

Minutes Approved at November 17 Meeting

Exeter Historic District Commission

**Nowak Room Exeter Town Office Building
October 20, 2011**

Members present: *Nicole Martineau, Ron Schutz, Fred Kollmorgen, Planning Board rep. Peter Cameron and Chairwoman Pam Gjetnum*

Call Meeting to Order

Chairwoman Pam Gjetnum called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm in the Nowak Room,

New Business: Public Hearings

The application of Donald N. Story for replacement of windows in the structure located at 5 Rocky Hill. The subject property is located in the R-2 Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #71-61. Case #11-20

Ms. Corinne Carignan presented the application on behalf of Mr. Story stating the applicant wishes to replace 9 windows in his 2-story classic colonial home constructed in 1959. The windows being considered for replacement are in a state of disrepair and can no longer be maintained by the applicant. The replacement windows would be double hung 6 over 6 vinyl windows with the muntins between the two panes of glass. The windows to be replaced are located on the back, sides of home and garage; the windows in the front are to remain. When queried, it was determined the exterior casing would be vinyl. Mr. Schutz stated his preference would be for a wood casing as opposed to vinyl and with simulated muntins on the exterior so as to not see an even reflection on the glass on the outside. Ms. Martineau added they were looking for simulated divided lights which look like individual panes of glass and the product being considered does not have that feature. Ms. Gjetnum re-iterated the house was constructed in 1959. And Ms. Carignan added the house is on the edge of the historic district

With the application on the table the Chair asked the members to decide if the windows are acceptable under the Commission's ordinances. Mr. Kollmorgen moved to accept the application; seconded by Mr. Cameron. Motion carried.

With application accepted further discussion was sought pending a motion of approval. Ms. Schutz reiterated it was not what he was looking for: windows were not wood nor did they have simulated muntins on the exterior but did concede it was not an older historic home.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to approve application; seconded by Mr. Cameron. The Chair asked for public comment; there being none the members proceeded to vote. Mr. Kollmorgen and Mr. Cameron voted in favor. Ms. Martineau and Mr. Schutz abstained. Ms. Gjetnum cast an affirmative vote. Motion carried.

The application of Susan Gorman for additional (new) signage to be added to an existing sign located on the property of 28 Front Street. The subject property is located in the C-1, Central Area Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #72-46. Case #11-21

Ms. Gorman stated she will be sharing an office with Mandeville Canyon Designs at 28 Court St. Her office will be in the rear with the entrance walkway on the west side of building. Because the marquee at 28 Front St. is full she wishes to attach her 18" x 18" sign to an existing bracket on the property that displays a 12" x 18" sign for The Ironwood Design group. Ms. Gorman had a mock up of her sign design

Minutes Approved at November 17 Meeting

but not to scale. The bracket/sign is to the left of the walkway and the sign will fit flush with the existing Ironwood sign. The existing lighting will be used; no additional lighting will be added. As to construction material of sign it was determined it was to be of composite material. After review and discussion of the Town Ordinances on what size signage was permitted at that address, it was determined the proposed sign even when combined with the dimensions of the existing sign was within the permitted 6 sq ft. Mr. Schutz moved to accept the application; seconded by Mr. Kollmorgen. Motion carried.

Further discussion confirmed the bracket has been in place for some time displaying the various businesses signs of former occupants; this is only a new addition onto the bracket. The signage area of both signs is within the 6 sq. ft permitted per Town Ordinance 5.7.8A 3.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to approve the application; seconded by Mr. Schutz. With no further discussion the motion carried.

The application of Glenda Engelbach (d/b/a/ G. Skin Therapy) for new signage to be located on the structure at 1 Court Street (a/k/a 24 Front Street. The subject property is located in the C-1 Central Area Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #72-159. Case #11-23

Ms. Engelbach stated her application is for signage to be located on the southeast corner of 24 Front Street at the lower level. The sign will be attached with a metal bracket to the brick facade. Entry to the establishment is from the Court St. parking lot associated with the building. She added it complies with the requirement that the bottom of the sign be 8 ft. from the ground. The dimensions of the bracket-arm were not available but it would be sufficient to accommodate the double-sided sign. It is to be constructed of a wood composite material (MBF). In referring to the Ordinances it was determined it was a commercial directional sign. Mr. Kollmorgen moved to accept the application; seconded by Mr. Schutz. Motion carried.

In further discussion of the application and responding to the question of lighting, Ms. Engelbach wished it to be illuminated and did state it in the application but did not plan on doing the lighting at this time. She was reminded she would need to return to HDC when she wished to add the lighting with specifics.

Mr. Kollmorgen made the motion to approve the application for the signage but without the lighting. Mr. Schutz seconded. Motion carried.

The application of Ray and Susanne Wenninger for the proposed construction of an additional driveway on the property located at 2 Hall Place. The subject property is located in the R-3, Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #72-46. Case #11-22

Atty. Sharon Somers of Donahue Tucker and Ciandella representing the Wenningers started the presentation stating her clients purchased the 4-unit dwelling in 1988. With a map orienting the members to the site Atty. Somers outlined the present site conditions noting the long driveway accommodating three cars. Until recently arrangements with the Grange permitted additional parking spaces for the tenants. With the conversion of that building to housing units, Mr. Wenninger had a need to find/create an additional parking to keep his units marketable. The applicant feels the design/application being presented is the best possible solution for the need. Before turning presentation over to Mr. Wenninger, Atty. Somers summarized the items members should consider in reviewing the application. Using a colored rendering of the house/property it was noted the large birch tree would be retained, the design retains the symmetry of the front lawn, the entrance would be from Hall St. and the parking would only be visible from Hall St. Although portions of the stone wall would be removed it does retain its residential quality. Lot coverage would not stand out in comparison with other properties along Hall St. Dept. of Public Works has visited the site and found no stormwater issues as a result of the proposed

Minutes Approved at November 17 Meeting

location of the driveway. The Building Inspector, Doug Eastman, was consulted and did not have issues with the proposed plan.

Mr. Wenninger resumed with construction specifics. Unfortunately most of the available land is in the front and this design seemed to be least obtrusive and minimize the impact the view of a parking area from Pleasant St. The land in front of dwelling would be excavated down 1 ½ - 2 ft to sidewalk level near the house, down 6" near Pleasant St and then construct a foot high berm on which mature (3-4 ft.) plantings would be placed to shield the view of the parking area and vehicles. The portion of the wall removed from the Hall St. side/entrance would be relocated to the rear. Ms. Martineau spoke to the slope of the lot and would a retaining wall be required. The applicant replied it would just be re-graded. And to the number of cars, the 500 sq. ft. driveway in front accommodates two (2) cars and the driveway in the rear three (3) cars; space is needed for snow removal. Mr. Kollmorgen asked if attention was given to ZO regulating density and dimensional regulations: percent of lot coverage with house and parking areas. He had not but felt it was in compliance when viewing surrounding properties. Mr. Eastman had visited the site and had not addressed that issue. Mr. Kollmorgen moved to accept the application: seconded by Ms. Martineau. Motion carried.

Mr. Kollmorgen asked the details of the excavation be reviewed. Mr. Wenninger complied walking through the specifics. Mr. Schutz empathized with the need of parking but considering the nature of house and location he would like to speak against this application. In his opinion it does take away from the symmetry of the property—removing one-half of the front lawn. He felt it was the role of the Commission to preserve the Historic District and this is not an elegant solution to the (parking) problem. Atty. Somers countered it has been used as a multi unit family dwelling for many years and was such when purchased by her clients. With the Grange building no longer available for use, Mr. Wenninger explored many options and it was certainly in his best interest to find a less costly option but this plan seems to provide the best solution. Yes, it may be obtrusive from Hall St—a narrow street of all driveways but not inconsistent with Hall St. streetscape. And from Pleasant St., the large birch tree is preserved and the mature plantings on the berm will carry the visual line to the plantings in the rear.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to approve: Mr. Cameron seconded. Motion carried. In calling for a vote Mr. Kollmorgen, Mr. Cameron and Ms. Martineau voted in the affirmative: Mr. Schutz opposed.

Other Business:

The minutes for the July 21 and August 18 meeting were not available to all the members. Mr. Kollmorgen moved to accept the minutes of the September 15 meeting: Ms. Martineau seconded. Mr. Schutz and Mr. Cameron abstained as they were not present. Motion carried.

Mr. Schutz remarked on his observation of a large rental sign at 24 Front St. Although the ordinance permits a temporary sign noting availability of units, this sign has in its construction details a sense of permanency and not temporary. He suggested the Code Enforcement Officer view the sign and determine if it falls within the sign ordinances for that location.

Adjournment—at 7:55 pm Mr. Schutz moved to adjourn. Mr. Cameron seconded. Vote: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted,

Ginny Raub
Recording Secretary