

Exeter Historic District Commission  
Final Minutes  
March 20, 2014

Call meeting to Order: Chairwoman Pam Gjettum called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm in the Nowak Room of the Exeter Town Office Building.

Members present: Julie Gilman, Selectwoman, Pam Gjettum, Chairwoman, Len Benjamin, Patrick Gordon, Fred Kollmorgen, Vice Chairman, and Pete Cameron

Al Lampert – Property Owner, Tom House – Architect.

First business is back to Al's Garage. Tom passed out copies of his changes to the design that came about from the work session and a letter from Nicole. Patrick asked Al, have you contacted any one of the five Preservation Contractors that were recommended by the board. Al answered no. Tom redid the elevations and kept the same window openings. Over the entry, took out the brick and put the wood in. Upper levels will be kept with the wood clapboards. Garage door will be taken out, an opening put in and that would be the same wood panel. The roof is architectural shingles with a 9/12 pitch.

Clifford Street elevation will be same character as the other building. The upper level will be kept with the wood siding that was talked about. Julie asked if the flat part was in the middle of the roof and Tom stated that it was. He then stated that all the mechanics would be hidden. Patrick then asked Tom if he had a roof plan, which he did not. On the right of way elevation, just took the vocabulary from the other two buildings and walked it around to the back and were able to maintain the large windows, like the ones on Franklin Street. Tower on the right is just a recessed opening, just to keep rhythm of the larger windows along the first floor.

Patrick asked about the roof pitch. It is not going to be 45 because the pitches are not the same. Tom stated that if he made it 45, Clifford Street would be up higher. Fred asked if the double windows were going to be trim and not siding. Tom stated they would be just trim.

Tom stated that the apartment entry elevation is similar to the Clifford side. Patrick stated he is having a hard time reading the roof plans without a roof plan. Pam asked if there would be a flat section on the roof surrounded by gables, or drop offs. Tom stated that was correct. Fred then asked how the water would get off the roof and Tom stated roof drains. Patrick stated that a roof plan would help and Tom sketched a roof plan for the commission. Patrick stated that he was concerned about the roof over the apartment entry. It is a single pitch all the way up to the ridge, so it will be draining all of that roof area plus both gables on both ends. Tom will put drains in. Patrick stated that the towers on the Franklin Street side were a different pitch and Tom agreed that they were.

Fred mentioned again his concern about the water flow and having some sort of cricket or gutter. Tom stated there will be a gutter at Clifford Street and at the apartment entrance. Patrick concerned about snow building up on the apartment entry roof crickets. Tom agrees and will look into it. Fred once again mentions his concern about water coming down. Perhaps heat tape will help or maybe very large down spouts.

Pam mentioned that when the new library was built, the architect talked the commission into putting a flat roof in the middle, and that was a terrible mistake. Pam stated that it was a well of water that kept leaking down. Again, Fred mentions that the apartment elevation and the Clifford elevation does not show how the water will get down and Tom should show how he is planning on getting the water down the drains.

Patrick asked about the roof pitch the 11/12 or 12 over 11. Was Tom doing this to maximize the height in order to get apartments or a loft. To maximize what can be done within the 35 foot height limit. Tom stated that it was partially yes and because of the towers. Patrick stated that the roof massing is not working. Patrick not sure if this is because they are trying to maximize the height of 35 feet. He then asked how many apartments were going to be in there. Tom stated that the plan was four and there would be three or four and three of four on the second floor because of the interior brick. The original application was for four apartments. Tom stated that when they put the brick wall in there, it is creating two levels. It was fine to have a two level entry if there was going to be a restaurant, but when you get beyond the wall that you want to keep, now there are two stories and the second floor is not really doing anything. In the work session, it was discussed that by keeping the walls inside, one of the four apartments would have a reduced floor plan. There was no mention of additional apartments or height being added. Otherwise, it is just a waste of space. Patrick stated that the commission does not have a floor plan to show where those apartments are. Patrick then stated that Franklin Street is turning into a three story building. Pam stated that they were now getting four more apartments. Fred mentioned that this is driven by keeping the walls.

Tom stated that if he took down the interior walls, he could go back to the original design and only have four apartments. Julie asked Tom if he got a copy of Nicole's letter, which he did. Pam stated that Nichole could not be at meeting, but she did submit a letter and she then read some of it.

Al Lampert spoke and said that the height of the design is driven by maintaining the walls. The walls that the commission want to say, drove the height up. We cannot have eight units because we cannot justify the parking. We can only have four units above and even with that, we have to ask the town for some relief. I spoke to the Planning Department and they said by driving this building up because of the walls, we put ourselves in the position that we need multiple requests from the Zoning Board of Adjustments or relief from the Planning Board because we go way over for parking. That lot has no parking and if you put in eight apartments, that is sixteen spots, plus guests. Also, the commercial space on the bottom floor. With four apartments and commercial space, it just makes it with some relief. Mr. Lampert suggested they go back to Jewett's Construction's letter. It is not commercially feasible what you want us to do. The range of additional costs without any issues is between \$150,000 and \$171,000 baseline. We still have not dug holes to find out what is under there. Mr. Lampert is asking for commission to vote on whether or not to save the walls. We have done everything you have asked. At this point, we are at a standoff because it is not going to work. The cost involved and it is only the basic, is not going to work. If we can go back to the original design, it will bring the height down to where you want it. Mr. Lampert once again stated that it is not commercially feasible to do what they want.

Len wanted to know what Mr. Lampert would estimate in ball park figures, what the building would cost or how much would be involved. Mr. Lampert stated that this whole cost keeps changing. To build a building now like that, probably \$200 a square foot and this is without anything else. Also, the cost of redoing the parking lot. Patrick stated that on the floor plan now the building is approximately 60 x 70, 12,600 feet, which equals about a \$2.5 million dollar building. \$171,000 to save those walls is 6% of that. 10% of that amount would have been \$252,000, which far exceeds the \$171,000 at the high end of their range. Mr. Lampert stated it is not the total cost. Have not even included the parking lot that we need to support this and we don't want to go that big inside. We want to be smaller on the inside, but we can't be smaller and have less costs because of the walls. I don't want three floors. I want four apartments with commercial because that is all we can get in there. Patrick stated that there is not a construction budget to know what it would be. Pam stated that the commission does not do any dollars.

Len asked Mr. Lampert if this project was still feasible because of the cost. Mr. Lampert stated that it does not work for us because trying to create a building to fit the walls is too big and we don't need a building that big. The interior walls changed the whole thing. We are still dealing with unknowns. Tom is on his fourth design. The first design we had, we thought was going to work. Len wanted to know if the interior walls make the difference, and they do.

Tom read # 5 on the Jewett Construction letter which talks about costs to the Town of Exeter. Julie responded to #5 stating that there will be no cost to the town. Responsibility of blocking off sideways, etc. is up to the builders.

Len asked about the preservation of the three walls. The building would be a three story, which would be eight apartments, but Mr. Lampert cannot have this because of the parking situation. Tom stated they originally went for a four unit because that seemed to work out with merging the parking in the back. Len asked if they build a three story building, will they be able to get sufficient parking and both Mr. Lampert and Tom said no. They want to go back to the original plan. We are trying to make four units that will appeal to the people. Getting rid of the walls will bring it down to a shorter height.

Pam stated that Mr. Lampert and Tom do not want the commission to pass their design because they want to go back to the original one and only have four apartments. Mr. Lampert stated that going back to the original plan means not keeping the interior walls. It will not work. Bottom line is revenue.

Fred stated that he thinks the architect will take some of the good ideas that were brought out and incorporate them into the plan. Patrick stated that if the building is being brought down to a 2 ½ story building, it should be the same height as the other buildings beside it. Pam wants them to make the building fit the area and does not want anything that is going to stand out.

Commission is asking Mr. Lampert and Tom for an outline to put into context. Also, a floor plan, list of all exterior materials and colors, outline of buildings – site sections, roof plan, and where condensing units going. These will be brought to the next meeting.

Pete recommended that all of this should be written down instead of verbal. Commission spends a lot of time trying to remember what they said and didn't say. Thinks it should be written on letterhead. Commission not voting on anything tonight.

Julie asked the board what they thought about the roof being flat. Pam is a little leary. Patrick is ok with it. Patrick added that one more thing be added to Tom's list and it is window details. Tom asked that when they come back, they are coming back without the interior walls and the answer was yes.

#### New Business:

Stephen Kaneb bought The Loaf and Laddle in December. Has an application to add onto the left side of the building. He passed out pictures to the commission. Proposing to put sloped roof, gable end. Below that, realign door and windows. Also, fix the chimney. Patrick thanked Stephen for showing pictures with context. Julie thinks it is a good idea. Len agrees as well. Fred asked about the alleyway. There is a big piece of hardware there. Stephen will look into it and try to unexposed it. If second story is added, it opens up opportunities to change some things that maybe could not have been done before.

Patrick stated that the windows should be kept in character. Patrick stated that aluminum cladding, all wood and fiberglass have been approved for windows. Fred would like to see fiberglass shutters, especially on the riverside. Wood will be used on the outside of the first floor. Second floor, maybe something different. Julie stated that it is an addition and not the original building. Fred would like to see samples of the windows. Second floor will be residential.

Julie passed out a list of books she will be ordering for the Heritage Commission. Wanted the commissions input about using them. Pam pointed out that some of the books are available in the public library.

Motion to approve minutes from February 20, 2014 meeting by Fred with amended changes, seconded by Patrick. All in agreement and minutes approved.

With no further business, meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Herrick  
Recording Secretary