



**Town of Amherst, NH  
Historic District Commission  
DRAFT MINUTES**

**Barbara Landry Conference Room**

**Thursday, 19 April 2018, 7:00 PM**

1 *Historic District Commission members in attendance were: Jamie Ramsay, Chairman;*  
2 *Chris Hall, Vice-Chairman; Dave Chabinsky, Chris Buchanan, Tom Grella, BOS*  
3 *Ex-Officio, Bill Rapf – alternate, Sally Wilkins.*  
4 *Staff in attendance included: Simon Corson, Planner; Kristan Patenaude.*  
5

6 **I. Call to Order**

7 Chairman Jamie Ramsay called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.  
8

9 **II. CASE #: PZ9634-030218 – Will & Jeanne Ludt (Owners) – 3 School Street, PIN #:**  
10 **017-081-000 – Request for approval to replace an existing white picket fence to be**  
11 **completed in (2) phases.**  
12

13 Present: Will & Jeanne Ludt – Owner  
14

15 Mr. Will Ludt presented his request to replace his white picket fence in the span of two  
16 calendar years. If it becomes possible for them to afford the whole build in one year then  
17 they will pursue that. The current fence was installed in 1983/4 by Mr. Ludt and his father;  
18 it is now in much disrepair. Mr. Ludt received two estimates for replacement and will go  
19 back to the original supplier, Gate City out of Nashua. The fence will be the same cedar  
20 wood, same style, same picket design, and painted the same white color. The project will  
21 be started around May/June 2018.  
22

23 In response to a question from Mr. Hall, Mr. Ludt stated that it is their intent to match the  
24 neighbors fencing as well.  
25

26 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Chabinsky and SECONDED by Mr. Grella to accept the*  
27 *application as submitted.*

28 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*  
29

30 **FINDINGS:**

31 1. Proposed fencing is a replacement in kind.  
32

33 *Ms. Sally Wilkins entered the meeting at 7:10 p.m.*

34  
35 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 20-day appeal process works, in case the  
36 Historic Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.

37  
38 **III. CASE #: PZ9704-032218 – Simon Sarris (Applicant) – 66 Boston Post Road, PIN #:**  
39 **005-162-004 – Request for approval to construct a new single family Colonial-style**  
40 **residence.**

41  
42 Present: Simon Sarris (Applicant) & Brian Zagorites (Designer/Builder)

43  
44 Mr. Zagorites presented the Commission with the plan for the new construction. The  
45 proposal is a 2-story Colonial home, with cedar siding, clapboards, and Pella SDL windows  
46 which will be clad on the outside but wooden on the inside. He explained that the  
47 application states the address as proposed for Boston Post Road, but it will actually  
48 probably be on New Boston Road.

49  
50 In response to a question from Mr. Hall, Mr. Zagorites stated that the home will have a  
51 single driveway off the right side of the house.

52  
53 Mr. Simon Corson explained that this property is classified as “open space” by the National  
54 Register.

55  
56 In response to a question from Mr. Hall, Mr. Zagorites explained that Mr. Sarris does not  
57 wish to have a walk out basement, so they will fill in the back hill a bit to make the land  
58 approximately level from the front to back of the house.

59  
60 Mr. Ramsay stated that the projected 1<sup>st</sup> floor ceiling height of 9 feet tends to heighten the  
61 house and make it seem more modern than a traditional Colonial. He would recommend an  
62 8.5 foot ceiling which would make it seem taller inside but not weaken the look of the  
63 outside.

64  
65 Mr. Sarris stated that he would much prefer a 9 foot 1<sup>st</sup> floor ceiling. Also, changing the  
66 height would affect the placement of the staircase. Mr. Sarris explained that he modeled the  
67 house after the John Reed house in Nashua, which also has 9 foot ceilings.

68  
69 The Commission discussed that, even though the house would sit 100 feet back from New  
70 Boston Road and 500 feet from Boston Post Road, the back of the house is plainly visible  
71 from the road.

72  
73 The Commission discussed the asymmetry of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows on the back of the  
74 house. Mr. Chabinsky explained that the asymmetry catches the eye and that, historically,  
75 window sizes would be consistent throughout the house.

76  
77 Mr. Hall stated that the proposed location has nothing around it except for 1960/70's ranch  
78 homes and maybe contributes more to the Historic District than most of the surrounding

79 homes. He believes, based on this, the Commission could possibly be less picky on certain  
80 items.

81  
82 In response to a question from Mr. Chabinsky, Mr. Zagorites stated that the Pella windows  
83 will be aluminum clad inside. Mr. Chabinsky stated that he is willing to make an exception  
84 for these windows in a new construction house, as they keep with the flavor and style.

85  
86 Mr. Ramsay stated that he would like to see the muntin bars at 5/8", if possible.

87  
88 Mr. Ramsay suggested that Mr. Sarris look for examples of outside lighting around the  
89 Village. Scale will be important. He asked that the applicant submit the proposed lighting  
90 to the Commission once decided on, for approval.

91  
92 In response to a question from Mr. Grella, Mr. Sarris stated that the driveway will be  
93 gravel.

94  
95 In response to a question from Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Sarris explained that they would like to  
96 add a garage at some point in the future, but it will be far set back and resemble a barn.

97  
98 Ms. Wilkins stated that there are a few issues the Commission is dealing with: the 1<sup>st</sup> floor  
99 ceiling height, the irregularity of the rear windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, and the clad windows.

100  
101 Mr. Ramsay suggested that the (2) rear master bathroom windows be substituted with the  
102 slightly wider, taller windows that are also being used in the front of the house. The  
103 applicant agreed with this suggestion.

104  
105 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Hall and SECONDED by Ms. Wilkins to approve the*  
106 *application for a new construction house with the adjustment of (2) windows (either A or*  
107 *D, as listed on the spec) to be changed for the (2) rear master bathroom windows, and for*  
108 *all windows to have no more than 3/4", or less, muntin bars.*

109  
110 **FINDINGS:**

- 111 1. Proposed house is visible from both sides.
- 112 2. Proposed house is new construction.
- 113 3. Property is classified as open space by the National Register.
- 114 4. Proposed house is well set back from both roads.
- 115 5. Style and architecture is consistent with regulations, article VII of new construction.
- 116 6. Lighting to be approved by the Chairman after submitted to the Community  
117 Development Office.

118  
119 *Voting: 6 ayes, 1 opposed; motion carried.*

120  
121 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 20-day appeal process works, in case the  
122 Historic Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.

123

124 The applicant and home builder asked if, in the future, the application could possibly be  
125 amended to include specifics for other aspects that the Commission reviews during the  
126 meeting, so that the applicant and Commission can be better prepared.

127  
128 **IV. CASE #: PZ9708-032718 – Sebastien Coursol (Owner) – 24 Hidden Pond Drive, PIN**  
129 **#: 005-047-000 – Request for approval to construct a 12’x20’ storage and workshop**  
130 **shed.**

131  
132 Present: Sebastien Coursol (Owner)

133  
134 Mr. Coursol stated that he has modified the drawing of the shed based on the  
135 Commission’s site visit. The amended structure is now 10’x20’.

136  
137 Mr. Hall stated that this house, and thus the proposed shed, are virtually invisible from the  
138 road and that the proposed construction keeps with the style of the house.

139  
140 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Chabinsky and SECONDED by Mr. Hall to accept the*  
141 *proposed plans, with the revised drawing, as presented to the Commission.*

142  
143 **FINDINGS:**

- 144 1. House and proposed construction are nearly invisible  
145 2. Non-contributing property

146  
147 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*

148  
149 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 20-day appeal process works, in case the  
150 Historic Commission’s decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.

151  
152 **V. CASE #: PZ9711-032818 – Rand & Linda Peck (Owners) – 92 Boston Post Road, PIN**  
153 **#: 017-060-000 – Request for approval to construct an 8’x10’ garden shed.**

154  
155 Present: Rand Peck (Owner)

156  
157 Mr. Peck explained that he’d like to amend his proposal from an 8’x10’ shed to an 8’x14’  
158 shed due to the size of the equipment he needs to store in there. The shed will extend back  
159 farther.

160  
161 In regards to a question from Mr. Grella, Mr. Peck stated that the wall height will remain  
162 the same.

163  
164 In regards to a question from Ms. Wilkins, Mr. Peck explained that the amended proposal  
165 will have 2 windows in one of the walls, facing the applicant’s house, and 1 window in the  
166 gable end facing the street.

167  
168 In regards to a question from Mr. Chabinsky, Mr. Peck stated that the windows will be  
169 24”x30”.

170  
171 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Chabinsky and SECONDED by Mr. Buchanan to accept the*  
172 *amended application as presented.*

173  
174 FINDINGS:

- 175 1. Property is very visible from the road; shed will be visible from the road.  
176 2. Proposed shed massing is appropriate to the lot.  
177 3. Proposed shed materials are appropriate.  
178 4. The Commission approved a very similar shed for this applicant in 2015.  
179 5. Property is a contributing property, number 56 in the National Register.

180  
181 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*

182  
183 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 20-day appeal process works, in case the  
184 Historic Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.

185  
186 **VI. CASE #: PZ9722-032918 – Greg Bolton, Len Angelo (Owners) – Moulton's – 10 Main**  
187 **Street, PIN #: 017-086-000 – Request for approval to replace exterior door at**  
188 **delivery/receiving area and informal discussion regarding the fencing & screening.**

189  
190 Present: Greg Bolton, Len Angelo (Owners)

191  
192 Mr. Angelo explained that the sliding door is proposed to be replaced with an overhead  
193 door. It will look exact to the picture submitted to the Commission, with the exception of  
194 not including any windows on it.

195  
196 In response to a question from Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Angelo explained that the door will be  
197 brought forward slightly to match where the area of plywood currently is. The trim will all  
198 be rebuilt and painted white.

199  
200 Ms. Wilkins stated that she would like to see the fake hardware removed from the proposed  
201 door. The Commission doesn't generally encourage the use of fake hardware. Mr. Ramsay  
202 stated that there shouldn't be much that would draw attention to the door.

203  
204 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Wilkins and SECONDED by Mr. Chabinsky to approve the*  
205 *application as submitted, with the removal of any fake hardware and windows shown in the*  
206 *picture submitted.*

207  
208 FINDINGS:

- 209 1. Property is a commercial property.  
210 2. Property is non-contributing.  
211 3. Property is highly visible.  
212 4. Existing door is in extreme disrepair.  
213 5. Proposed replacement door is for commercial use.

214  
215 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*

216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261

Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 20-day appeal process works, in case the Historic Commission’s decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.

Mr. Angelo explained to the Commission that they would like to clean up the dumpster area by fencing it in, if possible.

Ms. Wilkins explained that the proposed dumpster/fence area is in the public right of way, and thus the Historic District Commission has no authority on it.

Mr. Corson stated that the applicants can bring the proposal to the Community Development Office, which would be happy to get the conversation started with the necessary groups (Board of Selectmen, Police/Fire Departments).

Mr. Hall suggested that the Commission at least give the applicants some suggestions of what type(s) of fencing would be appropriate, so that they might begin their plans.

*Mr. Hall exited the meeting at 9:05 p.m.*

**VII. CASE #: PZ9723-032918 – Million Dollar View LLC (Owner) – 110 Amherst Street, PIN #: 005-050-000 – Request for approval to construct a privacy fence along both North & South side property lines.**

Present: Sam Katz (Owner)

Mr. Katz explained that the requested fence is necessary due to the house being built sideways and thus facing into the neighbors’ property. All of the showings for the house have requested a fence be put up.

Mr. Chabinsky stated that the Commission’s regulations regarding privacy fences are very specific. They call for a very specific style, either a 4 foot or 6 foot solid board fence; maximum 6 feet. These are approved on an exception-only basis.

Mr. Corson stated that this proposal is a direct exception from the regulations, which do not generally allow what is being proposed. He suggested that providing further documentation for this proposal would be a great idea.

The Commission stated that they would like to have defined lengths of the proposed fence.

Mr. Katz stated that he would like to construct the fence in between some arborvitaes that are growing there. He stated that 80 feet on either side of the house should suffice for a fence length.

*A MOTION was made by Mr. Chabinsky and SECONDED by Mr. Buchanan to approve the proposal for a privacy fence not to exceed 6 feet in height and no more than 80 feet long on the North side of the property, to run between the plantings that the applicant has*

262 *already put in. Also, a privacy fence not to exceed 4 feet in height and no more than 80 feet*  
263 *long on the South side of the property. This fence must be solid wood construction.*  
264

265 **FINDINGS:**

- 266 1. Property is visible from the road.  
267 2. Property is in the Historic District.  
268 3. Property is non-contributing.  
269 4. Property has a unique layout and orientation, with the front directly facing into a  
270 neighbor's property.  
271 5. Based on Section 9.8A – good cause has been shown.

272  
273 *VOTING: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*  
274

275 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 20-day appeal process works, in case the  
276 Historic Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.  
277

278 **VIII. John Bement – Amherst Garden Club – Conceptual Design**

279  
280 Mr. Bement explained that in 2 years it will be the Amherst Garden Club's 50<sup>th</sup>  
281 anniversary. For the event, the group would like to erect some sort of commemorative item,  
282 or monument. He is hoping the Commission can guide him in the approval process.  
283

284 Mr. Corson explained that if this proposed item will be on town property then approval will  
285 come from the Board of Selectmen.  
286

287 In response to a question from Mr. Bement, Mr. Buchanan suggested creating a monument  
288 that is similar to the one on the Milford oval. He believes an appropriate monument will  
289 blend with the community and become an element of the space.  
290

291 **IX. Minutes: January 6, 2018; January 18, 2018; August 17, 2017 amended minutes**

292  
293 Mr. Corson explained that the August 17, 2017 minutes are being amended to strike an  
294 applicant's name from the record.  
295

296 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Chabinsky and SECONDED by Mr. Buchanan to accept the*  
297 *August 17, 2017 minutes as amended.*

298 *Voting: 4 ayes, 2 abstentions; motion carried.*  
299

300 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Chabinsky and SECONDED by Mr. Ramsay to accept the*  
301 *January 6, 2018 minutes as written.*

302 *Voting: 4 ayes, 2 abstentions; motion carried.*  
303

304 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Buchanan and SECONDED by Mr. Grella to accept the*  
305 *January 18, 2018 minutes as amended.*

306 *Voting: 5 ayes, 1 abstention; motion carried.*  
307

308 **X. Adjournment**

309

310 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Ramsay and SECONDED by Mr. Chabinsky to adjourn the*  
311 *meeting at 9:42 p.m.*

312 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*

313

314

315

316

317

318

319 *Respectfully submitted,*

320 *Kristan Patenaude*

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330