly seconded by Mr. Bergeron. On a vote of  
249 4–0, the Historic District Commission approved COA-2015-07, Modification #4, and the waivers  
250 from Section 21.6.3.A.3 & Section 21.6.3.D.7 of the Land Development Code for the request to  
251 infill an existing window opening, window, door, and light fixture replacement, and associated  
252 restoration and site work at 161-185 Main Street (TMP #584-006-000) as described in the plan  
253 set identified as “Parish of the Holy Spirit St. Bernard Church 173 Main Street Keene NH  
254 Repairs and Interior Design/Remodel,” prepared by DB Architects, dated June 23, 2022, and  
255 other application materials with no conditions.

256  
257 Mr. Clements said the applicants would receive a Certificate of Appropriateness saying this  
258 application was approved, allowing them to move forward with their building permit.

259

260 **5) Staff Updates**

261 **A) Outreach Efforts – Informational Brochure**

262  
263 Mr. Clements reported that things had been mostly quiet in the District and the Community  
264 Development Department had received few, if any, minor project applications. He mentioned the  
265 informational mailer the Commission had been working toward that would be mailed to every  
266 home in the District. He asked for the Commission’s approval to mail them in their current form.  
267 He noted that the QR code on this draft needed to be replaced. The Commission agreed that it  
268 was nice to see something new and refreshing after many years. Chair Weglinski asked how  
269 people would know they are receiving it because they are in the Historic District. Mr. Clements  
270 replied that it was a good point, and everyone agreed that it was prudent to include a cover letter  
271 explaining better. Mr. Clements would also edit the mailer to include the catch phrase, “you are  
272 the historic district.”

273

274 **6) New Business**

275

276 No new business ensued.

277

278 **7) Upcoming Dates of Interest**

279 **A) Next HDC Meeting: December 21, 2022 – 4:30 pm, City Hall 2nd Floor**  
280 **Council Chambers**

281

282 Mr. Clements was unsure the Commission would receive any applications before the deadline.  
283 He would be in communication.

284

285 **B) HDC Site Visit: December 21, 2022 – 3:30 pm (To be confirmed)**

286 **8) Adjournment**

287



288 There being no further business, Chair Weglinski adjourned the meeting at 5:13 PM.

289

290 Respectfully submitted by,  
291 Katie Kibler, Minute Taker  
292 November 23, 2022

293

294 Reviewed and edited by,  
295 Evan J. Clements, Planner

296

## 2022 Minor HDC Projects: January-December

The list below includes requests that were approved administratively by staff on behalf of the HDC from January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022. Since the beginning of the year, a total of five requests have been approved administratively by staff. These requests either met the threshold for a minor project as outlined in Article 21.4.1 of the Land Development Code (LDC), or they were proposed for a Non-contributing or Incompatible resource and it was determined that they did not warrant review and approval by the Historic District Commission (per Article 21.4.2.C of the LDC). More information about each project is available on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of City Hall.

1. **COA-2019-05, Modification #1 – 34 Court St – Former Grace Methodist Church Tuckpointing Repairs:** Applicant Paragon Digital LLC, on behalf of owner 34 Court LLC, proposes tuckpointing repairs along the east and west facades of the former Grace United Methodist Church located at 34 Court Street (TMP# 568-022-000). The property is 0.18 acres in size and is ranked as a Primary Resource in the Downtown Core District.
2. **COA-2020-02, Modification #1 – 21 Davis St – Cigar Bar Seasonal Patio:** Applicant The Diplomat LLC, on behalf of owner 21 Davis Street LLC, proposes to create a patio in front of the cigar bar located in the building at 21 Davis Street (TMP# 584-058-000). The property is 0.18 acres in size and is ranked as a Non-Contributing Resource in the Downtown Core District.
3. **COA-2022-02 – 43-45 Roxbury St – Edward Jones Office:** Applicant and owner, FLC Elm Street Realty Trust LLC, proposes to convert one of the existing vacant tenant spaces in the building at 43-45 Roxbury Street (TMP# 571-004-000) into an Edward Jones Office and install a condenser along the southern building facade. The property is 0.27 acres in size and is ranked as a Non-Contributing Resource in the Downtown Core District.
4. **COA-2018-03, Modification #1 – 34 West St – Rooftop Mechanical Equipment:** Applicant and owner Post Office Offices LLC, proposes to install seven condensers on the roof of the loading at the rear of the former Post Office building located at 34 West St (TMP #575-033-000). This parcel is 0.42-ac in size and is ranked as a Primary Resource in the Downtown Core District.
5. **COA-2009-24, Modification #1 – 24 Vernon St – MPS Outdoor Seating Area:** Applicant and owner Monadnock Area Peer Support Agency, proposes to install a screened outdoor seating area on the 0.28-acre parcel property at 24 Vernon St (TMP #568-058-000). The property is ranked as an Incompatible Resource and is located in the Downtown Core District.