	November 21, 2019APPROVED-AMENDED
1 2	In attendance: Jamie Ramsay- Chair, Doug Chabinsky, Chris Hall, Chris Buchanan and Bill Rapf (Alternate).
3 4 5	Staff present: Nic Strong – Community Development Director, Kristan Patenaude – Minute Taker.
5 6 7	Jamie Ramsay called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm. He introduced the Commissioners.
, 8 9	OLD BUSINESS:
9 10 11 12 13 14	 CASE #: PZ11392-053119 – Carol & John Bennett (Owners & Applicants) – 6 Main Street, PIN #: 017-084-000 – Request for approval to replace vertical board siding on side of barn with clapboard & replace existing rotted shutters. <i>Applicant requested to withdraw the application on 10/25/19.</i>
15 16	Chris Buchanan moved to untable the case. Chris Hall seconded. All in favor.
17 18 19 20 21	Chris Hall moved to grant the withdrawal of the application, without prejudice. Chris Buchanan seconded. All in favor.
22	<u>NEW BUSINESS:</u>
23 24 25 26 27	 CASE #: PZ11957-103019 – Gerard & Maureen Zimmer (Owners & Applicants) – 6 Davis Lane, PIN #: 005-096-002 – Request for approval to construct a 14'x20' storage shed.
28	Present: Gerard Zimmer (Owner & Applicant)
29 30 31 32 33 34	Gerard Zimmer stated that the proposal is in hopes of moving items to the storage shed in order to use the existing garage for cars. He worked with the nearest neighbor to determine the best location in the backyard for the shed. The neighbor had no objections to the project. The proposed shed will be from Reeds Ferry, the Colonial design.
35 36 37 38	Bill Rapf agreed that the property's backyard is very large and the shed will be far from anything. This is a modest, non-contributing house and he doesn't believe the proposed shed will be distracting at all.
39 40	Chris Hall noted that the Commission is not in receipt of some details, including the number of windows, doors and specifications.
41 42 43	In response to a question from Chris Hall, Gerard Zimmer stated that the proposed shed will be

November 21, 2019 **APPROVED-AMENDED** 44 windows will be as shown in the picture, but that he is open to whatever type of siding the 45 Commission recommends. 46 47 In response to a question from Chris Hall, Gerard Zimmer stated that there will be a base of crushed stone under the shed but that the structure will not be raised up at all. 48 49 50 FINDINGS: 1. Non-contributing property, #51 on the National Register 51 52 2. Proposed structure will have slight visibility from the public view. 53 3. Proposed shed is similar to the shed next door, and thus not out of place in the 54 neighborhood. 55 4. Proposed size of the shed, 14'x20' is not overpowering to the property. 56 Jamie Ramsay noted, initialed and dated on the application that the proposed shed will have 57 cedar clapboard siding and that the cupola in the picture will not be on the shed. 58 59 60 Chris Hall moved to approve the application as amended. Bill Rapf seconded. All in favor. 61 62 63 Jamie Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the Historic District Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other interested party. 64 65 3. CASE #: PZ11955-103019 - Christina Ferrari & Timothy Yarnall (Owners & 66 Applicants) – 5 School Street, PIN #: 017-080-000 – Request for approval to 67 replace wood fencing, deteriorating woodwork on front porch, replacement of 68 columns, flashing on porch roof & footings, remove and replace gutters and 69 downspouts. 70 71 72 Present: Christina Ferrari (Owner & Applicant) & Greg Mattison, Mattison Contracting, LLC 73 74 Christina Ferrari explained that this proposal is identical to one presented to and approved by the 75 Commission in September 2017. Due to a change in contractor on the project, the work was not initiated and the approval has since lapsed. 76 77 78 In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Christina Ferrari explained that there is no change 79 to the intent of the originally submitted proposal. The proposal looks to replace most items in 80 kind. The fence will need to be redone, but in the same style. 81 In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky, Christina Ferrari agreed that the major change 82 83 between the two applications, is that this one includes a fence. 84 85 Greg Mattison, general contractor, stated that he plans to utilize all of the existing steel rods from

recreated with Douglas Fir tongue and groove decking, in order to replace it with historically 87 88 correct materials. 89 90 Will Ludt, 3 School Street, stated that he is a next door neighbor to the project, and appreciates that the applicant will be keeping the curve to the fence. He believes it to be an iconic fence in 91 92 town. 93 94 Doug Chabinsky requested that a full list of the materials to be used be submitted. Greg Mattison agreed and stated that he would have the list to the Commission by the first week in December. 95 96 97 In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Christina Ferrari stated that she would prefer the deck facing to be square-shaped. 98 99 The Commission reviewed the findings as referenced from the approved minutes of September 100 21, 2017, as follows: 101 102 103 FINDINGS: 104 1. House is on the National Registry, Lot #80 105 2. House is a Contributing Property 3. Proposed construction is highly visible 106 4. Proposed construction materials are all wood, or consistent with current materials 107 108 Doug Chabinsky moved to accept the application, with the amendment of receiving a 109 list of materials after the holiday. Chris Hall seconded. 110 All in favor. 111 112 Jamie Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the 113 Historic District Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other interested party. 114 115 4. CASE #: PZ11956-103019 – Thomas Stantial & Melissa Gallery (Owners & 116 Applicants) – 5 Foundry Street, PIN#: 017-040-000 – Request for approval to 117 install two high velocity HVAC systems to be located on the left side of the house 118 - one to be located behind the house and the other to be located on the left side of 119 120 the house. 121 122 Present: Thomas Stantial & Melissa Gallery (Owners & Applicants) 123 Thomas Stantial explained that they just closed on the house on November 1st. They have 124 renovated three historic homes in the past. This property has forced hot water and baseboard 125 heaters. They would like to correct these items, as they are not historically accurate. They would 126 127 also like for the home to have central air conditioning. They are proposing two high velocity HVAC units, one to be located behind the garage and one mid-way on the left side of the house. 128

129 They hope to re-landscape the property in the spring, and will work to conceal both units at that 130 time.

APPROVED-AMENDED

APPROVED-AMENDED

- 131 Chris Hall noted that the unit to the side of the house appears quite close to the neighbor.
- 132 Thomas Stantial explained that these are the quietest units that can be purchased.
- 133
- 134 Chris Buchanan noted that, per Historic District Commission Regulations Article 7, Section
- 135 8.1, D: "The visual impact of ... utility structures and equipment shall be minimized." In the past, the
- 136 Commission has asked others to minimize the appearance of such structures with shrubs that will
- 137 obscure them year-round.
- 138
- 139 Matt Longo, 7 Foundry Street, stated that he is the nearest neighbor and has concerns regarding
- 140 the proposal. He is concerned because the property lines are not exactly known and he is worried
- about some of the landscaping possibly crossing onto his property. He also has concerns about
- 142 the aesthetics of the house in regards to the unit on the side of the house. Finally, he is worried
- about the possible noise from the unit. He is opposed to the proposal in its current suggested
- 144 location.
- 145
- 146 Thomas Stantial stated that they would prefer to have both units at the back of the house, but the
- 147 HVAC company stated that running copper pipe from the front of the house all the way to the
- 148 back would not be the best idea.
- 149
- 150 Jamie Ramsay stated that the abutter's property line is to be respected.
- 151
- 152 Chris Hall and Matt Longo took time to review the application as presented.
- 153
- 154 Chris Hall explained that the applicant will buffer the sound and look of the unit in any number
- 155 of ways, hopefully with as natural of a look as possible. Matt Longo stated that this is a 156 reasonable compromise.
- 157

159

- 158 FINDINGS:
 - 1. Contributing property, #40 on the National Register
- 160 2. Property is in a very prominent location and is highly visible
- 161
 3. Per Article 7, Section 8.1, D this does not comply visually, but to help make it comply,
 162
 163
 164
 165
 165
 166
 166
 167
 168
 169
 169
 169
 169
 160
 160
 160
 161
 161
 162
 163
 163
 164
 165
 165
 165
 166
 167
 167
 168
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 160
 160
 160
 161
 161
 162
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 165
 165
 165
 166
 166
 167
 167
 167
 168
 168
 169
 169
 169
 169
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 160
 <li
- 164
- 165 Thomas Stantial agreed that they will get the neighbor's approval before deciding on what to166 buffer the side unit with.
- 167

168 Chris Buchanan moved to accept the application as submitted, with the inclusion of 169 landscaping to obscure the utilities year-round. Doug Chabinsky seconded. 170 All in favor.

- 171
- 172 Jamie Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the
- 173 Historic District Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other interested party.

174

APPROVED-AMENDED

175 176 177	 CASE #: PZ11968-103119 – Brendan & Katherine Farrell (Owners & Applicants) – 84 Boston Post Road, PIN #: 017-057-000 – Request for approval to replace existing fence in front of house and repair rotted siding.
178	······································
179	Present: Brendan Farrell (Owner & Applicant)
180	
181	Brendan Farrell explained that he is proposing to replace the fence almost exactly as it is. It will
182	be the same color and same architecturally.
183	
184	Chris Hall noted that the pictures submitted appear to show a Gregorian style fence. This is not
185	allowed for in the regulations. The regulations state that simple picket fences are allowed, but not
186	gothic style pickets.
187	
188	Brendan Farrell agreed that the simple picket style is the type of fence that he will put up. The
189	Commission agreed that this is a replacement in kind.
190	In many ten a martine ten a martine from Chair Hall Decades Demultanelling that the mattine
191	In response to a question to a question from Chris Hall, Brendan Farrell explained that the rotting
192	siding areas will be replaced in kind with the same material and paint color. The Commission
193 104	agreed that this is also a replacement in kind.
194 105	Due to both of the items being replecements in kind, the applicant does not need to move
195 196	Due to both of the items being replacements in kind, the applicant does not need to move forward with the hearing process.
190 197	forward with the hearing process.
197	Chris Hall moved to accept the application for withdrawal, without prejudice, with the
199	understanding that all work done will be strictly replacements in kind. Jamie Ramsay
200	seconded.
200	All in favor.
202	
202	OTHER BUSINESS:
204	
205	6. Minutes: October 17, 2019
206	
207	Chris Hall moved to approve the minutes from October 17, 2019 as submitted.
208	Jamie Ramsay seconded.
209	3-0-2 (C. Buchanan & D. Chabinsky abstained); motion carried.
210	
211	7. Chris Buchanan, Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee – Discuss a plan to
212	use interlocking brick-style permeable pavers in place of asphalt on upcoming
213	road construction.
214	
215	Chris Buchanan, Chair of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee described what a
216	Special Roadway District is, as per the Multimodal Master Plan. There are not many places in
217	town that can be designated as such, but the Village streets fit the concept. The idea is to

encourage safety by defining the area as different from the surrounding zones. In the past, signs 218

APPROVED-AMENDED

219 have been used to communicate these spaces, but this type of highway language is not very

- 220 effective, per experts. The best way to communicate this message is through gateway treatments
- and alternative pavement surfaces. These proposed modifications would be done during already
- scheduled roadwork, as a way to reduce costs.
- 223

The currently proposed roadwork schedule is for Davis Lane, Carriage Road, and Main Street in the Village. The Committee is seeking a capital reserve fund to be funded over several years, in

order to obtain funds for the gap between the cost for asphalt and the proposed interlocking

- 227 pavers.
- 228

229 Chris Buchanan explained that UNH conducted an environmental and plowability study which

- showed that the interlocking pavers are a positive idea. The plan would be that eventually all of
- the roadways in the Special Roadway District would be changed over to the pavers, but this will
- only be done in small segments during road construction. The intent is to change the character of
- the entire district in order to make streets more becoming of mixed use.
- 234

235 Chris Buchanan introduced Ashley Allard and Dan Nevinckas, of the company Unilock, to

- describe their product. Ashley Allard explained that interlocking pavers help to slow down
- drivers and also are permeable and thus, a cost-savings to the town as a drainage system. The
- visual effect of the pavers is that the road is no longer dominated by vehicles, but shared in
- conjunction with pedestrians and cyclists. The pavers can be plowed and no special snow
- maintenance equipment is needed. The town would want to use salt, not sand, as a snowtreatment on the pavers.
- 241
- Chris Buchanan noted that the town is moving towards using 100% salt on their streets, whichwould work well with these pavers.
- 245

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Ashley Allard stated that the high quality concrete
pavers have a high PSI and will stand up to rock salt. There is a long-term savings to the town
with these pavers, as regular asphalt needs to be re-sealed or re-surfaced over time, where these
do not.

249 250

In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky, Ashley Allard explained that the entire roadway
would be redone in the pavers, leaving less of an issue for frost heaves. The interlock of the

- 253 pavers allows for a natural warming area in the base, which prevents popping.
- 254
- 255 In response to a question from Chris Hall, Dan Nevinckas stated that there are paving lots done
- by Unilock that are 35 years old. Unilock is the oldest paving stone manufacturer in the United
- 257 States. Roads constructed with these pavers have a long life expectancy, 25 years or more.
- 258
- 259 In response to a question from Chris Hall regarding the driving area in front of the previous
- 260 Sports Authority area, Ashley Allard explained that this roadway is actually stamped concrete.
- 261 This is not paver material and is usually slippery in the winter.

262

APPROVED-AMENDED

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Dan Nevinckas explained that an engineer signsoff on the full spec of the project.

265

In response to a question from Chris Buchanan, Dan Nevinckas stated that Unilock recently
completed a project on Church Street in Portsmouth. The city decided that they didn't want these
pavers to be permeable due to steep slopes in the area and are so far very happy with the project.
Portsmouth is looking for ways to expand their city standard and Unilock took into account its
historic design.

271

Will Ludt, 5 School Street, suggested that if the Village streets are going to be reconstructed, the
town might want to consider burying the cables while there's an opportunity to do so. He also
suggested that there be more of a push for no thru trucking in the Village.

275

276 In response to a question from Chris Hall, Dan Nevinckas explained that there are options to

277 factory-seal the pavers in order to lessen the amount of tannic acid staining that occurs naturally

when leaves fall on them. These stains will not absorb into the pavers however and will

eventually wear off.

281 In response to a question from Chris Hall, Ashley Allard explained that, during a typical

application, there will be a rigid edge created between the streets and abutting driveways, and then an edge treatment will be done to merge the two. This makes for an aesthetically pleasing

- then an edge treatment will be done to merge thetransition point.
 - 285

Doug Chabinsky stated that Amherst never historically had cobblestone streets. He believe this
idea feels out of place with the Village. Asphalt has become almost innocuous versus this new
cobblestone-like material (uniform vs. patterned). He is not sure the aesthetic view fits the
Village, but he think it might be better safety-wise.

290

Chris Buchanan stated that the number one objective of this project is to increase safety for
multimodal users in the Village. The Commission's regulations also call for a reduction in
asphalt, which this would help to achieve.

294

295 Chris Hall noted that he is open-minded to the idea. The project is not looking to create false 296 cobblestone streets, but simply another type of surface.

297

In response to a question from Chris Hall, Chris Buchanan stated that there is about a \$155,000

299 gap between asphalt and these pavers for the three Village streets. The plan would be to

300 complete these three streets over three years. Ashley Allard also noted that the pavers give a 301 long-term, lifecycle cost savings to the town.

302

303 Chris Buchanan explained that the CIP Committee will be taking a deeper look at this project

304 from a planning perspective. The Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee will also be

- 305 communicating with the DPW in order to get an updated schedule for road construction. The
- 306 next major steps for this project will probably come at this time next year.

APPROVED-AMENDED

307 In response to a question from Chris Hall, Chris Buchanan stated that the Village lampposts were 308 ordered in July and took about 8 weeks to make. He will check with the DPW on the status of that project. 309 310 The Board discussed the compliant from 120 Amherst Street briefly, and decided to defer the 311 item to the next meeting, to give time for consideration of the options involved. 312 313 314 Chris Buchanan moved to adjourn the meeting. 315 316 **Discussion:** 317 Nic Strong asked the Commission if the group was going to begin cases by accepting the 318 319 application as complete, and determining regional impact, as noted in the Staff Report. 320 Jamie Ramsay stated that he believes regional impact is a moot subject for this 321 322 Commission, as its objective is to maintain and preserve the District. 323 324 Nic Strong noted that any land use board that receives an application is supposed to consider if there could be regional impact; the Historic District Commission is a land use 325 board. She agreed that there could be a motion made at the beginning of each meeting to 326 state that there is no regional impact on any of the applications to be heard. 327 328

- 329 Chris Buchanan explained that there is not much guidance on how the Commission
 330 should conduct itself; if Nic Strong has any suggestions for the group, they would find it
 331 helpful.
- Nic Strong explained that the Commission can look at the list of items to be submitted for
 an application, and then determine if the application is complete or if other items are
 needed.
- Doug Chabinsky stated that applications were once checked more thoroughly for
 completeness in the Community Development Office before coming before the
 Commission. If there are certain requirements for an application, the Community
 Development Office should tell applicants at the time of submittal.
- Chris Hall noted that about 80% of the applications in the past six months had insufficient information and very few were turned away, as the Commission worked with homeowners during the process. Help from the Community Development Office would help head off these applications and give the owners a heads-up. The paperwork is pretty clear to fill out. He is confused as to why so many applications are now coming to the Commission incomplete.
- 349Nic Strong explained that the Community Development Office can tell applicants to350submit certain items but the only entity that can accept the application as complete is the

332

336

341

348

APPROVED-AMENDED

351	Commission itself. If applicants don't submit certain items, or don't understand the
352	application, they can still come before the Commission. Each applicant gets a copy of the
353	staff report before the meeting, which includes the checklist of items needed/submitted.
354	
355	The Commission discussed a process by which each Commissioner would go into the
356	Community Development Office once a month to review received applications for
357	completeness.
358	
359	Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission wants to encourage applicants to do work
360	correctly. The process can still be made easier for applicants; a completeness pre-review
361	by the Office or Commissioners might achieve this.
362	
363	Nic Strong agreed to consider the pre-review process. She also noted that there is likely
364	some language on the checklist that is confusing to applicants and should also be
365	reviewed.
366	
367	Chris Buchanan explained that the Commission has been considering an overhaul to their
368	regulations since 2016.
369	
370	The motion was moved at 9:16pm. Doug Chabinsky seconded.
371	All in favor.
372	
373	
374	
375	Respectfully submitted,
376	Kristan Patenaude
377	
378	Minutes approved as amended: February 20, 2020