

**TOWN OF BEDFORD
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
May 7, 2019**

A meeting of the Bedford Historic District Commission was held on Tuesday, May 7, 2019 at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH.

Present: Janet Tamulevich (Chair), Charles Fairman (Planning Board Liaison), Phil Greazzo (Town Council Alternate), Theresa Walker (regular member), Christopher Allen (regular member), Joe Vaccarello (alternate member), Mark Connors (Assistant Planning Director, Staff liaison)

Absent: Catherine Rombeau (Town Council), Judy Perry (Vice Chair), Steven MacDougall (alternate member),

I. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Acceptance of Agenda:

Chairwoman Tamulevich called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

MOTION by Mr. Vaccarello to accept the agenda for the May 7, 2019 meeting of the Historic District Commission. The motion was seconded by Ms. Walker. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

II. Old Business:

None

III. New Applications:

1. **Alan & Jean Peterson (Owners)** – Request to construct a 4-foot by 10-foot greenhouse addition to an existing woodshed at 64 North Amherst Road, Lot 20-84, Zoned R&A.

*Owner: Alan & Jean Peterson
Applicant: Alan Peterson
Proposal: Request to install a 3' x 10' greenhouse addition to an existing woodshed
Location: 64 North Amherst Road, Lot 20-84
Existing Zoning: "R&A" Residential & Agriculture
Surrounding Uses: Residential*

Background

The property at 64 North Amherst Road includes a residence and a large detached barn. According to the Town's assessing records, the home dates

back to 1770. Originally known as the John Riddle House, the home retains many of its historic details of a late 18th century cape, including a prominent center chimney.

Project Description:

The applicant proposes to add a 3-foot by 10-foot greenhouse addition to an existing woodshed located on the rear of the home. The greenhouse will be the same width as the woodshed and face internally to the property and away from North Amherst Road. The greenhouse roofline will follow the roof pitch of the woodshed and slope toward the ground. The greenhouse will stand 7-feet at its highest point and 57 inches at its lowest. The greenhouse addition will include a chiseled stone base.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval of the request. Although the greenhouse will be a more contemporary addition to a historic property, it is a modest change that will face away from the road and surrounding properties. It is also consistent with the property's long use for agricultural purposes.

Mr. Peterson explained to the Historic District Commission that he would like to take his over 200-year-old woodshed add a sash and build a sunroom where plants can grow and where he might smoke cigars in cold months. The windows of his home were replaced and he salvaged the old sash for use in the sunroom project. He will also be installing a manufactured stone wall. The sunroom will project about 4 feet out from the front of the woodshed and will have the same slope of the roof (a 48-inch slope) and sit on top of the manufactured wall. The wall will be above the 18-inch code requirements for tempered glass and such. The sunroom will be painted white and will match the white sash. He shared his own architectural drawings with the Commission.

There were no abutting neighbor comments.

Mr. Fairman asked if it would be used as a sunroom or a greenhouse and whether or not lights would be left on all night for growing and possibly disturb neighbors. Mr. Peterson stated the primary purpose would be to grow seedlings and there will be no bright lights used for growing. There will be one electrical outlet for a single light. Mrs. Peterson stated she would like to grow herbs and tomatoes in the sunroom.

Mr. Fairman pointed out that greenhouses have been in the historic district for a long time, and they are appropriate for the historic district. Ms. Walker commended the Petersons for repurposing the sash for this project.

MOTION by Ms. Walker that the Historic District Commission approve the request to construct a 3 foot by 10 foot greenhouse addition to an existing woodshed at 64 North Amherst Road, Lot 20-84, in accordance with the information provided by the applicant, Alan Peterson, because the applicant has demonstrated consistency

with the Historic District Regulations and Ordinance, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All work shall be completed by the applicant within two years of the date of the Historic District Commission approval.**
- 2. The applicant shall submit photos of the completed work for the file.**

The motion was seconded by Mr. Vaccarello Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

- 2. Patricia McLaughlin (Owner)** – Request for conceptual review of a proposal to demolish the rear portion of the residence at 266 Wallace Road and build a two-story 1,800 square-foot addition within a similar building footprint as the old addition, Lot 20-91-4, Zoned R&A.

Owner: Katherine M. McLaughlin Irrevocable Trust of 2006
Applicant: Patricia McLaughlin
Location: 266 Wallace Road, Lot 20-91-4
Existing Zoning: “R&A: Residential & Architectural
Surrounding Uses: Residential, Retail, Restaurants

Background

The residence at 266 Wallace Road is one of the more prominent homes in the Historic District due to its distinct Dutch Colonial architecture and location on a slight bluff overlooking the Wallace Road and NH Route 101 intersection. The home sits on a 3.14 acre lot and includes several different wings, spanning 5,313 square-feet of interior space.

Staff could not locate any previous HDC applications for this property. However, as part of the Route 101 project, the NH Division of Historical Resources conducted an inventory of historic properties along the corridor. The inventory notes that the property dates to 1840 and was previously part of a 100-acre farm. The property “illustrates the transition of a 19th century farm to a 21st century suburban lot,” according to the inventory form. Owing to numerous renovations and remodels over the years, the property was determined to be ineligible for listing on State or National Historic Registers. Copies of the inventory are included in the HDC packets for reference.

I. Project Description:

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing rear addition and construct a new addition within approximately the same building footprint. The applicant notes that the foundation for this portion of the structure is deficient and crumbling. It appears as though an existing wing to the south of the rear wing would remain standing. The front portion of the residence would remain as well. The applicant notes that the improvements are designed to allow the current residents to comfortably age in place. The McLaughlin Family has owned the home for many years as well as

several abutting residential properties. The applicant has submitted elevations of the proposed addition as well as floor plans. The addition appears to be of the same height as the existing main residence and the size of windows and other features appears to be proportional with those of the residence. The applicant will need to provide more detailed specifications for exterior features as part of the final HDC application.

II. Staff Recommendations:

Since this is just a conceptual discussion, no decisions will be made at this meeting. The Historic District Commission should use the opportunity to gain additional information from the applicant before a formal application is presented and to provide feedback. Possible issues of interest include the height of the residential addition, proposed exterior building materials, and any associated changes to the property.

Greg Rehm owner of Liberty Hill Construction & Mark Fournier introduced themselves to the Historic District Commission. Mr. Rehm and Mr. Fournier are in the design and budgeting phase of a large project on the corner of Route 101 and 266 Wallace Road. It is a family compound, and Mr. Rehm believes the original house was built in 1760. Various additions were then added to the property. The family living there now is survived by 4 children. The purpose of the renovation is to make modifications to the home that will allow two of the sisters to age and live in place. The goal of the project is to remove a 20'x50' 2-story structure located off the back of the main home and replace it in kind with a new structure that is safer, more efficient and looks like the current one.

Because it is a large project in the historic district, Mr. Rehm and Mr. Fournier would like to first do a review and get a sense of what they should be aware of and what would be needed for the formal application process.

Chairwoman Tamulevich asked if the foundation is crumbling. Mr. Rehm hesitates to call it a foundation anymore and said that the structure that is slightly supporting the building is eroding and falling in. This has been occurring over time. They believe there are some drainage issues, and it was not built up to today's standards. The family has selected this portion of the building for a rebuild because it is in the worst shape.

Chairwoman Tamulevich asked about the materials of the existing house and ones proposed for the section slated to be rebuilt. Mr. Rehm indicated that there are two different siding products on the house: Aluminum clapboard and vinyl clapboard. Since they both look the same, the more economical choice would be to match the vinyl clapboard on the new building. The entire roof needs to be replaced, so they will be replacing the entire roofing on the main house, the new building, and a portion of the connecting structures.

Chairwoman Tamulevich asked if there would be a change in window size. Mr. Rehm explained the goal is to replicate the windows that are currently there meeting the new standards of egress. Most of the windows are on the back of the house where they cannot be seen, and there are two second floor bedrooms that need windows that meet the new standards of egress.

Ms. Walker was interested in seeing exactly what was being proposed for removal. The Commission looked at a diagram which indicated it was Building "B". Only the second floor of Building B can be seen from the road and the remainder of the building is barely visible from any vantage point from the street. She asked when this portion of the structure had been built. Mr. Rehm said that underneath the building full newspapers were used as insulation and those newspapers were dated 1947-1949 which provides a safe assumption of the construction date of this portion of the structure.

Mr. Fairman asked if there would be a cellar. Mr. Rehm indicated the plan is to match the elevation of the new basement with the existing house basement, so that the stone foundation is not undermined. He was told that the main house's basement was built around 1760. It is in pretty good shape for the age.

Ms. Walker asked if this property has ever been moved. To Mr. Rehm's knowledge the building has never been moved; however, it is a family property purchased in the 1960's and family members have built a compound of homes in the back of the property and there is a baseball field and pool in the back too. Family members live in the compound and thus have an interest in investing in and keeping it. Access has been cut in from Briar Road to eliminate having to access the compound from Route 101.

Mr. Fairman asked if there were any water problems. Mr. Rehm indicated none were visible, nor have any been disclosed going back to when the family moved in in the 1960's. When addressing the septic systems, a test pit will be dug. There is no standing water on the property and the basement is dry.

Mr. Fairman instructed that when Liberty Hill Construction comes in for final approval the Historic District Commission would like diagrams that show exactly where the septic is located. Mr. Rehm is happy to disclose anything they might come up with as they look into whether or not anything needs to be done with the septic.

Ms. Walker asked if the 2 bedrooms in the existing Building B would remain in the new structure. Mr. Rehm explained that they are not changing anything and the 2 bedrooms will remain. The residents will be aging in place, so any safety concerns will be updated such as eliminating steps, keeping things level, creating accessible bathrooms, a straight staircase and set up for a stairlift in the future.

Mr. Allen asked if the efficiencies discussed were related to mobility issues or energy. Mr. Rehm indicated it related more to bringing Building B up to today's energy standards by better insulating it and not using single pane windows. Mr. Fairman suggested that they consider eliminating the thresholds over the doors which becomes a nuisance for people with mobility issues. Mr. Rehm indicated some of the thresholds would be removed. Mr. Fournier said the bump-out that can be seen in property photos is a step down from the main house, and that will actually become the "new level" for everything and thus provide more headroom on the first floor. Mr. Fairman asked why the bump-out is being kept. Mr. Rehm explained the family desires to keep it "as-is" because they've enjoyed having their meals as a family in that spot for over 60-years and do not want to change it.

Mr. Fairman asked what they would be using for heat. Mr. Rehm said the existing forced hot water system would be matched.

Ms. Walker asked if the windows of the main structure (other than Building B) would be addressed. Mr. Fournier said that is not in the plan. The roof has to be replaced in order to create a weather-tight seal in all of the many connections. The current budget has the 20'x50' Building B structure as the core project.

Ms. Walker indicated that when Liberty Hill Construction comes in for final approval the Historic District Commission would like to see samples of the siding and roof covering. Chairwoman Tamulevich would like Liberty Hill Construction to do the matching and then bring it to the Historic District Commission so they can see how well the new product matches the old. Mr. Fairman thought the roof had already been replaced, but Mr. Fournier indicated it had only been replaced on the garage. There is one layer of roofing on the main house and the 20'x50' Building B, but there are two relatively new layers on the garage. There is a problem in the connection with the bump out and the roof that goes into the garage roof. Mr. Rehm indicated they could bring the actual roofing shingle and a piece of siding for the Commission's review.

Chairwoman Tamulevich requests that they also bring pictures of windows and doors to show how well they match and keep in harmony with the existing home. Mr. Rehm said a lot of the exterior is not historical. As remodelers the challenge becomes whether to match the existing exterior so that everything looks like one; or upgrade the portion they are restoring to historical standards which does not look like the existing exterior. Mr. Allen feels the point they are making is fair; however, the Commission would merely like to see the materials they will be using so that they can gauge the difference and the relative change. Chairwoman Tamulevich realizes there have been changes made to the home over the years and that there will be differences, the Commission just wants to make sure that the differences will be minimized. Bringing photos is fine. Mr. Rehm indicated he understood what the Commission is looking to see.

Ms. Walker asked if there would be any disruptions to the site, such as trees having to come up. Mr. Rehm stated that they walked the entire site with their various trade partners (including the sitework/excavation/foundation contractor) and there was not a single tree, branch, or shrub that needs any addressing. The construction site entrance will come in from Briar Road (not Wallace Road) because it is more forgiving for entrance and exit and less disruptive.

Ms. Walker provided the Historic District's recommendation:
Since this is just a conceptual discussion, no decisions will be made at this meeting. The Historic District Commission should use the opportunity to gain additional information from the applicant before a formal application is presented and to provide feedback. Possible issues of interest include the height of the residential addition, proposed exterior building materials, and any associated changes to the property.

Mr. Connors asked when they would come back. Mr. Rehm indicated that Liberty Hill Construction is developing the project, and this is one of the first steps relative to approval or permitting, so he would like to come back for next month's Historic District Commission meeting on June 4, 2019, so the Commission can have the most time to evaluate and provide feedback. The intent is that the project starts this year. Mr. Connors indicated that they must get the application in by May 14, 2019 (next week) in order to be on the meeting agenda for June 4, 2019.

IV. Other Business:

1. Election of Historic District Commission officers for 2019

Mr. Connors introduced the new members:

- Chris Allen - a recent transplant from New York now living on the corner of Liberty Hill Road and Meetinghouse Road since mid-to late 2017. He is excited to be a member of The Historic District Commission.
- Steven MacDougall –could not be in attendance tonight but will attend the next meeting on June 4th.

MOTION to elect Ms. Walker as Chair of the Historic District Commission by Ms. Tamulevich. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fairman. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

MOTION to re-elect Ms. Perry as Vice Chair of the Historic District Commission by Mr. Fairman. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tamulevich. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

V. Approval of Minutes – March 5, 2019

MOTION by Mr. Vaccarello to accept the minutes of March 5, 2019. The motion was seconded by Ms. Walker. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

VI. Communications:

None.

VII. Members Comments and Concerns:

None.

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Mr. Fairman to adjourn meeting at 7:37 pm. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vaccarello. Vote taken – all in favor. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Tiffany Lewis