

TOWN OF KINGSTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Thursday, October 9, 2018
Public Meeting

Members Present:

Virginia Morse, Chair
Susan Prescott, Vice Chair
Glenn Coppelman, Planning Board representative
Madelynn Ouellette
Nancy Pratt
Stanley Shalett

Absent: George Korn
Stacy Smoyer

Other Attendees: Renee Carlisle
Denis and Debbie Couture
Reese Morabito
Alfred Rousseau

Ms. Morse called the meeting to order.

Town Board Updates:

HDC: *Acceptance of Minutes:* Ms. Morse asked for omissions, additions, and/or corrections to the transcribed Minutes of the meeting held on September 13, 2018. Ms. Prescott made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Ouellette seconded this. All in favor, none opposed. Mr. Coppelman abstained as he was not present at the meeting.

Critical Correspondence: Ms. Morse stated that Robert Steward, the building inspector, came across a book of the history and care of houses in Medford, MA. It has good detail and descriptions and can be a resource to the town of Kingston. There is a particular section describing the renovation of homes that is of interest to the Board.

Planning Board and CIP: Mr. Coppelman stated there is no item of note from the Planning Board. With regard to the Capital Improvement Committee, members had their first meeting, and the second meeting is on Monday, 10/15/18, to review the department submittals. Ms. Morse confirmed there were no submittals on behalf of the HDC.

Ms. Morse mentioned that after HDC approval, George Chadwick of the All American Assisted Living project had many items to discuss with the Planning Board. Thus, their HDC approval is approaching expiration without the project being completed. Ms. Morse contacted Ms. Faulconer and George Chadwick and set the new date for the obtained approvals as April 2020. Mr. Coppelman requested clarification that this is in lieu of requiring an extension to the application, and Ms. Morse concurred.

Heritage Commission: Ms. Prescott attended the recent meeting and has no update of interest to the HDC. One item that may be of note is that there is the option of having up to 2 individuals with a focus on the Humanities give a presentation; this is allowed by the town per a one-year period. The Heritage Commission may take advantage of this option. Mr. Coppelman explained that the NH Humanities Council has a series of people that speak to various towns/libraries, and a request can be made to arrange for one of these speeches. Ms. Morse asked if a listing was available, and Mr. Coppelman confirmed that one can be found on the NH Humanities Council website.

ZBA: Ms. Pratt's proposed plan was scheduled to be heard at the next ZBA meeting, but she may postpone it due to the requested septic work.

Reese Morabito, 115 Main Street

Request to Extend HD1 Zone for New Home Business

Mr. Morabito is requesting a rezoning of his home to the Historic District. He is one house away and is looking to open up a small antique/furniture store and hopes to turn his garage into a little store.

Ms. Morse explained that HD1 ends at the house next door to Mr. Morabito's, and his house is zoned Single Family Residential. In Single Family Residential, a home business is not allowed. Mr. Coppelman clarified that residential home occupation is allowed, but a commercial business requiring a site plan review is not. Mr. Coppelman pointed Mr. Morabito to the Ordinances. If the business is hidden from view with discrete signage and operated by the resident of the property, it is considered residential home occupation and does not require a permit. Mr. Morabito stated this is his intent, and Mr. Coppelman gave him direction as to where to look for the relevant Ordinances.

Ms. Morse asked if Mr. Morabito was hoping to sell these antiques or crafts from his home, and he stated this is his intent and intends to keep the business small with little auto traffic. The only construction that may be done is to change the garage door to a barn door.

Ms. Morse asked Mr. Coppelman if a home occupation allows for the sale of goods in one's home. She explained to Mr. Morabito that to extend the District would require either a warrant article for a zoning change with a petition from the HDC or a resident with 25 signatures of registered voting members of the town.

Ms. Pratt asked Mr. Morabito if it is his intent to attempt to extend the District to include his home. Mr. Morabito explained that his wife contacted Town Hall regarding this and was told they had to be part of the Historic District to sell out of the home. He then spoke with Glenn Greenwood who directed him to either the Planning Board or pursue the petition option but suggested the Planning Board would be the preferred course of action. Mr. Morabito then contacted Ellen Faulconer who suggested that he come here.

Mr. Coppelman directed Mr. Morabito to Article 207 in the Zoning Ordinances. He also explained that extending the District to accommodate one's home can be difficult as it is

to the benefit of only one property and can be scrutinized. Ms. Pratt asked what would be an appropriate reason to extend the District. Mr. Coppelman explained that this could occur in the case of a home significant to the town or region that got missed during districting. Mr. Morabito said his home was built in 1850 and is an old farmhouse with a barn.

Ms. Prescott asked Mr. Coppelman if Mr. Morabito could ask for a variance in the event that his proposed business is not allowed in the Ordinances, and Mr. Coppelman stated this is the case. Mr. Coppelman then directed Mr. Morabito to the ZBA if this is desired.

Mr. Morabito stated he will review Article 207 and thanked the Board for their time and direction.

Denis and Debbie Couture, Couture Eclectic, 167 Main Street
Signage and Lighting at Business

Ms. Morse passed out copies of the sign Ordinances to the Board members.

Ms. Morse explained that in her previous discussion with the Coutures, it was explained that the current sign is only temporary. Ms. Couture stated that work is being done to make the necessary custom framework to have the permanent sign installed.

Ms. Morse explained that the Approval was for a sign to be installed a little above and a little below the fascia. Ms. Couture stated this is still the intent.

Ms. Morse asked what material the sign will be made out of. Ms. Couture stated it will be vinyl on plywood. A second sign had to be ordered since it could not be installed the way it was intended to be. Ms. Morse reiterated that the temporary sign is unacceptable. She noted that the fascia on that particular property is difficult to work with and asked where specifically the Coutures intend to install their sign. Ms. Couture stated this is why they obtained a professional to come in and make custom brackets for the sign. Mr. Couture stated they also have been working with the Planning Board regarding this issue. Ms. Couture stated they were not aware of how difficult the sign installation would be.

Mr. Couture explained that the signage plan has not changed, and the current sign is only temporary.

Ms. Morse asked how the sign will be held onto the brackets, and Mr. Couture stated it will be on plywood. Per Mr. Couture, the dimension of the sign is 2.5 x 6. Ms. Prescott asked how the sign will be attached to the plywood, and Mr. Couture explained it will be trimmed out to the plywood.

Ms. Morse asked Mr. Couture to physically mark a picture of the storefront to show exactly where the permanent sign will be installed.

Ms. Morse now asked the Coutures to hold up the sign they brought to the meeting. Ms. Prescott stated that it is not 6 x 2.5 feet. Mr. Couture stated he did not have a tape

measure to measure it and ordered a sign that is 6 x 2.5 feet, but multiple members of the Board concurred that it is not that dimension and is different than what was approved. Ms. Morse also noted that the sign the Coutures brought in does not match the picture of the sign provided to the Board at the time of approval. Ms. Couture believed she may have taken the wrong sign to the meeting and confirmed that the permanent sign will be 2 x 6 feet.

Ms. Morse now asked the Coutures about differences in font and some added text between the approved sign and the new one. Ms. Morse attempted to confirm if the permanent sign will reflect the font change and the added text; Ms. Couture stated that the permanent sign will indeed include the font change but will not include the text. Ms. Morse went into detail regarding what the permanent sign will look like:

- Size will be 6 x 2.5 feet
- “Couture Eclectic” with plain font with Serif, footer on top and bottom of letters
- “Artisans Collective and Decor” on one line in plain font
- No text regarding a classroom
- “Main Street”

She stated if the Coutures would like to change the design or content of the sign, they would need to reapply for approval. Mrs. Couture requested that the picture of the sign already provided to the Board be considered the final design for the permanent sign without any changes.

Ms. Prescott asked about the trim around the sign. Mr. Couture stated it will be white PVC trim with no painting necessary. It will be plain 1 x 1 stock.

Mr. Shalett asked if the picture would be included in the sign, and Mr. Couture stated it will be.

Ms. Morse now discussed the issue of lighting. She asked if lighting would be added, and Mr. Couture stated he would like lighting from above the sign, which has already been approved. Ms. Morse now explained that they cannot use lighting to outline anything around the window or use backlighting or mini-lights around the column. She noted that the Coutures have removed the urn that had a flag and lights in it, but she reiterated that there cannot be lights that remain on. Mr. Coppelman explained that there are specific lighting ordinances and directed the Coutures to Ordinances section 303.3 Sign Requirements, C.4. Regarding the sign’s overhead lighting and the hours that the sign can be lit, he directed the Coutures to section 303.3, C.6. Mrs. Couture now asked if seasonal lights are permitted, and Ms. Ouellette stated that something like Christmas lights or other holiday lights would be fine, but if she is asking about illumination for the whole porch, that is a different issue.

Ms. Morse clarified that an “open” sign or a sign displaying a class can come in and out of the window but cannot be permanent signage. Ms. Prescott asked about window signage, and Ms. Morse explained to the Coutures that only 10% of window space can be used for signage. She mentioned that in the past, there was a window sign with a woman’s image on it, an image similar to what has been approved for the permanent sign for the store, but the Coutures have since removed it. She explained that a sign such as this cannot remain in the store’s window.

Ms. Morse confirmed that the Coutures have her phone number and offered guidance whenever necessary.

Ms. Ouellette asked if approval was needed for the light fixtures. Ms. Morse stated that overhead fixtures were approved, but the specific design was not requested of the Coutures. Mr. Couture stated the lights have not been chosen yet.

Alfred Rousseau, 182 Main Street

Roof Repair, Replacement of Windows and Siding

Ms. Morse stated a formal application has been received from Mr. Rousseau and that she already discussed the project with Mr. Rousseau.

Mr. Rousseau explained that the roof on the house is currently being repaired with slate and copper trim, utilizing slate from the roof of an attached small barn. He is requesting approval to re shingle the small barn with asphalt shingles of a similar color. He would like to replace the windows with original trim and corners to retain the historic character of the home, so Mr. Rousseau suggested using replacement windows (6-over-6) and maintaining the original trim and corners. A decision has not been made as to whether the siding will be restored and repainted or changed to vinyl.

Ms. Morse explained that the property has a shed or small barn attached to the back of the house that cannot be seen from the road or the side. It has a slate roof, so the slate from that roof is being used to repair the roof on the house; this is considered maintenance and does not require Board approval. Copper trim will be installed. However, Mr. Rousseau needs approval to replace the slate on the shed part with asphalt instead. She reiterated that it is a small roof and not visible from the street. His intention is to put asphalt shingles with the color matching as closely as possible the color of the existing slate, a dark gray-black color. He also wants to do a window change, and a decision has yet to be made about siding. Ms. Morse suggested that sequenced approvals can be provided to give him more time to make a decision regarding the windows and siding. Regarding existing windows on the home, there is currently 6-over-6 in some places and 2-over-1 in other places; also, the existing windows do not match. Mr. Coppelman asked about the year it was built, and Mr. Rousseau stated it was built in 1845, the same year as Mr. Coppelman's home, and is a Greek Revival style home. Mr. Coppelman asked if Mr. Rousseau knew what the windows originally were, and he stated he believes the majority of them were 6-over-6 but was not sure. When the work is done, Mr. Rousseau plans to make them all the same and symmetrical.

Mr. Rousseau also explained that he has 2 attic windows that are falling out, and with the new vented copper top on the ridge, those 2 windows are no longer needed; he is hoping to remove those. On the right side of the home, there is a window in an existing closet and a window where he wants to install a closet which are to be removed, and in the front of the home, there are 2 windows that do not match the others (are asymmetrical). Ms. Morse passed around an old picture of the house to the Board members, but it is difficult to tell what the design of the windows is, and in any event, the picture is from the 1980s and may not reflect the original appearance of the house when it was built. Ms. Morse asked Mr. Rousseau to approach the Board and physically point out on the picture of the house which windows he would like to remove. All Board members present reviewed the picture with Mr. Rousseau.

Ms. Prescott asked if the existing windows match upstairs and downstairs, and Ms. Morse stated they do not.

Mr. Coppelman and Ms. Prescott also noted that the attic windows on the ridge serve as a design element, not just ventilation, and Mr. Rousseau suggested he can add some sort of element, a square vent or a triangle for example, to give it some character rather than just cover the area with clapboard. Ms. Ouellette offered that the attic window could be replaced with a small fixed window rather than a vent or trim work.

Ms. Morse noted that the 2 front windows proposed to be removed are the same distance apart from the rest of the windows, so they are not asymmetric from that standpoint and would warrant further discussion.

Ms. Morse explained that the house is not in good repair; it was rented after the owner passed away. The greenery is also trapping moisture around the house. She is pleased that Mr. Rousseau is restoring the home and considering its historic appearance and character.

Ms. Morse explained the HDC can provide approval for the installation of asphalt shingles on the small barn. Mr. Rousseau will need to make his final decisions regarding windows and siding and will need to provide written specifics to the Board for their approval. She reiterated that he must perform the work as approved by the Board without changes. He was encouraged to get samples and bring them to the meeting.

Ms. Morse asked if any Board members for any feedback regarding the proposed removal of windows. Ms. Pratt shared that he has a good purpose for removal of these windows, and their removal will improve the symmetry of the house. Ms. Ouellette expressed concern about the windows in the attic, and Ms. Prescott agreed. Ms. Prescott encouraged Mr. Rousseau to look at pictures of historic houses for guidance as well. Ms. Morse pointed him toward the resource room at the library for pictures of historic homes in town. She expressed concern about the windows perpendicular to the road (the closet windows) and is looking forward to the final plan to see what he intends to do.

MOTION: Ms. Ouellette made a motion to approve the installation of asphalt shingles on the roof of the small attached barn located in the back of the house and for the main roof to be repaired with slate removed from this small barn. Ms. Morse added the color of the asphalt shingles must match as closely as possible the existing slate. Ms. Pratt seconded this motion.

Members in favor: 6.

Members opposed: None.

Members abstained: None.

Members recused: None.

Renee Carlisle, 8 Bartlett Street

Demolition, Building Replacement

Renee Carlisle now approached the Board after submitting a formal application. She had a dilapidated small garage that needed to be demolished and would like to rebuild the structure with a design that matches the historic character of her home. The submitted application was for the demolishment of the structure, not rebuilding it.

After discussing this project with Ms. Morse prior to this meeting, she was directed to the building inspector due to the severely deteriorated condition of the garage. It was deemed a hazard by the building inspector and has since been demolished.

She is requesting guidance on rebuilding the structure but does not have any specific plans at this time.

Ms. Morse explained she had conversations with Ms. Carlisle regarding approval for demolition of the structure, and she got pictures of what the garage looked like. The application was for demolishing the garage, but the plans for rebuilding it are not in place at this point.

Ms. Carlisle explained that she is soon to be divorced from her husband, Jeremy Carlisle, but he is assisting in the process due to this recent change. As such, he talked with the building inspector, who then approved the demolition as the structure was considered dangerous. Ms. Morse explained that if the structure is considered dangerous, the inspector is allowed to approve removal.

Mr. Coppelman had questions regarding rebuilding the structure. Ms. Carlisle explained that she intends to rebuild the garage in the same footprint (12 x 18). She would like the style to reflect that of her home as the demolished garage was added after the house was built and had a different style.

Ms. Morse explained that when the plan for rebuilding is submitted, consideration must be made of all setbacks from property lines, and specific details of the style, trim, clapboard, siding, and roof must be provided. The Board will need pictures or drawings of the house as well as those for the new structure with specific details so the Board can ensure they match. Mr. Coppelman stated it would be helpful if an artistic rendering is provided. Ms. Morse encouraged her to look at pictures of similar-aged houses. Ms.

Carlisle stated that the house was built in 1825 and used to be a general store, and her intent is to restore it with historic details.

Ms. Carlisle is planning to rebuild this by 2020, within the next year and a half. Mr. Coppelman explained that a Certificate of Approval lasts for 2 years and that she would require an extension if she goes beyond that timeframe.

Mr. Coppelman stated that if any electricity or other updates are planned be added, it will require special approval and would need to be noted on the application. Ms. Carlisle did not intend this to be the case but will consider that if needed.

New Business: Discussion of Fencing for New Outdoor Patio, Rick's Food and Spirits, 143 Main Street

Ms. Morse received an inquiry from Rick Korn about the fencing for the outdoor patio area. Rick Korn received his approval from the HDC for his outdoor seating area. He installed the pavers as approved, and they look nice. He had the upright posts for the fencing installed and requested that Ms. Morse visit and provide her opinion regarding installing a different fencing design that includes boards rather than a split-rail fence for the security and safety of patrons. Rick was concerned that the split-rail fence could be wobbly. Ms. Morse stated that when she visited his business, the upright posts are 4 x 4. He would like to install caps on the posts and fascia board across the top with a rail underneath. His vision is to retain the ability for patrons to view the Plains without an obstruction, and he had showed a picture to Ms. Morse of wire and chain fencing.

Regarding this issue, Ms. Ouellette did research on different options for fencing and had pictures on her phone. Ms. Morse and Ms. Ouellette looked at these pictures and preferred one with posts and chains. Mr. Coppelman concurred. The Board members agreed that the fencing on the picture sent by Rick looked too industrial for the District. Ms. Morse suggested possibly the installation of a top board with fascia for sturdiness but adding window boxes to soften the appearance. Ms. Ouellette liked this idea. Mr. Coppelman thought the posts with the chains may be easier to take down and store for the winter.

Ms. Prescott pondered about the source of Rick's security concerns regarding fencing, and Mr. Coppelman added that Rick already discussed adding signage to direct patrons upstairs to be seated outside, which should help with this.

Both Ms. Ouellette and Ms. Morse looked through the minutes from the meetings where Rick's project was discussed to see exactly was approved, and the approval detailed split-rail fencing. Ms. Ouellette suggested he should come back next month to request a change in fencing if needed.

Ms. Prescott shared she saw fencing in Exeter that has a top rail rest in a V-bracket that would make the rail easily removable. The usage of this bracket could work even though he already installed the 4 x 4 posts.

Ms. Ouellette asked if the posts would be painted, and Mr. Coppelman thought it was supposed to be left to weather. The approval does not specify if the fence should be painted and what color was intended. Ms. Prescott and Ms. Ouellette felt it would be better if it was painted so it can match. Ms. Pratt felt matching the colors would be appropriate.

Ms. Morse asked if the 4 x 4 was in compliance with the approval, which specified split rail. Many of the members agreed that it was not. Mr. Coppelman asked if the posts reflect the height specified in the Minutes, and Ms. Morse stated it appears that is the case.

In looking through his paperwork, Mr. Coppelman did find 2 exhibits that were previously provided by Rick, and these pictures show a split-rail fence.

Ms. Morse stated she will go back and discuss this with Rick, who can either make changes to what has been installed or come back to the Board to request approval of an amendment to the approved design.

Updating the District Sign Ordinances/Creation of Signage Guidelines

Ms. Morse stated that Ms. Ouellette and Ms. Pratt have been gathering pictures for review and reference. The Board is currently reviewing the proposed language created by Ms. Ouellette. Per Ms. Morse, no warrant article is necessary as this only involves the creation of signage guidelines rather than adding or amending the Ordinances.

Ms. Morse suggested that once building projects slow down, the Board will have more time to work on this project. The goal is to ensure the guidelines match the Ordinances, and if something needs to be changed/added to ordinances, it can be done next year. She suggested this could be discussed at the December meeting.

Ms. Prescott asked if the guidelines will be a packet of information, and Ms. Morse concurred.

Mr. Coppelman stated he wants to ensure the guidelines are not negating or saying something different than the Ordinances. He referred to Ordinances section 102.6, Kingston Historic District Sign Ordinance. This section talks about the goals and standards of signage in the District. In this section, the language is broad, so the proposed packet of guidelines will back up the Ordinances rather than interfere with them.

MM&S to adjourn at 9:02 PM. Ms. Prescott moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Coppelman seconded. All other members agreed.