

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

In attendance: Doug Chabinsky – Acting Chair, Tom Quinn - Planning Board Ex-Officio, Chris Buchanan, Martha Chabinsky, and Tom Grella – Board of Selectmen Ex-Officio.  
Staff present Nic Strong – Community Development Director, Kristan Patenaude – Recording Secretary (remote)

Doug Chabinsky, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced Commission and staff members present.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 1. CASE #: PZ15995-070622 – Neil & Patty Benner (Owners & Applicants), 8 Cross Street, PIN #: 017-099-000 – Request for approval to replace fencing due to disrepair.**

Doug Chabinsky read and opened the case.

Doug Chabinsky stated that this is an after-the-fact, in kind replacement.

Neil Benner apologized for the after-the-fact application. He was unaware that an in-kind replacement required an application. He went to far lengths to make sure this was an exact in-kind replacement.

**Tom Quinn moved to accept the application as complete and that there is no regional impact. Seconded by Chris Buchanan.  
Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**

Neil Benner showed the Commission pictures of the in-kind replacement. He intends to paint the fence in early October, as he was told he needed to wait three months after install to paint it.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the after photos look pretty identical to the before.

Chris Buchanan asked the applicant to describe the lengths he went to in order to match the previous fence.

Neil Benner stated that he asked for quotes from three fence companies; two of which, through vetting, were determined not to be able to match the old fence in-kind. Gate City Fence Company, Nashua, NH, was able to match it and install it as a custom fence. It is the exact same profile down to the inches.

**FINDINGS:**

- 1. The property is a 1900's End House/Greek Revival**
- 2. The property is quite visible**
- 3. This property is listed as #99 on the National Register**

September 15, 2022

APPROVED

**Chris Buchanan moved to approve the application as submitted. Seconded by Tom Grella.**

**Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**

Doug Chabinsky thanked Mr. Benner for coming to the Commission after the fact and for doing his due diligence. Chris Buchanan thought that the fence looked great.

- 2. CASE #: PZ16062-071922 – Rory & Kathleen Feely (Owners & Applicants), 7 Carriage Road, PIN #: 017-021-000 – Request for approval to add (3) gabled dormers to the main house; add shed dormers to the 1 ½ story addition; raise the roof of the ell to match the middle connector; add a side elevation porch/bay; extend the stable in the back yard to incorporate a two-car garage; replace existing windows; and close/remove the side door at the front of the house. *Continued from August 18, 2022.***

Doug Chabinsky read and opened the case.

Doug Chabinsky apologized to Rory Feely. He explained that he tried to give suggestions regarding the proposed materials list but may have made the situation more confusing. He also apologized to any other Board members if he overstepped his bounds.

Rory Feely thanked Doug Chabinsky for his apology and attempts to help. He asked that his wife be promoted to the meeting, as she was attending remotely. Kate Feely was promoted to participant.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the materials list was supplied by the applicant. The Commission's role is to review the design, style, massing, and architectural details to make sure that the proposal fits with the Village. The massing and prominence of the property in relation to those around it can impact the Village and are also reviewed.

Rory Feely stated that the existing clapboard siding has a 4" reveal and is pine and/or cedar. Any replacements or new clapboard will match the existing. The intent is to leave as much of the existing as possible. Any rotten boards will be replaced. The existing roof shingles are approximately 25 years old. He is looking for a more durable material and is proposing architectural shingles which are laminated and of similar color to the existing. Doug Chabinsky stated that architectural shingles have a wide color palette, and this could be a place to make a statement, but he would like to see it closely match the existing. Rory Feely stated that the proposed shingles will be a variation of the charcoal and gray colors that currently exist.

Rory Feely asked if the Commission would like to hold off on discussion regarding the proposed windows to the end, as it may be a longer discussion. Doug Chabinsky agreed.

Rory Feely stated that he appreciated the feedback on the garage doors. There is nothing in the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Preservation that speaks to garage/barn

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

doors. He has provided a picture of the existing doors which have since broken. He is not married to any of the proposed examples he provided to the Commission. He has struggled to find what is appropriate from a historic perspective, as garage doors are a 20<sup>th</sup> century item.

Doug Chabinsky stated that his recommendation is just to match the property and those around it as closely as possible. He used Fimbel Garage Doors to create an outer frame with vertical boards on the inside. This could then be stained or painted.

Rory Feely stated that the intention would be to match the maroon/red color of the existing garage. He will focus on a door with vertical panels that limits cross boards.

Martha Chabinsky stated that she believes the plainer the door, the better.

Chris Buchanan stated that he did similar research and found similar limits. He does not have a strong opinion. There was a mention in the Portsmouth NH, Historic District Commission regulations which spoke to a lack of windows in the garage doors. Rory Feely agreed with this feedback.

Martha Chabinsky stated that she likes the idea to limit the number of windows, but that this will also depend on how the door will match the existing house.

Rory Feely stated that the barn portion of the house has horizontal clapboard with a 4" reveal and the existing garage door has vertical panels on it.

Chris Buchanan suggested that the applicant could attempt to replace the door in a similar style to the existing, or, if not possible, the applicant could seek a plain style without windows.

Rory Feely stated that the porch features 8" wooden posts, "faux" (not supporting) ornamental arch features in the corners, and 4"-7" width floorboards. The intent is to match that style on the side of the house, with 8" posts, arched ornamentation features, and floorboards between 4"-6".

Doug Chabinsky stated that the ornamentation features are unique, as is the front porch itself. This is the only property in the neighborhood that has this front porch. This new porch area will be striking.

Chris Buchanan stated that the proposal for the porch, especially with the replication of the ornamental features, is strongly aligned with the regulation requirements.

Rory Feely stated that he reviewed the 2019 Historic District survey and report when determining the color and style for the porch.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the porch should have all-wood boards.

Rory Feely stated that the proposal includes new pedimented gable style dormers for the front of the property and shed wall dormers at the sides. The existing shutters at the front of the house are

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

proposed to be replicated, with functional wood shutters appropriate to the new windows. The existing shutters are approximately 1.5" high, at a 15-degree angle to the vertical towards the wall. Doug Chabinsky stated that the shutters will be a function of the window size.

Rory Feely stated that he reviewed the regulations regarding windows and reviewed past meeting minutes for window applications. The proposal is for three casement style windows, but most of the proposed windows are double-hung, sash windows. Most of the proposed windows are a 6-over-6 style, but some are also 2-over-2. He has measured the muntins and believes them all to be the same at 7/8", but understands that 5/8" may be more appropriate, as mentioned in emails from Doug Chabinsky. He will seek out the 5/8" option instead.

Doug Chabinsky stated that tinted windows are not appropriate. The manufacturer's spec sheet will give the Commission all the information it needs to know if the proposed window is appropriate. Rory Feely explained that the next step in the project process is to create construction drawings and then go out to a contractor. The window manufacturer has not yet been chosen. Doug Chabinsky stated that the people next door picked a window from Pella and showed the Commission the spec sheets. Windows are an item that has been an issue in the Village.

Rory Feely stated that the intent is to remove the exterior storm windows and replace them with aluminum clad windows with a 5/8" muntin and double-hang sash. New windows could be casement windows, but he would agree to make these double-hung sashes.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the proposal needs to stay true to the architecture of the house when it was built, which had sash windows. He asked if the applicant had spoken to the Building Inspector or Fire Chief regarding egress for the proposal. This may require some casement windows. If a proposed window has to change at that point due to the Building Code, the applicant will need to come back before the Commission.

Rory Feely stated that he was unaware of this. He asked what choice the Commission would have if the Building Inspector determined that a different sized window was needed to meet Building Code. Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission may want to review the location of that window to see if it can be more hidden. Rory Feely stated that he believes all of the windows will be adequately sized for egress.

Rory Feely stated that he reviewed the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Preservation regarding window materials. Eight or nine metals were listed as being used historically, including aluminum in the sashes. Based on this, although contrary to the feedback previously received, he has kept the proposed aluminum clad windows in his application. Also, the regulations are written that proposed materials should match existing materials on the property, and aluminum is a material in the house's storm windows. The proposal is to remove these and reveal more of the beautiful millwork which surrounds the windows. From a longevity and durability standpoint, aluminum clad windows are the way to go. It is also becoming more difficult to find all-wood windows, as aluminum clad are more common.

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

Doug Chabinsky disagreed. He stated that he just replaced half a dozen windows last summer at his property and delivery of the all-wood windows was cheaper and faster than aluminum clad. Rory Feely stated that he is unsure of this, as he has not yet gotten to that point in the process. Doug Chabinsky also stated that some manufacturer's aluminum clad windows look atrocious, while others could match more closely and be more carefully considered.

Kathleen Feely stated that this is her and her husband's application, not another surrounding property owner's or Mr. Chabinsky's. They are proposing aluminum clad windows. They have adjusted where it seems reasonable to do so. Unless prohibited by the regulations, which the HDC has to abide by, their case is putting forward aluminum clad windows.

Doug Chabinsky stated that he was simply expressing what the Commission and Town are reviewing. Replacing windows that cannot be refurbished speaks to keeping the same materials on a significant house with large visibility. There needs to be a balance based on the property, its visibility, and character, with what the applicant is proposing and how the regulations are interpreted. The Commission is having a discussion regarding all of these items. He acknowledged that this is the applicant's property and noted that it is too bad the owner's real estate agent did not let them know they were purchasing a historic property in the Historic District.

Kathleen Feely stated that this is incorrect. One of the reasons they purchased this property was due to its historic nature. They also own a historic home in Philadelphia. This is irrelevant to the discussion. Aluminum clad windows are being proposed and are not prohibited in the regulations. She asked which article and section the Commission is quoting to state that aluminum clad windows are prohibited.

Doug Chabinsky stated that he was referencing Article VI, Paragraph F: "Where replacement is essential, new windows should match the originals or be in character with the building as may be reasonably achievable. The original window type (hung sash, casement, pivot, etc.) should be retained as should the configuration of the individual panes of glass formed by the muntin grid. Multi-paned sash should have true panes formed by true muntins and should not utilize applied or embedded muntin grids..." This is what the Commission is working to balance.

Rory Feely stated that Paragraph F also states, "for windows added as a part of an addition or new windows in the existing structure, the above regulations are recommended practices." This proposal is looking to add windows as part of an addition and add new windows to the existing structure.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the paragraph also mentions "where replacement is essential," which this application is also proposing. Rory Feely stated that replacement of these windows is essential because of habitability and safety for his family. The existing windows are pre-1970 and there could be an issue with lead paint flaking which cannot be mitigated against. He is not

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

of the opinion that replacement is essential is part of the consideration anymore. It was noted at the last meeting that rehabilitation is not reasonably achievable.

Doug Chabinsky stated that replacement is the only choice in this case, but it still needs to be kept in character. That is what the Commission is discussing.

Kathleen Feely stated that the paragraph mentions that new windows should match the originals, and many of the existing windows to be replaced have aluminum in them and so would be matched.

Chris Buchanan stated that 'original' in that paragraph phrasing means original to the structure, not existing. Rory Feely stated that the windows original to the house are not in the house currently. Chris Buchanan stated that he believes this is, thus, a moot point.

Chris Buchanan asked how the applicant determined the existing windows are not original to the house. Rory Feely stated that he walked through the house with a BMA architect as part of research for this project, and the feedback was that original windows would likely have been smaller and blown glass, but the existing windows are plate glass.

Martha Chabinsky noted that it was previously stated that aluminum clad windows can be different based on manufacturer. She asked how the proposed windows can receive a blanket approval until a manufacturer is known. She asked how the process is carried out. Kathleen Feely stated that she is the applicant and she wanted to be heard.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission could not properly hear Kathleen Feely and that she may be too close to her mic. Kathleen Feely stated that the Board needed to stop interrupting her. She stated that the Commission asked them to come back with a materials list, which they did, not a manufacturer's list. They do not need to come back with a manufacturer's list which she thinks is inappropriate, they need to come back with a materials list, of which aluminum is a material, and they did so.

Doug Chabinsky stated the Commission requested to know what the windows would be built of. If the applicant wants to install aluminum clad windows, there are differences between manufacturers, some of which are acceptable and some of which are not. If the Commission votes to approve aluminum clad windows in this case, it may also specify a manufacturer it sees as acceptable for the windows or bring a sample for the Commission to review. Typically, when applicants bring in a materials list for windows, this contains a spec sheet from a manufacturer, and he previously stated in an email to Rory Feely. Kathleen Feely stated that this is not a requirement for an application package.

Martha Chabinsky stated that the regulations are not specific on each item so that the Commission has the ability to make rulings based on each individual property. The regulations do not state that an applicant can never use aluminum because this might change based on the

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

property and whether it is contributing or not. This is why the regulations may be a little bit nebulous.

Rory Feely stated that he disagrees. Article I of the regulations speaks to the Purpose and Article II speaks to how the Board will make determinations and says that it “shall” make it based upon the general criteria. From a guideline perspective, Article I speaks to how the Board should rule, and one of these is that personal preferences of Board members are not an acceptable item to review on. He noted that Article I, paragraph B states that, “Whenever an application for the construction, maintenance, or rehabilitation of a property in the Amherst Historic District is received, the Historic District Commission shall consider said application; and if the commission finds that the applicant meets the general criteria set forth herein, it shall grant the requested permit.” ‘Shall’ is used, which is a mandatory word, where ‘should’ is used elsewhere in the regulations, which is a conditionally based word. The next Article lists the basic criteria. This tells the Commission how it should make its rulings. The Commission should not have an opinion on the regulations.

Doug Chabinsky stated that it is not an opinion, but is an interpretation based on the wording of the regulations. Rory Feely stated that Section XII speaks to how to interpret words. Doug Chabinsky continued, and Kathleen Feely noted that her husband was not yet done speaking. Doug Chabinsky apologized, and Rory Feely continued. Rory Feely stated that Section XII.2 gives a number of definitions in case there was a misinterpretation and states that, “words or phrases in these Rules of Procedure shall be interpreted to give them the same meaning as they have in the Amherst Zoning Ordinance and/or in common usage so as to give these rules their most reasonable application.” Thus, a reasonable application for windows, per Article VI F, should follow recommended practices, but these are only recommended and not required. They are proposing to pick windows that have a sympathetic visual appeal to the District, have 5/8” muntin bars as requested by the Commission, include removal of the aluminum storm windows to reveal the millwork, and ultimately lead to a more visually appealing property.

Martha Chabinsky asked how the applicant will decide on a manufacturer for the window.

Tom Quinn stated that examples of garage door styles are supplied, but this is not specific to materials. As windows are a continuing problem in the District, it does not seem like a leap to ask for a spec sheet on specified windows. Windows themselves are building materials, so only stating what they will be made of is not enough, in this case. He believes more specifics are needed and would not feel comfortable signing a blank check for any type of 6-over-6 aluminum clad window.

Tom Grella agreed. He would like to see examples of proposed all-wood, aluminum clad, and vinyl windows, in order for the Commission to make a better-informed decision. Doug Chabinsky stated that vinyl is off the table. Rory Feely stated that this makes it sound as though the Commission will be picking the window for the applicant. Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission would like to see if the proposed aluminum clad windows can be differentiated from an all-wood window using samples. Rory Feely stated that samples are not necessary, as his

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

house sits 40' from the public way, and the outer rails are less than 2" wide. The three main manufacturers, Marvin, Pella, and Jeld-Wen, have architectural aluminum clad windows but he and his wife find it inappropriate for the Commission to choose the manufacturer for them. They may wish to change their minds along the way of this process within the specifications provided in the design.

In response to a question from Kathleen Feely, Rory Feely stated that they provided the Commission with a quote on the Pella architectural series aluminum clad windows. Doug Chabinsky stated that this was not listed in the description of materials received from the applicant. The Commission was provided a description of the proposed windows, but this did not discuss low e-coating, the sill, and style. A spec sheet would be appropriate, and this discussion would not be necessary. Rory Feely stated that he has read the minutes from past meetings and, windows are always the point of contention with the Commission. Doug Chabinsky stated that applications submitted with a spec sheet are the ones that go through the process more smoothly. Rory Feely stated that, from a guidance perspective, he used the regulations and their wording, as that is all he had. Doug Chabinsky stated that the application asks for a list of materials to use for building, so one would expect a bill of materials with all associated data sheets. Rory Feely stated that he has provided that. Doug Chabinsky read from the applicant's submittal that the windows are proposed to be aluminum clad, double-hung sash, with 7/8" muntin grid; this does not state if the windows will have any tint, low e-coating, an architectural, historic sill, or be simulated divided lights. Rory Feely stated that he has seen chicken scratch applications for 30+ windows proposed and approved by the Commission in the past. He noted that Article VI F. states that new windows in addition structures or replacement windows should follow the recommended practices. Doug Chabinsky stated that he has no idea what this aluminum clad window will look like and if it will be appropriate for the Village. Rory Feely stated that the new windows will be multipaned with simulated divided lights. In accordance with Article VI F., the new windows will be in character with the building and will closely approximate the existing windows. This was provided in the materials list. He is unclear what else the Commission needs.

Doug Chabinsky stated that, for all he knows, the applicant could install tinted windows in the property. Kathleen Feely stated that she will go on the record to say the windows will not be tinted.

In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky, Rory Feely stated that the width of the sill will be 2 1/4".

In response to a question from Rory Feely, Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission wants to see an internal spacer in the proposed windows. Kathleen Feely noted that all of these sections are not listed in the application form.

Doug Chabinsky stated that, as the application requests the style and construction of the proposed windows, he would like to better understand the construction for these aluminum clad windows, such as if they have fixed muntin bars, if the exterior is aluminum clad wood and the interior is all wood, sill thickness, if there is an internal spacer, size of the muntins 5/8", if they



September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

will be tinted and if there is a low-e coating or not. Rory Feely stated that he believes if the Commission needs more details than that the proposed windows will be 6-over-6, double-hung sash windows, then the Commission is being unreasonable. Kathleen Feely asked if this level of detail has been provided for every application that has been submitted and approved. Doug Chabinsky stated that all the applications he has approved have had a spec sheet from a manufacturer.

Rory Feely asked if they would have to come back before the Commission if they decide to change manufacturers. Doug Chabinsky suggested that the applicants bring a spec sheet for each of the three potential manufacturers for the Commission to review, as they may all be okay to proceed with.

Tom Quinn stated that spec sheets are the easiest thing in the world to get. This conversation is wasting a lot of time. If the applicant could simply bring in the spec sheets, this conversation could be completed.

Rory Feely stated that, on principle, he believes it is inappropriate for the Commission to request spec sheets and approve this based on a specific manufacturer. He may want to change his mind in the future regarding the manufacturer, which he has the prerogative to do. As long as he keeps with the intent and design, the manufacturer is irrelevant. This is not an item a Commission should be determining at the beginning of the project.

Doug Chabinsky suggested that the applicant bring in spec sheets that are specific to what the Commission finds important. Rory Feely stated that he is unclear as to what the Commission is requesting. Kathleen Feely stated that this is inserting an unreasonable amount of subjectivity and personal HDC member views into the conversation. Doug Chabinsky disagreed.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission would like the following information on the proposed windows: style, number of panes, muntin thickness, single or double paned – if double paned, windows should be simulated divided light with an internal spacer, if the sill will be a historic style (2+” thick), aluminum clad, proposed coating.

Rory Feely stated that all he has to go on are the regulations. Article VI F. does not speak of the sill, glass coating, etc. Doug Chabinsky stated that all of these items speak to the architectural detail of the windows and, thus, the house.

Rory Feely stated that Article VI F. is not nebulous; it states that the above are recommended practices only. Martha Chabinsky stated that she believes the regulations were written this way to allow for leeway in making decisions and not complete rigidity.

Doug Chabinsky noted that Article II C., General Criteria, states that “the scale and general size of new construction in relationship to existing surroundings, with consideration of such factors as height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, (windows, doors etc.), and architectural details.” The windows and how they are constructed affect the overall character of

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

the house. If the windowsill is not historically accurate, if the material has a sheen, if there is a spacer, these items impact the character whether it is aluminum clad or not.

Rory Feely stated that Article II C. is not relevant. This is not a new construction project. This is an addition project. This Article also still speaks only to general items and not the specifics the Commission is requesting.

Doug Chabinsky quoted from Article VI A., "the historical architectural character of a building or structure -- expressed by design, style, rhythm, form, massing, scale, proportions, features, and materials -- shall be maintained or restored. When a change is proposed, significant existing materials and elements shall be retained whenever possible." Windows are part of the features and materials of the house. It matters what these look like and how they are constructed. Better definition is required, even if the applicant wants to make it as general as possible so that they can go with any manufacturer they want.

Rory Feely stated that Article VI A. mostly speaks to changes to existing structures. He is not proposed to restore any windows in this house. He is proposing to replace the windows. "When a change is proposed, significant existing materials and elements shall be retained whenever possible;" this is the relevant portion of this Article and is being proposed through this application.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the proposed replacement windows still need to maintain the same character and style of the house. Rory Feely noted that the regulations state that this should be the case, "whenever possible," and he will do that.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the applicant is proposing simulated divided light windows made to resemble single pane divided lights. He needs to see specifications that the windows will look that way. The application is lacking definitions to assure that.

Rory Feely stated that he provided significantly more detail than is required by the regulations. There is nothing in the regulations which asks for this level of detail, such as the emissivity.

Doug Chabinsky stated that he never spoke about emissivity. Some people like low e-coating windows and some people like tinted windows, which would not be appropriate. He does not have this information regarding the proposed windows. The application states that the windows will be 6-over-6, aluminum clad, with 5/8" muntins, but he still does not know what he will end up seeing.

Rory Feely stated that, earlier, the Commission listed important items being style, muntin thickness, e-coating, etc. The list to state what will not be put on the windows is enormously long. He has already stated what will be put on the proposed windows.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission is concerned with these windows having clear glass, internal spacers, fixed 5/8" muntins, putty glazed profiles, a specific number of lights, and

September 15, 2022

APPROVED

historic sill thickness. Rory Feely stated that he agrees to clear glass, with internal spacers, and 2 ¼" sills. The exterior millwork will stay the same. Martha Chabinsky asked if the applicant will now need to bring in spec sheets with these items listed. Doug Chabinsky stated that these items will be written down by the Commission and the applicant will then have to match it with any manufacturer.

Doug Chabinsky asked for the Commission's thoughts.

Chris Buchanan stated that he believes the applicant's agreed upon window specs are likely to be adequate for him. He noted that the existing windows are not original windows to the house. The applicant's documentation is very thorough regarding the existing and proposed conditions. He finds that the replacement of the existing 2-over-2 windows with 6-over-6 is more in alignment with the style of this building. Removal of aluminum storm windows usually results in a net reduction in the amount of metal visible on a structure. He does not find the previously noted items from the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Preservation regarding metal by the applicant relevant, but still believes that the applicant has provided an adequate general description of the windows. Spec sheets are the clearest and fastest way for these items to be decided by the Commission, based on the detail and information provided in them. The Commission should not endorse any specific manufacturer and, he does not believe is doing so, but choosing a certain manufacturer allows for ease in choosing the right window. He believes this application generally has very detailed information and so, if the Commission would like extra information on certain items, writing them down is the only way to note these and move on.

Tom Quinn, Tom Grella, and Martha Chabinsky stated that they echoed Chris Buchanan's statements.

Doug Chabinsky apologized to the Commission for the length of this discussion but stated that this level of detail is what he was trying to suggest to the applicant in the original emails.

Tom Quinn asked if the addition on the barn will require a variance. Rory Feely stated that there is a zoning ordinance which speaks to allowing an addition no closer than any existing structure on the site. The lot has been surveyed and this has been submitted to the Register of Deeds. The footprint of the property, relative to the boundary line, has been noted on the plan.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- 1. The property is a Contributing property**
- 2. This property is listed as #21 on the National Register**
- 3. This property is highly visible**
- 4. This property is listed as an Upright-and-Wing/Greek Revival - Italianate and is unique to this area of the Village, as many of those around it are more rural**
- 5. It is unique because it is the only house on Carriage Road, and one of the only in the Village, with a front porch and associated level of architectural detail**

September 15, 2022

APPROVED

**Chris Buchanan moved to approve the application as submitted, with an accompanying materials description document and a series of amendments, as discussed during this meeting: the garage door to be as plain as possible, with a preference of a style to match the existing door or, if not possible, a windowless door as in Figure 7 of the materials submitted; roofing material to be charcoal or gray color; aluminum clad windows with clear glass, internal spacers, 2 1/4" sill and 5/8" muntin bars firmly affixed both inside and out. Seconded by Tom Quinn. Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**

Doug Chabinsky explained to the applicant how the 20-day appeal process works in case the Historic District Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other interested party.

**3. CASE #:PZ16221-082422 – Stephen Bobotas (Owner & Applicant); 20 Manchester Road, PIN #: 020-031-00 – Request for approval to install a replacement oil tank in the rear of the house.**

Doug Chabinsky read and opened the case.

Tom Quinn asked where the new oil tank will be placed on the property. He stated that he believes a plan showing the location of the proposed work is a requirement for a complete application.

Nic Strong stated that the applicant supplied a picture of the house. Martha Chabinsky suggested that the applicant draw the proposed location on the map.

Tom Grella stated that he believes the specific distance for an oil tank may need to be reviewed by the Fire Department. The State has regulations regarding outdoor storage for fuel. Chris Buchanan stated it may be the case that this should be reviewed by the Fire Department.

Stephen Bobotas stated that, when walking the property with the installer, the location was determined because the existing fireplace allowed for a buffer, as the tank will be in front of the brick. A concrete foundation will be poured directly in front of the buffer and then the new tank will be placed on top of this. This will not be visible from the road. Only one abutter could potentially see the tank. He showed the Commission the location on a map.

Tom Quinn stated that he believes this is adequate in his mind.

**Tom Quinn moved to accept the application as complete and that there is no regional impact. Seconded by Martha Chabinsky. Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**

Chris Buchanan noted that the regulations speak to the fact that the placement of outdoor utilities should be out of sight as much as possible, as is being proposed in this application. Installation of vegetation, such as evergreens, etc., should be used to obstruct the view of the outdoor utility.

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

Doug Chabinsky noted that a fence could also be used to obstruct the view of this item.

**FINDINGS:**

**1. The property is a Contributing property**

**2. This proposed work will be out of the line of sight from the public view**

**Tom Grella moved to approve the application as submitted, subject to Fire Department approval of the location. Seconded by Tom Quinn.**

**Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**

- 4. CASE #: PZ16238-082922 – Tara Syverson & James Zona (Owners & Applicants); 12 Main Street, PIN #: 017-006-000 – Request for approval to build a 24' wide x 30' deep two car garage.**

Doug Chabinsky read and opened the case.

**Tom Grella moved to accept the application as complete and that there is not any regional impact. Seconded by Tom Quinn.**

**Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**

James Zona explained that, due to Zoning Board negotiations, the proposed garage was moved a little further from the southern property line. This led to a decrease from 26' to 24' wide and an increased depth of 30'. The existing two-car garage is very small, and this property is a duplex, so only one of the stalls can be utilized. The architectural drawings completed a couple of years ago are being used again, with some doctored numbers as discussed.

In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky regarding the proposed windows for the garage, James Zona stated that the plan is all-wood construction, 6 simulated divided lights, but he is unsure on sill thickness.

Chris Buchanan asked if the motion could include that the windows in the garage will match the sill thickness of the recently approved addition application for this property. Doug Chabinsky agreed with this proposal. He noted that the windows can be either single or double paned, but if double, 5/8" muntins are required.

James Zona stated that the proposal for the barn is to have a vertical shiplap barn-style. He does not have specs for the garage doors but intends to go to Fimbel and seek doors that are plain in style. He would like them to be brown in color. Chris Buchanan stated that the Commission does not rule on color.

James Zona stated that the side entry door will be all-wood construction and likely double paned. Doug Chabinsky noted that a steel or fiberglass door would likely be approved, as exterior wood doors do not typically last very long.

September 15, 2022

**APPROVED**

In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky regarding lights proposed above the garage door, James Zona stated that he liked the idea of this. Tom Grella stated that there are other properties which have this around the Village. Chris Buchanan stated that having windows above garage doors is common for these types of houses. Those with the lights in the doors are anachronistic.

James Zona asked about a proposed dormer for the garage. He noted that this is not necessarily needed. Doug Chabinsky stated that he is considering the massing of the building with a dormer.

Chris Buchanan stated that he has been reviewing the regulations regarding new construction and matching massing for similar styles around the District. Typically, barn style construction is simple upon installation, so not adding a dormer would be closer to an original style. However, other buildings in the Village have been modified and remodified, so it is part of the character of the Village to repurpose old buildings. Having no dormer would look more like an original barn and would be acceptable. The addition of a dormer, as though it was put in later, would also not be a problem, is his opinion.

Doug Chabinsky stated that his concern is that this may lead to large massing next to the, now, large house. This is a lot of volume in one area.

In response to a question from Chris Buchanan regarding the height of the structures, James Zona stated that he does not know the height of the main house. He stated that the adjacent section has a 12-pitch roof. The proposed garage is proposed to have the same pitch and same height walls. Chris Buchanan stated that the scale of the proposed garage is likely smaller than it truly is, and it is hard to envision how this garage will look. James Zona stated that the existing 2-car garage is 11' wide, with 10' walls and a 12-pitch roof, so the peak is 21' high. The proposed structure will match this within a foot or so. The Commission asked how this could be possible. James Zona noted that he misspoke, the 2-car garage is 22' wide, 11' per bay. The new garage is proposed to be 24' wide, with the same pitch roof.

**FINDINGS:**

- 1. The property is a Contributing property**
- 2. Visible from two public ways, Main Street and Boston Post Road**
- 3. This item is listed on the National Register**

**Chris Buchanan moved to approve the application as submitted, with the following: the windows will be all-wood construction, the sill thickness will match the thickness of the recently approved addition, that the garage door will be as plain as possible with windows above the door but not in the door, and with or without a dormer.**

**Seconded by Tom Quinn.**

**Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**

Doug Chabinsky explained to the applicant how the 20-day appeal process works in case the Historic District Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other interested party.

September 15, 2022

APPROVED

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**1. Minutes: June 16, 2022 & August 18, 2022**

**Tom Grella moved to approve the minutes of June 16, 2022, as submitted. Seconded by Martha Chabinsky.**

**Voting: 4-0-1; motion carried [M. Chabinsky abstaining].**

**Tom Grella moved to approve the minutes of August 18, 2022, as submitted. Seconded by Tom Quinn.**

**Voting: 3-0-2; motion carried [C. Buchanan, M. Chabinsky abstaining].**

**2. Continued Discussion on HDC process**

Chris Buchanan stated that a regularly reoccurring lack of clarity regarding how to handle window applications. There are strong opinions on how to handle these items. He suggested writing those opinions down and reviewing his previously distributed draft document.

Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission received the grant on rewriting regulations. The Commission is hoping to negotiate with the person who wrote the Portsmouth and Exeter regulations.

Chris Buchanan suggested eliminating the item on mature trees from the regulations. He requested that the Commission review the proposed draft regulations amendments at its next meeting.

**3. Any Other Business**

Chris Buchanan explained that the last Town Meeting voted to approve an engineering study for upcoming roadwork in the Village in 2025. This is an opportunity to see if the roads should be rebuilt as they are or seek federal funding for roadways which may reduce speed and increase safety. The engineering firm hired will begin the process on October 4, 2022, from 9am-11am with a virtual meeting of stakeholders including local residents, businesspeople, and members of various boards/commissions. The point is to shape the dialogue between these groups. There would then be a general public meeting held to receive more feedback two weeks later in October likely at Wilkins School. He extended an invitation to all on the Commission to attend and invite other stakeholders. Doug Chabinsky stated that he is interested in attending.

**Tom Grella moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:10pm. Seconded by Tom Quinn.  
Vote: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Kristan Patenaude

Minutes approved: October 20, 2022