

**APPROVED MINUTES
JULY 6, 2023
HDC MEETING**

Members Present: Temporary Chair Jane Finn, Ruth Zikaras, Etoile Holzaepfel, David Myers, and Joseph Cuetara, Alternate

Absent: Kate Murray and Guy Stearns, Alternate

The meeting was held in the Macomber Room. Jane Finn, Temporary Chair, called the meeting of the New Castle Historic District Commission to order at 7:00 pm. She advised that three members of the HDC and an alternate had resigned and introduced the new board.

Jane Finn is a Select Board member and Temporary Chair, Ruth Zikaras was an alternate and is now a member of the Commission, David Myers and Etoile Holzaepfel are new members and Joseph Cuetara, is an alternate. All present will be voting tonight.

Finn asked anyone who was going to speak to sign in. She then went over the rules of addressing the board and not each other, asking also that people speak one at a time and when speaking to please state their name and address.

1. Public Hearing, for Applicants Ron and Mary Pressman, of 34 Oliver Street, Map 16 Lot 40, (front lot) for an Appeal of Administrative Decision of an approved application by the Historic District Commission on April 6, 2023, and remanded back to the Historic District by the ZBA Notice of Decision on May 23, 2023, to remove existing structure & construct a new home per Zoning Ordinance 9.3.5.1.

Finn advised that this application had been heard and approved by the HDC at the April 6, 2023 meeting but it was appealed to the ZBA with regard to the purview from Portsmouth Avenue. The ZBA decided that the HDC must consider the purview from Portsmouth Avenue and remanded the application back to the HDC. Ms. Finn advised that the view from Portsmouth Avenue is the only matter before the HDC tonight with regard to this application.

Guests: Michael Cerbone, Architect, and Attorney Tim Phoenix both representing Ron and Mary Pressman, Ian Moodie, Bill Lomas, and Jim Cerny

Michael Cerbone stated the matter before the HDC is regarding the front lot which was sent back to the HDC from an appeal to view the property from Portsmouth Avenue. Cerbone stated that he started on Oliver Street and went up Portsmouth Avenue and took pictures from between houses on Portsmouth Avenue, which he passed around to Commission members.

1 Joe Cuetara confirmed that it was the front lot being considered and not the back
2 lot. Etoile Holzaepfel asked Cerbone to point out adjacent houses and where parts
3 of the proposed house, particularly the existing barn, were located and Cerbone
4 pointed out where one may see a glimpse of the house behind the barn. Members
5 asked about the barn and were advised that the barn existed for a number of years
6 and is remaining on the property. Holzaepfel, David Myers and Joe Cuetara
7 looked carefully through the pictures presented by Cerbone and questioned and
8 commented on where the house may possibly be seen. Holzaepfel asked about the
9 height and was informed that the proposed house is 6 ½' feet above the ridge
10 height of the Callahan house. The pictures were then passed to Jane Finn and
11 Ruth Zikaras who also looked at the pictures and questioned Cerbone about
12 placement of the house. Zikaras commented that one might see a gable roofline
13 from the corner of Oliver Street, but the house sits one foot further back from the
14 road than the neighboring Callahan house. There may also be a glimpse of the
15 roofline from Portsmouth Avenue because it is higher than the Callahan home but
16 it's also setback. The existing barn is visible but it will be blocking much of the
17 house.

18
19 The public was then welcome to view the photos and some asked Cerbone
20 questions regarding the photos.
21

22 Holzaepfel asked Cerbone about the elevation for the house which he showed
23 plans to the new members of the board depicting the main house, connector and
24 garage. Holzaepfel asked where the 6' above the ridgeline of the Callahan house
25 was and Cerbone showed her on the plan. Holzaepfel commented that the gable
26 end of the main house which is 6' above the Callahan house may possibly be seen
27 from Portsmouth Avenue, but other portions of the house are substantially lower.
28 So if anything is seen from Portsmouth Avenue, it was determined that it may be
29 the gable end of the roofline.
30

31 Tim Phoenix spoke on behalf of the applicants, commenting that there are some
32 former board members and some new members and he wanted to refresh
33 everyone's memory that the important point is that this home has been approved
34 by the HDC but is back for rehearing because the Commission was under the
35 mistaken impression that the views were only relevant from streets within the
36 historic district. The application was remanded back by the ZBA for
37 consideration with regard to the view from Portsmouth Avenue. Phoenix stated
38 that he drove down Portsmouth Avenue, and the front of the house may be seen
39 down Oliver Street from the corner, but in general, it's pretty tough to see from
40 Portsmouth Avenue and he submitted there should be no change in the
41 Commission's approval.
42

43 Ian Moodie stated he made an appeal to the ZBA because the HDC was
44 interpreting the ordinance incorrectly. The application was remanded back for re-
45 hearing before the HDC with no limit as to what can be discussed. Moodie stated
46 that this is an awkward lot, and a house of this size would be appropriate on a lot

1 this size if it was a regular lot. Moodie opined that this house is crowding
2 neighboring houses and he has been trying to make a point of the mass of the
3 house even though it's allowed per the zoning ordinance. Moodie believes this
4 house is massive and affects other properties and diminishes the value of other
5 properties. Moodie stated that the ordinances were painstakingly written by
6 residents of this island and the Commission's purpose is to make sure that wasn't
7 in vain. Nothing has happened yet, no excavators have hit the ground, and the
8 purview of the master plan is to slow down build up. It's maxed out on its size
9 and maxed out on its lot. Moodie asked that the Commission reconsider this
10 application.

11
12 Bill Lomas of 54 Portsmouth Ave abuts the property at the rear of the lot where
13 the existing house is. Lomas stated he is relatively new to town although his
14 parents have resided in New Castle since 1977. Lomas' understanding was that
15 the Commission was to look at one specific issue, as the massing has already been
16 addressed. Lomas understood that the Commission is to consider how the
17 property looks from Portsmouth Avenue. Lomas stated he has walked by, driven
18 by and ridden his bicycle by the property and around the neighborhood, looking at
19 it from different angles. Lomas advised he is 100% behind having this property
20 built as is, that the house is a beautiful home as is the one on the back lot, which is
21 certainly better than the tear down. The Pressmans purchased the property and
22 got a subdivision approved. They have two homes which don't need any
23 variances and have designed them to historic standards of the HDC and they are
24 going to bring new taxes to the town.

25
26 Jim Cerny of 44 Portsmouth Avenue is an abutter to the back lot, his property
27 being two houses removed from Ian Moodie and Bill Lomas. Cerny stated he
28 agrees with everything said by Lomas and has attended the meetings and the site
29 walk. The problem is that one abutter doesn't like it and knows the town boards
30 and how they work and is raising flags. The applicant's attorney, Tim Phoenix
31 went through the definition of massing at the ZBA hearing and Chair Baker sent
32 the matter back to this board to affirm the view from Portsmouth Avenue only,
33 not to re-hear the entire application.

34
35 Tim Phoenix read the notice of decision from the ZBA which determined that the
36 HDC improperly did not consider views from Portsmouth Avenue and therefore
37 the ZBA voted 4 to 1 to remand to the HDC to apply the ordinance criteria of
38 visibility from ANY street. The house has already been considered from every
39 street in the historic district so the Commission need only to consider the view
40 from Portsmouth Avenue.

41
42 Finn said she spoke to the town attorney on massing and feels comfortable with
43 the volume issue. Joe Cuetara stated he is persuaded by Attorney Phoenix's letter
44 of May 23rd adding that it seems that one person has a problem with this project
45 and no one else does. Finn confirmed that the only issue before the HDC is to
46 judge the view from Portsmouth Avenue. Holzaepfel lives near the property and

1 walks Oliver Street and Portsmouth Avenue daily and viewed the lot carefully.
2 She does not see any significant adverse impact looking at it from Portsmouth
3 Avenue. Holzaepfel commented that she had not seen the elevations relative to
4 the Callahan house prior to tonight, and doesn't believe it's a negative view, it is a
5 traditional view of the peak and it's attractive and not detrimental to the historic
6 district.

7
8 David Myers said he is new to the board but spoke to prior members. He also
9 walked the street and the neighborhood and cannot find any impact and is not
10 quite sure why the ZBA remanded it back to the HDC. Finn commented that it
11 was because the Commission had interpreted the ordinance incorrectly. Ruth
12 Zikaras agreed with Finn.

13
14 M/S/P Ruth Zikaras motioned with regard to 34 Oliver Street, Map 16, Lot 40 front lot,
15 regarding the appeal of the administrative decision of approval of HDC of April 6,
16 2023 which was remanded back to the HDC by the ZBA decision of May 23,
17 2023 for new construction per ordinance 9.3.5.1, to approve this new construction
18 based on the fact that the scale and general size of new construction in relation to
19 streetscapes is compatible with other houses in the historic district. Zikaras added
20 that most of the Commission members have walked the street and neighborhood
21 and agree that there is no negative impact on the streetscape. Dave Myers
22 seconded; all in favor.

- 23
24 2. Public Hearing, continuation from the June 1, 2023, HDC meeting for Applicants,
25 Ellen & Randy Bryan, for 34 Wentworth Road, Map 16 lot 64, constructing a
26 stonewall on his property, with approval by the HDC per Zoning Ordinance
27 9.3.5.1.

28
29 The applicants withdrew their application.

- 30
31 3. Public Hearing, for Applicant Ben & Candice Stebbins, for 119 Portsmouth
32 Avenue, Map 16 Lot 6, 9.3.5 Activities Subject to Approval by Historic District
33 Commission to rebuild a new home per Zoning Ordinance 9.3.5.1.

34
35 Guests: Ben and Candice Stebbins, Applicants, Hank Stebbins, Phyllis Stibler,
36 Karen and Ed Kinnaly

37
38 Hank Stebbins, an attorney and father of the applicant stated that he has lived in
39 New Castle for seven years, having just had a wonderful tour of the gardens. This
40 lot had 120 Norway maples that were spread over this yard and the underbrush
41 was never cared for. The house needed serious improvements to get rid of rot and
42 unfortunately they recently had a fire. The fire was not so extensive that it burnt
43 the house down, however, the smell was so awful and they could not get the fire
44 and smoke odor out of the house. Their insurance company recommended gutting
45 the house to the studs. Instead of demolishing the house internally, the entire
46 house was taken down. There were three additions to the house over the years,

1 the most recent being in the 90's. There were two additions in the back and the
2 rooflines were all different. The garage was in the back and you had to go around
3 and enter from the back. An in-law apartment was also added and the additions
4 just made the layout very cut up. After the fire and the amount of damage, and
5 after the removal of trees, they decided to take the structure down and went to the
6 Building Inspector for a demolition permit, which they received.
7

8 Two years ago they replaced windows and siding and the prior Building Inspector
9 gave the Stebbins a permit and nothing was said about the house being in the
10 historic district. The applicants recently applied for a demolition permit and
11 received it and again nothing was said about going before the HDC.
12

13 The Stebbins then went into town hall for a building permit 4-5 weeks ago and
14 were advised they need approval from the HDC. The 120 Norway maples have
15 been taken out so now the property is visible from the street which is why the
16 Building Inspector said they have to go to the HDC. The property is right on the
17 line, but within the historic district. The applicants are keeping the house way
18 back from the road and landscaping hides much of the house. The 16' driveway
19 is the only way to see the house. They are building a house that fits the
20 neighborhood and you don't see it driving down Portsmouth Avenue. The
21 applicants request that the Commission act promptly because they need a house as
22 they have been renting and have three small children. This property isn't a street
23 front property, as there is narrow frontage on the road and the lot spreads out in
24 back. Attorney Stebbins advised this is a perfect example of an exception, which
25 is what the Commission is required to do.
26

27 Chair Finn advised that the Commission's purview is what can be seen from
28 Portsmouth Avenue. Etoile Holzaepfel said it's more than that because it is in the
29 historic district so the architecture of the house needs to be considered pursuant to
30 the historic district ordinance and it has to maintain the character of the historic
31 district. Holzaepfel advised the property is visible from Laurel Lane because of
32 all the trees that have been removed and it is a historic property.
33

34 There was discussion and some confusion as to where the historic district ends.
35 Etoile Holzaepfel said she stood at the end of the property and looked over at
36 Oliver Street and also went to the Northwestern corner of the Stebbins' property.
37 She couldn't find a boundary marker but assumed it was the stone wall. Stebbins
38 advised that there's a big rock that depicts their property and the neighbors.
39

40 Etoile Holzaepfel asked if they had inquired at Town Hall as to whether they are
41 in the historic district. Stebbins stated that two years ago they got new windows
42 including changing the design of the windows, new siding and a new roof and Ian
43 Moodie, the Building Inspector, told them they were not in the historic district.
44 They also recently received their demolition permit with no one advising that they
45 had to come before the HDC. Stebbins said they didn't study the law or
46 ordinances because of what they were told. Russ Bookholz, the Building

1 Inspector, said it's not visible from Portsmouth Avenue so they were not required
2 to go before the HDC. Holzaepfel asked Stebbins if they had already removed the
3 trees when they sought the demolition permit and he advised that yes, the trees
4 were already down. Russ Bookholz gave them the permit for demolition. Ruth
5 Zikaras stated that the house can be seen more now with the trees down.
6

7 Phyllis Stibbler stated that she shares a boundary with the applicants and is
8 supportive of their plan. The applicants have shared landscape plans and building
9 plans with Stibbler and she is very confident that what they are doing is
10 appropriate to the neighborhood. Stibbler stated they are a young, wonderful
11 family to welcome into our town.
12

13 Joe Cuetara commented that if they went to the Building Inspector and sought a
14 demo permit and the trees were down, the Stebbins were acting in good faith.
15 They weren't trying to evade the process.
16

17 Holzaepfel stated that we cannot change what has happened but we are looking at
18 new construction in the historic district and the plans are hard to read because of
19 the scale so it is difficult to make a determination as to architectural details.
20 Stebbins stated they are using the same footprint as the former house, adding that
21 there's lots of ledge and the driveway goes all the way around and it's all
22 impervious so there is no place for the rain to penetrate. They are removing the
23 impervious material, decreasing it by 5,000 SF. The biggest change is that they
24 have moved the garage to the front of the lot. Stebbins advised that the elevation
25 you will see most is the east elevation, which is if you are looking straight down
26 the driveway.
27

28 Etoile Holzaepfel said the Commission really needs to see the architectural
29 details. She then asked Stebbins if they had replaced windows a couple years
30 back with 6 over 6 and he advised that not all the windows were 6 over 6, just the
31 ones you can see from Portsmouth Ave.
32

33 The applicants did not request a work session because of time constraints as the
34 family is without a home and they have concrete ready to pour. David Myers
35 asked if their proposal was for a metal roof and Stebbins advised that yes on the
36 lower roof, but if the Commission doesn't like metal roofs, they will do asphalt
37 shingles. It was advised that metal roofs are not historic and Stebbins agreed but
38 pointed out that the prior house was vinyl siding and vinyl windows, so there
39 wasn't much historic about the house.
40

41 Ruth Zikaras wanted to confirm that they are using hardy board for the clapboard,
42 and the plans look as though there are also shingles. Stebbins confirmed they
43 will use hardy board shingles on the sides and clapboard on the front.
44

45 Karen & Ed Kinnaly, 26 Laurel Lane stated they share a long property line with
46 the applicants and wanted to know how tall the house will be. Stebbins stated the

1 previous house was 21.1 feet and the new construction will be 29.9 feet to the
2 ridgeline. Karen Kinnaly was concerned because the Stebbins' property is higher
3 than the Kinnaly property and it's now going to be a two story home. The
4 elevation of the new house is two and a half stories and zoning allows 32'.
5 The third floor will not be finished. Stebbins advised that the basement is below
6 water table so the house will be on a slab on grade. Their sump pump is working
7 all the time, so storage that was in the basement is now going in the attic.
8

9 Zikaras again asked Stebbins to clarify the height of the prior home, which was
10 21.1 feet; Holzaepfel contended the other end of the prior home was not the same
11 height (18'4") and the center portion was somewhere in between. Stebbins
12 advised that because of several additions, the rooflines were all different. The
13 plans presented by the Stebbins showed the prior house on the top and the
14 proposed house on the bottom for each elevation.
15

16 The driveway is 30' long. The new house will be the same as the old footprint;
17 however, where the screened-in porch was, the garage will now be built so they
18 can remove the driveway and impervious surface. One of the members of the
19 Commission asked about the square footage of the house. The new house will be
20 6,200 SF as compared to the old house which was 3,348 SF. Stebbins stated there
21 was a three car garage and they took one garage and made it into living space.
22 The lot size is 30,320 SF and there are no variances required for construction.
23

24 When asked about the windows, the Stebbins stated they chose 4 over 1 because
25 neighbors on Oliver Street have them. Holzaepfel advised that she needs to see
26 the architectural details to make a decision and Finn stated the Commission also
27 needs elevations and views, stating that the architect on the prior hearing had
28 large plans of every side of the house. Holzaepfel stated that the scale is part of
29 the issue because it's hard to determine on the drawings presented. She also
30 commented that when the Stebbins made changes to the home, they used the same
31 design of windows. However, Stebbins said there were different sizes and the
32 ones seen from the street were 6 over 6 but in the back of the house were
33 casement windows.
34

35 Stebbins again advised that they did not know the home was in the historic district
36 and spent \$60,000.00 to prepare plans and applied for a permit and that is when
37 they found out they were in the historic district. Finn asked if the architect had
38 any input about making it more historic. The Stebbins had not asked the architect,
39 Amy Dutton, who has done a couple houses in New Castle, to change the plans.
40 Holzaepfel asked the applicants if they were willing to have a work session and
41 they advised that they want a vote and were willing to make it conditional on
42 aspects of the house such as the windows and other materials. They have a year
43 rental, time is running out and their family has no place to live. Stebbins stated
44 that if the Commission wants more detail on windows or doors, they are happy to
45 provide those details but they would like to get a foundation poured as the
46 Building Inspector won't let them pour anything until it is approved. Stebbins

1 requested approval of the foundation, which will be the same footprint as the prior
2 house and the Commission can make it conditional upon review and approval of
3 windows, doors, siding, etc. Stebbins advised that if the Commission approves
4 the foundation, the footprint is the same even though the size of the house has
5 increased, partly due to the angles of the previous roof pitch. Holzaepfel stated
6 the previous home was not a full 2 stories but Mrs. Stebbins stated it was two
7 stories in the back, advising that the additions were more square footage than the
8 original small house. The original house was approximately 600 SF and then
9 several additions were added.

10
11 Phyllis Stibler stated she has lived there for 30 years and advised that the house
12 was never well maintained. Stibler stated she has gone through 2 years of the
13 Stebbins making changes to make the house better and she doesn't want to deal
14 with two more years of construction. Stibler knows the character of the
15 neighborhood and believes the new construction is actually an improvement.

16
17 Joe Cuetara stated please correct me if I'm wrong but using the prior Brady
18 Bunch house as a basis for this property doesn't make sense and asked how many
19 two story houses are on Laurel Lane or Portsmouth Ave. Holzaepfel said most
20 houses on Laurel Lane are capes. Cuetara stated to use a former house that had
21 no integrity as a baseline, doesn't make any sense. Myers stated we are not using
22 the former house as a baseline, we are using architectural historic standards as a
23 baseline. The plans were not made in accordance with architectural standards of
24 the historic district because the architect didn't know it was in the historic district.

25
26 Mr. Stebbins stated the plans have no historic precedence because the architect
27 was not asked to design a home for a historic district, however the architect is
28 familiar with the historic ordinances. Mrs. Stebbins asked the Commission to
29 state what doesn't go with the historic ordinances and to talk about those. Mr.
30 Stebbins stated he has done some development in the past and you can't be stuck
31 in 1600, 1700, 1800 as we are building a house in 2023. It is set back, it
32 encourages the character of the neighborhood and we would like to move our
33 family into a house. The fact that we cannot move forward on at least pouring a
34 foundation on logistical splitting of hairs of where the line of the historic district
35 is, is very frustrating. Stebbins stated that multiple decisions have been made on
36 this property as well as renovations with no mention of being in the historic
37 district and now here we are, it doesn't make any sense that now we are in the
38 historic district. He asked that whatever the Commission needed to do to make a
39 vote, please just do so.

40
41 Ruth Zikaras attempted to clarify specifics about the new construction and
42 confirmed that the previous house was 21.1 feet high and the new construction
43 will be 29.9 feet high and the square footage of the prior house was 3,348 SF with
44 6,200 SF for the new construction; they are taking what was a screened porch and
45 turning it into a garage. There will be hardy board shingles on the gable ends and
46 the center will be hardy board clapboards. Metal roofing is not allowed in the

1 historic district, so it was agreed that asphalt shingles will be used for the roof.
2 Myers stated it is historically accurate to have clapboards on the center and
3 shingles on the gable ends.
4

5 The Commission had questions about the front entry and whether it was double
6 doors along with additional questions about the prior house and the new
7 construction which Stebbins informed once again that it will be the same
8 footprint but the new construction will now be all two story. It was asked if the lot
9 line is going to be the same or whether it is moving back or forward and Stebbins
10 informed that no, the lot lines remain the same, the house is on the same footprint
11 and the distance between houses and properties is the same. The only change is
12 the garage being moved to the front and that the entire house is on a slab instead
13 of a foundation.
14

15 Etoile Holzaepfel asked if they would consider revising the entry to a single door
16 and it was agreed as well as revising the roof material used over the garage from
17 metal to asphalt architectural shingles. However, Stebbins wanted to point out
18 that they are happy to do a single door but reminded the Commission that the only
19 part of the house you are able to see from the road is the edge of the garage. The
20 photo of the front entry is when you walk 20-30 feet onto the property and it's at
21 an angle.
22

23 Cuetara advised that as matter of precedence, his backyard cannot be seen from
24 Vennard Court or Main St and therefore the HDC allowed a Juliette balcony
25 because it was not visible. Stebbins agreed that the ordinance stated "and is
26 visible from any street".
27

28 Etoile Holzaepfel said she can look directly across and see their property coming
29 and going on Laurel Lane. Holzaepfel mentioned she is in a traditional cape with
30 6 over 6 windows although she is not in the historic district. Stebbins said their
31 home is closer to Laurel Lane than Portsmouth Ave. Finn confirmed that the
32 HDC purview is the view from any street.
33

34 Jack Stebbins advised the Commission that if they have specific details they are
35 concerned about, the applicant is willing to change them. The reason we are here
36 is that this family doesn't have a place to live and they were told to go ahead with
37 demolition. We would like to find a way to get the approval we need to start the
38 foundation and then work with you on windows and doors, but waiting will bring
39 the applicants into a different season for construction. They are willing to be
40 compliant with your recommendations.
41

42 Mr. Kinnaly stated he is incredibly empathetic to their situation. The Kinnalys
43 wanted to learn what the Stebbins were proposing, adding that it is the first time
44 they are seeing the plans. Kinnaly stated the Stebbins may face economic
45 hardship if there is any major change or if they cannot begin construction adding

1 that it doesn't feel fair as they've been told to go go go and now to stop. Kinnaly
2 stated that he supports their application.
3

4 Finn stated the difficult part is the house was designed before they knew it was in
5 the historic district. Jack Stebbins again stated the Commission can make
6 approval subject to the Commission's review and approval of windows and doors
7 as the Stebbins will be back at the next meeting with more detailed plans.
8

9 Myers stated we are all terribly empathetic with your situation adding that he
10 would like to see the roof material changed, and also the front door needs to be
11 changed for the historic district. Stebbins asked what era are we dealing with.
12 Myers advised that it's not an era, as that is one of the questions Myers asked
13 when he got on the board was what are we trying to be true to here. Mrs. Stebbins
14 asked if there is a front door downtown that sticks in any board member's mind
15 that they should emulate.
16

17 There was some discussion between members whether the Commission has
18 purview of those items not visible from the street. Myers stated the commission
19 is in charge if they can see any portion of it. Finn stated we are comfortable
20 making a motion as to the foundation subject to approval of architectural design.
21

22 Stebbins confirmed that the Commission wants more detail and architectural
23 information; Atty Stebbins suggested to make a motion for issuance of a
24 certificate of approval granted subject to further review of the architectural details
25 such as windows, doors, roofing material, and front entrance.
26

27 Etoile Holzaepfel stated the motion should state the Commission is agreeing to
28 the mass and footprint of the proposed new construction subject to further review
29 of the architectural materials and details such as windows, doors, roof and siding
30 materials.
31

32 The Commission mentioned the possibility of having a special session so they
33 would not have to wait any longer for approval.
34

35 M/S/P Etoile Holzaepfel moved that the Commission grant a certificate of approval for
36 the massing and the footprint of the proposed new structure at 119 Portsmouth
37 Avenue, Map 16, Lot 6, subject to further review and acceptance of potential
38 changes to windows, doors, materials including windows, roofing and siding, at a
39 future meeting of the HDC. David Myers seconded. All in favor.
40

41 The Stebbins were advised the Commission would consider having another
42 meeting this month and not wait for a regular meeting so they could get their
43 approvals. The applicants were advised to look at windows, roofing, and the front
44 door and also at homes in town to see what you like for doors. Stebbins asked
45 about 6 over 6 windows and whether that is what the Commission wanted. Myers
46 replied that if this was a 1700s house, we would want to see 6 over 6. But that is

1 not your house, so depends on the types of homes in your neighborhood. If the
2 windows are consistent with windows in your neighborhood, we would
3 potentially approve them.
4

5 4. Approve minutes June 1, 2023
6

7 M/S/P Ruth Zikaras motioned to approve the minutes of June 1, 2023 as amended; Jane
8 Finn seconded. Approved.
9

10 5. Any New Business
11

12 The board needs to understand what their purview is and David Myers doesn't
13 agree that purview is from the street only. This is a question for the town
14 attorney.
15

16 M/S/P David Myers motioned to appoint Etoile Holzaepfel as Chair; Myers stated he
17 would be chair next year but not this year. Finn seconded; all approved. Ruth
18 Zikaras nominated David Myers as Vice Chair. Etoile Holzaepfel seconded. All
19 in favor.
20

21 Jane Finn stated she will follow up with the town attorney. Carrie Ann Roman is
22 the town attorney and Finn will ask if Roman would meet with the entire board as
23 they have lots of questions.
24

25 David Myers moved to adjourn; Etoile Holzaepfel seconded. All approved
26

27 Adjourned 9:07 pm.
28

29 Respectfully submitted,
30 Diane L. Cooley, Recording Secretary