

TOWN OF TEMPLE, NH
TEMPLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Monday May 21, 2007

Final Minutes of Public Meeting

Members present: John Kieley (JK), Randy Burnham (RB), Mary Nutting (MN), Dan Cournoyer (DC), Vivian Nicholl (VN), Sarge Collier (SC), Phyllis Mazza (PM).

Others present: Connie Kieley, Margaret Cournoyer, Michelle Clements, Tedd Petro, Richard Benotti, Sandra Benotti

Guest Speaker: Emily Paulus, NH Div of Historical Resources.

Meeting called to order by SC at 7:00 pm.

1. SC made a motion to waive review of minutes from April 19 meeting. All voted in the affirmative unanimously. VN handed out the draft minutes at the end of the meeting.

2. SC introduced Emily Paulus. Discussion led by SC about ordinance.
 - Lack of guidelines, and clarification of revision vs. redraft.
 - Specified 6.1 of ordinance stating that it is too powerful, mostly with regard to “repairs”.
 - RB spoke about setting precedents and maintaining uniformity in applying the ordinance.
 - Michelle Clements said there were many changes to the district that didn’t apply for approval.
 - Emily Paulus discussed other communities updating their ordinances every 5 to 10 years and suggested that Temple do this and also have cross-referencing to updated RSA’s. More recent ordinances are more specific in identifying which changes need review and which ones are exempt, i.e. paint color should be exempt. She also suggested that since Temple’s HD is so small, perhaps the residents should decide.
 - Change to ordinance requires a majority vote of 2/3 at Town Meeting.
 - Connie Kieley asked to specify whether rewriting the ordinance would be amending it or updating it.
 - Emily Paulus also suggested starting with national review criteria and exemptions. In the process try to include the residents of the district, advertise and increase visibility, enhance positive aspects, and be helpful to residents instead of just being a review board.

- Ordinance written in 1980's now considered too onerous especially with regard to repairs.
3. Emily Paulus led a discussion about adding properties.
 - Tedd Petro asked if current properties would have an option to opt out if a new ordinance was adopted.
 - He also added that the HDC should protect people's investment and that the ordinance should be more relaxed in an effort to keep owners happier.
 - Connie Kieley asked how the HDC could promote positive aspects of the district.
 - Michelle Clements asked what the historic base is for future discussions since so much vinyl has now been used in material for repairs, etc.
 - Emily Paulus suggested updating the ordinance as our first initiative. Only after this should adding more properties be considered.
 4. Discussion regarding changes that occur to properties in the HD.
 - RB discussed precedents set and if changes without approval happened in the past, does that mean it has to be approved in the future.
 - RB also asked if previous changes without approval could be described as a "variance".
 - Emily Paulus stated if changes occur without approval the HDC must be proactive and contact the landowner to enforce the ordinance if necessary.
 - Regarding the past changes, new changes would still require approval but reasons for past oversights might have to be explained.
 - Emily said that current updates to HD's tend to be more specific and repairs are normally not subject to review. The ordinance should be modified to not include repairs rather than just clarifying it in the regulations.
 - Changes in materials used should still require approval. The review criteria should specify which types of materials will be used. Examples of exemptions are: hardware, light fixtures, paint colors, flag poles, etc.
 - MN asks about using newer materials and whether they are more accepted now. Emily explained that newer construction can be newer materials, but historic structures are generally maintained with historic materials. Try to illustrate past and present uses of certain materials.
 5. Discussion regarding guidelines to use in defining rebuilding criteria. Emily stated they should be clear enough to know what is suitable. Some commissions allow that a certain percentage be the determining factor as to how much is to be restored to specification, i.e., 50% or less damaged be fully restored as is. A structural engineer report can help determine the extent of repair or restoration needed.
 6. RB asked for the Application for Certificate of Approval from the church. Richard Benotti presented the architectural drawing:
 - 30 x 30 building located behind the parsonage.
 - Electric Co. will place 2 electric poles at no cost.
 - It will be built 300 feet from the Birchwood Inn
 - Abutters whose properties would be affected were discussed.

- SC requested D. Benotti prepare details for a Public Hearing.
 - Dates for the hearing were discussed. June 11 was decided with additional suggestion for the regular Commission meeting to be held at that time instead of June 18. VN made a motion for Public Hearing date and meeting change; SC seconded; all were in favor unanimously.
 - VN will send letters to abutters, place Public Hearing notice in Monadnock Ledger-Transcript to appear in the week of May 25, and change date of regular meeting on posted notices at the Municipal Bldg., Willard's store, and Town Hall.
 - CK asked about the steeple work being done and whether an application was filled out. Sandy Benotti stated that the church Trustees came to the Commission with this request in March 2006. The minutes recorded state that a motion was made and agreed upon to not require a Public Hearing for approval. Details about the process and materials to be used were discussed during that meeting.
 - Discussion was held regarding the time frame for when work would begin on a project after approval of application, and when work should be completed. Emily Paulus mentioned the "sunsetting provision", usually 2 years completion for work undertaken. She further clarified that work ongoing means that the property owner is in compliance.
7. SC led discussion about Certified Local Government program. Emily Paulus explained that the Historic Preservation Office rewards communities that put broad preservation policies in place. The grant awarded is for the entire municipality. Requirements are that the town has a local HD with a commission, and the ordinance must be consistent with the state statutes and RSA's (Temple's would require changes to be made). She suggested adopting a model code of conduct including an ethics code and updating language of ordinance and RSA citations. 10% of the money available is through federal appropriation and there is approximately \$60,000.00 – \$70,000.00 available to be divided among applicant awards. There are some restrictions on usage. Acceptable uses include survey work for the purpose of historical resources, preparations for National Registry, training, architectural drawings, and preparation work for consulting fees.
 8. Emily Paulus made reference to names of people able to help regarding questions of preservation and a guidebook. Liz Hengen – Preservation Consultant and Rob Stevenson from Jaffrey. She also encouraged the Commission to send her any revisions to the ordinance for review via e-mail.
 9. RB moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:19 pm. VN seconded. Voted in the affirmative unanimously.

Public Hearing June 11, 2007 @ 7:00 pm at the Municipal Bldg. to be followed by regular meeting.

Minutes submitted by Secretary Vivian Nicholl