

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

APPROVED  
HDC MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 5, 2019

Members Present: Chair Rodney Rowland, Vice Chair Hughes, Kate Murray  
Elaine Nollet, Irene Bush and Judy Groppa.

Absent: Tom Maher

Chair Rowland called the meeting of the New Castle HDC to order at 7:01 pm. He advised that there were two public hearings on the agenda. The Chair asked that anyone wishing to speak, must please sign in and advised that all applications had been published, fees paid and abutters notified. The Chair, Vice Chair, Kate Murray, Elaine Nollet and Irene Bush will be voting on the first hearing; on the second hearing, Vice Chair Jeff Hughes recused himself so Judy Groppa will be voting.

1. Public Hearing for Ellen and Randy Bryan, 34 Wentworth Road, to remove a garden shed, rehab a second shed, add a second garage bay and various stone retaining walls. Map 16 Lot 64

Guests: Mr. and Mrs. Randy Bryan.

Mr. Bryan provided a handout with additional detail of the proposal submitted. The Applicants come before the HDC tonight with several items to be reviewed and approved: 1. Removal of the garden shed, 2. addition of a second garage bay, 3. rehab of the knoll shed, and 4. building two retaining walls. The Building Inspector told the Bryans all of these items need review by the board.

The garden shed is 10' x 20' with a hip roof on the west boundary of the house, is currently within the setback and the Bryans will be removing it. It is currently about 40' from the Mason property, in good condition and not anchored to the ground. The shed and roof are only partially visible from the street, it is mostly hidden. However, it is in the way of excavating for the foundation for the approved garage and also is in the way of the proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> garage bay. It will eliminate a non-conforming detached structure from the setback area and will lower the lot coverage. The shed to be removed shows as yellow on the plan and the item in red is the proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> garage bay.

The Bryans are proposing a second garage bay to be attached to the first bay with the same carriage style look and same door size, 9' x 7', as the approved garage. It will have the same roof shingles and will look like an extension on the back. The garage door will be a Pella door, classic carriage style, with windows on the top panel. The roof will be a hip style roof, similar to the shed style roof on the back of the 1<sup>st</sup> garage bay. The second bay will have no windows viewable from the street, however, there will be windows on the back side of the garage and they will be compatible with the windows already in the house, 1 over 1 double hung,

1 vinyl, white windows. The trim will be white Azek. The Bryans have two cars  
2 and will be living in the house year round and want to be able to age in this house.  
3 They would like security and privacy and the attached garage will provide both.  
4 They have had their car parked in the lot across the street and it has been keyed  
5 and also when parked across the street, has received a dent. The second garage  
6 bay will provide security.

7  
8 Elaine Nollet asked if the 2<sup>nd</sup> bay would be visible from the street and yes, the  
9 front face of the garage door will be visible but not much else. The second bay  
10 will project into the setback area by the Sweet's property and a variance has  
11 already been approved by the ZBA. The garage addition is 150' from the road  
12 and relatively small and the bulk of it is somewhat hidden by land forms on the  
13 property and by existing structures.

14  
15 Mr. Bryan submitted the following as approval criteria: the owners' request is not  
16 out of line with other houses that have transitioned from seasonal to year round;  
17 the garage is quite removed from the street, retaining the house as the primary  
18 aesthetic structure, the net setback footprint shrinks by about 90 SF, and the  
19 volume is about the same as the shed that is being removed. Mr. Bryan added that  
20 this second bay is five feet further from the Mason property than the shed that is  
21 there now and is about the same size as the shed. It will have cedar shingles  
22 stained gray-brown and black architectural asphalt shingles on the roof in keeping  
23 with the remainder of the house and approved garage. The added second bay is  
24 further from the setback line, will be attached to the approved garage and will  
25 look like a natural extension of the house and garage.

26  
27 They would like to rehabilitate the knoll shed as it is in an advanced state of  
28 decay. Windows and door frames are rotten and the floor is not level. The  
29 contractor says the bones are still good and worth saving. They will do repairs  
30 with few minor changes to the shed. The shed is minimally visible from the knoll  
31 and 140' from the road. It is grandfathered within the setback. The windows will  
32 be double hung, two over two and a couple windows are one over one.

33  
34 The Chair commented that the changes are not shown in the application. The  
35 Applicants will remove a door from the left side, which is out of view, and move  
36 it to the right side and make double doors. The roof pitch and trim details will be  
37 the same. They may eliminate 1 or 2 windows that are not in view of the street,  
38 one on the back side and one by the proposed double door will come out. They  
39 will install a new double door on the north side. There is a sample of the double  
40 doors on the plan page marked "MP Doors".

41  
42 Elaine Nollet asked if it's not visible from the street, why does it matter, to which  
43 Judy Groppa responded it should maintain the architectural integrity. The Chair  
44 wanted to know what type of door is being installed to be sure it is appropriate.  
45 Mr. Bryan stated the doors will retain the two over two look of the windows, with  
46 a framed window area with approximately the same dimensions as other windows

1 on the house, and also have a kick panel on the bottom. The door will be made of  
2 a composite material.

3  
4 The application contained a description of the replacement windows which are  
5 made by Andersen. Andersen has both an aluminum clad wood and a  
6 architectural series, composite version and Mr. Bryan wanted to know what the  
7 board's preference is. The Chair stated he believed the composite would fit better  
8 but without seeing a sample, it's difficult to determine.

9  
10 Mr. Bryan showed the board which retaining walls need their review. They  
11 would like to install a retaining wall by the road as there is an outcrop next to the  
12 road. The outcrop and the fence look north toward the Feder property and the  
13 drop off between the outcrop and the fence make mowing difficult. The Bryans  
14 would like to fill it in and put a rock wall, decreasing in height as it goes from the  
15 Feder property toward the rose bush. The wall would be about 2' high near the  
16 Feder property and go down to about 6" near the rose bush. It will be about 30'  
17 long and they intend to have it match a stone wall that is between their property  
18 and the Feder's property. The wall will go in front of the rock, essentially where  
19 the fence is now. Jeff Hughes asked what is on the Feder property side and Mr.  
20 Bryan stated there is a rock wall.

21  
22 Chair Rowland stated that from the picture it looks like it drops off in the corner  
23 and is a straight line but it seems it would actually draw back. Mr. Bryan stated  
24 between the Feder's and Bryan's property there is a 1- 1 ½ foot rock wall and this  
25 proposed rock wall will blend into it. The wall will be made out of granite stones  
26 from 1 – 2 cubic feet in size, embedded in cement, which will not be visible from  
27 the street. Near the Feder property, the wall will be almost 2' and it will taper  
28 down to about 6" by the rose bush.

29  
30 Kate Murray asked if the rock wall is a lot longer than what is shown on the plan  
31 and Mr. Bryan stated it is about 30' long. He showed the board pictures of rock  
32 walls in town, one at the Trefethen School, one from the late Mark Connolly's  
33 property on Wentworth Rd, and one from Feder's property adjacent to the Mason  
34 property. The rock wall would look similar to the Hummock's wall. The rocks  
35 on the top of the wall will be flat.

36  
37 The Chair advised Mr. Bryan that the owners of 24 Wentworth Road said Mr.  
38 Bryan had told them he was going to use pre-treated railroad ties with a 6' fence  
39 on top of the retaining wall. Mr. Bryan responded they are not using railroad ties  
40 but they would like a short retaining wall no higher than 18" in spots, to as low as  
41 6", to hold fill they will put in the area by the Feder property where it abuts the  
42 Mason property. The fence will not be stacked on top of the retaining wall, the  
43 retaining wall will be behind the fence.

44  
45 The other stone wall the Bryans are proposing is crescent shaped with an accent  
46 on top that follows the contour of the new driveway being put in to access the  
47 garage. The driveway runs across the front of the house with a kickout in front of

1 the knoll shed. The Bryans would like to put a stone wall in there to  
2 accommodate changes in ground level and to have a flatter, larger social area.  
3 The height of the wall will be 6" to 18", decreasing in height as it goes down to  
4 the road. The look will be similar to the stone wall by the Feder property, with  
5 stones 1-2 cubic feet in size with filler stones. The wall will be faced with stone  
6 and have poured concrete behind it.  
7

8 Vice Chair Hughes commented that it would not be like the stone wall at the  
9 Trefethen School because that one is loose stone. Chair Rowland advised the  
10 board does not want to see a concrete retaining wall and asked the Bryans why  
11 they would not install a loose stone wall as they are historic. Mr. Bryan stated  
12 that having built stone walls, he finds that loose stone walls come apart. He  
13 thought a cement backed stone wall would be better. He then passed his phone  
14 around which contained a picture of a cemented stone wall from the Hummock's  
15 which is cemented but the cement is not highly visible. He stated he would  
16 change to a loose stone wall but thought the cement would be better for long term.  
17 The Chair stated that there is a loose stone wall along the Feder property and it's  
18 not at all like what you are proposing and he wants to be sure the stone wall  
19 blends in with what the Feders have,. He asked Mr. Bryan who owns the stone  
20 wall between his property and the Feders and was advised that a survey shows the  
21 property line goes right down the middle of the stone. The Chair asked if the  
22 applicants could make the connection from the stone wall at the front of the house  
23 to the stone wall between the Feders' property if they don't own that stone wall  
24 outright. Mr. Bryan stated the stone wall is a good 12" deep and they own half of  
25 it and they propose to build a stone wall on their own property of which the last  
26 key stone laid may touch the wall on their side. Mr. Bryan said there are a  
27 number of discontinuities in the wall and believes the improvement in appearance  
28 of that whole section would be more favorable both to the Feders as well as the  
29 Bryans and they would like to make their property more easily maintainable.  
30

31 Mr. Bryan added that the criteria is that there are numerous stone walls around the  
32 district with compatible style and materials. The Bryans will also be using stone  
33 from their property and the size and appearance are intended to blend and not  
34 clash. The wall will not rise above ground level and is strictly a retaining wall.  
35 Kate Murray pointed out that Mr. Bryan stated he was changing the ground level.  
36

37 Mrs. Bryan pointed out that there is a stone wall and split rail fence by the  
38 Wentworth just like what they are asking to do. The Bryans would remove three  
39 sections of split rails and the split rail fence will remain where the roses are  
40 because that area is level.  
41

42 The Chair stated that if concrete is used, the stone walls will look the same  
43 forever and will not age. A loose laid stone wall will change over time. One with  
44 cement will not and will always look like it was laid yesterday. The Bryans asked  
45 if the Chair would like loose stone on the front with something to be sure the dirt  
46 stays and doesn't come through the stone.  
47

1 Kate Murray stated it's a major change to the property as they are adding fill and  
2 adding a stone wall, which takes away from the historic character. Vice Chair  
3 Hughes stated he would like to do another site visit to the property to see what  
4 impact the wall would have to the Feder property. The Board agreed.

5  
6 Chair Rowland asked the board if they had any questions regarding the removal  
7 of the garden shed. There were none. He asked if there were questions regarding  
8 the addition of the garage bay and Irene Bush stated she had a concern about the  
9 massing of the house, as the size is double of the original house. The Chair stated  
10 that you will not see much of the second bay garage from the road and that in  
11 terms of massing, it meets zoning requirements and is less non-conforming.

12  
13 Chair Rowland asked if there were questions regarding rehabilitation of the knoll  
14 shed, which is quite visible from the road. Mr. Bryan stated the shed has been  
15 there for over 70 years. Judy Groppa stated she could not picture how the double  
16 doors would fit in and asked how wide is the shed. The shed is 10' wide and the  
17 double door has a frame size of 60", so essentially it will be in the middle with 2 –  
18 2 ½' on either side, and it will not be visible. Chair Rowland wanted to be clear  
19 that the clapboard and trim are staying the same. Mr. Bryan stated that if they  
20 cannot find compatible clapboard, they may re-use clapboard from the back of the  
21 shed on the front and that it will have a black or charcoal roof to match the house.

22  
23 Chair Rowland suggested the Board table a decision on the stone walls as they  
24 would like to do another site walk.

25  
26 The Chair opened the hearing to the public at 7:55 pm but there was no one to  
27 speak. The Board then decided to vote on the applicants' petition item by item.

28  
29 M/S/P Jeff Hughes moved to approve removal of the garden shed as proposed; Kate  
30 Murray seconded. All members voted in favor including the Chair.

31  
32 M/S/P Jeff Hughes moved for approval of construction of the 2<sup>nd</sup> garage bay; Kate  
33 Murray seconded. All members were in favor, including the Chair.

34  
35 M/S/P Jeff Hughes moved for approval to rehab the knoll shed; Elaine Nollet seconded.  
36 Chair Rowland stated that all areas of the shed visible from a public way must  
37 have materials replaced with in kind materials. All members voted in favor,  
38 including the Chair.

39  
40 M/S/P Jeff Hughes motioned to table the hearing on the stone wall to the next meeting as  
41 the Board would like to do a site visit to better understand where the walls will be  
42 placed. Elaine Nollet seconded; all members were in favor including the Chair.

43  
44 2. Public Hearing for and John and Caroline Barrie, 57 Oliver Street, to revise front  
45 door from prior approval. Map 16 Lot 28

46  
47 Guests: Shannon Alther from TMS Architects; Caroline Barrie.

1 Jeff Hughes recused himself as he is a neighbor.

2  
3 Mr. Alther stated they found a good amount of rock as they did the renovations  
4 which slowed things down but renovations are finally moving along. As they got  
5 to the front door which faces directly east, they decided they wanted to make a  
6 slight change. The old entry had an aluminum storm door that swung out and a  
7 wood door that swung in. They would like to eliminate the aluminum storm door  
8 and have a wooden door with sidelights that swings out.

9  
10 The existing entablature will be lengthened to accommodate the new sidelights  
11 and actually fits the scale better. The building is white and will have white  
12 sidelights and a white door. Kate Murray asked what an internal roll screen was  
13 and Alther responded it is a screen that goes across from one side to the other, like  
14 a pocket door without the pocket. It can be installed on the inside so there is no  
15 storm door as they would like to see the door enhanced instead of seeing a storm  
16 door. The main section of the house is 1776.

17  
18 Elaine Nollet, who lives across the street, asked about the windows as they had  
19 indicated at the October hearing that they would be using Marvin windows but  
20 they have installed Andersen windows. Alther stated they had originally looked at  
21 Marvin, Andersen and Pella as they wanted to replicate windows that had  
22 originally been on the house. The Andersen and Marvin windows are very similar.  
23 Nollet also pointed out the three modern windows on the west and north side,  
24 windows without mullions, on the new addition on the back. Alther advised they  
25 put single pane windows as they wanted the glass to look as though a screen does,  
26 as it is a three season porch. Irene Bush asked if it was still a screen porch; they  
27 replied it has transitioned to a four season room and they swap out the screens  
28 when it gets cold. Chair Rowland said he interpreted the solid panes as a screen  
29 porch sort of look and passed around the plans presented at the hearing in  
30 October 2018.

31  
32 Kate Murray noted the old door has four lights over the transom but the new door  
33 has three and it matches the windows better as there are three panes across the  
34 windows. Murray asked Rowland if four windows had any significance but he  
35 stated they do not. Alther had a picture of a door with four lights at the top and  
36 asked what the board liked better. The Chair liked the second door presented with  
37 the four lights at the top.

38  
39 There was no one from the public with questions or comments.

40  
41 M/S/P Kate Murray motioned to approve the change of the front door with the four light  
42 transom window on plans dated 9-6-2019, Irene Bush seconded. All members in  
43 favor including the Chair.

44  
45 After the hearing, Jeff Hughes spoke about the Barrie property and how the roof  
46 is longer than what was proposed and that it no longer looks like a screen porch,  
47 questioning why the building inspector did not bring it to the Board's attention. It

1 is inconsistent with what the HDC approved, so Mr. Graves should have called  
2 the Chair. The Building Inspector should follow through with the Chair when  
3 applicants make changes to the approved plans. The Chair stated that the part  
4 time inspector, Ian, has been driving around and inspecting and has called the  
5 Chair 2-3 times with questions, something Mr. Graves has never done.  
6

7 Irene Bush asked the Chair about the Bryans' stone walls and whether they should  
8 go before the Planning Board. Kate said the impervious surface has increased and  
9 that she would find out about runoff and speak with the Chair of the Planning  
10 Board.  
11

12 4. Approval of August 1, 2019 Minutes  
13

14 M/S/P Kate Murray motioned to approve the minutes of August 1, 2019 as amended;  
15 Irene Bush seconded. All approved, including the Chair.  
16

17 5. Old Business  
18

19 M/S/P The Chair stated he is unsure as to which board members' terms are up.  
20 Irene Bush nominated Rodney Rowland to be Chair and Jeff Hughes to be Vice  
21 Chair. Kate Murray seconded. All members were in favor.  
22

23 The Chair added that he will clarify terms and that the board also needs another  
24 alternate as Peter Reed resigned.  
25

26 The Governors Council approved the funds for the CLG grant but the amount was  
27 cut so the survey will be done in phases.  
28

29 Elaine Nollet gave Chair Rowland the historical society proposed sign.  
30

31 Kate Murray motioned to adjourn; Jeff Hughes seconded. All members were in  
32 favor.  
33

34 Meeting adjourned at 8:26 pm

35 Respectfully submitted,

36 Diane L. Cooley, Recording Secretary  
37