

July 18, 2019

**APPROVED**

1 In attendance: Jamie Ramsay- Chair, Chris Hall – Vice Chair, Tom Grella-Selectman Ex-Officio,  
2 Doug Chabinsky, Sally Wilkins, and Chris Buchanan

3

4 Jamie Ramsay called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

5

6 **1. Public Meeting: Village Lantern Pilot Project – Chris Buchanan**

7

8 Chris Buchanan explained to the Commission that his inspiration for this project came from a  
9 concern with how the Village appears to its townspeople and a look into its cultural heritage. As  
10 there is no budget to bury the lines in town, the project became one to improve the lighting  
11 around the Village to be more aesthetically pleasing. He addressed what type of lighting would  
12 be appropriate by doing a large amount of research, and finding that lighting from the 1760-1837  
13 era would possibly be the most fitting. There are historical photos that indicate many different  
14 types of lanterns were used in the Village, and there are current photos that show the same. In  
15 January he went before the HDC to review three different styles of lanterns. The group selected  
16 the colonial post lantern to be the most appropriate. The style selected can be hand-made in  
17 Exeter. They will be copper with frosted glass, and on New England white cedar, square,  
18 unpainted posts. The lightbulbs are dark sky friendly and will direct light downwards. There are  
19 many different brightness options that will need to be explored as the project moves forward.  
20 The DPW and Town Administrator have also been interested in the project and helped to push it  
21 forward.

22

23 In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Chris Buchanan stated that the posts will be 8' tall  
24 and 2' will be buried underground. The lanterns will be about 3' tall. The posts will be direct  
25 buried.

26

27 In response to a question from Chris Hall, Chris Buchanan explained that Bedford, Rindge and  
28 Portsmouth have all taken on similar lighting projects. They appear to be happy with the  
29 decision, as they continue to implement the new lanterns.

30

31 In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky, Chris Buchanan stated that, if the pilot is  
32 approved, the DPW is ready to immediately purchase pilot lanterns to be placed in front of the  
33 Town Hall, as it takes up to 8 weeks to have them made.

34

35 Tom Grella suggested getting the largest bulb possible and attach a dimmer switch to it.

36

37 Parker Mitchell, 16 Main Street, stated that he likes the style of the new lights and that they seem  
38 more appealing than the current utility lights.

39

40 In response to a question from Sally Wilkins, Chris Buchanan stated that it is his impression that  
41 the two pilot lanterns will stay in their proposed place outside of Town Hall even if the project  
42 doesn't extend further.

43

July 18, 2019

**APPROVED**

44 Reagan Ruedig, Portsmouth, NH, explained that the Portsmouth lanterns are currently CFL's and  
45 she finds them to be a bit bright. The lanterns there are only found in the Historic District and  
46 some on the roadways going into town. She likes the idea of Amherst's lanterns being frosted  
47 glass, as they might not be as bright.

48  
49 The Commission agreed that the pilot project should move forward.

50  
51 **2. Historic District Survey Presentation – Preservation Company - Discussion**

52  
53 Reagan Ruedig, of Preservation Company, presented the survey document to the Commission.  
54 She explained that the group went over 314 properties in town and took over 1,300 photos. Each  
55 property was then assessed and analyzed by the group, including by an architectural historian.  
56 The forms and styles for each of the properties was documented. The document also contains  
57 character defining features and general distinctive qualities where appropriate. There is a  
58 separate column for 'of note' features, such as stone walls or hedges that contribute to the  
59 property itself. She gave some basic background on the Historic District, including that it was  
60 designated in 1976 and then expanded four years later as the result of a town vote. Houses  
61 labeled 'contributing' are listed in the National Register, whereas houses labeled 'non-  
62 contributing' are not.

63  
64 In response to a question from Doug Chabinsky, Reagan Ruedig stated that there are older homes  
65 in the newer districted area. Preservation Company is not sure why they wouldn't have been  
66 included when originally designated.

67  
68 Preservation Company has a list of properties that abut the National Registry District that  
69 probably should be included in the National Register District due to historical or architectural  
70 significance. These houses have integrity and seem to be notable. There is also a list for houses  
71 that do not abut the National Register District but are still architecturally notable and should be  
72 paid attention to, maybe on a higher scale than other non-contributing properties. Finally, there is  
73 a list of houses that are in the National Register that maybe should no longer be considered  
74 contributing due to changes to the property.

75  
76 Chris Hall suggested that, as much as possible, Preservation Company gives the Commission  
77 recommendations or guidelines in their completed document. He would like to have a more  
78 transparent document for the HDC to use in the future, and hopes that Preservation Company's  
79 survey can help with that.

80  
81 In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Reagan Ruedig stated that Amherst has done a  
82 very good job with making new construction or additions look historically accurate.

83  
84 In response to a question from Chris Hall, Simon Corson, Town Planner, stated that this  
85 information will be included in the digital database so that the map can be brought up during  
86 cases to see a property's information and photos. The database will also include some simple  
87 measuring tools and GPS information.

July 18, 2019

**APPROVED**

88 In response to a question from Chris Buchanan, Reagan Ruedig stated that it might not be a bad  
89 idea for the town to think about updating their National Register District.

90

91 OLD BUSINESS:

92

93 **3. CASE #: PZ11365-052119 – Adam & Tiffany Jacobs (Owners & Applicants) – 21**  
94 **Mack Hill Road, PIN #: 020-019-000 – Request for approval to replace existing**  
95 **single-story screened porch/3-season room and patio with two-story finished space,**  
96 **shed dormer to garage and first and second story deck/balconies. Case tabeled from**  
97 ***June 20, 2019.***

98

99 **Sally Wilkins moved to retable the case to August 15, 2019 at the request of the**  
100 **applicant. Chris Buchanan seconded.**

101 **Voting: all in favor; motion carried unanimously.**

102

103 NEW BUSINESS:

104

105 **4. CASE #: PZ11466-061319 – Parker & Alice Mitchell (Owners & Applicants) – 16**  
106 **Main Street, PIN #: 017-008-000 – Request for approval to build an 8’x12’ garden**  
107 **shed along the side yard.**

108

109 Present: Parker Mitchell (Owner & Applicant)

110

111 Parker Mitchell stated that they would like to build a small shed in their side yard. It will keep  
112 with the look of the rest of the house and be hidden behind bushes, so as to not be particularly  
113 obvious.

114

115 Chris Hall stated that the location of the proposed shed is extremely hidden and there is about 30  
116 feet between the bushes and the lot line.

117

118 Parker Mitchell stated that the proposed shed will be sided with white cedar clapboards to match,  
119 and the roof itself will be wood/cedar. There will probably be 2 windows, one on each side, and  
120 they will be using reclaimed windows stored in their barn. He will custom build the shed himself.  
121 There are two options for the footing, either concrete blocks under or some rough cut granite  
122 curbing that will look similar to a fieldstone foundation. He hopes to pursue the second option,  
123 but it will depend on logistics.

124

125 The Commission discussed the roof choice, but had no strong feeling about the proposal to use  
126 cedar on it.

127

128 Chris Buchanan read Article VII, Section A. regarding new construction; “New construction  
129 shall be complementary to the configuration of existing buildings and streetscapes, including in  
130 height and width...”

131

July 18, 2019

**APPROVED**

132 In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Parker Mitchell stated that there will be two small  
133 standard sized windows, about 30” wide x 42” tall.

134

135 FINDINGS:

- 136 1. Contributing property, #8 on the National Register  
137 2. House is very visible; proposed shed will be virtually invisible  
138 3. Proposed materials are appropriate, and go beyond what’s required by the HDC, in  
139 terms of historically appropriate materials  
140 4. Massing for proposed shed is appropriate

141

142 **Chris Hall moved to approve the application with the addition of windows being**  
143 **either windows reclaimed from the barn, no significantly massing bigger than in the**  
144 **photograph shown, and two windows – if anything beyond that then would need to**  
145 **see a revised update. Doug Chabinsky seconded.**

146 **Voting: all in favor; motion carried unanimously.**

147

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

150

151 **5. CASE #: PZ11503-062719 – Amanda & Kyle Coffey (Owners & Applicants) – 14**  
152 **Courthouse Road, PIN #: 018-045-000 – Request for approval to enclose the**  
153 **breezeway between main house and garage to create a mudroom.**

154

155 Present: Amanda Coffey (Owner & Applicant)

156

157 Amanda Coffey explained that the proposal is to enclose the breezeway in order to make a  
158 mudroom which would be a large, helpful addition to the function of their family. The proposal  
159 will not change the size of the breezeway area and they will be maintaining the historical  
160 architecture and archways. The one door being proposed that is visible from the public way will  
161 mimic the entry way door on the house. There will be a small window added for ventilation.

162

163 In response to a question from Chris Hall, Amanda Coffey stated that the siding will be the same  
164 as the rest of the house on both the front and back.

165

166 In response to a question from Jamie Ramsay, Amanda Coffey stated that the window will be on  
167 the back only, and not visible from the public way. It will be a case window due to the size  
168 constraints.

169

170 Sally Wilkins noted that the Commission received a letter of support from an abutter.

171

172 FINDINGS:

- 173 1. Non-contributing property  
174 2. Built in approximately 1935  
175 3. National Register #157

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

July 18, 2019

**APPROVED**

176 4. Only visible door facing the public way is appropriate in style and keeps with the rest  
177 of the house

178  
179 **Chris Hall moved to approve the application as submitted. Doug Chabinsky**  
180 **seconded.**

181 **Voting: all in favor; motion carried unanimously.**

182  
183 Jamie Ramsay explained to the applicant how the 30-day appeal process works, in case the  
184 Historic District Commission's decision was contested by an abutter or other party of interest.

185  
186 OTHER BUSINESS:

187 **6. Minutes: June 20, 2019**

188  
189 **Sally Wilkins moved to accept the minutes as written. Chris Hall seconded.**  
190 **Voting: 5-0-1; motion carried.**

191  
192 **The Commission adjourned the meeting at 8:22 pm.**

193  
194  
195  
196  
197 Respectfully submitted,  
198 Kristan Patenaude

199  
200 Minutes approved: August 15, 2019