

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1 JUNKINS AVENUE
City Council Chambers**

7:00 p.m.

March 2, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman John Rice, Vice-Chairman David Adams, Members Ellen Fineberg, John Golumb, Rick Becksted, City Council Representative Joanne Grasso; and, Alternates. Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ken Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector



Site Walk–02-26-05-10:15 a.m. to Middle Street Baptist Church, 16 Court Street

I. OLD BUSINESS

A) Petition for Barbara Theodore, owner, and Olde Port Properties, applicant, for property located at 121 Bow Street, Unit #C wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (erect three fixed awnings on the Bow Street façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 059 and lies within the Central Business A and the Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the February 2, 2005 meeting to the March 2, 2005 meeting.

Chairman John Rice made a motion to take the application off the table; Sandra Dika seconded and was approved with a 7– 0 vote.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. George Carlisle, representing Ms. Theodore, stated that he would like to amend the proposal from the original proposed “fixed” awnings to seek approval to install three retractable rectangular shed-style awnings over the doors and windows of 121 Bow Street façade with a loose scalloped valance. The purpose of the awning is to shield the offices inside from the harsh sun. He presented two photographs, one of the existing building and the other showing the awnings on the building. The awnings will be black canvas with gold pineapples on it. The fasteners for the awning will be stainless steel.

Chairman John Rice stated the board had seen drawings from the previous meeting that provided a general idea of what the awnings would look like and asked the board if they needed more information in terms of representation.

Sandra Dika stated that the last package did not show what Mr. Carlisle proposed today.

Chairman John Rice asked Mr. Carlisle if he had any additional photos representing the amended request and asked Mr. Carlisle if the awning over the door had any signage.

Mr. Carlisle stated at the present time there is no signage over the door and wanted to note that at the last meeting there was some discussion about the height of the doors and the windows and David Adams mentioned at the last meeting that the doors were originally windows and Mr. Carlisle stated that he was right and that the scalloped brick above the windows and doors are at the same height but the windows themselves are six inches higher than the beginning of the door and suggested to the board that they might want to take that under consideration. He also stated that that they would like the freedom, if the awnings are approved, to hang the awnings at whatever height looks good and provides the protection they are after.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there was any questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz stated for the purposes of discussion he made a motion to approve the application as presented; Sandra Dika seconded.

Sandra Dika stated that she did some research by taking pictures of awnings around town and researched what awnings are and what they are used for. She also stated that most of the awnings around town are very subdued, they have the name of the company on the awning and very few have logos and provided some examples.

Sandra Dika asked Roger Clum if the Historic District Commission had review over what goes on an awning.

Ellen Fineberg stated the Historic District Commission does not review what goes on the awning.

Roger Clum stated that the Commission has always reviewed awnings but does not review color.

Ellen Fineberg questioned the statement made by Mr. Carlisle about requesting the freedom to hang the awnings wherever they wished and she wanted to hold him to hanging the awnings as displayed in the picture provided at the current hearing.

David Adams looked at the picture the applicant provided and counted the bricks. He found the awnings over the door to be approximately 24" above the awnings hung above the windows. He stated that all the awnings look the same but are doing two different things, the awnings over the window are providing protection from the sun and the one above the door is taller than a person going in and out the door. He also stated that it makes sense for the awning above the door to be higher than the awnings hung over the windows.

Richard Katz stated that all of the things the board requested in an awning are presented in this application and could not see how the board could ask for anything more.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the commission if they wished to amend the application as presented to reflect the height requirement of the door awning be hung 24" above the window awnings and moved for a motion.

David Adams so moved and Richard Katz seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

The Commission then voted on the amended application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

B) Petition for 426 Middle Street, LLC, owner and Barbara MacKusick, applicant, for property located at 426 Middle Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing windows on side and rear of house with Harvey Majesty windows with permanently affixed grids on both the inside and out and replace the existing windows on front of the house with Marvin windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 045 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the February 2, 2005 meeting to the March 2, 2005 meeting.

Chairman John Rice made a motion to take the application off the table; Ellen Fineberg seconded and was approved with a 7-0 vote.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Matthew Marini, representing Barbara Theodore, stated from the last meeting, that they kept the suggestion of using the Harvey Windows on the side and rear of the house and found Marvin Windows to be used as the replacement for the front existing windows.

Chairman Rice reconfirmed with Matthew and Barbara that the Harvey Windows will be used to replace the windows on the side and rear of the house and that the Marvin Windows will be used to replace the windows on the front/street-side of the house.

Matthew and Barbara agreed.

Chairman Rice inquired if there would be a change in the size of the windows being replaced.

Matthew replied that there would be a reduced change in size as there are different proportions than what is there right now.

Chairman Rice asked if a wood window were to be used in the front.

Matthew agreed and said that it is a wood Marvin window with the exterior being aluminum clad.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions.

Ellen Fineberg asked if the windows on the side and rear of the house are also aluminum clad.

Matthew agreed.

Ellen Fineberg also asked if they had made sure that the colors matched up.

Matthew said that they both being white, the colors match up.

Ellen Fineberg stated that she assumes the reason they decided to go with the Marvin windows on the front of the house was because replicate the originals better but are more expensive.

Matthew stated that is correct.

Ellen Fineberg stated rhetorically that the windows to be used on the side and rear will be Harvey Majesty because they are less expensive.

Matthew conceded.

Ellen Fineberg inquired about the difference in price was between the two kinds of proposed windows to be used.

Matthew stated that there is roughly a difference of \$220.00 and in addition, there is additional cost associated with the labor.

Ellen Fineberg asked Matthew to clarify whether there is more labor associated with the Harvey Majesty window installation or the Marvin window.

Matthew stated that with the Harvey Majesty window you're installing a new frame within the existing frame whereas on the front of the house they will be installing a new sash to the existing frame and they will have to trim the opening to make the window plum and square.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there were further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Richard Katz stated for the purposes of discussion he made a motion to approve the application as presented; Ellen Fineberg seconded.

Richard Katz stated that the applicant has made a good effort in addressing the commission's concerns and moved for the commission to approve the application as presented and Sandra Dika agreed.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor.

The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 6- 1 vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Petition for Priscilla Semprini, owner,** for property located at 300 Newcastle Avenue wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replacement of doors and windows of breezeway on front and rear façade and demolish existing concrete front stairs and replace with wood stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 036 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Wayne Semprini representing Priscilla Semprini stated that he was there to seek approval from the board to replace the doors and windows of the breezeway on the front and rear façade of the house and to demolish the existing front concrete stairs in order to replace them with wooden stairs. He also stated that the current windows on the home provide no protection from the elements. He referenced the cut sheets submitted providing the detail on the type of door proposed and asked if there were any questions he could answer for the board.

Chairman Rice stated that he was ok with the window replacements but that he wanted cut sheets of the proposed stair replacement.

Wayne Semprini stated that the cut sheets for the stairs were his brother's responsibility and that they are existing concrete stairs that they intend to demolish and replace with wooden stairs.

Chairman Rice inquired about what type of wood would be used (i.e. pressure treated).

Wayne Semprini stated that the wood used for the framing of the stairs would be pressure treated but they hadn't decided formally on a particular type of wood for the decking and asked the board for any suggestions or recommendations on what type of wood they would prefer be used.

Rick Becksted suggested mahogany because it is reasonably weather resistant and not terribly expensive.

Wayne Semprini stated that they would use whatever wood suggested by the board just so they could expedite the renovations.

Rick Becksted recommended that pressure treated for anything structural underneath and mahogany for the decking.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there was any further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Rick Becksted moved for the commission to approve the application as presented, with the steps to be pressure treated for the structure and mahogany for the decking, John Golumb seconded.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor.

The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7- 0 vote.

2. Petition for Francesca M. Fernald, owner, for property located at 177 Mechanic Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing windows with vinyl double hung windows to match existing new windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 034 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Francesca M. Fernald, the owner of the property, stated that back in February of 2001, the board granted permission for her to replace the bay window and two larger windows in the front of her business. At the time, they wished to replace all of the windows but did not have the funds. They currently wish to replace the remaining windows in order to match the existing new windows. She went on to state that there are a lot rotten sashes and broken screens and would like to install the new windows to make the building appear more cohesive. The windows approved in 2001 are the windows they currently wish to use.

Chairman Rice inquired about the file from 2001 due to the request currently before the board. Chairman Rice did not remember the prior application and felt that there was some mistake as the board usually denies the type of windows the applicant had used and is proposing to use again.

Francesca Fernald stated that in her original application from 2001 the request had been made to use the classic snap-on windows and agreed to have the divider between the glass so in the future there were no issues with the plastic snapping off and breaking and not being replaced.

Chairman Rice stated that according to our records that was not what was approved or installed.

Roger Clum stated that was incorrect and that the advertisement stated "true divided light" whereas the discussion was to have the grids between the glass.

Chairman Rice asked which was approved.

Roger Clum stated what was installed, the grids between the glass.

Ellen Fineberg asked without anything adhered to the exterior of the glass?

Roger Clum stated that is correct.

Richard Katz stated that Roger was correct and that was how he remembered it.

Francesca Fernald stated that this current request would clean up the appearance of the business, it would keep the window openings the same size as the current size, all the trim would be the same, (i.e. wood and white trim) and provide better fuel economy.

Chairman Rice apologized and understood the request. He stated that the board generally or never approves the internal lights between the glass. He also stated to the board that if they approve this application due to prior approval, to make note that this is not the norm and that they are neither breaking precedent nor creating precedent.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there was any further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Joanne Grasso moved that the board approve this application as presented and David Adams seconded.

Ellen Fineberg asked that there be grids permanently affixed or adhered to the exterior of all the new windows installed because she'd rather fix this now then perpetuate it any further.

Chairman Rice suggested that Ellen Fineberg propose an amendment.

Ellen Fineberg agreed and proposed the amendment that the applicant is able to install the windows as requested but is also required to adhere permanently affixed grids to the exterior of each window.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone who would second that and John Golumb said he would second that.

Joanne Grasso asked the applicant if she had any knowledge of what she would use in order to satisfy the amendment proposed.

Francesca Fernald replied no.

David Adams stated that this is the predicament they found themselves in over 4 years ago and that is why they went ahead with the approval of the vinyl double-hung sash windows with the grids on the inside.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor of the amendment.

The Commission then voted on the amendment and the motion failed with a 2–5 vote.

Chairman Rice noted that the amendment failed and moved for discussion on the original application.

Richard Katz stated that he would like to vote in favor of the present application but he was very wary of granting the approval due to the location of the applicant's business, it being situated deeply within the historic district and that this application could be used in the future by future applicants proposing the same.

Chairman Rice noted the same.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 4 – 3 vote. Ellen Fineberg, David Adams and Rick Becksted in opposition.

3. Petition for Sheila Ghamami, owner, for property located at 369/371/373 Islington Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (place vinyl siding over existing asbestos shingles) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 022 and lies within the Mixed Residential Business and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Gerard Thibeault representing Sheila Ghamami requested to install vinyl siding over the existing asbestos shingles and to keep the existing wood trim. He stated that they are attempting to blend the building in with the other buildings on the same street and neighborhood.

Chairman Rice inquired if they were proposing that a vinyl trim board and corner board would be installed.

Gerard replied that the owner is willing to keep the existing wood trim with the vinyl siding.

Chairman Rice went over the cut sheets in front of him and reiterated what he saw, "trim detail around the windows, each side of the building".

Richard Katz proposed that we accept the resubmittance of the application and declared that the current application cries out for a site walk and work session.

Rick Becksted agreed with Richard Katz.

Chairman Rice stated that the application would be tabled again and agreed with Richard Katz's suggestion that there needs to be a site walk and decided to tack this petition onto the following agenda for a work session/public hearing.

Chairman Rice asked the board if anyone would like to make a motion to table this application and schedule a site walk with a work session/public hearing. David Adams so moved.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Table the present application for the March 9, 2005 meeting for a work session/public hearing and a site walk to take place on Saturday, March 5, 2005 at 10:00 am.

4. Petition for Bada Bing, Ent. LLC, and Kraig Kurtenbach, applicant, for property located at 21 Daniel Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replacement of metal framed front door and side lights with a wood unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is located on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 028 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

TMS Architects for the owner, Bada Bing Ent., LLC, stated that the space in question is approximately 1,500 sq. feet and that the Provident Bank plans to open a branch in the space in question. They proposed to take the two sidelights and change them into a small window unit. In addition, the front entry assembly will be aluminum clad on the exterior and wood on the interior painted in a dark green color. The window they proposed to use is named a page. Said window proposed to be used has a nicer appearance and is more cost effective.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions.

Sandra Dika asked if they brought a sample of the window proposed.

The representative of TMS stated no, but he would produce one if it was a requirement.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any cut sheets on the window proposed.

The representative of TMS stated no.

Chairman Rice suggested that they should supply the board with a sample of the window and cut sheets.

David Adams proposed that the application be approved as presented contingent upon the applicant submitting cut sheets of the window and a sample of the same.

Ellen Fineberg asked that it be approved at this meeting and review the sample and cut sheets at the following meeting.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there was any further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

Steve McHenry from McHenry Architecture spoke in favor of the present application before the board. He stated that the muntin profile is far more accurate historically than practically any other manufactured windows.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there was any further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone else that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMISSION

David Adams proposed that the application be approved as presented contingent upon the applicant submitting cut sheets of the window and a sample of the same. Rick Becksted seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

5. Petition for Chad and Laura Morin, d/b/a Goody Two Shoes, LLC, owner and DeStefano Architects, applicant, for property located at 36 Market Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior changes to an existing building at the rear (replacement of storefront and addition of two (2) new doors on rear building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 029 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Jennifer Ramsey of DeStefano Architects spoke for Chad and Laura Morin, d/b/a Goody Two Shoes, LLC. She went over the plans page by page and identified the first sheet as the location plan. The second page was the existing plan. The third was the previously approved plan of the building. The fourth page was the proposed amended plan from the previous month. She stated that they were looking for permission from the board to install a new egress door and move it slightly down Ladd Street, remove the current signage, have the storefront wrap around, replace the existing door, use trifab framing with the metal frame exposed around window with all wood trim and construct new masonry beams, using bricks and mortar to match existing building. The fifth page was the existing elevation. Page 6 showed the location of the proposed new door and the storefront. Page 7 showed the back elevation of the building. Page 8 detailed the recess of the storefront proposed. Additionally, Jennifer Ramsey stated that on the back lot there is an existing opening where they propose to install a new egress door. Page 9 displayed the existing view of the business on Ladd Street. Page 10 showed the existing view the business. Page 11 displayed the existing storefront and page 12 showed the proposed storefront.

Chairman Rice inquired about where the trifab framing system would be.

Jennifer Ramsey stated that it would be the storefront and the windows units within the storefront. She clarified that the trifab framing system is the exposed metal frame around the window.

Richard Katz inquired about the storefront wood detail whether or not it is new.

Jennifer Ramsey stated that it was new.

David Adams inquired about the brick and mortar on the new renovations of the storefront and whether or not they were going to attempt to match the coloring of the existing brick and mortar.

Jennifer Ramsey confirmed that they would do whatever necessary to blend the new and the old in their proposed renovations.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there were any further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMISSION

David Adams proposed that the application be approved as presented and Joanne Grasso seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

6. Petition for Middle Street Baptist Church, owner and DeStefano Architects, applicant, for property located at 16 Court Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building at the rear (an addition to the rear of the building at the connector to provide an accessible entry and elevator shaft, and a new masonry base for the sign at the front of the building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127, Lot 002 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Rob Ferguson of DeStefano Architects spoke on behalf of the Middle Street Baptist Church. He submitted a cut sheet at the time of the hearing to clarify any further questions raised from the site walk. Going over the plans, Rob pointed out the first page as the site plan that showed the proposed location of the elevator tower at the rear of the building and the location of the sign base together with the dimensions and setbacks of the renovations. The second sheet showed a photo of the existing sign and the proposed sign base to be added. He noted the brick and grout of the sign base should match the existing used on the church. He also noted that they added a 1" thick loose stone cap that will extend beyond the face of the brick at a half of an inch. He proclaimed that the existing sign would be centered in the 5 foot horizontal dimension of the sign base and the back of the sign would line up to interior base of the masonry wall below. Sheet 3 showed the existing elevation and the proposed elevation. Rob stated that they were seeking to add a shingled roof to the face of the existing masonry connector in order to hide as much of the elevator tower as possible. The ridge of the roof would remain below the eave of the existing church with new gutters to be installed in order to match the existing ones on the church. Sheet 4 depicted a photo of the existing rear elevation as well as the location of the proposed addition. Sheet 5 showed the proposed rear elevation and the height of the tower. Rob stated that they are proposing to install new Marvin wood Ultimate double hung windows of the same size as the existing windows in order to remain cohesive with the rest of the church. Additionally, Rob stated that they were proposing to add new

masonry headers above the windows to match the headers of the existing connector. He said they were also proposing to add a new aluminum door for entry at the ground level, which would replicate the existing door on the front entrance of the church. The final cut sheets gave detail on the windows and door. The sheet Rob handed out at the beginning of the presentation showed the two side elevations of the addition proposed. He stated that the existing gutter and downspout would be replaced in kind against a 1x8 trim board blocking which would allow the brick to return to that face and on the opposite side there would be two brick recessed panels that would mimic the sides of the windows, sills and headers and it would also soften the side of the elevation because behind the panels are the mechanical mechanisms of the elevator.

Chairman Rice stated that these changes were a result of the site walk.

David Adams questioned what the windowsills were made out of mentioned in the revised plans that were submitted at the present meeting.

Rob answered that they were wood sills that would match the existing wood sills on the church.

David Adams asked if the wood sills would be on of the all masonry faux openings.

Rob answered yes.

David Adams stated that it would be better if they removed the wood for the sills on of the all masonry faux openings and just use brick.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there was any further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMISSION

David Adams proposed that the application be approved as presented with the caveat that the wood for the sills on of the all masonry faux openings be removed and just use brick and Sandra Dika seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application with the caveat and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

7. Petition for Daniel McKenna/Greenway Financial, LLC, owners and McHenry Architecture, applicant, for property located at 383 Islington Street wherein permission is requested to allow a free standing structure at the rear (construct low screen fence around AC compressor area at rear of building and a four foot (4') high safety fence between Salem Street sidewalk and lower grade parking area at rear of building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144, Lot 021 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture on behalf of Daniel McKenna spoke on this petition requesting permission to construct a low screen fence around the AC compressor area at rear of the building and erect a four foot (4') high safety fence between the Salem Street sidewalk and the lower grade parking area at rear of building. He stated that he would go over the plans submitted page by page and keep it brief. The first page showed the site plan and the proposed location of the fence and its dimensions. The second page showed the existing conditions. The third page showed the plan and rear elevation views of the existing conditions with the proposed location of the ac units. The fourth page showed the location of the fencing with the dimensions of the doors and length of the fencing. The fifth page showed the elevation of the fenced-in ac units and the side view with its overall height. The sixth page was the cut sheets for the ac units. He noted that upon originally submitting the application, there was some concern over the noise the ac units may produce. He stated that the ac units were changed and are within the local requirements. The seventh page showed the position of the fence units.

Chairman Rice noted the great lengths that the applicant has undergone with the fence and hardware.

David Adams asked if there was a top to the fenced in area.

Steve McHenry responded no.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there was any further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMISSION

David Adams proposed that the application be approved as presented and Rick Becksted seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

8. Petition for Daniel McKenna/Greenway Financial, LLC, owners and McHenry Architecture, applicant, for property located at 79 Daniel Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building at the rear (renovate existing porch to convert portion of footprint area into wood screened trash and AC condensor area) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107, Lot 009 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture on behalf of Daniel McKenna spoke on this petition requesting to renovate the existing porch to convert portion of the footprint area into a wood screened trash and AC condensor area. Steve stated that the current conditions on the proposed area appear very messy and the site plan he submitted showed the property line, the building footprints and the area of the existing porch to be screened in with the recessed area for garbage. The second page showed the plan and elevation. The third displayed the proposed plan with the fenced in deck for enclosure of the ac units, and create a proper area for the applicant's 3 trash receptacles. The fourth page showed the materials proposed to be used and the fifth was the cut sheet with the ac units' information.

Chairman Rice asked the board if there was any further questions for the applicant. There being none, Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone that would like to speak to, for or against this application.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMISSION

David Adams proposed that the application be approved as presented and Richard Katz seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

III. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:45 p.m. a motion was made to adjourn the meeting and to meet on the following Wednesday, March 9, 2005 in order to complete the Agenda. The motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina V. Staples

/Cs