

James Campbell, AICP
Director of Planning & Development
33 Wakefield Street
Rochester, NH 03867
(603) 335-1338
jim.campbell@rochesternh.net



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Minutes

City of Rochester

Wednesday July 31, 2019 at 7 pm

City Hall Annex (second floor conference room)

33 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH

(These minutes were approved on August 14, 2019)

Members Present

Molly Meulenbroek, *Chair*

Martha Wingate, *Vice Chair*

Peter Bruckner

Nancy Dibble

Marilyn Jones

Joyce Bruckner, *(Planning Board Rep)*

Members Absent

Sandra Keans

I. Call to Order. Ms. Meulenbroek called the meeting to order at 7:00p.m.

II. Approval of minutes for July 10, 2019.

The minutes from July 10, 2019 were approved by a motion from Ms. Jones and seconded by Ms. Meulenbroek. All voted in favor.

III. TSM Architects, 22 South Main Street Certificate of Approval for rehabilitation of the existing building.

Shannon Alther of TSM Architects noted that he received comments from the HDC at the last meeting and presented on the proposed design. The proposed work includes replacement of windows, re-installation of windows that had previously been filled, addition of a section of new material to the façade that becomes visible as you move around the side of the building, and clear skylights that would not be visible from the street. He said his goal was to get some input from the Commission for these items.

Ms. Meulenbroek asked if any members had any initial questions, and then asked the applicant about the windows. Mr. Alther said that he would like to treat the larger windows like the front windows and would prefer that other windows be two-over-one double hung. The Commission member discussed the window with the applicant.

Mr. Alther went on to say he is thinking of using lead coated copper for the flashing. Ms. Jones asked if that would remain gray. Mr. Alther said that it would remain a warm pewter-ish gray. Ms. Jones asked if it would match the mortar. Mr. Alther said that the mortar is in good shape and he does not plan to repoint it. He said it is a tan color and they are proposing gray flashing.

Mr. Bruckner said he is curious about the entry. Mr. Alther said that the front used to be in the center of the building but was later moved; he said he would like to keep the entrance where it is.

Mr. Bruckner said that the current windows are unacceptable. Ms. Jones said the two-over-one would look good. The Commission and the applicant generally agreed that six-over-six would look too busy.

Mr. Bruckner said that he was okay with the lead covered flashing and that the Main Street façade is most important. He then asked what was happening with the sign. Mr. Alther said he would ask for a recommendation from the Commission and that he could go either way. Mr. Bruckner said he thinks the sign is not in tune with the building. Mr. Alther proposed bringing it back to a vintage look. Mr. Bruckner noted that it doesn't fit sticking out as far as it is. Mr. Alther proposed making an adjustment to the sign and bring it back to the Commission.

Economic Development Specialist Jennifer Marsh said if the sign is in compliance with the Ordinance, the applicant does not need to go back to the Commission for an approval for the sign.

Mr. Bruckner asked for a summary of the discussion. Ms. Meulenbroek summarized the discussion; saying there will be storefront windows at the street, an addition at the roofline, lead coated copper flashing, the windows would be two-over-one double hung, and the sign would be altered.

A motion was made by Mr. Bruckner and seconded by Ms. Wingate to accept the proposed application with the conditions summarized (storefront windows at the street, addition to the roofline, lead coated copper flashing, the windows will be two-over-one double hung, and the sign would be altered). All in favor.

IV. Granite State Investment, LLC, 45 Hanson Street

Adam Reeves of Granite State Investment, LLC described the proposed work to be done at 45 Hanson Street. He said he would like to replace the existing single pane windows with more efficient double pane windows. He said the building is currently vinyl and is proposing to replace the existing siding with a combination of vinyl shakes and panels. Mr. Reeves said he is proposing to use white azek for the corner boards and all the trim would be white; adding currently the building has brown and purple trim with bay windows.

Mr. Bruckner asked if the applicant would be using vinyl siding. Mr. Reeves said yes, he would be replacing the existing vinyl with newer siding. He went on to say he would be using Klear Konceal trimboard which would allow the vinyl to tuck behind the trim.

Mr. Reeves said that he wanted to get rid of the existing inefficient windows. He showed the Commission samples of the materials he is proposing to use. Mr. Reeves said he wants to use the shake siding on the top of the building and panels could be used for the bottom but is open to suggestions. He also mentioned that the project included repairing the existing rubber roof, which is not visible from the street. He said he is also proposing to replace the purpose door with a newer style commercial door.

Mr. Bruckner asked what the proposed use will be. Mr. Reeves said he is leaning towards office space.

The Commission went back to discussing the siding. Mr. Reeves said that he wants to accent the building and thought shakes might work well. He said that the sides of the building would receive the same window and siding replacement but is proposing shakes on the second story of the front only.

Ms. Meulenbroek asked if the Commission had any additional questions. Ms. Jones asked the applicant to decide about where the shakes would go. Mr. Reeves asked if the Commission had a preference. Mr. Bruckner recommended shakes on the front top and bottom stories. When asked, Mr. Reeves reiterated that the corner and window trim would be white. Ms. Dibble asked the applicant to clarify whether the

shakes would be gray. Mr. Reeves said yes, they would be a gray-blue color like the sample he showed.

A motion was made by Mr. Bruckner and seconded by Ms. Dibble to approve the proposal as discussed. All voted in favor.

Ms. Jones commented that a projecting sign on the building would bang back and forth due to wind. Mr. Reeves asked about the process. The Director of Planning & Development explained Planning Staff will get the Certificate of Approval to him.

V. Other Business/Non-scheduled Items

There was no other business to discuss.

VI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Bruckner to adjourn the meeting at 7:35 pm and seconded by Ms. Jones. All voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Durfee,
Contract Planner