



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

Barbara Landry Conference Room

Thursday, 21 June 2018, 7:00 PM

1 *Historic District Commission members in attendance were: Jamie Ramsay, Chairman;*
2 *Chris Hall, Vice-Chairman; Sally Wilkins, Planning Board Ex-Officio; and Tom*
3 *Grella, BOS Ex-Officio.*

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 7:03 PM.
8

9 **II. CASE #: PZ9815-042618 – Jeff Hall & Carol Fischer (Owners) & Joanne & Wilfred**
10 **Zeolie (Applicants) – 8 Foundry Street, PIN #: 017-031-000 – Request for approval for**
11 **the replacement of windows, placement of an air conditioning condenser unit and new**
12 **sliders in rear of property. Continues from May 17, 2018.**
13

14 Present: Joanne & Wilfred Zeolie (Current owners & Applicants)
15

16 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Wilkins and SECONDED by Mr. Grella to un-table this case*
17 *from the previous, May 17th, meeting.*

18 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
19

20 Mr. Zeolie explained that they took a closer look at the Commission's recommendations,
21 and have edited their proposal to include all wood windows with the 5/8" muntin bars. The
22 old window sashes will be replaced, but the frames will remain.
23

24 In response to a question from Mr. Hall, Mr. Zeolie stated that there are 27 or 28 windows
25 to be replaced in total.
26

27 The Commission discussed the applicants' options for a rear door/slider replacement.
28

29 Mr. Zeolie stated that they spoke to their neighbors regarding the air conditioning
30 condenser unit and there is a space on the property, behind the neighbor's garage, that will
31 be an acceptable spot to place it. It will be very quiet there and not very visible.
32

33 FINDINGS:

- 34 1. Contributing property
35 2. The front of the house is original, but was updated with non-compliant windows. The
36 center of the house was raised and rebuilt in the 1970's.
37 3. Property is highly visible.
38 4. Proposed windows are compliant and an improvement to the home.
39 5. Back of the house, proposed location for the condenser, is not visible from the public
40 view.

41
42 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Hall and SECONDED by Ms. Wilkins to approve the*
43 *proposed windows and air condenser as submitted.*

44 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
45

46 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the
47 Historic Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.
48

49 **III. CASE #: PZ9927-053018 – David & April Savino (Owners & Applicants) – 24**
50 **Courthouse Road, PIN #: 016-017-000 – Request for approval to pave existing**
51 **driveway – first 10 feet from road will be granite pavers and the remainder of**
52 **driveway will be asphalt.**
53

54 Present: David Savino (Owner & Applicant)
55

56 Mr. Savino explained that he is proposing paving the driveway for two main reasons: the
57 amount of upkeep needed to keep the current driveway in good condition, and his son's
58 allergies due to the amount of dust brought down from the driveway.
59

60 The paving is to be done by Shattuck Paving, with the granite paving being contracted out
61 to another company. The granite cobblestones will be 3-sided and real granite.
62

63 Mr. Savino agreed to contact the DPW in order to see about paving the whole driveway,
64 instead of using granite cobblestones, to see what they would recommend.
65

66 FINDINGS:

- 67 1. Contributing property
68 2. Property is visible
69 3. Driveway was formerly paved, but ripped out in the past.
70 4. Property is #139 in the National Register
71 5. Proposed changes to the driveway keep with the rest of the neighborhood.
72

73 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Wilkins and SECONDED by Mr. Hall to approve the*
74 *application with the additional comment that granite pavers are ok to use, but not required.*

75 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
76

77 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the
78 Historic Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.

79 **IV. CASE #: PZ9869-051418 – Million Dollar View, LLC (Owner & Applicant) – 110**
80 **Amherst Street, PIN #: 005-050-000 – Request for approval to construct an 8’x10’**
81 **shed behind the existing house.**

82
83 This case was held until later in the meeting.

84 **V. CASE #: PZ9911-052218 – John & Susan Ahearn (Owners & Applicants) – 101**
85 **Boston Post Road, PIN #: 017-028-000 – Request for approval to replace existing**
86 **garage doors due to deterioration.**

87
88 Present: John Ahearn (Owner & Applicant)

89
90 Mr. Ramsay explained that the Commission encourages applicants not to go overboard and
91 to keep garage doors as plain as possible.

92
93 Mr. Ahearn stated that he was hoping to add in the windows in order to increase the
94 aesthetic appeal of the garage a bit.

95
96 In response to a question from Mr. Hall, Mr. Ahearn stated that the garage doors will be
97 painted grey to match the rest of the house.

98
99 Mr. Hall stated that he believes the windows won’t stand out because the garage will be
100 made of wood and painted to look the same as the house. Ms. Wilkins agreed that it will be
101 consistent with other parts of the house.

102
103 **FINDINGS:**

- 104 1. Contributing property
- 105 2. Visible from the public way
- 106 3. Current garage is not historic
- 107 4. Proposed garage doors are similar to the existing garage doors.
- 108 5. Property is #28 on the National Registry

109
110 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Hall and SECONDED by Mr. Grella to approve the*
111 *application for the garage doors as submitted, with the recommendation from the*
112 *Commission to paint them to match the house.*

113 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
114

115 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the
116 Historic Commission’s decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.

117
118 **VI. CASE #: PZ9926-052918 – Susan Spies Revocable Trust (Owner & Applicant) – 142**
119 **Amherst Street, PIN #: 017-001-000 – Request for approval to replace existing 8’x8’**
120 **garden shed with new 10’x14’ garden shed.**

121
122 *This case was withdrawn prior to the meeting.*
123

124 **VII. CASE #: PZ9925-052918 – Michael & Margaret Dineen (Owners & Applicants) – 83**
125 **Boston Post Road, PIN #: 017-056-000 – Request for approval to add a 12’x14’ shed.**
126

127 Present: Michael Dineen (Owner & Applicant)
128

129 Mr. Dineen explained that this proposal is for a 12’x14’ shed, made by Reeds Ferry, to be
130 painted the same colors as the existing home. This will be the American Classic shed, with
131 double doors on the front, windows on each side, but without window boxes.
132

133 In response to a question from Mr. Hall, Mr. Dineen stated that the shed will be made of
134 cedar clapboard and vinyl shaped siding. The door is probably made of composite PVC.
135

136 FINDINGS:

- 137 1. Non-contributing property
 - 138 2. Proposed work is barely visible from the public view.
 - 139 3. Design keeps with the neighborhood and the existing house.
- 140

141 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Wilkins and SECONDED by Mr. Hall to approve the*
142 *proposal as presented.*

143 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
144

145 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the
146 Historic Commission’s decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.
147

148 **VIII. CASE #: PZ9935-053118 – Tara Syverson (Owner & Applicant) – 12 Main Street,**
149 **PIN #: 017-006-000 – Request for approval to construct a 4’ white wooden picket**
150 **fence around side of yard.**
151

152 Present: Tara Syverson (Owner & Applicant)
153

154 Ms. Syverson stated that the fence will be all wood, cedar, standard white, with standard
155 pickets, and probably reduced down to 3 or 3.5’. This is going to be used to enclose the
156 yard and help with her dogs.
157

158 The Commission discussed where the property line is on this house. Ms. Syverson agreed
159 to look into this issue before constructing the fence.
160

161 FINDINGS:

- 162 1. Contributing property
 - 163 2. Visible from the public way
 - 164 3. Proposed fence is not out of place in the neighborhood.
- 165

166 The Commission discussed what types of pickets, posts, and gates are generally deemed
167 acceptable in the Village.
168

169 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Hall and SECONDED by Ms. Wilkins to approve the flat*
170 *picket fence proposal with the addition of the fence caps being as simple as the fence caps*
171 *in the regulations (per page 7, under Square Pickets), with the height being 3' instead of*
172 *4', and with all gates being the same appropriate style as the fence proposed.*

173 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
174

175 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the
176 Historic Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.
177

178 **IX. CASE #: PZ9936-053118 – Joseph & Alison Mattson (Owners & Applicants) – 215**
179 **Boston Post Road, PIN #: 016-002-002 – Request for approval for a 10'x10' shed.**

180 Present: Joseph & Alison Mattson (Owners & Applicants)
181
182

183 Mr. Mattson explained that this proposal is for a 10'x10' shed to be constructed on the
184 northwest corner of the property. A majority of the shed will be shielded from Boston Post
185 Road view by two large pine trees. This will be a Heartland Shed from Lowe's. The lumber
186 is spruce pine and the color will be matched to the house.
187

188 In response to a question from Ms. Wilkins, Mr. Mattson explained that the shed will be
189 delivered in pieces and assembled by a professional.
190

191 FINDINGS:

- 192 1. Non-contributing property
 - 193 2. Proposed shed is almost non-visible from the public way
 - 194 3. Shed is to be made of good material and will match the color of the house
- 195

196 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Hall and SECONDED by Ms. Wilkins to accept the proposal*
197 *as submitted.*

198 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
199

200 Mr. Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the
201 Historic Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.
202

203 **X. CASE #: PZ9869-051418 – Million Dollar View, LLC (Owner & Applicant) – 110**
204 **Amherst Street, PIN #: 005-050-000 – Request for approval to construct an 8'x10'**
205 **shed behind the existing house. Resumed from earlier in the meeting.**
206

207 Owner/applicant was not present.
208

209 Mr. Hall explained that the proposed shed will not be visible from the public way, but will
210 be visible to the neighbors unless the previously approved fence is constructed.
211

212 FINDINGS:

- 213 1. Non-contributing property
- 214 2. House is a new build

- 215 3. Proposed shed is the appropriate shape
216 4. Proposed shed is not visible to Amherst Street, but marginally visible to abutters
217

218 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Hall and SECONDED by Mr. Grella to approve the proposal*
219 *for an 8'x10' shed as submitted, per page 6 of the application.*
220 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
221

222 **XI. Minutes: May 3, 2018 work session; May 17, 2018**
223

224 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Ramsay and SECONDED by Mr. Grella to accept the*
225 *meeting minutes from the May 3, 2018 work session as submitted.*

226 *Voting: 2 ayes, 2 abstention; motion carried.*
227

228 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Hall and SECONDED by Mr. Grella to accept the meeting*
229 *minutes from May 17, 2018 as submitted.*

230 *Voting: all ayes; motion carried unanimously.*
231

232 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Hall and SECONDED by Mr. Grella to adjourn the meeting*
233 *at 8:45 p.m.*

234 *Voting: all aye; motion carried unanimously.*
235
236
237
238
239

240 *Respectfully submitted,*

241 *Kristan Patenaude*
242
243
244
245