

**Kingston Historic District Commission**  
**September 21, 2016**  
**Public Hearing**

Members present:

Virginia Morse, Chair  
Stacy Smoyer  
Stanley Shalett  
George Korn, BOS rep.

Glenn Coppelman, PB rep.  
Susan Prescott  
Charlotte Boutin, V. Chair

Ms. Morse called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

**Board Business**

**MM&S to approve the minutes of July 12, 2016 as written (with the corrected date as noted).** (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Ms. Prescott) **Motion passed 5-0-2** with Mr. Korn and Ms. Boutin abstaining.

**Town Board Updates:**

**CIP:** Ms. Morse announced that she had received the CIP packet; Mr. Coppelman said the first meeting was scheduled for October 4<sup>th</sup> to review submittals and hopefully having it wrapped up by the end of the year with the goal of having it for the Budget Committee and Board of Selectmen.

**Planning Board:** Mr. Coppelman said that there was nothing pertinent for the HDC at the moment before the Planning Board.

**Board of Selectmen:** Mr. Korn said that work is continuing on the Bandstand.

**Heritage Commission:** Ms. Morse said that the KHC is hoping to join together with the HDC on a project in the future for an upcoming Kingston Days; this will be discussed more in the future. Ms. Boutin mentioned the brochure project that is being worked on.

**ZBA:** Ms. Morse said the ZBA granted a variance for the use request of All-American Assisted Living.

**Buck Lovern**  
**119 Main Street**

Ms. Morse distributed the application details for a proposed addition of a 3-bay garage and other things from 119 Main Street. The applicant reviewed the submitted plans; they are looking to add a room above the garage as a hobby room for woodworking; to access this they would like to use the existing road to get in the back of the yard adding that they are not adding a driveway as it has been there since the house existed; the closest point to the garage would be 28 feet, 6 inches from the property line. Mr. Coppelman said that the gravel drive is significantly closer to the lot line; Mr. Lovern said it was and re-stated that it had been there since the house was built; there is asphalt at the back end that they usually park on. Mr. Lovern said it is an actively used access way; he said he had a

“google earth” photo that showed it; he passed that photo around. He pointed out the existing house on the photo. Mr. Coppelman noted that one of the driveways is right on the lot line and the other one is pretty close to the lot line; he said the regulations now require a 20 foot setback. Mr. Lovern explained that one had been repaved approximately 2 years and he had to review the locations with the Road Agent; he is not looking to change the unpaved access or repave it. Mr. Coppelman asked how much higher the garage and hobby room would be than the existing house. Mr. Lovern said that it is about 5 feet above the existing building. Ms. Boutin noted that there were no measurements on the submitted drawings. Mr. Lovern said the last page included a floor plan with the measurements. Mr. Lovern said the upstairs room was smaller than the footprint of the garage to try to lower the roof; the garage is approximately 40 feet; the upstairs will be 40 by 25 feet; one side will store his hunting and fishing stuff and the other side will be for a woodworking/hobby shop; the house sits on the front end of the property which is a little over 2 acres with really nothing behind them. Mr. Lovern confirmed that the whole front of the house is brick; the eaves will have clear cedar clapboard, he is proposing similar siding on the garage as what exists on the side of the house; the roof will have the same shingles as the rest of the house. Ms. Morse stated that other than the small amount of elevation over the house, there really will not be much change from the view of the road as it is behind the house. Mr. Coppelman wanted to make sure that it was within the 10% elevation limit per the regulations although the Board can waive a regulation requirement. Mr. Coppelman read the regulation re: new construction; Mr. Lovern stated that the addition will be lower than the neighboring building; the new addition is 22 feet high. There was discussion regarding the interpretation of this regulation. Ms. Morse said, due to surrounding housing, she is not uncomfortable with the additional height. Ms. Morse confirmed that the current house is one story and with the addition will have two stories.

**MM&S to approve the application; waiving the 10% height increase regulation.** (Motion by Mr. Korn, second by Ms. Boutin) **Motion carries 6-1** with Mr. Shalett opposed.

Ms. Morse explained that the Certificate of Approval will be sent to the Building Inspector and Board of Selectmen; he has two years to complete the project from the date of the approval.

**C. Steven Briggs**  
**52 Little River Road**

Ms. Morse handed out copies of the proposal to the Commission; the applicant is proposing putting solar panels on the barn. Ms. Prescott stated that she is an abutter so will be recusing herself from the discussion.

James Halsbeck, operation manager for Revision Energy, introduced himself. He said it is a fairly straight forward solar installation project; he noted that this property was in HD II. He highlighted that the solar panels will be flush with the existing roof pitch; they won't be sticking up or tilted so it will have minimal impact on the aesthetics of the

building; the panels will be installed on the barn which is located behind the house. Ms. Morse said the submission included a picture of the house and the barn showing the location of the installation of the 42 panels. Mr. Coppelman said that the proposal was pretty straightforward and the Commission has allowed these on other areas in HD I.

**MM&S to approve the application as presented.** (Motion made by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Korn) **PUNA**

Mr. Halsbeck spoke in favor of the upcoming hearing with accommodations made for architectural considerations.

**All American Assisted Living**  
**Main Street**  
**Tax Map R34 Lot 71B**

Ms. Morse called the public hearing to order and read the public hearing notice for consideration of a 58 unit assisted living facility on the corner of Main Street and Route 125 noting that the ZBA had granted a variance for this non-conforming use. Copies of the application were distributed by Ms. Morse. Ms. Shalett recused himself as an abutter to the property.

George Chadwick with Bedford Design introduced himself and Steven Humphries, architect, and two other members of the design team: Glenn Kaplan and Ben Wells. He reminded the members that they had been before the Commission on July 12<sup>th</sup>; they received the use variance from the ZBA on August 11<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Chadwick explained that they were before the Commission with a 58 unit assisted living project; he pointed out the location on the submission plans. Their plan is to construct a narrow, meandering driveway located approx. 500 ft. from Main Street; he pointed out the parking on the plan which tries to keep the parking away from the Main Street view; they tried to create a vision of the project as a residential estate; they have provided some perspective views which he explained: one was as the building was approached; the second was from the middle of the site with the third view looking from where the driveway is located.

Mr. Humphries gave a quick summary of the building as the details hadn't changed much since the last meeting. The building is 58,000 square feet; two stories with hip roofs; there are three main components: on the right side of the building is the assisted living, the center is the common and service areas and there is a memory care wing on the left side of the building; on the second floor is predominantly all assisted living with a few common areas. Mr. Humphries continued with the review of the exterior of the building. He said it used very traditional building forms with simple hip roof forms throughout; the roof is dropped in the center to define the entry with dormers for architectural interest; there is a porch with columns along the front. He continued that the materials are going to be very New England vernacular so will be clapboards and shingles using fiber-cement siding which is akin to wood siding but a little more fire resistant; proposed 4 inch clapboard from the base to the bottom of the second floor windows and then 7 inch shingle from the horizontal band up to the roof line; the trim will also be fiber-cement,

white, 3 ½ flat trim for the horizontal bands, fascia and cornerboards; the roof will use asphalt-type shingle which is typical for the region and will be architectural grade; he had a board with samples for the Commission to review including the colors of the siding, trim and roof. Mr. Humphries confirmed that all of the siding will be the cement product.

Mr. Chadwick noted that a similar facility was built in Massachusetts which showed a different siding but did show the scale of the building with the detail and window patterns to give a sense of what the building would look like when complete.

Ms. Morse stated that she did go to their new Londonderry facility, by invitation, and did take pictures; she said that it appears that the air conditioning and heating units jarred out from the building. Mr. Chadwick stated that they will not be flush at this building; they will be the same as Londonderry. Ms. Morse noted that in the drawing they appear to be flush. Mr. Chadwick they typically jut out 5 inches; this provides floor space inside the building. Ms. Boutin said that with a new facility they could add the air conditioning and heating facility and done differently by going through the roof; basically a central air and heating system. Mr. Chadwick said that those are available but they 112 beds and give each resident the option of cool or heat at any given time to be able to individually control it; with a central system it is very complicated and costly to do that and ends up with a ton of equipment on the roof which is not so feasible with a sloped roof. Mr. Coppelman commented that, as nice as the building looks and the attempt to try to make it fit into the Historic District, the heating units give the building a type of hotel/motel look and feel which really does not go with the Historic District. He said that the fact that they jut out instead of being flush is even worse a condition. He asked if, at the very least, if they could be made to match the color of the surrounding siding as they really stick out as shown in the Londonderry setting. Mr. Coppelman said that this would blend it much nicer and blend better and more appropriate to the look and feel of the District. Ms. Morse stated that she agreed with Mr. Coppelman's assessment. The applicant clarified that the white on either side of the grill of the heating/ac unit was not integral to the units and were just trim. Ms. Morse suggested that it could be a different color; that around the window there could be a trim that could be the white color and between the trim and where the grill started could be the color of the wall; the applicant said that could happen. Mr. Coppelman said that by using the individual HVAC units, the applicant said that mechanicals would not need to be on the roof; he asked if that meant there were no mechanicals on the roof. Mr. Chadwick said there were mechanicals on the roof to serve the common spaces but it is limited; he said there is a parapet wall that shields them from view. Ms. Morse said that the layout in Londonderry was similar to that proposed; there was limited landscaping. She continued that previously, an abutter spoke about having trees and landscaping that was indigenous to this area; she noted that the landscape plan has yet to be presented to the Commission and they would like to see that for comments. Ms. Morse said that there were a minimal number of cars at the facility in Londonderry. Ms. Morse referred to the first page of the application at the bottom regarding the sign that notes that the sign will be facing Route 125 and there is a picture of the sign on page 2 but it is not very historic looking; she asked what the sign will look like to mark the driveway. Mr. Chadwick said that there has been a correction to the sign; the sign shown in the front is being moved to the corner; Mr. Humphries will

explain the material for the sign. Mr. Chadwick reviewed the lights; there was a picture submitted and they are the same lights as those in Londonderry. Ms. Boutin asked about the placement of the lights and how strong they would be in regards to interference to the residents. Mr. Chadwick said that the lights close to the individual units have been moved. Ms. Boutin asked the distance from the building to Rte. 125. Mr. Chadwick said that a number of trees would be planted along the Rte. 125 side as a noise and visual buffer; the building is approximately 150 – 200 feet from the pavement edge; from the ROW edge it might be 100 ft. +/- . Ms. Boutin said that it would be important for the noise buffer from the highway traffic for the residents. Mr. Chadwick said there are a number of trees within the ROW that are not being touched and not cutting down any more trees than had already been cleared for the project. She noted that Londonderry had left a very large buffer which was a positive; Mr. Chadwick said that it might not be the same thing but will be similar.

Ms. Morse asked if the Fire Department had asked for an additional access for this property. The applicant stated that they had met with the Fire Department and had received a phone call noting that the Town owned property next to the parcel; the previously proposed project gave the Town a right-of-way through this parcel; this has not been flushed out yet adding that if the Town wants to develop that parcel as some type of safety facility in the future would probably be able to get an access onto Rte. 125 better and easier than a private developer would; they would not expect that DOT would not give them access; at this point, the FD has not asked for a ‘back entrance’; when they go through the Planning process, SFC will review the plan for the Fire Department adding that this design does not work well for access to the Town parcel. There was discussion about a possible graveled emergency access way. Ms. Morse said that abutters concerns were that there not be an access onto the side parcel. Mr. Coppelman said that the lighting would be an issue during the site plan process and compliance with the dark-sky ordinance which the applicant was aware of. The driveway off Main Street does not have any sidewalks; they have proposed a walkway around the building and a meandering path to keep the residents off and away from Main Street; the only area of fencing is out by the wetlands for “fall” protection and won’t be seen from Main Street. Ms. Morse asked if it is necessary to have a turn-lane on Main Street to come in and out of the entrance driveway; Mr. Chadwick said no, a traffic-study has been done which will be presented to the Planning Board and a turn-lane is not required; a physical impact statement has been prepared regarding Town services requirements.

Mr. Coppelman suggested the HDC comment on something for the Planning Board review regarding commercial delivery traffic and requiring that this type of traffic reach the site via the Rte. 125/Main Street intersection rather than driving through the center of Town; this way any large deliveries of goods and services approach via Rte. 125. The applicant said they would think about this and it might be difficult to have vendors take the long way instead of the short-cut; Mr. Korn stated that he believed that this requirement was already in place; he will speak with the Police Chief about making sure it is posted correctly. The applicant said they will do their best to tell the vendors but is sometimes hard to dictate the route to the vendors. Ms. Boutin suggested they speak with the vendors about not delivering with an 18-wheeler. Mr. Coppelman was uncomfortable

with the answer from the applicant about not being able to speak with the vendors about delivery requirements; Mr. Korn re-iterated posting and enforcing; he stated if the fines are adequate the vendors will find another way around it. Mr. Coppelman stated that while he understands that the applicant can not enforce it with the vendors; they are certainly within their power to encourage it as they are the customer. The applicant agreed. Vendor deliveries and sizes of trucks were discussed. Ms. Morse asked again about the proposed sign location. Mr. Chadwick said that it is closer to the Town than the current placement of the political signs which he noted were in the State right-of-way. Ms. Morse asked if there would be another sign near the driveway; the applicant answered that there would be a very small sign like a directional sign. Ms. Morse said that the sign is the right size but wishes that it could look a little more historic; Ms. Boutin agreed that it was too “modern” looking. The applicant asked for suggestions. Ms. Morse suggested it look more colonial in nature; she agreed that it was very modern looking; she said she thought it was a really good proposal and didn’t want to turn it down due to the proposed sign adding that the Board did not have a final proposal showing the sign. When asked by the applicant what she would like to see, Ms. Morse stated that she did bring a few samples of signs that had some “sculpturing” appropriate to a historic district. Mr. Coppelman agreed noting that the sign proposed was a standard sign used at the applicant’s other facilities but reminding the applicant that they are before the Historic District Commission and the facility was in the Historic District and that meant that sometimes things are a little different; they had to make some accommodations for the building and that would be the case for the sign. Ms. Morse had some examples of signage on posts, hanging signage with appropriate molding/sculpturing/framing; standing off the ground instead of a solid block sitting on the ground; businesses within the district and their signage were reviewed. Mr. Chadwick suggested that the sign concern could be a condition of approval and they could move forward and return for review of the sign as they want to move forward and get to the Planning Board.

Mr. Coppelman said that height should be addressed. Ms. Morse read from the cover letter and agreed that the height of the building was not addressed in the description. Mr. Coppelman said the 10% issue was relative to any building within 250 feet of the project; since there is nothing within that radius, they are probably looking at a 35-foot height maximum. The applicant stated that the building was 32 feet in height.

Ms. Morse asked for any public comment. Mr. Shalett, 1 East Way, is an abutter and asked about the air conditioning and seeing the grill work; he believes that the best solution would be to use central air conditioning with the ability to turn on and off with a thermostat on the wall of the individual areas to eliminate that as there is no appearance like that all through Kingston let alone the Historic District; he thinks that part of the plan should be modified. He would also like to clear up whether any emergency access way would use East Way or use the Class VI road from Main Street; he also wanted to know the location of the parking lot and where it would be in relation to the building and rest of the site; he suggested that the lighting be subdued and historic noting that the dentist in the area had subdued lighting looking like something from a gas lamp. He would also suggest specific data submitted showing the exact height of the building. Ms. Morse said

that the applicant has stated on the record that the maximum height of the building is 32 feet high. He stated that all in all it is a good project and building design but is spoiled by the “grills” of the a/c units on each window as it does look like a motel.

Ms. Morse clarified that there will not be an exit onto East Way; if there is another exit required by the Fire Department, it might be through the right-of-way out near Rte. 125. Mr. Shalett re-stated that except for those items he mentioned, he is in favor of the project.

Mark Fitzpatrick, 191 Main Street, stated that he is directly adjacent to this and would like some type of buffer added as he does not want to look at dumpsters and having 116 people behind his house once the pathway is built; he added that he bought a house in the woods and the woods aren't there anymore and now a hospital is being built behind his house; he said that they are building a border on Rte. 125 with some nice trees but they are not adding any buffer to block his view of the back of the dumpsters. Ms. Morse asked if the applicant would like to address this concern. Mr. Chadwick pointed out where Mr. Fitzpatrick lived; they said that they do have landscaping planted to the extent they can along the rear of the building; it is a fully enclosed dumpster with a solid fence/screen in the back; they have some plantings in the back to soften the delivery area but he will look to see what else can be done to accommodate Mr. Fitzpatrick when they apply to the Planning Board as he is sure this will be something looked at during that review.

Scott Ouellette, 189 Main Street, stated that he thinks it is right that the HDC “sweat the details” with items such as the air conditioning as it is a key feature of the building and that the Commission is on the right track regarding the outline of the a/c unit and making it match the darker siding but the grill itself, if it stays the color it is presented, will still “pop-out”. He suggested that the Commission would want to keep them going and make the grill match the siding. As to the lights, he likes the look of them but suggested that black may be a better color than silver as silver gives the project an “industrial” look where the black matches the darker shades of the roof and may be softened in appearance; it should be confirmed that any of the lighting does not spill over onto neighboring property; they should be positioned to light up the driveway and walkways but not the neighbors; they should also be dark-sky compliant. Mr. Coppelman stated that the ordinance requires that there not be “spill-over” onto the neighboring properties adding that this would be closely reviewed at the site plan review process. Mr. Ouellette added that a double row of arborvitaes along the border would be appropriate for a visual and year-round buffer; a fence could be used but might be too much but the arborvitaes would be appropriate. Mr. Coppelman was going to suggest to Mr. Fitzpatrick that screening would be reviewed at the Planning Board level and he encouraged abutters to attend and participate. Mr. Ouellette said that the signage discussion should be continued at the HDC level and any lighting being proposed on the sign should be downward lighting as opposed to the up lighting and a little roof on the sign could incorporate downward lighting. Mr. Ouellette proposed that any approval could also include comments to the Planning Board about buffering, lighting or other concerns. The

applicant stated that the grills on the a/c units would be the same color as the siding per Mr. Ouellette's suggestion.

Mr. Coppelman suggested that the motion reflect the discussion during the meeting in case anything is missed in the motion, it would have been caught in the minutes.

Mr. Korn asked if any sign approval was going to be conditional upon additional review. Ms. Morse believed that should be part of the project. Mr. Coppelman stated he believed that this is a good proposal and is a needed type of facility in this region.

**MM&S to grant the Certificate of Approval for the plan as presented, keeping in mind that it is an approval from the HDC perspective and not an approval of the site plan nor is it usurping any of the Planning Board's authority, with the following conditions:**

- 1. the modifications to the ac/heating units be modified as discussed i.e. the grillwork and blocking on both sides of the grill be made to match the color of the surrounding siding (see discussion in the minutes);**
- 2. to the best that the operator of the project can do, that as much of the commercial truck traffic come to and from the site using the exit/entrance onto Rte. 125 as opposed as going through Main Street;**
- 3. the minutes to this hearing be provided as guidance to the Planning Board so when it gets to the site plan review level, the Planning Board has the benefit of the discussion that occurred during this hearing;**
- 4. This Certificate of Approval is not giving approval at this time for the sign/signage on the property at this time; that will be given separately by the HDC upon proper submittal/review.**

(Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Ms. Prescott) **PUNA**

Ms. Morse adjourned the public hearing portion of the meeting at 8:51 PM.

**MM&S to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 PM.** (Motion by Ms. Prescott, second by Mr. Coppelman) **PUNA**