

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

In attendance: Jamie Ramsay – Chair, Chris Buchanan, Doug Chabinsky, Bill Rapf, and Tom Grella – Ex-Officio.  
Staff present Natasha Kypfer – Town Planner, and Kristan Patenaude – Recording Secretary.

Jamie Ramsay called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Natasha Kypfer read the following statement: I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor’s Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, as extended by various Executive Orders, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor’s Emergency Order.

However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are: Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means:

We are utilizing Zoom for this electronic meeting.

All members of the Commission have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through dialing the following phone #312-626-6799 and password 834 2421 5881, or by clicking on the following website address: <https://zoom.us/j/83424215881> that was included in the public notice of this meeting.

Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting:

We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting, including how to access the meeting using Zoom or telephonically. Instructions have also been provided on the website of the Planning Board at: [www.amherstnh.gov](http://www.amherstnh.gov).

Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access: If anybody has a problem, please call 603-341-5290.

Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting:

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.

Let’s start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. When each member states their presence, please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to- Know law.

**Roll call attendance: Jamie Ramsay, Tom Grella Doug Chabinsky, Bill Rapf, and Chris Buchanan; all present.**

March 18, 2021

APPROVED

**OLD BUSINESS:**

- 1. CASE #: PZ13692-020421 –Joseph & Laura Ilsley (Owners & Applicants),  
13 Church Street, PIN #:017-065-000 – Request for approval to replace (22) non-  
original windows on the front and sides of the house with Signature Ultimate Double  
Hung G2 windows by Marvin. Continued from February 18, 2021.**

Joe and Laura Ilsley (owners) presented the case.

Joe Ilsley explained that the proposal is to replace 22 non-original windows on the house. The number one reason for this replacement is safety concerns with the couples' children. 100% of the current windows proposed to be replaced fail to meet egress. The replacement will achieve egress for 82% of the windows. The current storm windows on the existing windows require tools, such as pliers, to open. This is also a safety concern. Another concern is that of falling out the windows due to the safety mechanisms on the windows. Finally, there are lead abatement issues. He hoped originally to restore the windows, but there are concerns with meeting the CDC guidelines for lead abatement. He noted that there are also two windows on the house that are not historically accurate; he is proposing to replace those as well.

Joe Ilsley explained that he interviewed three experts in window replacement, who all said that restoring the windows would require removing some of the exterior and interior original woodwork. He explained that, at the last Commission meeting, Tom Grella stated that restoration windows were completed at 11 Church Street without any of this exterior removal. However, he checked with an expert who said that replacement windows can only be achieved with the aluminum clad windows he is proposing. He believes it would be inconsistent with the HDC goals to put new construction windows in the house while ripping historic elements off the house.

Joe Ilsley stated that the storm windows are proposed to be removed as part of this application. The removal of the storm windows will add energy efficiency and also allow for some amount of aluminum to be removed from the house. He explained that, if the HDC requires that new construction windows be placed in the house, it will be at a 220% increase in cost and require the removal of some of the historic exterior of the house. Joe Ilsley explained that he contacted the Community Development Office regarding the 11 Church Street window project. The Commission heard applications from 11 Church Street in 2013 and 2018. In 2013 the Commission approved an application for 11 Church Street that included 38 vinyl windows, not keeping with the all-wood requirements. The application in 2018 referred to all-wood windows, but the window specs for those placed in the parsonage are stated to be all-wood, aluminum clad windows, exactly as he is proposing for this property. He also noted that the nearby Brick School has vinyl windows. He believes the 11 Church Street example shows that aluminum clad windows will be indistinguishable and not have a negative impact to the Historic District.

Tom Grella stated that he contacted the applicant for the 11 Church Street project, who has stated that all-wood windows, with no cladding, were installed. Joe Ilsley disagreed and noted that the

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

88 application packet materials he received from the Community Development Office clearly show  
89 that the windows installed at 11 Church Street are aluminum clad. Joe Ilsley also noted that there  
90 is an “x” on the application next to the 11 Church Street windows that seem to be proposed,  
91 which are aluminum clad.

92  
93 Tom Grella noted that he would like to bring up Doug Topcliffe, 11 Church Street applicant, to  
94 discuss this matter. Joe Ilsley asked to first be able to finish presenting his application. Joe Ilsley  
95 explained that this seems like a preemptive denial of his application.

96  
97 Jamie Ramsay stated that he would like the applicant to finish presenting, and then to hear from  
98 11 Church Street to see if there are discrepancies between what was applied for and what was  
99 installed.

100  
101 Laura Ilsley explained that, after the February meeting, they contacted JELD-WEN to follow up  
102 as suggested by the Commission. An expert from that company came to their house, looked at  
103 the 11 Church Street property, and confirmed that the windows installed there are vinyl and  
104 aluminum clad.

105  
106 Joe Ilsley explained that the expert from JELD-WEN noted that all-wood windows without the  
107 aluminum cladding were not even offered by the company. This expert also validated everything  
108 said by the other three experts regarding extra cost and the exterior removal necessary. He feels  
109 that they have gone above and beyond to address all of the Commission’s concerns and to check  
110 into all options.

111  
112 In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Joe Ilsley explained that he doesn’t know if  
113 exterior work needed to be removed on 11 Church Street to install the windows, but that all the  
114 experts he spoke to stated that exterior work would need to be removed from his house in order  
115 to do so.

116  
117 Joe Ilsley noted that Commissioner Chris Hall also sent along recommended windows that have  
118 been approved by the Commission in the past. These are the exact same Marvin windows that he  
119 is proposing installing. He explained that four experts, plus someone from BROSCO, confirmed  
120 that exterior work would need to be removed in order to install new construction windows.

121  
122 Jamie Ramsay noted that the School District does not have to observe the HDC regulations, and  
123 thus the Brick School is a bad example to use in terms of looking at windows throughout the  
124 Historic District.

125  
126 Joe Ilsley stated that he believes the Commission should consider adjusting its regulations with  
127 the understanding of new materials that can be utilized and to make the regulations consistent for  
128 applicants. He explained that these inconsistencies do make for unnecessary hardships for  
129 applicants. The windows he is proposing will not create an issue to the Historic District but will  
130 help create a safer space for his children.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Joe Ilsley confirmed that the proposed windows will be a box window mounted in the frame.

Jamie Ramsay noted that aluminum storm windows help to protect the sash from the elements. He questioned if the applicant is sure that none of the window parts are original to the house.

Joe Ilsley stated that the house was built in 1778. He believes it is nearly impossible that the existing windows, with the mechanisms they have, are original. He is involved in the presentation of historic landmarks for his work. He believes when it is made too difficult for houses to stay in private ownership through strict regulations, one will see the degradation of historic districts. Installing all-wood windows would require the removal of some historic parts of the house, including the original pins. He explained that he and his wife consider themselves stewards for their property.

Chris Buchanan noted that this is not a precedent setting board, and that it should not look at other previous decisions to make a determination on this application. The Commission should only look to interpret its regulations for the matter at hand. It is not relevant if another house has done this or that.

Jamie Ramsay disagreed and stated that hearing from applicant of 11 Church Street is entirely relevant. The Commission's common sense can overrule the regulations. Hearing discussion from 11 Church Street does not necessarily mean it will be entertained as part of this decision.

Joe Ilsley explained that the information he presented was found directly from 11 Church Street's application. He is concerned that discussion with the 11 Church Street applicant is being brought up only as a rebuttal to his application and as a way to deny his proposal.

In response to a question from Joe Ilsley, Natasha Kypfer confirmed that she sent him the application package materials and associated documents that he requested from the 11 Church Street hearings that were located on the Town server.

In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky, Tom Grella noted that the minutes from the 11 Church Street meeting were from August 2018.

Joe Ilsley explained that he wanted it noted that this discussion seems to be an attempt to deny his application package based on a previous objection made by Tom Grella, no matter what evidence is brought up by he and his wife.

In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky, Joe Ilsley confirmed that he is proposing to remove the existing box windows and replace them, along with the sashes. Doug Chabinsky noted concerns about there being more wood surrounding the window because the aluminum box with new sashes will be a smaller shape to fit into where the original sashes were. Doug Chabinsky also questioned if the exterior pieces of the house could be removed until the windows and installed, and then placed back on.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

Laura Ilsley noted that they submitted all the exact specs for the proposed windows. Joe Ilsley stated that, for a house this age, if pieces are removed off the exterior, they will probably not come off in one piece. The people replacing the windows are not house restoration experts and damage may be done to the historic clapboards.

In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky regarding the amount of space being lost between the existing window box and the proposed window box, Joe Ilsley explained that from sash-to-sash, the greatest amount of difference will be approximately ½" total.

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Joe Ilsley explained that the entire proposed window is made of wood, except for a thin layer of aluminum cladding on the sash and muntins.

Jamie Ramsay stated that he would still like to hear from the 11 Church Street applicant. Joe Ilsley noted that he still feels as if this is being used as an objection to his application but deferred to the Chair's opinion.

Doug Topliffe, of 11 Church Street, stated that he came before the Commission twice. In August 2018, he came with an application to replace four double-hung windows, due to damage from a tree falling on the property. All of those windows were restored with all-wood windows, except for one awning-type window over the sink that was replaced with a JELD-WEN window. The other windows were restored with all-wood windows, simulated divided lights, with plastic grills from Sierra Pacific. These are custom sized windows with solid wood sashes.

In response to a question from Tom Grella, Doug Topliffe explained that there were a variety of styles that he was looking at. Some of them had aluminum cladding. If one of the varieties on his application had an "x" next to it, it was probably one that he was not considering due to the cladding.

Joe Ilsley noted that the windows described as being installed at 11 Church Street do have a composite material, plastic, similarly to the ones he's proposing.

Doug Chabinsky read through the motion from the August 2018 decision on 11 Church Street. He noted that the final window spec submissions were supposed to be reviewed by the Chair, as part of the approval process. Jamie Ramsay stated that he doesn't remember reviewing these specs. Doug Chabinsky stated that there should be record of the final window specs approved for this application.

Doug Chabinsky stated that he is unclear if the 11 Church Street windows really have plastic exteriors to them or not. Joe Ilsley stated that the application for 11 Church Street has all of the window specs and pictures that were approved by the Commission in 2018. He has gone through much due diligence to follow-up on all of this and believes that his proposal stands on its supportive evidence. Joe Ilsley urged the Commission to look at his application in terms of safety issues, along with his work to preserve the spirit and intent of the Historic District. He noted that the Commission cannot apply variable standards to each application.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

Doug Chabinsky stated that the vinyl windows approved on one area of the Church were approved due to moisture issues. The rest of the windows in that area were then switched to vinyl because the Commission apparently did not respond back to the applicant fast enough. He does not remember the exact specs for the windows on the parsonage.

Joe Ilsley stated that all they can go off is what is in the public record, which states that the replaced windows are JELD-WEN with plastic/vinyl exteriors.

Jamie Ramsay noted that the proposed windows for this application are Marvin, 5/8", SDL glazing, with muntins adhered to the exterior and interior, with a spacer bar between the glass. Joe Ilsley noted that these windows are the same ones used in another area of his house.

Jamie Ramsay noted that no other members of the public wished to speak at this time. The Commission went into deliberations.

In response to questions from Chris Buchanan, Joe Ilsley stated that the existing windows are not original, the existing siding is original, and new construction windows would mean the removal of some of the original exterior siding of the house.

Chris Buchanan maintained his stance that the Commission's decisions on other structures are not relevant when considering this application. He believes the Commission should look at its regulations only. Per Article III of the Preservation Guidelines, where materials factor in, the Commission should refer to the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The standards note that the removal of distinctive materials will be avoided, and that deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. However, item #9 in this states that new construction will not destroy historic materials and features. These items must be balanced against one another. Inconsistencies happen when interpreting these regulations due to human error. He explained that the wooden features of this house that appear to be defining to the overall characteristics of the building seem to be the exterior clapboards. Thus, destroying them to repair the windows, which are not original, would not be recommended. Changing the appearance of the windows that contribute to the historic character of the building by replacing materials that noticeably change the sash, depth of the reveal and muntin configurations is also not recommended.

Joe Ilsley noted that the total change to the window box area will be approximately 1/2". He is also planning to replace a couple of the windows on the house that don't have muntins, to make them look more historically accurate.

Chris Buchanan stated, per Article III, Section B.1., "every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property which requires minimal alteration of the building/structure." Altering the exterior of the building to replace the windows fails to meet this item. Section B.2. stated that "the distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site, and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided." The architectural feature

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

that the Commission should be looking at for this item is the original siding, as the windows are not original. He noted that the proposed windows are mostly wood with a thin layer of aluminum cladding. The proposed removal of the storm windows constitutes a net reduction of non-conforming materials.

Bill Rapf agreed with Chris Buchanan. He believes that the aesthetic of the building will look great without the storm windows. He noted that, unless someone were to tap on the windows, no one will know that they are aluminum clad. He believes that the Commission should look at its regulations at some point to make them more flexible for homeowners.

Doug Chabinsky agreed with Chris Buchanan's idea to look at the gain/loss from putting in replacement, aluminum clad windows, with the removal of the storms. He also believes that the Commission should review its regulations to look at them on the basis of materials available to homeowners.

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Joe Ilsley stated that the muntin positions will be identical on the proposed windows to the existing windows, except for the two windows that are not currently historically accurate, which will be changed to 6-over-6 windows with muntins.

**FINDINGS:**

- 1. Contributing property**
- 2. Highly visible property**

**Doug Chabinsky moved to accept the application as presented. Bill Rapf seconded. Roll call: Chris Buchanan – aye; Bill Rapf – aye; Tom Grella – abstain; Doug Chabinsky – aye; and Jamie Ramsay – aye. 4-0-1; motion carried.**

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.

- 2. CASE #: PZ13693-020421 –Victoria & Mike Parisi (Owners &Applicants), 3 Church Street, PIN #: 017-075-000 – Request for approval to install a 16x20' storage shed in the backyard. Continued from February 18, 2021.**

Mike and Victoria Parisi presented their case.

Mike Parisi explained that the proposal is to install a barn-style shed in the backyard. This will have traditional wood clapboard siding and an all-wood door. There was previously a barn in this area. The peak height of this structure will be 14'3". There are similar outdoor structures at 1 Church Street, with a peak height of 20', and another abutter, with a peak height of 22'. He explained that he has spoken with all three of his abutters, and all are supportive of this project.

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Mike Parisi stated that he is planning to paint the shed white to match the house.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

In response to questions from the Commission, Mike Parisi explained that he is proposing to use cedar clapboard on the shed.

Jamie Ramsay noted that there were no public comments at this time.

**FINDINGS:**

- 1. Contributing property**
- 2. Limited public visibility of the shed itself**
- 3. All proposed materials and style of shed are appropriate**

**Doug Chabinsky moved to accept the application as presented. Chris Buchanan seconded.**

**Roll call: Chris Buchanan – aye; Bill Rapf – aye; Tom Grella – aye; Doug Chabinsky – aye; and Jamie Ramsay – aye. Motion carried unanimously.**

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.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- 3. CASE #: PZ13817-022621 –Timothy & Lee Kachmar (Owners & Applicants), 15 Mack Hill Road, PIN #: 020-022-000 – Request for approval to replace and expand existing deck from 15x14' to 16x32', move stairs and add 4x6' landing.**

Tim Kachmar presented the case.

Jamie Ramsay noted that while he will hear and discuss this case, he will not vote on it, as he was previously asked to consider it.

Tim Kachmar explained that the existing deck is warped, and the wood is rotting. The deck is unstable and shaky. The stairs are also in disrepair. He is proposing moving the existing hot tub from its location and extending the new deck from the corner of the back of the house to where the windows are located above the existing hot tub location. This will be approximately 32' length. He is also proposing extending the deck to be 16' deep, instead of the existing 15'. He is planning to have stairs come down from the middle of the deck, to a lower platform, which will then have a double set of stairs leading from it to the right and left sides of the yard. He will add new footings as needed. He is proposing to use pressure treated lumber for the beams and moisture shield decking. A mahogany rail system will be added to match the current one. He was proposing to use PVC on the trim boards but will be accepting if the Commission prefers him to use wood instead.

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Tim Kachmar stated that the left side of the deck will fall even with the corner of the house. Tim Kachmar stated that he believes this will line up



TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

better with the house and look better for aesthetic purposes. This proposal also matches the stone wall on the property. By moving the deck over, it will also open up the view of the yard from the basement windows.

In response to a question from Bill Rapf, Tim Kachmar stated that the deck will be visible to someone driving up Mack Hill. Tim Kachmar noted that moving the deck will also allow it to be more private.

In response to a question from Chris Buchanan, Tim Kachmar noted that this proposal will not modify the original structure.

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Tim Kachmar noted that he is proposing to use a composite decking material.

Jamie Ramsay noted a concern about moving the deck from its current location and making it a more prominent structure.

Doug Chabinsky stated that he has no problem with the proposed location and believes it will better carry the line of the house.

Jamie Ramsay noted that there were no public comments at this time.

**FINDINGS:**

- 1. Contributing property**
- 2. Highly visible house; deck is moderately visible from public view**
- 3. All-natural materials proposed, short of the composite decking material**
- 4. Proposed is a replacement, and slight expansion of a dangerous condition structure**

**Doug Chabinsky noted that he would like the proposed PVC face boards and risers to be made of all-wood materials. Tim Kachmar agreed.**

**Doug Chabinsky moved to approve the application, with the modification that the proposed PVC trim, ledger, and risers, be changed to all-wood materials. Tom Grella seconded.**

**Roll call: Chris Buchanan – aye; Bill Rapf – aye; Tom Grella – aye; Doug Chabinsky – aye; and Jamie Ramsay – abstain. 4-0-1; motion carried.**

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.

**CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION:**

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

**4. CASE #: PZ13879-031221–Tyler Torola & Emily Myers (Owners & Applicants), 144 Amherst Street, PIN #: 017-002-000 – Conceptual discussion to build a fence around the backyard.**

Tyler Torola and Emily Myers presented the concept. Tyler Torola explained that they would like to place a fence around their backyard. They are open to style options but are considering a common picket fence. He explained that this will build upon an existing chain-link fence next door. The proposed fence will only be visible from Amherst Street.

Doug Chabinsky noted that a picket fence is an appropriate design for the Historic District.

Chris Buchanan encouraged the applicants to look at the Commission’s regulations regarding fencing. He pointed them in the direction of where to find the regulations to review. He explained that the applicant should review the regulations and come back to the Commission with specifics regarding their choice. He noted that the chain-link fence should not be allowed, per the regulations.

In response to a question from Tyler Torola, Natasha Kypfer explained that he should file an application by March 25, 2021, in order to be on the Commission’s April 15, 2021, agenda.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**5. Minutes: January 21, 2021; February 18, 2021**

**Tom Grella moved to accept the January 21, 2021, minutes as presented. Bill Rapf seconded.**

**Roll call: Jamie Ramsay – abstain; Tom Grella – aye; Doug Chabinsky – aye; Bill Rapf – aye; and Chris Hall – abstain. 3-0-2 motion carried.**

**Tom Grella moved to accept the February 18, 2021, minutes as presented. Bill Rapf seconded.**

**Roll call: Jamie Ramsay – abstain; Tom Grella – aye; Doug Chabinsky – abstain; Bill Rapf – aye; and Chris Hall – abstain. 2-0-3 motion carried.**

**6. Discussion: With Bill Birchard – Shade Shelter**

Craig Fraley, Director of the Recreation Department, explained that fundraising efforts are underway to install large shade structures at Joshua’s Park. These are proposed to be canvas canopies that can be removed in the winter. The metal frame will stay up all year. One canopy is proposed behind the existing shed on the property; this canopy is proposed to be 14’x22’. The other canopy is proposed on the other side of the playground; this canopy is proposed to be 12’x18’. Both of the canopies will be 10’ high, with an awning above. The same type of structure is located at the Baboosic Lake Town Beach. The fundraiser will also look at adding more trees to Joshua’s Park, so that once the canopies reach their end of life (approximately 30 years), there will be large shade trees to take their place.

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

Craig Fraley explained that there is also a proposal to install a shade structure for the gardeners to sit under. This could be added to the existing brick patio. The proposal is to install a pergola, to which natural vines and decorative plants can be added.

Craig Fraley explained that the canopy structures will be natural colors, to blend in with the playground. The canvas will be a tan color, and the posts will be brown to match the playground structure. He noted that some of the existing maple trees have died, possibly because the area is too wet. These may be replaced with red maples, which are better resistant to wet conditions.

In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Craig Fraley explained that the pergola will not be attached to the existing shed structure. It will sit about 15' from the building. The proposal includes moving some large stones under the pergola, for people to sit on in the shade.

The Commission thanked everyone involved for their efforts on this project.

## **7. Discussion: Board Recruitment**

The Commission agreed to wait to discuss this item until a future meeting. Natasha Kypfer noted Chris Hall suggested this discussion item but, as he was not able to attend tonight's meeting, it makes sense to table it.

## **8. Any other business**

Jamie Ramsay stated that, in the past, the Commission has always had informal discussions with potential applicants. He noted that these discussions have now risen to the level of Conceptual Discussions that require an application to be filed within a certain time period. He is unclear as to when this switch occurred and why these discussions were raised to a new level that requires additional fees to the applicant.

Natasha Kypfer explained that, per the HDC regulations, Section 12.6.B.6, the Commission shall conduct preliminary conceptual consults, noting this Section was modeled after the Planning Board's regulations. She explained that several of the recent applications, including 5 School Street, 12 Main Street, and 9 Carriage Lane have gone through the conceptual consultation process. She stated that it is important for the Commission to follow its regulation process to have conceptual reviews of applications because there is a formulated process for this. The flat fee to applicants for this review is \$60, for staff time and effort; no notification to abutters is necessary at this phase. She explained that the conceptual review is, exactly as it states, an opportunity for the applicant to get input from the Commission before submitting a formal and complete application. This is not a new concept, as it is outlined in the HDC regulations. This is similar to the fact that the NH RSA states that the Commission should consider regional impact for each application and discuss completeness of an application before hearing it. The Commission may not be in the habit of completing these items, but they are mandated by statute. She noted that it is important for the Commission to follow its regulations and treat all applicants equitably.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

March 18, 2021

**APPROVED**

Doug Chabinsky stated that he is unclear if the Commission needs to consider regional impact to each application. If this is included in the regulations, then he believes they need to be revised. He stated that, in regard to completeness, an application should not be on the Commission's agenda if it is incomplete.

Natasha Kypfer explained that it is not the Community Development Office's role to turn down an application, due to lack of completeness. It is up to the Commission to determine completeness. She explained that she does note in the Staff Report if items are missing from an application, although this has not been mentioned during meetings that she can remember.

Doug Chabinsky stated that he would rather the applications be screened before being submitted to the Commission, so that applicants are not just told to come back for a future meeting if the application is incomplete.

Jamie Ramsay stated that he believes it's a waste of time to elevate some of these items to the Staff Report. These could be handled with an informal discussion.

Chris Buchanan stated that Natasha Kypfer's explanation is correct, if these things are in the HDC's regulations. If the Commission does not like the regulations, it needs to modify them. There is a discrepancy between the Commission's habits and what the regulations say should be done. He noted that a discussion on regional impact is per State RSA. He believes concerns about the regulations should be addressed during a Commission work session with the Community Development Office.

Doug Chabinsky stated that, over his tenure, the Commission has spoken many times about trying to revise the regulations, but the issue of the regional impact regulation has not been discussed.

Tom Grella noted that the Heritage Commission recently reviewed its Rules of Procedure with the Community Development Office and easily made some changes.

The Commission agreed to try to set a work session for a future date to discuss this issue further.

**Doug Chabinsky moved to adjourn at 9:28pm. Tom Grella seconded.**

**Roll call: Jamie Ramsay – aye; Tom Grella – aye; Doug Chabinsky – aye; Bill Rapf – aye; and Chris Hall – aye. Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Kristan Patenaude

Minutes approved: May 20, 2021