

**Sharon, Bill**

---

**From:** Laura Justiniano <lzjustiniano@me.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 26, 2017 2:56 PM  
**To:** Sharon, Bill; Andrew Monastra  
**Subject:** HARB Mins 7/25

Enclosed the minutes

---

Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting 7/25/2017  
Minutes

Present -

Andrew Monastra  
Amber Buchanan  
William Sharon  
Laura Justiniano

Guest - Keith Place

- I. Meeting was called to order at 7 PM by A Monastra
- II. The minutes from the June meeting were approved as written
- III Agenda Items

**20 N Charlotte**

Applicant replaced an original wooden lattice window (did not open) for a modern window with 2 center opening panels with lattice or grid and 2 side plain glass panels. The window had to be replaced because original window glass was broken and wood lattice was rotten. The applicant alleged that he was not aware the property was in the historic district.

There is also the issue that if a window is being replaced without changing the size of the opening, it does not require a permit. So other repairs were done to the property, under a permit that did not include the window.

A recommendation is made for the applicant to explore the possibility of making the window look as close to the original as possible by adding additional grid or lattice to the plain glass windows.  
Motion to table until the applicant presents new design to the board with an original (or as original) looking window for approval.

Motion - A Monastra  
Second - A Buchanan

Applications for **29 N Hanover St** and **80 N Hanover St** were tabled as the applicants were not present.

**58 King St. Administratively Approved**

**Motion - A Monastra  
Second - A Buchanan**

**118 King St.**

The owner wanted to present to the board that the cost for recreating the window as the original was around 5K and out of his reach.

A recommendation is again made to the owner to find possible methods to recreate the original window. It is suggested that he searches for other cost effective alternatives, perhaps with woodworking students from the local woodworking workshops. Or even with modern 3D printing technology.

The applicant questions the board's insistence, why is it necessary that he recreates the original window. It was discussed that the original window had beautiful original and unique architectural details that could have been salvaged before disposing of the window and furthermore, the property is a duplex. The twin next door still has the original window.

Motion for the applicant to do more research and return to the board with findings next month.

**Motion - A. Monastra  
Second - B Sharon**

**Meeting adjourned.**