

These minutes were approved at the February 5, 2004 meeting.

DURHAM HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
THURSDAY, January 8, 2004 7:00 pm
Durham Courthouse

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman: Roger Jaques
Vice chair: Crawford Mills,
Secretary: Andrea Bodo,
Leslie Schwartz
Nicholas Isaak, Planning Board Representative:

MEMBERS ABSENT

Joan Graf
Malcolm Sandberg, Town Council Representative:

1. Chair: Roger Jaques called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm

He made a motion to move the approval of the minutes to the end of the mtg.
Motion seconded by Crawford Mills. Vote unanimously approved.

II. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Annual Report Draft
- B. Antique homes handouts submitted by Crawford Mills.
- C. Mailing list of owners and occupants of households in the Historic District submitted by Crawford Mills.
- D. Historic Preservation Commission GUIDELINES for Infill Development (New Structures) submitted by Andrea Bodo.

Chair Jaques made a motion to adopt the items under NEW BUSINESS to be heard at tonight's mtg. The vote was unanimous to hear these issues.

Review of the Annual Report: a brief overview was given by Chair Jaques. Report was submitted.
All members were in agreement with content.

Antique Homes: Crawford Mills recommended that members go to their website and look up the category of the homes and become familiar with what distinguished the styles of the periods. He also recommended that we have someone from the State Dept of Historic Resources come and speak to the group about the specifics in the district. Chair Jaques said that there was money in the rollover budget from last year.

Mailing List of households within the District: Crawford Mills compiled a listing of all the households within the District suggesting we have a database. Chair Jaques suggested that the list be made available in the Planning Office.

Guidelines for Infill Development from the Historic Preservation Commission: Andrea Bodo reviewed the Guidelines for New Construction from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for historic buildings and properties. The current HDC Article VI is in the Planning Board Rewrite Committee and will be presented in the public hearing on January 21, 2003. She feels that the RSA 175-54,B,1 that is currently in practice does not contain the language strong enough to make the argument to preserve the properties in our historic district. The Historic Preservation Guidelines were compared with those stated in the Durham Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, RSA 175-54, B, 1 and 2. The Commission felt that the language used in the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines was more convincing and should replace 175-54,B,1. Nick Isaak said that Mr. Eyerman had been hired by the PB to help with the rewrite and perhaps he and or Jim Campbell could review the language in the Secretary of Interior's Standards and give some insights into any other document that might be consulted.

Andrea will email Jim Campbell with the proposed change to the current RSA 175-54,B,1 for incorporation into the Zoning Ordinance rewrite. In the meantime, she will research to see if there is any more current language that could be proposed for the Planning Board Public Hearing January 21, 2004.

The proposed changes will be attached to this document of minutes for January 8, 2004.

Crawford Mills made a motion to incorporate the language of the Guidelines for Infill Development from the Historic Preservation Commission . The motion was seconded by Leslie Schwartz. The vote was unanimous.

III OLD BUSINESS

DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT

Chair Jaques reviewed his draft for discussion purposes only. Leslie Schwartz requested time to review the document and it will be put on the agenda for the next mtg.

IV: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

OCTOBER 6, 2003 amend the date to October 2, 2003

MOTION to approve the minutes made by Nick Isaak

SECONDED by Crawford Mills

DISCUSSION on the agenda, amend the date to October 2, 2003

OCTOBER 23, 2003

MOTION to approve the minutes made by Nick Isaak

SECONDED by Crawford Mills

DISCUSSION insert the location on pg 1 to Town Council Chambers

Pg 2 under LIGHTING FIXTURES – 2d line “found there were issues regarding to appropriateness of light scanners” delete “to” and change “scanners” to “shields”

Pg 3 – 3d paragraph 5th line down – strike out “Went to the substance of the project although”..and “There were issues” will start the sentence.

NOVEMBER 6, 2003

MOTION to approve the minutes made by Nick Isaak

SECONDED by Crawford Mills

DISCUSSION pg 13 “The motion as amended passed unanimously”

The minutes were unanimously passed as amended.

Crawford Mills made the motion to adjourn the meeting, Leslie Schwartz seconded the motion.

Their being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45pm

Andrea Bodo
Secretary HDC

To: Jim Campbell

From: HDC - this is the language from the Historic Preservation Guidelines.....Can this be incorporated to replace 175-54 B, 1 and 2 ?

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic *Buildings recommended against*:

"Introducing any new building, streetscape or landscape feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character," or

"Introducing a new landscape feature or plant material that is visually incompatible with the site or destroys site patterns or vistas."

Infill development should not copy historical styles, but must be architecturally compatible with the area and adjacent or nearby historic structures.

Materials used at the time of construction of structures in the area are recommended; however, other materials which are consistent with typical structures in the area may be acceptable when consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines.

- **Guidelines**

- A. *Size, Shape and Proportion***

New building facades should be designed to look appropriate to, and compatible with, adjacent buildings. If there are no immediately adjacent structures, the applicant should look to nearby structures and blocks.

1. *Building height should be similar to nearby buildings, respecting the predominant heights of existing houses or commercial structures.*
2. *Facade proportions (ratio of width to height) should be similar to those of surrounding buildings to create or complement streetscapes and views with the area.*
3. *Building setback should follow established setbacks on the street and must comply with zoning requirements.*
4. *Roof forms should follow predominant styles of adjacent buildings. The pitch of the residential roofs varies a great deal in the historic districts, but generally are substantially steeper than those of more recent construction.*
5. *Utility connections should be placed to minimize visibility from the street.*

- B. *Materials***

1. *Materials should be compatible with those used in adjacent structures or, when there are no immediately adjacent structures, buildings within the surrounding area. Exterior surfaces should be painted or otherwise finished in a similarly compatible manner.*
2. *Materials of foundation walls should be compatible with those of nearby buildings. If use of matching materials is impractical, substitutions which are not obtrusive should be used, such as grey finished stucco near granite block foundations rather than concrete blocks.*

- C. *Details***

1. *Infill design can be approached with non-historic designs using simple and neutral elements which will fit better with the character of the neighborhood. New designs generally should not copy existing structures, but must be consistent with the character, style and scale of those structures.*
2. *Door and window height-to width ratios should be similar to those in neighboring structures. The pattern established by the relationship of window or door openings and the surrounding wall area should respect the neighboring structures. The percentage of glass to wall should approximate that of neighboring structures.*
3. *Facade elements which can help give a new structure a historically compatible appearance include:*
 - a. Window hoods and lintels;

- b. Entrances with porches and balustrades;
 - c. Cornice lines with architectural detailing;
 - d. Brick work with quoins, corbels, and other details;
 - e. Friezes;
 - f. Gables;
 - g. Columns and pilasters; and
 - h. Chimneys
4. *Any such detail elements must be consistent with the design of the structure. Adding details typical of one historic period may be inconsistent with a structure typical of the style of another period.*

below is the existing document RSA 175-54,B 1 and 2

4. Structures which are merely typical of their age and style. Such structures should be altered in a fashion of that age or style, if in keeping with the character of the Historic District.
- B. Criteria for conformance (new structures). New structures and buildings and those being moved into the Historic District must conform to the existing structures in the district in terms of general size and scale but need not conform in precise architectural style. In addition:
1. Unless waived by the Commission, a structure must conform, within a variation of ten percent (10%) to an average of the dimensions of its nearest neighbors as follows:
 - a. Height.
 - b. Length.
 - c. Width.
 - d. Street frontage.
 - e. Setback from the street.
 - f. Number of stories.
 2. Such a structure shall conform to the general style of the Historic District by being similar to neighboring structures in the criteria listed below, unless waived by the Commission:
 - a. Openings within the facade as a percentage of the facade, i.e., doors and windows.
 - b. Similarity of construction materials and surface texture, i.e., rough, smooth, wood, brick, etc.
 - c. Similarity of rooflines, i.e., slopes and shapes.
 - d. Similarity of architectural details, i.e., cornices, lintels, arches, porches, balustrades, wrought iron work, chimneys, etc.
 - e. Similarity of landscaping and ground coverings, i.e., grass, trees, shrubs, brick, granite, etc.
- C. Demolition or removal. No existing building or other structure may be demolished or moved out of the Historic District until approval has been granted by the Historic District Commission. An application which includes a detailed plan for the reuse of the site shall be submitted, and the Commission shall determine the appropriateness of the plan. A certificate of approval for demolition and reuse shall only be granted upon a showing by the applicant that to deny such certificate would result in a hardship unique to the property in question and that such hardship is not common to neighboring properties in the Historic District.