

Kingston Historic District Commission
October 11, 2016
Public Hearing

Members present:

Virginia Morse, Chair
Stacy Smoyer
Charlotte Boutin, V. Chair

Glenn Coppelman, PB rep.
Susan Prescott
George Korn, BOS rep.

Absent: Stan Shalett

Ms. Morse called the meeting to order at 7:08 PM.

Commission Business

MM&S to approve the minutes of September 21, 2016 as amended: p. 3, second paragraph, “Caplan” should be spelled “Kaplan”; p. 4, “hearing” should be “heating”; p. 5, middle paragraph, add “ordinance” to “dark sky compliance”, p. 5, change driveway reference from “Rte. 125” to “Main St./Rte. 125” intersection; p. 6, 9 lines up from bottom of paragraph, add “District” after Historic and before Committee; p. 8, change “could be” to “would be”; confirm that “Ms.” Morse is referenced appropriately throughout the document. (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Ms. Prescott) PUNA

Town Board Updates:

CIP: Mr. Coppelman said that the CIP committee met for the first time on October 4th and reviewed the submittals. He announced the date and time of the next meeting.

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.

Museum Committee: Walt Roy, maintenance liaison for the Museum Committee, addressed the Commission noting that even though the Town is exempt, he came to speak to the Commission to inform them of upcoming projects. He has met with Rich St. Hilaire and Ms. Morse regarding maintenance. Ms. Morse invited Mr. Roy to speak with the Commission about the projects that will involve Town-provided materials with volunteer work. Mr. Roy reviewed the projects including repairs on the museum, firehouse, Tramp house, Cobbler shop, Nichols additional signage. They are also aware that the KHC is also working on a sign project but not the details of the project. Ms. Morse was impressed that the Town will be paying for the materials with the collaboration of volunteers. He added that they are trying for the project materials for next spring.

Rick Korn

Main Street

He explained the additional sign he is proposing to the Commission; it will be on the side; black and white with black trim. He continued speaking with the Commission

about the details of the sign. Ms. Morse said that he currently has 7.5 feet now for the sign; he can have a total of 24 square feet for a building sign; Mr. Coppelman stated that he will be able to do whatever the math works out to be per the ordinance; take the current footage from 24 square feet which is the total number allowed than that is the number he can use for the sign. Ms. Morse noted that the proposed sign is within the 24 square feet that is allowed. Mr. Korn described the lighting; Mr. Coppelman said some decorative “goose-neck” type of lighting would work; Mr. Korn agreed. Mr. Coppelman referred him to the lighting ordinance specific to shielding and not spilling onto other properties or interfering with traffic. Ms. Morse noted that there was not an application for the Commission; Mr. Korn stated that he did not fill out an application. Ms. Morse instructed Mr. Korn on the procedure regarding the application including a representation on the sign and a description/drawing of the lighting that was being proposed with language noting that they are shielded and compliant with the ordinance. She added that while it looks like it will be within the requirements of the ordinance, the commission can’t give an approval without the application and information in writing. Mr. Coppelman said that if there is a picture or manufacturer’s spec. sheet available, it would be beneficial to include with the application. Ms. Morse added that the materials being used should be included with the application.

Russell and Susan Prescott
46 and 50 Little River Road

Ms. Morse stated that she noted down that the proposal was a change of use from barn to residence but was not sure that was correct. There were four copies of the application available for the Commission’s review.

Mr. Prescott said that they thought it would be nicer to change the existing barn into a residence rather than have the residence only 20 feet off the road; he continued that there is a 4 bedroom, proposed dwelling on Little River Road; he reviewed the location. He would like to make sure the barn remains historically accurate but would like to get the sense of the HDC before moving forward with the design; pictures were provided for the Commission’s review. They would put a foundation under it and raise it up a bit. Mr. Coppelman confirmed that the submission showed the existing barn, building and shed and a proposed dwelling; if the barn was done then the proposed dwelling wouldn’t be done, it would be one or the other. He wanted an idea of the HDC’s acceptance of the abstract plans before going forward with specifics and permits. Mr. Prescott confirmed that there were two separate lots being discussed; there wouldn’t be two residences on one lot; there is an approved septic design. Mr. Prescott showed the property lines. Mr. Coppelman said that he liked the idea of re-using structures and barns led themselves to great re-use. The condition of the building was discussed. Mr. Prescott stated that the size of the barn is 36/37 by 36/37; basically square; it will be raised for a foundation.

Ms. Morse confirmed that Mr. Prescott was basically checking on any objection prior to moving forward with more detailed information. Ms. Morse said it seemed a wonderful idea and has been impressed with the renovations/restorations of the home and barn and would be in favor a proposal with repurposing of the barn. Mr. Coppelman, for the

record, stated that this proposal would not be “prohibited”. Ms. Morse said that she would encourage them to go forward and return with a full proposal for a decision from the Commission.

Mr. Prescott explained that this would keep the home further away from the road and give them the ability to keep as many of the trees as possible. The probable history and vintage of the barn was discussed. Mr. Prescott confirmed that the barn was post and beam construction.

Ms. Morse noted that the comments expressed so far from the Commission was positive and they should move forward with their plans.

Commission Business, continued:

Town-Owned Properties in the HDC:

Ms. Morse asked Mr. Korn about one of the properties (aka: Saunders house) and whether it was being auctioned per the HDC request to the BOS. Mr. Korn said there are four properties being auctioned and believes that is one of them; he suggested Ms. Morse confirm this with the Board’s administrative assistant. There was discussion regarding any stipulations that might have been able to be put on the sale of the property. Ms. Smoyer did a “family tree” of the property. Ms. Morse asked how to make that type of information useful when a home like that is part of the cultural heritage of Town and is up for auction. Ms. Morse asked about the specifics of the auction. Mr. Coppelman asked about notifying the Preservation Alliance to send the information out in case there might be interest in this specific property. Ms. Smoyer suggested having a packet of information regarding the property available at the auction. Ms. Morse agreed with notifying the Preservation Alliance who could let people know of a historical property up for sale; she also suggested it could be information distributed by the auctioneer as it might add “heart” to the building and might add more interest to the auction block. Mr. Coppelman agreed that it might encourage a bidder who has an interest in historical buildings. Ms. Morse asked Ms. Smoyer to contact the Preservation Alliance about the auction and the building’s history. Ms. Smoyer will try to contact them. Mr. Korn confirmed that this was the only historic house up for auction. There was further discussion regarding the Preservation Alliance and email contact capabilities. Mr. Korn confirmed that it was one of the properties for auction in November. There was discussion regarding how the auctions were held.

Review of previous discussions:

- Updated letter to HDI and HDII residents re: benefits and responsibilities
- News articles
- Web site updates
- Ms. Morse asked about the two-year completion timeline and whether there should there be a checklist and timeline to confirm that the projects have been

completed. Mr. Coppelman thought that a “tickler” file would be a good idea to check on the projects.

- Ms. Morse recently came across a document titled “Kingston Historic District Commission Procedure and Guidelines” explaining that it is specific to the required procedures; she wondered if a cover letter with the procedures might be helpful to applicants. Mr. Coppelman thought it would be a great addition to the application as there is nothing there now. Ms. Morse said she would “tweak” this and bring it to the Commission next month to look at it.

Mr. Coppelman will draft a letter for HDI and HDII owners introducing them to the Historic District and bring back to the next meeting. Ms. Morse has been pleased with the Selectmen’s office and Building Inspector in their referrals to the HDC. She commented on how helpful Catherine Grant in the Selectmen’s office has been including sending out all the abutter’s notices.

All-American Living Sign Proposal

Ms. Morse said she was contacted by George Chadwick regarding a different proposal for a sign; the colors are red, white and blue. Mr. Coppelman said he wished they would choose more historic colors. Ms. Morse handed out copies of the proposal explaining that the background is blue, the star is red and white, the lettering is white, and the line under “All-American” is red. The Commission reviewed against the original proposal. Mr. Coppelman read that it will be aluminum and PVC construction. Ms. Morse said she spent a lot of time reading the sign ordinance. She had some questions about the submission so contacted Mr. Chadwick; the sign said that there won’t be any lighting so she asked if they planned to light it from the ground up. Mr. Chadwick said the sign will be internally illuminated. Ms. Morse noted that design requirements of 303.3 (5) (9) say that there will be no interior illumination of HDC signs. Ms. Smoyer stated that it was originally going to be externally lit; Ms. Morse agreed. Ms. Morse re-iterated Mr. Chadwick’s comment on the internally illuminated sign; she stated that it was not allowed, so that would be a “no”. Ordinance requirements were read to provide the feedback that the applicant was looking for; illumination only by steady, stationary shielded light sources.

Ms. Morse asked how this applied to signage as the entire proposal was huge; she said a free-standing sign could have signage on both sides; she said it wasn’t just the sign, it was a giant box and if the whole thing is considered a sign then it is way too big. Mr. Coppelman read from 303-3, Definitions, the frame is included in the sign dimensions but not the structural supports. Ms. Morse read dimensions as noted on the proposal; it appeared that the sign was, at a minimum, 25 square feet which was too big by one square foot. Ms. Morse and Ms. Smoyer both commented that it was really ugly; she stated that all they did was add a top to it; Mr. Korn agreed. Ms. Morse clarified that she had provided them with multiple copies of signs that had been approved to give them an idea along with copies of the regulations. There was discussion of “branding”; the economics of using an existing sign lay-out. Mr. Coppelman noted that the cost of changing the sign to better comply with the Historic District was “small potatoes” for a

project of this nature. Ms. Morse agreed. Ms. Coppelman stated that had the building been closer to Main Street, he would have been adamant about some of the design features but since it is set way back, he said some of it was okay. He continued that the first thing people see coming into the District is going to be that sign and it needs to blend in with the historic nature of the district that it is in; he guessed that they hadn't probably built in historic districts up to this point and he thinks this point needs to be driven home again as it was already mentioned at the public hearing. Ms. Prescott said that they had also said there would be another sign closer to the entrance and perhaps that could be included in the application. Mr. Coppelman said directional signs were allowed. Ms. Prescott questioned as to whether they were going to have another sign in front of the building as well. Ms. Morse said they were moving the one on Rte. 125 to around the corner on Main Street but not putting up both; there would also be an "entrance" sign. Mr. Coppelman said they can only have one free-standing sign, regardless, per the ordinance so they have to choose a location. Ms. Morse said that one of their arguments regarding blending in to the district is that they don't have to advertise it a lot for customers to come in like you would for a retail facility; anyone visiting a resident doesn't need the "branding" sign like a retail facility might need for customers to find it.

Mr. Coppelman read on 303-7; 303.3 (C)8 – "directional signs at driveway location containing no advertising material, not exceeding 5 sq. ft. and not extending higher than 7 ft. above the ground are permitted." He said that he believes the proposed sign had the logo on it which is advertising and the ordinance is specific.

Ms. Smoyer said that she can envision other more appropriate designs. Mr. Coppelman said the historic signs outside Clark's Garage with the sign built into it might be more appropriate. Ms. Morse had a picture of the sign in Londonderry. Ms. Smoyer said that they should create a sign that they want using the Town's guidelines; they can be "meshed" together to work.

Ms. Morse said the feedback, by Commission consensus, is to try again and reference the Historic District requirements, the samples that were given them for guidance; the sign is too big as presented; internally lit is not permissible. Mr. Coppelman suggested they check the Ordinance references the Commission reviewed during this discussion; he added 102.6 (A) re: goals and standards under the Historic District Sign Ordinance. He noted 4 things listed specifically including that the visual impact of all signs shall be consistent with the historical and architectural qualities of the HD as a whole; to promote the general visual attractiveness of the HD; to encourage signs with names of businesses, business owners or proprietors rather than trademarks and product names and to follow all other goals and standards consistent with RSA 31:89 (F). Mr. Coppelman suggested checking out that RSA. Mr. Coppelman said that complying with the goals and standards was more important than checking out the square footage and other details; he stated that this provides the general guidance. Ms. Morse will give them this feedback. She restated that this is the gateway to the Historic District and it should be appropriate for that.

MM&S to adjourn at 8:50. (Motion by Ms. Prescott, second by Ms. Smoyer) **PUNA**