

**TOWN OF BEDFORD
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
September 3, 2019**

A meeting of the Bedford Historic District Commission was held on Tuesday, September 3, 2019 at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH.

Present: Theresa Walker (Chair), Judy Perry (Vice Chair), Charles Fairman (Planning Board Liaison), Catherine Rombeau (Town Council), Joe Vaccarello (alternate member), Mark Connors (Assistant Planning Director, Staff liaison)

Absent: Phil Greazzo (Town Council Alternate), Janet Tamulevich (regular member), Christopher Allen (regular member), Steven MacDougall (alternate member)

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

Chairwoman Walker called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Mr. Connors read the evening's agenda. Chairwoman Walker reviewed the rules of procedure with the applicants. Chairman Walker appointed Mr. Vaccarello as a voting member this evening.

II. Old Business

- None

III. New Applications:

1. **Mark & Robin Standen (Owners)** – Request to install 42 solar energy panels on the residential property at 33 Meetinghouse Road, Lot 21-45-1, Zoned R&A.

Background - This application concerns a rambling ranch-style single family home constructed in 1961 and situated on a 1.2 acre parcel at 33 Meetinghouse Road at the corner of Meetinghouse Road and Pinewood Terrace. Though the home fronts Meetinghouse Road, the driveway is located off Pinewood Terrace and the garage fronts that cul-de-sac. The home sits several feet above the grade of Meetinghouse Road, however foliage on the property partially obscures the view of the front of the home from the roadway. All surrounding homes on Pinewood Terrace and the south side of Meetinghouse Road were built after 1960. However, a cape-style home located immediately across Meetinghouse Road dates to the 1700s.

The applicants were most recently in front of the Commission in October 2016 to replace garage and rear and front doors, to install gutters and fencing, and to add

new shingle-style siding on the garage. The HDC approved the application and the improvements were made.

The applicants are now proposing to install 42 roof-mounted solar panels on the roof of the home. Based on the information submitted by the applicant, it appears all of the panels will be placed on the rear or side-facing portions of the roof. The garage and far western portions of the home feature different roof pitches and will include the side facing panels. Due to the slope of the lot and the foliage on the parcel, even the side-facing panels will not be visible from Meetinghouse Road, except for a portion of the panels on the garage (see attached photos). The garage panels will be visible from Pinewood Terrace.

Industry specs for the solar panels, the planned location of the panels, and narrative information is included in the HDC packets. The material does not indicate if the applicants will need to remove any existing trees to allow more sunlight to reach the panels, and the Commission may want to inquire what, if any, tree-clearing is planned.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval of the improvements proposed by the applicants. The improvements will not significantly alter the character of the property, will generally not be visible from Meetinghouse Road, and are consistent the review criteria of the Historic District Commission. If tree-clearing is necessary for this application, Staff would recommend a condition be added to maintain some vegetated buffer between the property and the abutting home to the south (7 Pinewood Terrace).

Draft Motion:

I move that the Historic District Commission approve the installation of 42 rear- and side-facing roof-mounted solar panels at 33 Meetinghouse Road, Lot 21-45-1 as requested by the applicant in accordance with the information submitted, because the because the applicant has provided evidence that demonstrates consistency with the HDC ordinance and regulations, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The Applicant shall submit final sign design for review and approval by Staff prior to installation.*
- 2. All work shall be completed by the applicant within two years of the date of the Historic District Commission approval.*
- 3. The applicant shall submit photos of the completed work for the file.*

Mark Standen and Robin Standen discussed their proposal to add 42 solar energy panels to the east and south facing roof slopes of their property at 33 Meetinghouse Road. An aerial photo of the property was reviewed. The front of the home faces Meetinghouse Road. The driveway comes off of Pinewood Terrace. The solar panels

will not be visible from Meetinghouse Road. They will be black to dark grey in color and will blend in with the color of the roof.

Chairman Walker asked if the Standens anticipate that the panels will change the appearance of the property at all from Pinewood Terrace or Meetinghouse Road. Mr. Standen stated he was not aware that it would change the appearance drastically from either road. Chairman Walker asked if they anticipated having to clear any trees. Mr. Standen said they do not anticipate having to clear any trees.

Mr. Fairman asked if he had discussed the project with any abutters. Mr. Standen indicated that he had only had discussion with his neighbor directly across, Pauline. Mr. Fairman asked if he had gotten in touch with the neighbor due south, but Mr. Standen indicated he had not been able to get in touch with them. Mr. Fairman asked if the neighbor to the south would receive glare from the solar panels in their yard. Mr. Standen said that there is potential for that to happen but it is mostly shaded from the trees on the Standen's property. The majority of the trees on the lower part of the Standen's property block the view of the south neighbor's view of the roof. Very little of their property is visible except a small portion through the lower part of the trees. The neighbor may see some of their house through the bottom of the trees, but not through the top of the trees.

Mr. Fairman said behind the home facing south there is a swimming pool, and he didn't think there were any trees along the swimming pool and that the area was fairly clear. Mr. Standen indicated that is correct. Mr. Fairman asked if the trees along the border of the pool would be coming down. Mr. Standen indicated they would not be coming down. Mr. Fairman indicated they should come back before the Historic District Commission if that changes based on the solar. Mr. Standen indicated that it was recommended that they pull down trees, but they refused to do it. Mrs. Standen said that if anything changes they could come back before The Historic District again.

Mr. Fairman asked where the electronic controls for the solar panels would be located. Mr. Standen said they would be inside the house. Mr. Fairman asked if they would have access to a power line that is high enough for this. Mr. Standen indicated they do.

MOTION by Mr. Vaccarello that the Historic District Commission approve the installation of 42 rear-and-side-facing roof-mounted solar panels at 33 Meetinghouse Road, Lot 21-45-1 as requested by the applicant in accordance with the information submitted, because the because the applicant has provided evidence that demonstrates consistency with the HDC ordinance and regulations, 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.**
3. **If tree clearing is necessary for the operation of the solar panels a vegetative buffer shall be maintained between the residence and the abutting property at 7 Pinewood Terrace.**

The motion was seconded by Ms. Perry. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

IV. Other Business:

1. **Frank Robertson (Owner)** – Request for conceptual review of proposed architectural elevations for a planned new single-family residence on a vacant lot on Wallace Road, Lot 14-67-1, Zoned R&A.

Background: The applicant was in front of the Historic District Commission last month to discuss very conceptual ideas for the architecture of a proposed single-family home on this lot (meeting minutes are included in the HDC packets). The applicant has developed architectural designs for the proposed home. The architecture is not finalized and the plot plan still needs to be updated to show the home location and the limits of tree-clearing. However, the applicant asked to appear again before the Commission to get additional input as he works to finalize the materials in hopes of appearing for final approval in October.

The lot is 5.67 acres and is located in the northwest corner of the Historic District across from Lane Drive. This lot was created as the result of a subdivision approved by the Planning Board in 2011. It is bordered by the Van Loan Preserve (Conservation land) and ranch style homes to the north and east dating to the 1950s and 1980s. Eversource transmission lines are located a short distance to the west. More historically significant are the Riddle House and the Van Loan House, two landmark historic properties in the District, which are located only a short distance to the south.

Project Description:

The applicant has submitted elevations showing the front, rear, side, and garage-level elevations of the residence. Of the photos submitted by the applicant for the last meeting, the home is most similar to the barn concept but has some significant deviations. The home is a Cape style with a prominent gabled roofline laid out in an 'L-shape' footprint formation. The trim and windows are simple and unadorned and Colonial in nature. The home includes a rooftop cupola and French doors framed by a barn door treatment. The three-car garage doors also appear to be designed to replicate a barn style. As discussed at last month's meeting, the rear elevation includes more prominent windows. The applicant has also submitted proposed floor plans for informational purposes, however the HDC does not regulate interior features.

The applicant has not yet submitted any information on exterior materials, proposed exterior colors, the height and dimensions of the home, exterior lighting, or plot plans showing the location of the home. In staff's opinion, the preliminary architectural elevations are attractive, but it will be important to get more information regarding exterior materials and the siting of the home on the lot.

Staff Recommendations:

The Commission should provide the applicant as much feedback as possible on the architectural elevations submitted.

Frank Robertson had visited the Historic District Commission in August to discuss various home styles he was proposing and returned to discuss a more specific drawing of the property he would like to construct. Mr. Robertson stated in August they discussed a colonial, barn-style, or raised ranch style home. Mr. Robertson and his wife decided to go with a barn-style home and think it would be the best option for the neighborhood. Mr. Robertson worked with the engineer on the front elevation, and on the plans the only thing he would like to change is the 6x6 window to the right of the main doors, because it is the only window in that bedroom he feels the room would be dark, so he would like to incorporate another 6x6 window on the face of the house in the bedroom. Chairman Walker asked if the front doors were glass. Mr. Robertson explained they are not far along enough in the design about the doors, but he does not anticipate the doors being all -glass. Chairman Walker asked if the barn doors flanking the front door would be stationary or if they would be sliding. Mr. Robertson's said he had gone to look at the home on Gage Road that Mr. Fairman had suggested visiting, and he would like to have the barn door split in half on either side of the front door and match them.

Chairman Walker asked what he is envisioning for finish materials looking Mr. Robertson would like to incorporate both shiplap wood and vinyl, if possible. A gentleman he spoke with at the lumber yard said that shiplap is high maintenance. He saw a building at a jobsite where shiplap was used as the main siding material and Azek was used on the trim and it looked really nice. Because shiplap is so high maintenance he feels that he couldn't do the whole house in it. He doesn't want to have to paint the whole house every 3-4 years. There is a photo showing where the rooflines begin to pitch up and there are two small windows - - he would like to use vinyl on the lower half and Lower half and vertical shiplap on the top half. Mr. Fairman said that shiplap is generally done horizontally. He said he has pine shiplap on his summer home and that it stands up very well horizontally, but he has found that there has been some shrinkage and the gaps grew a little bit and required some filling and painting.

Mr. Fairman indicated that he loves the design of the home - - the doors, the front garage door looks great, and the side and front look good. He suggested considering a small bay window in the bedroom between the front door and the bathroom window, rather than putting in two windows. Mr. Robertson thought that the windows had to all be the same, based on the previous discussion on the spec house he'd built, but if he can have different windows he is open to a bay window.

Mr. Vaccarello asked about the right-side elevation and the two windows and asked where the shiplap would start. Mr. Robertson said it would probably start Mr. Robertson said it would be where the roof line kicks in. Mr. Vaccarello asked if it would be vertical. Mr. Robertson indicated it would be vertical and he would probably wouldn't do the strips in between. Having it higher up it would be less likely to rot or come into contact with snow loads or splashing from the ground. Mr. Robertson heard if a board rots, you can pop it out, stick a new one back in and paint or stain it.

Chairman Walker asked if he would paint or stain the shiplap the same color as the siding or if it would be done in an accent color. Mr. Robertson is not totally sold on the two-tone, but his wife would have the final say. Chairman Walker said the clay or white colors Mr. Robertson is proposing are acceptable and very traditional colors.

Chairman Walker said that she appreciates the design very much and likes the minimal ornamentation around the windows and the roofline. She likes the cupola and the barn doors are appropriate. She appreciates the work he has put in to designing something that will work for his family but also suit the neighborhood well.

Mr. Robertson asked if having a copper roof on the cupola would be a problem. There was no opposition to this.

Mr. Robertson asked if at some time in the future he wanted to put in a four season-room on the rear elevation of the house if that was something he could do. Chairman Walker asked if he was considering a greenhouse, but Mr. Robertson explained that it would be something that bumps off the back of the house with more windows that would serve as a seating room to hang out in outside of the footprint of the house. Mr. Fairman did not think it would be a problem.

At the last meeting, Mr. Robertson had discussed doing larger windows off the back, and at the walkout where there is the slider French doors he might like to replace one of the windows with another set of doors - he is not sure yet. After this meeting, he has another month to finalize the plans. He asked if he had that option to do that. Chairman Walker didn't see a reason why not. The Historic Commission's main concern is how it will look in the front and what will be visible from the abutters and

traffic, and maintaining the appearance of the Historic District. She does not see an issue with one set of French doors compared to two sets of French doors.

Mr. Fairman asked if the second floor is actually the main floor and is on a slope, and that the first level is below grade. Mr. Robertson indicated that was correct and that that it faces the back portion of the property, not the neighbor to the right. The side of the house that faces the neighbor to the right has minimal windows and will not be intrusive to them.

Mr. Vaccarello said that it would be helpful on the final plans to show the angles so people can understand which is the front, back, and side of the house. Mr. Robertson will work to get that finalized and have Sanford put the house on the plot plan and get everything situated and located and come back with that. They did a test pit last week, and it was pretty good digging, so he thinks he can push the house back pretty close to where he would like it to be. He isn't sure he will be able to go as far back as he would like because they pulled some measurements on the house and one day it is 75-feet, and the next it is 62.5 feet – and it got to the point that he was so far over the embankment and he is unsure that he can totally be where he would like to; but the back of the house still sits pretty far back. He walked the lot and there is a thicker boundary of wetlands on his side compared to the spec house. As far as blockage goes it is pretty thick, and then the driveway will come straight down the right side of the property and there will be a 20-30 foot buffer between his driveway and the neighbors (Lot #328) and if you are going up the driveway it will hook toward the left to the garage doors.

Mr. Robertson discussed tree cutting. He walked the lot and found a lot of pines and some nicer trees. He would like to keep the nicer hardwood trees but would like to cut the pines (although maybe not in the back of the lot, because he doesn't plan to do much there). In the front – not near the road, but closer to the house – he would like to keep the hardwood, but the pines are just dead branches about 90% of the way up and are in horrible shape and he would like to get rid of them. Chairman Walker indicated that the commission has no issues with him having a front lawn. Mr. Robertson understands that but doesn't want anyone to get upset if he cuts down any trees. He would really like to get rid of the pines, and he thought about planting some apple trees there. Chairman Walker asked if there were vines growing up through the trees. Mr. Robertson said there were a couple.

Mr. Robertson asked if a swimming pool needed to be on the plot plan for approval. Mr. Connors said it needs to be on the plan if he wants to build it with the house, otherwise he would have to come back at a later time if the pool is not built with the house. Chairman Walker suggests putting anything he is anticipating doing on the plan because approvals from the Historic District Commission are good for two years so if he anticipates doing anything additional down the road it should be on the plans.

Mr. Robertson discussed the garage. The door on the left is the 9-foot door where he would park his school bus. That garage door is similar to the other two garage doors but does not have windows. He's not 100% sure he is going to use that type of door but wondered if having a door that is different from the other two was any problem. Chairman Walker appreciates the fact that he has attempted to make all 3 doors look uniform in size, of course recognizing that there is glass on two of the garage doors. From the drawing, she feels they look pretty uniform and that the larger door did not stick out like a sore thumb. Mr. Robertson wants to keep uniformity and not have a 9-foot door that looks totally different from the other two doors. He even wants it to match somehow with the barn door.

Mr. Fairman commented that the set of windows above the 2 standard size garage doors look very historic. A lot of old barns and garages have that set of windows. He thinks it is very hard to tell that the 3rd garage door is bigger than the other two and it is camouflaged very well.

Chairman Walker asked if he anticipates any finished space above the garage. Mr. Robertson indicated that would be the master bedroom area.

Mr. Connors asked if he would like to have a light in the cupola. Mr. Robertson said possibly and that it may look nice at night lit up. Ms. Rombeau asked for Mr. Robertson's thoughts on exterior lighting. Mr. Robertson said that he has seen lights for the garage doors on other old homes that come off straight across, arch up and hang down and are domed. He will not be throwing any spotlights from the corners. He would like to keep it as historical as he can even with the lighting. He discussed doing a brick walkway similar to the one he is doing on the spec house, and a granite step off the breezeway door.

Chairman Walker opened the floor for public comment, even though this is a conceptual discussion, so we could field their questions and concerns.

Lisa Muskat of 49 Church Rd. thinks the cupola looks nice but said it would be nice to have the prefab cupola dimensions on the plan so that they could make sure it is in scale with the house. She asked about the tree clearing on Wallace Road and asked if there is a dimension that the town recommends being that the town owns from the median of the road back a certain distance (even though it is not their property). Mr. Connors said that is called the "Town Right of Way" and for all intents and purposes the Town does control that portion of the lot, and a building permit would need to be applied for disturbance of a stone wall, repairing a stone wall, tree clearing and things like that. Ms. Muskat said it is difficult for those who live on the street to go from having it be so wooded – If this house is to be pushed so far back and there is just driveway and if it is not going to be claimed for a mobile yard, why not leave some of

the natural buffer there. Chairman Walker asked Mr. Robertson to reiterate his thoughts on the frontage. Mr. Robertson said there is it will be 20-25 feet of wetlands from the stone wall in (the whole length of the front of his lot) that will be untouched. He wants the walk out so he is sacrificing some of his back yard for this. He does want some front yard.

Chairman Walker asked to view the aerial shot in order to identify the area of the wetlands in question. The driveway will come in 20-30 feet along the property shared with Lot #328, and the majority of the remainder of the frontage to the neighbor to the South is wet (the portion of the property near Lane Road) – she asked if that was the area that would remain intact. Mr. Robertson said the corner of his lot closest to Lane Road all the way up to Lot #328 is wet on the entire frontage and he has to have a culvert put in so he can install the driveway. Mr. Connors said a State permit was needed, and Mr. Robertson indicated he is working to get the permit now. If the land is wet, it can't be touched – so Ms. Muskat indicated she was fine with that.

Ms. Muskat feels it is great that the bulk of the doors are 9 feet the whole way across and asked why all doors would not have glass and be the same and uniform. Mr. Robertson said he hasn't even gone that far yet with the architect. Chairman Walker explained that the garage door furthest to the left is intended to house a larger vehicle and will be 9-feet which is a little bigger than the average garage door. Mr. Robertson said that the garages will not be facing the road. Ms. Muskat said she can appreciate that.

Ms. Muskat asked if it was permissible in the Historic District to have a commercial vehicle. Mr. Robertson said it was not a commercial vehicle – it is his personal vehicle. Chairman Walker thinks it is a passenger vehicle that is just larger than what most of us drive. Ms. Muskat thinks it would be more in keeping with the look of an agrarian building to have all three doors uniform and you could park your vehicle in any bay that you choose.

Ms. Vaccarello from 316 Wallace Road asked for an explanation about how much of the back area would be cleared from trees. She asked what would be cleared, and with the culvert in the wetland area she noticed that in the back part of her property there is a culvert for the one in between (the one we are discussing) and that her property has a culvert that she was shocked to see points right into her property onto the back yard, and she is concerned that if there are wetlands up above and the culvert is also pointed in her direction that she will receive every bit of run-off from both properties. She spoke up about this before and was reassured that her property will not be impacted at all with any overflow of water, but she would like to go on record that with this property we are talking about wetlands and the culvert is pointed in the same exact direction and she doesn't understand how that is not going to be a

problem for her in the Spring. Mr. Robertson said it had been discussed in 4 prior meetings about the property. If she wants to talk about it further he said we could get “Ken” to come back and talk about it at another time, but it has already been discussed and approved. Mr. Connors said that to get subdivision approval an engineer must prepare a stormwater analysis proving that the lot won’t increase stormwater runoff. Ms. Vaccarello asked what happens if that does turn out to happen. If they notice that they have more run-off on their property what happens? Mr. Connors explained she could contact the Town and they would work with her, but this is something that is handled at the subdivision level when they approve the subdivision, and stormwater is not considered to be under the Historic District Commission’s purview.

Ms. Vaccarello asked about the tree clearing and noted it was said that no trees would be touched in the wetland area, but there absolutely were a lot more trees removed than she was expecting in the wetland area for “the property in between us”. She is hoping to see plantings going in and she wants to make sure that there will not be as many trees cleared (as Lisa Muskat asked) – and that is not what she noticed on the other property. Chairman Walker thinks when there is an actual site plan to review it will become clearer and we will be able to address Ms. Vaccarello’s concerns more specifically. Ms. Vaccarello would like to know how many trees would come down on the whole property because she has a straight shot view, so depending on how many trees are removed from the back with the property in between hers she is wondering if she is going to be able to see right into the area of the house where the lighted cupola would be. Chairman Walker asked Mr. Robertson to explain where he intends to put his property on his lot, which might address some of Ms. Vaccarello’s concerns. Mr. Robertson said that where his property “T”’s is at a much higher elevation than the home he is building now. He has push fill further back in order to get his home to sit further back on the lot, so his house is actually going to drop down. It will not be sitting higher than the Colonial home. As far as seeing his lit-up cupola goes – he plans to have it on a switch and if it bothers her, he asks her to call him. Ms. Vaccarello is trying to get a sense of where it will be visually and what she will be seeing. Mr. Vaccarello asks that when Mr. Robertson is ready, that we have a site map and next meeting we can see exactly where the house is and what trees he is thinking of clearing for space so that everyone can visualize how it will look. There is currently no elevation represented, so it is hard to tell anything. Mr. Connors said that when Mr. Robertson has Sanford do the plot plan just let him know to show the tree clearing and if you want to have a yard just show that on the overhead because it makes it a lot easier to understand when you are dealing with a plan.

Chairman Walker confirmed that he wants a walk-out and is sacrificing some backyard space. Mr. Robertson said the whole left side of the hammer sits behind the house he is building now. If you were to walk there, it slopes down and there is nothing he can do there, so his intent is to leave it untouched. Toward the center he

would like to pull out some pines, leave some hardwoods. He will not clear cut the area. There is also nothing he can do behind 328.

Chairman Walker believes in earlier testimony Mr. Robertson stated he wanted the walkout and will be giving up some of the rear yard area in order to obtain that. Mr. Robertson indicated that is correct. He said when you are looking at this lot and you are pulling off of Wallace road and coming up his driveway and you turn left toward the house he is building that whole section (the left side of the hammer) sits behind the house he is building now. If you were to walk back there, it slopes down and there is nothing he can do back there. He doesn't plan on touching anything back there in that whole corner. It was indicated with the cursor on the aerial photo of the lot the area he was talking about where nothing would be touched. He doesn't intend to pay anyone to take anything out of there and said that it does not benefit him in any way. Moving toward the center is where his walkout will be – and that is where he would like to take some trees down. He is not going to clear cut that whole area, but he definitely wants to get rid of some pines and push it back a little bit. He would like to leave as many hardwood trees as he can. He said it is the same thing in the corner behind #28 - - there is nothing he can do back there. It serves no purpose for him to pay someone to go back there to move trees on either one of those corners. Chairman Walker asked about the corner that is behind the lot with the and asked the distance/rear boundary of the spec house lot to Mr. Robertson's land (the boundary line that he shares with the spec house). Mr. Robertson has not looked yet. Chairman Walker would like to know how long it is so she can get an idea of how big that corner is so they know how much of a buffer it will provide with the uncut trees. Mr. Connors thinks the lot is 5-6 acres and guesstimates that is a little under an acre.

Mr. Vaccarello would also like to see plans for the septic and leach fields. Mr. Robertson said looking at the front of the house – going down the left is where Sanford said the septic would be located. It will be tied together more next month when the plans are ready.

Mr. Robertson said next month will be the 3rd meeting on this. If he can get dimensions of the cupola and he can show a pretty accurate depiction of the trees and yard, and the plot plan can he get a vote to approve this. Mr. Connors indicated if the completed application is submitted to the town and he is on the agenda it would be possible to go for a vote. Ms. Rombeau said it would be possible, but also possible that there would be more questions depending on what they see, but it doesn't mean that they can't vote on it if we feel we have adequate material. Mr. Connors suggests bringing a tear sheet if Mr. Robertson plans to put in a prefabricated cupola. Mr. Robertson asked if he could come back down the road in regard to the cupola because currently he is unsure how to size it. Must he have a decision on the cupola now before he starts? Chairman Walker believes that if he hasn't made a decision about the cupola, she believes the commission could take a vote and it would be a condition

that he come back before he makes a final decision on the cupola and before installing anything. Mr. Robertson will try and figure it out. Mr. Connors said it would make it easier for him if he had everything so there would be no need to come back. Chairman Walker said that because we do not have a full commission this evening, there may be some members who come to the meeting next time with questions at the October meeting. Chairman Walker appreciates being involved as Mr. Robertson goes through his decision-making process. Mr. Robertson would just like to get everyone's questions as soon as possible, rather than coming back next month to more questions, and coming back another month to more questions. It is getting really dragged out. Chairman Walker said she could appreciate that, and that is why she opened the floor for questions from the public. Mr. Robertson feels the whole tree clearing issue is getting a little crazy. He's said before that he is not going to create a huge back yard and he is not going to create a huge front yard. Chairman Walker hopes that seeing the site plan and seeing the clearing line well defined will answer a lot of those questions.

Ms. Rombeau asked to see photos of the exterior lighting in October.

Mr. Robertson asked how everyone feels about the siding, colors and windows. Mr. Fairman and Chairman Walker felt he did a great job on the design and that it wasn't an attractive house that is not eyesore even if it is seen by another house, and that cutting some trees to create a yard is fine as long as he is not clear cutting the property. As long as he meets all the requirements and the staff says he's ready Mr. Fairman doesn't see any reason we cannot vote at the October meeting. Ms. Rombeau asked if Mr. Connors could provide Mr. Robertson with information about the perimeters the Historic District Commission considers with the trees and what can be taken down (size, diameter, and how many trees can be taken down). This information may be helpful to him now, rather than waiting next month.

Mr. Vaccarello said that no one is trying to drag things out, but when you put everything out there, questions can arise and that is merely part of the process – nothing else. Mr. Robertson understands, and has learned a lot compared to when he did the previous house, but the tree thing is baffling to him because there are many other people in the Historic District that have massive yards that are way bigger and more clear cut than what his will be, so he doesn't understand why he is getting so much flack over these trees. Chairman Walker said that she doesn't think it should be classified as "flack" she considers it clarification and a lot of it will be solved when we can see a plan. Mr. Connors said that we care about trees, but nobody is saying that you cannot have a lawn. Mr. Robertson understands what people want to see, but it's also his property and his house and to some degree he wants what he wants. Chairman Walker thinks it's an attractive house that is appropriate house for the district. She appreciates that he did learn since the time he first brought in plans for the spec house and thinks the process is going to go smoother because of that.

The Historic District Commission will plan to see Mr. Robertson again at the October meeting.

V. Approval of Minutes – August 6, 2019

MOTION by Mr. Vaccarello to accept the August 6, 2019 minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rombeau. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

VI. Communications:

Mr. Connors said the last meeting Ms. Rombeau asked about mailing the fact sheet to all the property owners in the district. We looked into it, and found that it is something we can do, it is just an administrative task trying to put together 250 mailings, but it is something that we are going to do. The cost is not very much, and it is a good idea to get the information out there. The mailing will go out in the next month or so.

VII. Members Comments and Concerns:

- None

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Ms. Rombeau to adjourn meeting at 7:55 pm. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vaccarello. Vote taken – all in favor. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Tiffany Lewis