



11 Lion St.

There was an acknowledgement from Staff that the recent idea of taking the cottage and moving it to a town property to be converted into a harbormaster office seems to be appealing to both the Yacht Club, HDC, harbormaster and president of the Town Council. In order to move forward with the concept, Staff suggested all pertinent parties meet as this could be a “win win” situation. Ms. Hitchen confirmed she would pinpoint a meeting time for everyone involved to further discuss the idea, costs, logistics, process, etc. Ms. Balkcom acknowledged a huge part of this effort is Ms. Hitchen as she is a proactive thinker and thankfully Mr. Cullen drove by the site at the right time.

**2. Sage & Matthew Goodwin
 70 Kenyon Avenue; Map 85 AP 2 Lot 69
 Window Replacement – FINAL**

Ms. Carron recused herself from the application as she is a direct abutter to the subject property. Again, with only having three HDC members present the hearing could not be held. Ms. Balkcom sincerely apologized for the situation but would have to postpone the hearing. Ms. Hitchen acknowledged a special HDC meeting for the homeowner could be held and will be rescheduled as soon as possible.



**3. Ronald Amirault
 11 Lion Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 395
 Modifications/Alterations – CONCEPTUAL**



Ms. Balkcom stated the commission *Standards* 1, 2, 4 and 8 that apply to the application. *Standard 1* states original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible, rather than replaced. *Standard 2* states if existing materials have deteriorated beyond repair, the new materials shall match the original in composition, design, texture, and other visual qualities. *Standard 4* states all proposals for additions and architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own. *Standard 8* states original window sashes can usually be repaired and retained. In the event that a window sash must be replaced the replacement shall match the original in size, operation, materials, configuration, number of lights, muntin width and profile. Window manufacturers offer a wide variety of factory-made windows appropriate for

installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. Ronald Amirault, owner of the property, represented the application. He explained the building consists of four "cold water flats" which has not been occupied since the 1960s. A cold water flat is an old tenement house that did not have indoor plumbing for hot water; the two water closets/bathrooms were located in the hallway that the tenants shared. Mr. Amirault asserted he has prepared three different exterior conceptual plans and was looking for HDC feedback in order to convert the structure into two residential units which will require some exterior modifications in terms of window arrangement and number of entryways.

Mr. McGeorge acknowledged he has been in the subject building which he deemed peculiar in nature. He looked forward to seeing final plans as well as the renovation take place.

Mr. Maxwell inquired about the three different submitted options. Mr. Amirault pointed out the existing front side of the building was originally the rear before the railroad tracks were constructed. He claimed the two small front windows were the location of the shared bathrooms. He felt as though the existing rear side is more aesthetically appealing which he would like to replicate on the existing front. Mr. Amirault noted he preferred proposal 1 (A3.1) since that would provide the two units with separate access.

Ms. Balkcom advised the applicant of the process involved for approvals, noting HDC conceptual approval can be granted then all necessary zoning relief and finally returning to the HDC for final plan approval.

Mr. Amirault said proposal 3, his least favorite, is only if the HDC did not want any doors or windows to be moved and he would have to find a solution to one unit entering the front door and the other unit entering the existing rear door.

Mr. McGeorge commented that as far as altering the fenestration, he preferred the A3.1 rendering due to maintaining a well-balanced structure. He realized ideally not moving the windows or doors would be preferable and is the route to take but having seen the interior configuration it will be very challenging to restore. Mr. McGeorge acknowledged saving the structure is more important

than maintaining the existing fenestration. He felt as though proposal 1 (A3.1) is appropriate due to the existing condition of the building.

Ms. Balkcom agreed with Mr. McGeorge that proposal 1 is a great option for restoration purposes. She queried as to whether the units will be sold or rented. Mr. Amirault verified there will be two 3-bedroom townhouse style apartments.

Ms. Balkcom wondered why there are so many different window pane configurations in the house. The Applicant assumed over the years the 6/6 windows were replaced with 2/2 or whatever style was easily accessible. Mr. Amirault noted the prior owner, who lived next to the building, got tired of the renters in the 1960s, stopped renting the property and used it as storage as it was filled to the ceiling with books, furniture, etc. when he bought it.

Mr. Maxwell asked about the condition of the structure including the windows and interior portion of the building. Mr. Amirault said all the windows will have to be replaced which are all in terrible condition and he would like all the windows to match in configuration. As for the interior, it has been gutted and there is no interior remaining. He suggested there is a chance he will request the use of the Anderson 400 Series when he returns for final plan approval.

Ms. Balkcom indicated the building is very simple in design and the windows are very important to it that she would only approve a high quality window be installed.

Mr. Amirault confirmed the clapboard is in decent shape and the simple window trim will be reapplied; as for the water table there is a lot of rot and will require replacement.

Ms. Carron and Mr. Maxwell also liked the submitted proposal and will be happy to see residents once again living in the building.

In summary the Commission acknowledged proposal 1 (A3.1) is an acceptable rendering to move forward with. As for final plan submission they expect to see no synthetics used, detailed site plans, interior plans are very helpful, all details and specifications for all architectural components including moldings, windows, doors etc.

4

.....