

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 August 14, 2019 at 7 pm

City Hall Annex (second floor conference room)

33 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH

(These minutes were approved on , 2019)

Members Present

Molly Meulenbroek, *Chair*
Martha Wingate, *Vice Chair*
Peter Bruckner
Nancy Dibble
Marilyn Jones
Sandra Keans
Joyce Bruckner, *(Planning Board Rep)*

Members Absent

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

II. Approval of minutes for July 31, 2019.

The minutes from July 31, 2019 were approved by a motion from Ms. Wingate and seconded by Mr. Bruckner. All voted in favor.

III. 73 North Main, LLC, 73-77 North Main Street Certificate of Approval for window replacement.

Adam Allain represented the applicant and explained they were having a tough time getting windows without going commercial. He said that due to the size and number of windows, replacements would cost 20% of the total cost the investor can put into the project. He stated the need for energy efficient, safe windows and the challenge of getting two pane windows. Continuing to summarize the project, Mr. Allain said that the only way is to have a transom on the top level. Originally he thought it would be solid but now he proposes glass and would be looking to do black trim.

Mr. Allain went on summarize some of the other aspects of the project, including door replacement and the fire escape. He said the door needs to come out and there is no way to rebuild it. The window next to the door needs to be replaced as well. The fire escape is an eyesore and needs to be removed. The back of the building has a blocked-in window with new brick that Mr. Allain states should not have been filled in. He stated that he is trying to make the building look attractive.

Ms. Meulenbroek then clarified that the applicant was only seeking approval for the windows at this time.

Mr. Allain said yes, and that he will come back for the other exterior changes.

Mr. Bruckner asked if he was talking about all windows. Mr. Allain said yes, and showed some pictures of various windows on different sides of the building.

Ms. Meulenbroek asked if any Commission members had any questions or comments.

Mr. Bruckner commented about the façade. He noted that the building is one of the most prominent buildings in town. He pointed out the difference between the windows on the front, including the arched eyebrows. Mr. Bruckner stated that he had called and spoken to a window manufacturer about reproducing the windows and the company confirmed it was possible. Mr. Bruckner said that he thinks the right thing should be done and that the Commission is the caretaker of one of the most important buildings on Main Street. He added that there could be other ways of raising funds.

Ms. Wingate asked to clarify the dimensions. She drew a sketch of the window on the white board and asked Mr. Allain if they were correct. The sketch showed the arched window with a 69” rectangular bottom and a 24” tall curved top pane. It was confirmed that these were the dimensions Mr. Allain mentioned.

Mr. Allain said the cost to replace each window is \$2,000.

Ms. Keans stated that the building is a showcase building and asked whether the discussion was about all facades.

Ms. Meulenbroek responded yes. She went on to ask the applicant whether the rear and side windows, with the exception of the tall windows, would be the same.

Mr. Allain said there were different sizes and read through a list of some of the dimensions.

Ms. Keans asked if he planned on keeping all the windows and doors. Mr. Allain said no, the doors on the back would go back to windows.

Ms. Keans asked if he had heard back from the Fire Department. Mr. Allain said no. He stated there were about 40 windows total and that the first floor would be staying vacant.

Ms. Meulenbroek asked about the first floor rear door. Mr. Allain said he will come back for that.

Ms. Meulenbroek said she would have to agree that the tall windows are significant. Mr. Bruckner said that it is common with a project of this magnitude to submit proper drawings. Ms. Meulenbroek asked if there were any renderings. Mr. Allain said that there were no modifications to the first floor. He showed the Commission some project images.

Ms. Meulenbroek said that the Commission could postpone the decision. The Commission gave the applicant some recommendations. Mr. Allain said if the cost of the windows went over \$100,000 the project would be over.

Ms. Meulenbroek provided clarification regarding Historic Tax Credits. She suggested the applicant reach out to the NH Preservation Alliance for options and guidance.

A motion was made by Mr. Bruckner and seconded by Ms. Wingate to postpone the decision on window replacement and continue the hearing to the September 11, 2019 meeting. All voted in favor.

Mr. Allain said he will provide additional information to the Commission.

IV. Pavan Reddy, 74 South Main Street Certificate of Approval for a building addition to an existing structure.

Mr. Reddy presented the proposed project to building an addition on the side of the building known as the Gilman Building. He explained he purchased the building two years ago and has recognized that the practice is changing and people want more space. Mr. Reddy went on to explain that the available space is putting a strain on the long-time dental office. He continued to describe the building. It is a 12-chair office but the office was designed to function in the 1960's. Mr. Reddy said he would like to pull in more patients, showcase technology, and improve user experience.

Mr. Reddy showed the Commission aerial images of the project and pointed out a 2002 addition that contains the newer doctor's office. He showed a conceptual illustration of the 38 foot by 18 foot proposed addition. Mr. Reddy said that the windows will mimic the existing windows, the roof will be flat to help distinguish it from the original structure, and the side will merge with the 2002 addition. He explained that one of the challenges was that the wheelchair ramp has to go because it is located where the addition is proposed. He proposed to add a lift in the front of the building on the right side of the stairs. This location is close to the accessible parking spaces and will be screened by landscaping.

Ms. Meulenbroeck asked the Commission if they had any questions.

Ms. Keans stated she was confused about the plans and that she had seen other plans. Mr. Reddy explained the past discussion about the addition with the Planning Department staff and reiterated what he presented is the project he proposes moving forward with.

Ms. Keans asked about the setbacks. Mr. Reddy explained that he has discussed this with the Planning Department and has submitted a Planning Board application for a Conditional Use Permit. He said it is required because the addition is not proposed to be located at the build-to line at the front of the lot. He reaffirmed that the application submitted to the Commission is what he is proposing to do.

Ms. Wingate said she thinks the proposal looks nice and asked if the siding would be the same. Mr. Reddy confirmed it would.

Ms. Wingate asked about shoveling the roof. Mr. Reddy said that he would most likely do it.

Mr. Bruckner asked if there was an internal elevator. Mr. Reddy said no, and mentioned the staircase and the trouble he had finding someone to restore it. He said the patients stay downstairs.

Ms. Meulenbroek asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Bruckner asked to look at the elevations again. He mentioned that a larger front setback from the existing structure may be better. Mr. Reddy explained that they were limited by the chairs inside and that pushing the addition back further was not possible.

Mr. Bruckner expressed his concern over the awkward piece where the addition joins the 2002 addition. Mr. Reddy explained the reason for that design was snowfall, the space will just be used for storage.

Mr. Bruckner said that a cricket would deal with snow and water and be more respectful of the building.

The applicant and the Commission continued to discuss the feasibility of a cricket, including existing water damage, space, and direction snow would go.

Ms. Wingate said she wanted to let Mr. Reddy know that she appreciates the time he took to come up with the design, explain it, and answer questions.

Mr. Reddy added that the lower windows on the side will be bigger than the upper windows. Mr. Bruckner

stated that is traditional.

A motion was made by Ms. Wingate and seconded by Ms. Dibble to approve the application for the addition as presented. All voted in favor.

V. Troy Dillow, 32 Wakefield Street Certificate of Approval to allow a mural design on the rear of the building facing Barker Court.

Matt Wyatt represented the applicant and explained the project. He described other public art projects and showed some images and noted the artist is from Texas and that she has a southwest style.

Ms. Meulenbroek asked the Commission if there were any questions. She clarified the building is behind the insurance building.

Mr. Wyatt said he is hoping to give people a different perception of the parking lot. The artist, Bianca, likes to get students involved. He also noted the property owner is a supporter of the arts. Mr. Wyatt went on to explain he is trying to concentrate public art in areas that received the most traffic, not just downtown.

Mr. Bruckner said it enhances the parking lot and is a nice splash of color.

Ms. Wingate mentioned a study that looked at improvements to parking.

A motion was made by Mr. Bruckner and seconded by Ms. Wingate to approve the application for the mural as presented. All voted in favor.

Mr. Bruckner asked about maintenance. Mr. Wyatt explained there is a protective wax coating that can be applied. He said he has seen no graffiti. He also said he would like to come back in five years with a new proposal for a new mural – the painting is not intended to stay forever. Mr. Wyatt said he hopes projects like this will turn people on to the arts.

VI. Other Business/Non-scheduled Items

Todd Radict, owner of Skeletones made an announcement about a meeting on August 26th regarding downtown revitalization.

Economic Development Specialist, Jennifer Marsh said it is a good opportunity for everyone to get involved. Mr. Wyatt said input from business owners is really important.

Director of Building, Zoning & Licensing Services, Jim Grant said a few years ago Dave ?? was involved with downtown revitalization and may be a good person to reach out to.

VII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Wingate to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 pm. All voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Durfee,

DRAFT