

TOWN OF BEDFORD
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
October 6, 2020

A meeting of the Bedford Historic District Commission was held on Tuesday, October 6, 2020 via the Zoom meeting platform.

Present: Theresa Walker (Chair), Charles Fairman (Planning Board Liaison), Phil Greazzo (Town Council Representative), Lisa Muskat (regular member), Joe Vaccarello (alternate member), Steven MacDougall (alternate member), Lori Radke (Town Council Alternate), Mark Connors (Assistant Planning Director, Staff liaison), Rebecca Hebert (Planning Director)

Absent: Christopher Allen (Vice Chair), Judy Perry (regular member)

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

Chairwoman Walker called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and appointed Mr. MacDougall and Mr. Vaccarello as voting members for the evening.

Chairwoman Walker read an opening statement: Due to the Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, the Bedford Historic District Commission is authorized to meet electronically. This meeting is being conducted using the Zoom platform. All members of the commission have the ability to communicate with each other during the meeting and the public has access to listen and participate by dialing: 1-929-205-6099 and entering the meeting id: 99821178774 and password: 076841. Instructions regarding remote access to the meeting have been published in advance and are available on the Historic District Commission's agenda which is posted on the Town's website. There is no physical location for this evening's meeting which is permissible pursuant to the Governor's emergency order. The Town of Bedford is providing public access to the Zoom meeting by telephone, and the meeting will also be broadcast live on BCTV's Channel 22. Members of the public may email staff at planning@bedfordnh.org to ask questions during the meeting or notify us of any technological issues. Planning staff will be checking that email throughout the meeting. If you have joined the meeting using Zoom you may also ask questions when the Chair opens the hearing for public comment through your phone connection. All votes this evening will be taken as a roll call vote. If there are technical issues during the meeting, the Chair will recess the meeting and we will try to correct the problem. If the issue continues, the application will be postponed and the meeting will be adjourned.

Mr. Connors reviewed the evening's agenda.

MOTION by Ms. Muskat to accept the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vaccarello. Roll call vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried 4-0.

II. Old Business:

- None

III. New Business:

1. **Olivia Magueflor-Dugan (Owner)** – Request for approval to construct a two-story side and rear addition and to amend a previous approval to allow for the replacement of all windows at the residence at 34 Meetinghouse Road, Lot 21-43, Zoned R&A.

Ms. Magueflor-Dugan asked to revert back to her original request to replace the existing windows at her home. Originally she asked for them to be replaced, but then decided she would like to restore them per the Historic District Commission’s suggestion. She got quotes from several people and the cost difference between restoring and replacing is a significant, so she would like to revert back to replacing the windows instead of restoring the windows in the original building.

Q: Chairwoman Walker asked if there was anything additional Ms. Magueflor-Dugan would like the Historic District Commission (HDC) to consider regarding replacement of what she will call the “historic windows”.

A: Ms. Magueflor-Dugan provided the pictures of the windows. The second quote she received indicated the windows are at a level that they would need significant restoration. In addition, 3 out of 6 windows in the main building have broken glass panes; so even if she were to consider replacing the original storm windows and put back in the original it still wouldn’t make sense in achieving her objective to have an insulated window.

Q: Mr. Fairman asked if all members of the board know the history of Ms. Magueflor-Dugan’s request and the background.

A: Chairwoman Walker indicated that all members present were at the site walk and familiar with the requests.

Chairwoman Walker doesn’t think there’s any dispute that the windows, as they are, are in poor condition and not functioning the way windows should normally work. When she looks at the pictures of the windows and compare them with the photos of the windows she is planning on replacing them with, her concern would be to make them look as similar as possible to the original windows in order to maintain the historic appearance of the home.

Ms. Magueflor-Dugan agreed with that objective and confirmed with her contractor that the design would be a similar design and similar window. If the window is 9-over-6 or 6-over-6, it will have the same number of grills, except be a newer wood window.

Q: Chairwoman Walker asked if they would be the same size as the existing windows, or if Ms. Magueflor-Dugan was proposing that the size of the openings change at all.

A: Ms. Magueflor-Dugan indicated it would be the same size.

Chairwoman Walker opened the floor for questions and comments on the windows from the board.

Q: Ms. Muskat asked to confirm if the windows Ms. Magueflor-Dugan is proposing to replace are all thermal pane wood windows and asked what material the new replacement windows are made of.

A: Ms. Magueflor-Dugan explained the replacement windows are Jodoin wood windows. Mr. Connors put the window specifications on screen for review.

Mr. Fairman commented that he faced the same problem in his own historic home several years ago and feels it makes all the sense in the world to replace them energy-wise and appearance-wise. It is hard to restore old windows and have them be energy efficient. Storm windows are put outside the windows for efficiency, but they are not attractive. He feels replacing the windows with as-similar-looking-windows as possible is the right decision. He suggested making sure they are the most efficient windows you can get for the money, and when the contractor replaces the windows to make sure he looks at the casement around the window to make sure there are no hidden issues when he pulls the old window out so that they can be repaired and made as airtight as possible. Windows will not get the efficiency you expect if the area around it is not well-built.

Q: Mr. MacDougall agreed with what Mr. Fairman said and agrees Ms. Magueflor-Dugan is doing the right thing in replacing the windows. He asked what would happen to the old windows, and if they would be kept at the property for no other reason than they are part of the home that has been there for so long. He would hate to see them end up in the dump in the event that someday she sold the property and it might even be purchased by the Historic District Commission to become part of the history of the town and the windows could be put back in if there was no longer an issue of efficiency. He suggested that the windows be preserved. Chairwoman Walker if there was a place on the property where the old windows could be stored.

A: Ms. Magueflor-Dugan said she could probably store the old windows in the carriage house in the back but asked if the Historic District Commission accepts donations of old windows. Chairwoman Walker indicated the Historic District Commission does not accept donations of old windows.

Mr. Greazzo and Mr. Vaccarello had no questions. Ms. Radke had joined the meeting by this point and indicated that she had no questions and feels it is a good idea to replace the windows for all the reasons Mr. Fairman mentioned previously.

Q: Chairwoman Walker has no issue with the replacement of the windows; feels the windows Ms. Magueflor-Dugan are reasonable and are going to achieve the Historic District Commission's goal to maintain the historic appearance. When the site walk was done, Chairwoman's Walker's perspective was that the shutter and the front door were more historically significant than the windows. One of the shutters had fallen of the home, so she asked if it would be rehung after the replacement of the windows was complete.

A: Ms. Magueflor-Dugan indicated that is her intention.

Q: Chairwoman Walker asked if a change to the front door was being contemplated.

A: Ms. Magueflor-Dugan said no, and indicated they are trying to restore the window because of the condition it is in.

Chairwoman Walker opened the floor for questions or comments from the public. Mr. Connors indicated no one was on the phone, and no emails were received.

MOTION by Mr. Vaccarello to grant the application to replace all of the windows on the residence at 34 Meetinghouse Road, Lot 21-43 as requested by the applicant and in accordance with the information submitted, 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 within two years of the HDC approval.**
- 2.) The applicant shall provide photos of the completed work for the file.**
- 3.) The replacement windows shall include the same six over nine grid pattern as the existing windows.**

The motion was seconded by Ms. Muskat. Roll call vote taken – all in favor.

Motion carried 5-0.

Chairwoman Walker thanked Ms. Magueflor-Dugan for her patience in working with the commission, allowing them to come out to do the site walk, and investigating the alternative of restoration. The HDC appreciates the work she put into it and her cooperation.

The group moved on to discuss a rear addition to Ms. Magueflor-Dugan's property

Ms. Magueflor-Dugan explained that they are requesting approval for a balcony and porch on the back of the house (off the kitchen). The group viewed drawings of the proposed addition. Ms. Magueflor-Dugan said they would like to put a farmhouse-style porch with no railings, just white posts. The floor will be a wood deck of pressure-treated pine wood. The siding will be the existing wood clapboard already on the house. It will have a 60"x80" French door with windows. The dimensions will be 20' long x 11' wide. The balcony will have pressure-treated wood for flooring. It will have standard height wood railing. The peak of the roof will be the same as the existing peak of the home's shingled roof. The door of the balcony will match what is being used on the porch (French doors). In the drawings she also provided some alternatives such as a clear glass door. The balcony will maintain the existing wood clapboard already on the house. The color will be the same as the home and the posts will be white wood. In addition she would like to enlarge the window at the back of the kitchen from 2' to 3'- 6" wide instead of 24". The height will remain the same.

Q: Chairwoman Walker understands the width of the deck on the patio (20" x 11") but does not understand how much is "addition" and how much is "balcony" – and if the balcony will come to the edge of the patio.

A: Ms. Magueflor-Dugan said the balcony will be parallel to the end of the porch and the balcony 5'3" wide x 11'3" long.

Scott Wells, the individual who drafted the plans for Tim and Olivia Magueflor-Dugan introduced himself. Originally he drew up a schematic for just the downstairs porch with a French door, but the homeowners both have issues with the confined upstairs bedroom space, so he then prepared a schematic with an extension of the second story with a dormer and gable on top which provides them another 8'3" x 13'3" of bedroom space and a balcony of roughly 11'x5'. The balcony floor will be pressure treated wood, and underneath that will be some type of waterproof membrane that is pitched to drain off the ends underneath the handrail. The balcony wall will match the siding of the existing home.

Q: Chairwoman Walker said in the drawings it looks like there is an area to the left of the balcony that extends out to the length of the bottom porch but is not part of the balcony. She asked if that would be open area.

A: Mr. Wells said there would be a flat 1” pitch roof on either side of the balcony which serves to cover the porch below.

Q: Mr. Fairman asked what direction the back of the house/proposed balcony and porch additions are? He complimented the architect on a great design on an old house (which is not easy to do). He would like to see a weathervane on the front peak of the old house because he thinks it would complement the overall design.

A: Mr. Wells said it is the West elevation.

Q: Chairwoman Walker asked if the balcony and porch doors are lined up on top of one another, or if they are offset.

A: Mr. Wells said there are beams in the ceiling of the existing house that are structurally functional, so he centered the porch door between two of the ceiling beams. There is a 5’ door because there is only 5’ between the ceiling beams and the door has to fit between them. The upstairs door is offset because it is centered on the balcony and located right over one of the previously mentioned ceiling beams.

Q: Chairwoman Walker remembered during the site walk that there was a large picture window that birds kept flying into, and she asked if this was the same location the porch door would be located.

A: Mr. Wells said that is correct.

Chairwoman Walker opened the floor for questions and comments from the board.

Mr. MacDougall and Mr. Vaccarello had no questions – both commented that they liked the design.

Q: Ms. Muskat asked what was behind the decision for the two 45-degree angles on the porch level. They are not at the same 45-degree angle, so she is wondering what that is in response to.

A: Mr. Wells explained that there is an oil tank that required him to truncate the porch 20’ (even though 24’ if available); so he left off the last 4’ of the porch in order to avoid the oil tank. The roof is symmetrical and the 45-degree angles match at the roof but are different on the porch’s deck because of the oil tank. He could make them square, but Ms. Magueflor-Dugan thought that it softened the look of the structure.

Q: Ms. Muskat likes the design but feels it is very busy when you compare it to how simple the volumes are on the existing house and even the newer additions that have happened over time. She shared a thought: If you were to take your new dormer near the carriage house and push it over you may be able to get both of the French doors to align.

A: Mr. Wells said that is true, but if he moves things around on the balcony he has to move the exterior posts on the porch and they are centered on the existing ceiling beams. If he shifts everything 2' it will not line up structurally.

Ms. Muskat said the drawing seems busy. Ms. Magueflor-Dugan said that because her kitchen is so small she had requested that the porch doors swing outwards, and that is why the plans are drawn that way to show out-swinging doors. Ms. Muskat thinks it would be easier to understand the scale of what they are proposing if there was a site plan showing the relationship to other elements on the property. There are a lot of things going-on on the property (the pool, driveway) and it would be nice to have a clear survey to look at in one central drawing/plan in order to understand everything including the setbacks and where the wetlands are. Chairwoman Walker agreed that it is difficult to get an idea of the scale of what is being proposed without being able to see the footprint. She understands the need for extra space and thinks it makes a lot of sense where the addition is positioned off the back of the property from the kitchen, but agrees that it does look very busy (with the multiple roof lines) compared to the simplicity of the simple design of the home.

Q: Chairwoman Walker suggested removing the peak from the balcony and leaving it straight which would make it less ornamental and more in character with the existing home. She wondered if some of the architectural details could be simplified to make it more cohesive with the original structure.

A: Mr. Wells said the rooflines are complicated because the 3-pitch dormer roof would have a 9" soffit, and the gable ends don't have a soffit. He had to make a "call" as to where the rooflines end. The railings were designed based on photographs of some railings that Ms. Magueflor-Dugan liked. The drawings presented tonight are more simple line drawings than a finished rendering with color and shading which would do it more justice. Ms. Muskat would like to see a drawing that would allow the board to understand the corner boards and where the soffits are because those are the things that could make this addition look really successful.

The group looked at photographs that Ms. Magueflor-Dugan provided that were her inspiration for the design of the balcony and railings.

Q: Mr. MacDougall asked if it would be cedar siding like the existing home.

A: Mr. Wells said the siding would match the addition.

Chairwoman Walker understands that before Ms. Magueflor-Dugan can move forward and obtain building permits there is additional work required because of the wetlands behind the home. Mr. Connors explained that Ms. Magueflor-Dugan needs to get a plot plan to show that the addition would be at least 50-feet from the wetland setback. Ms. Magueflor-Dugan is in the process of finding a surveyor to do the job which will cost her at least \$1,500 to do so. She had asked Mr. Connors about this, because the existing carriage house has a solid foundation and the addition's boundaries lie prior to that building, so she was uncertain if this is really necessary, but she will do it if it is required. Chairwoman Walker noted that wetland setbacks change over time, so do building codes and town ordinances. What was permitted when the carriage house was built may be very different than what is allowable now. "That is not in the purview of what we are doing tonight," she said.

Chairwoman Walker would like to see the additional renderings providing finished detail that Mr. Wells discussed. Those are the things that will make this successful. She doesn't like slowing the process down, but since Ms. Magueflor-Dugan is still in the process of getting a plot plan, it really may not be slowing the process down at all if we were to table this application and have her come back next month to present the additional information.

Mr. Fairman wondered why the work should be held up. The design has some details missing, but when you look at the overall design considering all the obstacles of working within the existing structure he doesn't see why they can't begin working before the snow flies. If the work is not planned to be done this Autumn, that would be a different story. If they want this to be closed-in before the worst of the winter, though, they will need to get going on the work. He is unsure how long getting a wetlands permit will take, but as he looks at it...it doesn't appear to be a big issue.

Chairwoman Walker asked Mr. Connors if a plot plan was required prior to the issuance of any sort of building permit. Mr. Connors said there is no permit and the plot plan is needed to confirm that the addition is at least 50-feet from the wetlands. If it incurs on that 50-feet, Ms. Magueflor-Dugan would need to get a variance in order to build the addition. Chairwoman Walker asked if this was a requirement prior to any issuance of a building permit. Mr. Connors believes so. Ms. Magueflor-Dugan could confirm this with the building department, but his understanding is that when a wetland is close to someone's property a plot plan is needed prior to issuing a permit.

Mr. Fairman said that Historic District approval may not affect things, because if the HDC approves and then they find that a variance is needed because of the wetlands whatever the HDC approved would have no bearing on the distance to the wetlands - - and it would be determined elsewhere whether or not Ms. Magueflor-Dugan can or cannot do it. HDC approval would be more about architectural features and whether it fits with the existing structure. Chairwoman Walker doesn't disagree, but it is some of

the architectural features that she feels we need detail about in order to make a decision tonight.

Q: Mr. Vaccarello asked if Ms. Magueflor-Dugan was planning on starting this project before winter this year, or if the project would go into 2021.

A: Ms. Magueflor-Dugan said she was planning to do it before the 2020 winter. She would like to know all of the details the HDC wants, because when she asked Mr. Wells to do the drawings, she did not realize anyone other than the planning or building departments would be interested in the details.

Mr. Vaccarello said that is a good point and echoed what Ms. Muskat and Chairwoman Walker have said because he is able to picture certain things from having been on the site walk, but this is an entirely new structure that the HDC has not seen, so more detail would be helpful in seeing the overall picture. Nobody likes to hold up the process, but the HDC's only job is to look at the details and designs. That is his opinion.

After looking at this a little longer, Mr. MacDougall said he agreed with Ms. Muskat. He said it's nice when you can put an addition on an antique home like this and not be able to tell that it is an addition. He feels there are two different time periods that we are looking at and this difference in time periods would be pretty evident in the addition. He said to some degree it is personal taste, but he feels there is a way to better blend more of the old part of the house into the new part of the house being proposed to make it look seamless. As it stands now, there would be no difficulty differentiating the old home from the new portion. Since the home is in the Historic District a little more effort should be made to make it match the old style of the very simplistic old Colonial home.

Q: Mr. MacDougall asked if there was no foundation under this, just the pylons underneath the porch deck which will support the second-story balcony.

A: Mr. Wells said when the project originally started it was just going to be a porch/deck. When the second floor was added he was unsure if pylons were going to be sufficient structurally, so instead they may look to a 12' x 10" concrete pier or 4" pier underneath the posts. He is unsure about this and would need to talk to a structural engineer about it. It will not be a full foundation, though.

Q: Mr. MacDougall asked if Mr. Wells understood what he meant when he said the original home and addition seemed to be in two different time period styles.

A: Mr. Wells said he was open to design to whatever the style was hundreds of years ago when the home was originally built. The submitted drawing was only schematic at this point.

Chairwoman Walker summarized that she is not hearing any concern or objection to a porch and addition going on the home from the HDC – the issue is the amount of lacking detail the HDC has regarding the how the finished addition and deck are going to look that would prevent them from approving this to go forward at this meeting. They need to see the final details to make sure they compliment the existing structure and the appearance and character of the Historic District where the house is located.

Mr. Greazzo had no further comments or questions.

Ms. Radke said while she understands what Mr. Fairman has said about not holding up applications, she thinks the board needs to be consistent when dealing with applications. Ms. Radke has only been on the HDC since March 2020, but she knows that other applicants were required to show more detail and she applauds the HDC for asking for it. She agrees with getting the detail and being consistent among all applicants.

Mr. Fairman said when he looked at Mr. Wells’ architectural drawing he saw a house and a small barn. The new addition (the porch) appears historical to him. He agrees having a balcony above is “a little flaky”, but thought the addition looked like a small barn attached to the existing house. That is what he saw...he is not sure if that was the intent of the architect. He agrees in having more details and perhaps squaring off the cut-off corners. He originally thought the HDC could move forward with approval having faith that it was going to come out; but, he now feels it is better that we get the detailed drawings and look at them and has no problems about holding the project up.

Chairwoman Walker opened the floor for questions or comments from the public. There were no callers on the phone, and no emails were received.

MOTION by Mr. Fairman to table the application until next (November 2020) meeting for more details; and neither approving nor denying the application this evening. The motion was seconded by Ms. Muskat.

Mr. Vaccarello amended the motion to include that the decision would be tabled until further details are provided to the external structure and more of the finish drawings are provided in order to render a motion on the application. Mr. Fairman was in agreeance to the amended motion. The amended motion was seconded by Ms. Muskat. Roll call vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried 4-0.

IV. Approval of Minutes - August 4, 2020

MOTION by Mr. MacDougall to accept the August 4, 2020 minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Muskat. Roll call vote taken (2 abstentions: Charwoman Walker and Mr. Vaccarello who were not present at the August 4, 2020 meeting – all others in favor. Motion carried 3-0.

V. **Communications:**

- None

VI. **Members Comments and Concerns:**

Chairwoman Walker said that the HDC always meets on the first Tuesday of the month; but in November the meeting would fall on November 3rd which is election day; so, she proposed postponing the meeting 1-week and meeting on November 10th instead in order to accommodate the election schedule.

MOTION by Mr. Vaccarello to reschedule the November 3, 2020 Historic District Commission meeting to November 10th. The motion was seconded by Ms. Muskat. Roll call vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried 4-0.

VII. **Adjournment:**

MOTION by Mr. Vaccarello to adjourn meeting at 8:07 pm. The motion was seconded by Mr. MacDougall. Roll call vote taken – all in favor. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Tiffany Lewis