

**RECONVENED MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1 JUNKINS AVENUE
City Council Chambers**

7:00 p.m.

**January 4, 2006
RECONVENED ON
January 11, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman John Rice, Vice Chairman David Adams; Members, John Golumb, and Alternates, Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

MEMBERS ABSENT: City Council Representative, Joanne Grasso and Ellen Fineberg

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

II. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by **Jonathan & Cheryl Booth, owners, and David Witham, applicant**, for property located at **19 South School Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (construct a two-story 6'x16' addition and a one-story 12' x 16'-6" addition to the rear, add a new roof over existing side door and relocate some existing windows). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 73 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. *This request was tabled at the December 7, 2005 meeting.*

Mr. Adams moved to take the application off the table and the motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed unanimously.

- David Witham spoke on behalf of the petition
- The first page shows the site plan with two additions
- On the left side of the house there is a 6 x 16 two-story addition to get the stairs up to code
- In the rear of the house there is a 12 foot x 16foot 6 inch one-story addition which is family room space
- The next sheet shows photos of the house and the shape of the lot and the proximity to other homes, fences and vegetation
- The third sheet shows the left side elevation
- On the far left side of the page shows the one-story 12 foot x 16 foot 6 inch addition. In the middle of the page shows the sixteen foot two-story addition, which comes out six feet from the house
- The original house is on the far right of the page and the back part of the house was an addition from approximately the 1970's

- The red outline on the clapboards shows where there is an existing window and on some of the other elevations they made an attempt to clean up some window locations trying to get some better alignment where some other windows have gone astray
- The right side of the addition shows the rear addition to the far right and also shows on the second floor in the middle there are three window locations being changed to clean up some alignment on those windows
- The additions will have similar material and clapboard siding and trim details as is on the existing house now
- The next page shows the rear addition. In the center it shows a one-story rear addition
- There is quite a bit of glass with the french doors
- Mr Adams asked about the gable six foot side of the proposed two-story addition
- Mr. Witham stated that the six foot addition steps in 18 inches or so from the width of the main house
- The last two sheets show two different schemes. One shows an overhang roof over the rear side entry and are looking at a couple of possible overhang roof scenarios that would stick out about three feet to cover the landing. The clients would prefer slate
- The windows will be true divided light, identical to what is there now
- The french doors will be true divided light as well
- Mr. Adams would feel more comfortable about this once he walks the lot and sees the back yard view. The only issue he has is the large expanse of glass.
- Chairman Rice asked if the 12 x 19 addition sunporch is telescoping off the back. Mr. Witham confirmed that
- Chairman Rice asked why it is not centered
- Mr Witham stated that there was some setback issues on the right side. Part of the room is incorporated into existing space within the house
- Mr Adams suggested they consider running a corner board on the existing two-story L down and leaving it in place
- Mr. Witham stated he drew it that way at one point and was nervous about the elevation and creating too many vertical lines
- Mr Wyckoff thought the plan was pretty appropriate and a good job was done of designing it

B) Work Session requested by **Kevin McDevitt, owner (Riveredge Owners Association)** for property located at **117 Bow Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (construct roof deck and rooftop pavilion structure with skylight additions). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 57A-0001 and lies within the Central Business A, Downtown Overlay and Historic A districts. *This petition was tabled at the December 7, 2005 meeting.*

Mr. Adams moved to take the application off the table and the motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed unanimously.

- Steve McHenry spoke on behalf of petition. Also, Kevin McDevitt was present
- Mr. McHenry stated that they have been before the Commission once before at a Work

Session about this application

- The second page shows the overall elevations of the east elevation and north elevation of the river view
- Top floor shows the proposed structure on the left hand side of the North elevation on the top and on the east elevation directly under it
- The street is the direct view elevation from the east cut away so you don't see the parapet wall
- They are building up over the existing parapet wall creating an overhang that is not there now which you can see a portion of on Page three on the east elevation drawing on the right hand side
- Included on page three there is an existing eyebrow opening on the right hand side behind the fire stairs where there is a door opening which opens out onto a small deck over an existing rooftop. Right now there is a sloped roof in that location with a window opening. They are exploring the idea of making a small deck over that area because it abuts the master bedroom suite and lowering the masonry window opening so there will be access out onto the deck
- Page 4 is the side or north elevation view at the top of the page. On the right hand portion of that there is the egress stair and the deck in its side view.
- On the lower left hand side of page 4 the parapet detail is shown and they propose building over the existing parapet to create the overhang they are proposing
- Chairman Rice asked how much they are building up the parapet
- Mr. McHenry stated that they are building it up about five inches which is the edge out to the water side. They need to get the parapet plus its railing up to its co-compliant height above the deck
- Page 5 shows the rear view toward Bow Street. It has two windows and the siding material, which they are exploring, is a metal composite material that can be of a number of different colors, textures and surfaces. It has a metal sheet appearance on the outside on the flat surfaces.
- Chairman Rice asked about these new materials that are being used now throughout the HDC for walls and roofs
- Mr. McHenry stated that they could not do this with all masonry up above at this point because they are standing with one piece of steel from one side to the other. He stated he would bring in a whole pallet. There are a couple of different manufacturers they are looking at now and each of them have either a flat surface or a rough surface that looks like stucco and a series of different paint finishes as well. The material will not be a shiny finish. The material will not be a shiny finish and are thinking about a soft green or a gray and they don't want it to stick out in terms of its color or its surface.
- Page 6 is the floor plan view of the pavilion. The last time they were here the area that is now labeled "roof pavilion" was extended all the way out to the parapet on the side. They have added an additional area from where the chimney is now located that goes over to the parapet so it has a step affect. This was done to add another bedroom to the space, and, to address some concerns expressed by the abutters that too much view was being blocked. They pulled the wall back eight feet which helps out the view from high above down toward the water
- The next several pages are computer generated perspective views. The same drawing looked at from different points of view

- Page 7 shows the view from the center of the river
- Page 8 shows a good sense of the overall mass of it relative to the context
- Page 9 is a closer end view. This shows not only the L shaped deck that is different than it was before, but, the smaller deck on the right hand side of the window opening which has been dropped down to create the deck off the bedroom
- There is a monitor skylight on the roof on the right hand corner. This is the same size and location as it was before. However, there were two larger skylights on the roof of the pavilion on the previous plan that have been eliminated. There are two small skylights over the master bedroom area and the top of the stairwell
- Page 10 swings back around
- Page 11 pulls back from the view and it shows the skylight monitor on the rear of the building and the parapet as it builds around the original brick parapet. How it terminates on the building is up in the air right now. They are not happy with this detail at this point. Although, they are happy with the overall profile of the parapet extension they are not happy with how it terminates against the building or steps down is still in question.
- Mr. Adams asked about terminating against the building
- Mr. McHenry stated that they are talking about how it terminates against the pavilion structure.
- The egress stairs are in the way so it is more likely that the overhang will slide back to the other step that is closer to the left hand corner of the pavilion rather than drag itself all the way over toward the stair. The next door building is pretty close.
- The rationale for the overhang was both for aesthetics and also is meant to help out on the brick façade on the water side. They were concerned about the wear and tear of the façade
- Mr Adams asked about the fire escape and who it belongs to
- Mr McHenry stated that it is shared with the other building and will have no impact
- Page 12 pulls the area back further. There was a question last time about the potential obstruction of view from St John's church. This shows the view from the church
- Page 13 is the view from the center of Bow Street
- Mr Wyckoff stated the plan looks a lot cleaner than the plan submitted before
- Mr Golumb also stated that it looks a lot cleaner and likes the addition of the two windows
- Mr. McHenry stated that there were no windows in the rear portion on the last plan. They did have a side window in the hallway that existed before.
- Mr. McHenry stated that one window goes into the bathroom and one is in the stairwell. There is another skylight shown on page six and you can see the two skylights, one in the hall, and, one in the bedroom.
- Mr Katz stated that the success of the project, to a certain extent, depends upon the color and texture of the siding. One does not want to draw attention to the structure because it is trying to fit in as far as always being there. He wonders about the overhang cornice on the structure. Someone mentioned it looked oriental. It does not look industrial. They are picking up the cornice on the parapet wall and can that be lessened as far as the amount is concerned.
- Mr. McHenry stated that, at first, it was an aesthetic issue. They have had problems with the façade above the windows that they had to do pressure testing on.

- Mr. Katz stated that the one that is mirrored on the building looks bigger and wondered if it could be diminished somewhat
- Mr. McHenry stated that Mr. Katz has a point with the proportionality of it with regard to the one-story structure versus the three-story structure
- Chairman Rice stated that what is interesting is that it mirrors the rectangular or horizontalness of the building with a flat roof
- Arthur and Joan Jones, owners of the Bow Street Inn, who directly abuts this property and they are adamantly opposed to the proposal to construct a pavilion on the roof of this building. They feel the structure will negatively impact the view. A letter of opposition was read
- Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions for Arthur and Joan Jones. Chairman Rice asked if they have met with the applicant. They indicated that they have. Chairman Rice noted the abutters comments. Mrs. Jones asked what the next step is.
- Chairman Rice stated the next step would be a public hearing
- Mrs. Jones asked if the Commission is going along with the plan
- Chairman Rice stated that this is a work session and the HDC does not approve or disapprove of any plan during work sessions
- Mr Katz stated the ordinance guidelines of section 10-1001 that were read by Mrs. Jones and stated that they are the guideline criteria for people that object. However, he stated that one should read the footnote as well which states “Being rejected is an attitude that everything in an area should be frozen in the time period with little or no change allowed. Change can be a recognized vehicle for the continuing prosperity of an area, but, only if it is linked to the character of the area”. Mr. Katz stated that, the characteristics, criteria and guidelines that were stated by Mrs. Jones are subject to interpretation by the members of the Commission, by the applicant, and, by people who object to a particular structure, so, this process causes this sort of situation. He stated that he is inclined to be in favor of this plan depending on the applicant’s attempt to make it as unobtrusive as possible as far as the siding is considered. He stated that, if Mr. And Mrs. Jones feels this is going to be approved, he noted that section 10-1009 states that, as abutters they are entitled to appeal the decision within 10 days, which would result in a rehearing, and, if there is still no satisfaction, within 10 days they can appeal to the BOA as well, so, there are avenues for the abutters if they feel that strongly about this.
- Mr Rice stated that the Commission can only interpret what the attorney tells the Commission and stated that preservation of views are not within the HDC power, even though, it would make a lot of sense to preserve people’s view in terms of preserving economic value. They have fought the battle of trying to preserve abutters’ views on a number of occasions and each time they have receive the same interpretation from the Legal Department. He suggested that the abutters talk to the Planning Department to see where these decisions have gone. He stated that the HDC is supposed to be impartial and he is trying to give the abutters the time to state their entire case and to have people help them interpret the ordinance.

C) Work Session requested by **Mark H. Wentworth Home for Chronic Invalids, owner**, for property located at **346 Pleasant Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior

renovations to an existing structure (replace fire escape with fire stairs, add new ADA compliant entry, and replace façade material and some windows) and to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a one-story addition to garden level nursing care unit). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts.

Mr. Adams moved to take the application off the table and the motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed unanimously.

- Chairman Rice recused himself from this Work Session and Mr. Adams took over the chair for this work session
- A representative for the applicant spoke on behalf of the petition
- He found some precedence for repeated curb for the doorways. He did see some elements that were favorable as it relates to scale
- In the revised plan they created a different approach.
- They pulled the façade in tighter.
- The vestibule was tacked on to the front. They took the vestibule and tucked it into the building. From interior perspective it is successful
- The façade is straighter
- Entry is asymmetrically located to the side
- Grade is dropping
- The landscape plan will create a planter
- There are no steps coming down
- The entry will have canopy
- There is a tall façade of glass which will bring in a lot of light
- Mr Adams stated that it is almost a two story entryway
- The materials on the building: Will maintain an existing brick base. They will change the windows and replace the clapboard
- Instead of one single color will use more than one and will use what is most appropriate colors that go with surrounding neighborhood to break up horizontal mass of building
- Mr Adams noted that HDC does not have any say on what color is used
- Mr Wyckoff noted that there are two second-story windows on the entryway side

D) Work Session requested by **Melissa Bicchieri, owner and Sonny Iannacone, applicant** for property located at **206 Northwest Street** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (detached garage) and new construction to an existing structure (additions to house). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 122 as Lot 6 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

Moved to table to a time indefinite as the petitioner was not present to be heard at this time. *(The applicant subsequently appeared before the Commission and the Commission heard the petitioner at the end of the meeting)*

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Work Session/Public Hearing for RRJ Properties Limited Partnership, owner, and Martingale Wharf, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **99 Bow Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (two additions creating a mixed use building of restaurants, street level retail and offices) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the Central Business A, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts. *This petition was tabled at the January 4, 2006 meeting to the reconvened meeting on January 11, 2006.*

- Attorney McNeill spoke on behalf of the petition
- Attorney McNeill read a letter that was submitted by Ms. Dika as a rebuttal to an article that was in the newspaper. The letter was addressed to Assistant Building Inspector Roger Clum.
- Attorney McNeill asked Ms Dika to step down from voting on this petition
- Chairman Rice suggested the Commission go into Executive Session
- Ms. Dika stated she would like to speak on the record to Mr. McNeill's concerns. She stated she saw an editorial in the newspaper with her name in it and later made some comments on the points of facts in the editorial. When she finished she started a letter but had no intentions of sending the letter – but she had questions about her comments accuracy as the editorial stated that her comments were that based on the zoning ordinance and height allotment on various parts of city and that people should be allowed to build to those heights. It stated that it was her understanding that the new construction would be oversized based on other buildings. She put her comments down and sent to Mr. Clum to see if they were appropriate. She was not thinking she was putting them in the public record. She asked Mr. Clum if it was a good idea to send the letter to the editor and was told by council it was not a good idea. She was commenting on the editorial itself and not on this particular project.
- Mr. Clum stated he consulted with Attorney Sullivan and with Ms Dika today and Attorney Sullivan stated it was up to Ms Dika as to whether she should recuse herself. Mr. Dika felt that was not necessary and she could impartially vote on this project.
- Attorney McNeil passed around some photographs with some changes.
- Some changes were made to the roofscape and to the façade
- Some physical changes were made
- Building 1 – They changed the penthouse roof from a slope metal siding to asphalt shingles
- Building 2 – They lowered one floor and changed the roof to asphalt
- Building 3 – They changed the dormer and changed the roof to asphalt shingles
- On the existing Martingale the roof was lowered 9 inches and the dormers were changed
- Buildings 6 and 7 are smaller and were dropped down a bit. The dormer configuration changed and there is a slope roof now
- Mr Adams noted that they increased the roof heights of the two adjoining buildings to accommodate the issue of perspective. He asked if the building will look less tall in perspective

- Mr Golumb stated that the new plan looks a lot cleaner and fits in a lot better with the street. He likes the detail of the roof and the change of roofing material
- Mr Wyckoff agrees especially with buildings 6 and 7 and stated that they are much better. He stated that they look like they are Bow St buildings
- Ms Dika stated that they did a good job of differentiating sections of the building. She stated that looking at the older buildings on the left side and the second floor windows the windows step up floor by floor and the windows are actually straight across
- Mr Adams stated that if you look at the Georgeopoulos building it has more windows in alignment at a shorter distance. There is not quite as flat a surface as the buildings at the lower end of Bow Street. He felt that they were most successful in breaking the buildings into segments than he has ever seen
- Ms Dika asked if brick color could change between sections
- New building does not look like a 1970's condominium
- Mr Rice suggested moving on to the harbor side
- There were no concerns about the harbor side.

A Motion to go to Public Hearing was made and seconded and passed unanimously.

Mr. Golumb asked about the brick markup.

Mr. Adams asked about the front façade and about the modifications on the first floor of the Martingale and whether it is the intent of the applicant to add any masonry on the Martingale. –

Mr. Ricci stated that they intend to install infill and molding joints. Mr. Ricci noted that the mortar used on the Martingale is different than the mortar used on the other buildings.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they intend to replace the windows on the Martingale.
Mr Ricci indicated that most of the windows on the Martingale will be reglazed.

Chairman Rice asked if there were anyone from the public that wished to speak.

Attorney Tom Watson spoke, representing Bob and Hazel Hall who live at 107-109 Bow Street that lies east of the property in question. He stated that he commends the developer for listening to all the comments and suggestions of the Commission, and, in addition, he commends the developer for lowering the height of the buildings and making changes to the infestation on the façade. There was one concern that was pointed out at the December he meeting. At that time it was his opinion that the setting for these buildings is set on two streetscapes, the lower and upper, which is two completely different settings. He stated that buildings 6 and 7 will transition from one setting to another. He noted that the buildings blend into lower Bow Street very well However, when they get to his client's building they create an abrupt change and defining the boundary between these streetscapes. He stated that the upper section of the buildings are all different and independent of each other. His suggestion is to allow more space between building 7 and the two-story building that lies east of that. He stated that building 7 should be narrowed by 10 feet and the section that has the stairwell should be removed. He stated that this would create the transition from the upper and lower streetscapes.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions for the applicant, hearing none, the Chairman asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Golumb made a motion to approve the application as presented and Mr. Katz seconded.

Mr. Golumb stated that this plan is much better than what was presented in December and that the roofs fit in better.

Ms Dika thought the other plan was scary and that this plan is much better.

Mr Katz stated that this will be a real addition to the streetscape of Bow Street.

Mr Adams stated that he was concerned about the issues related to the impact of this project on the street and how this proposal can work on the site. He asked about the historic precedence of this project.

Chairman Rice stated that the applicants have shown a good deal of stewardship during this process.

A vote was taken and it was passed unanimously.

2. Work Session/Public Hearing for Ana Maria Ferro and Ferdinand T. Preller, owner for property located at **514 Middle Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing decks, porches and stairways and replace with 14' 10" x 14' deck with egress decks and stairways) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 19 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts. *This petition was tabled at the January 4, 2006 meeting to the reconvened meeting on January 11, 2006.*

A motion was made and seconded to take the application off of table and was unanimously approved.

- Gary Anderson spoke on behalf of petition.
- They are moving a series of decks and stairways.
- They want to rebuild in order to have the decks and stairways meet code.
- There were two concerns at the last meeting. One was the railing detail and the other was the use of lattice.
- Mr. Katz had noted that vinyl or synthetic both have cross hashing and either one would be acceptable.
- Mr. Adams stated that he would love to see a durable material.

- Mr. Adams noted that based on the picture submitted the proposal does not meet the requirements.
- Mr. Adams stated he would like to see some dimensions.
- Mr. Anderson stated that the owner would prefer something more maintenance free.
- The railings are two 2 x 4 rails.
- The material is trek
- The style will carry throughout the project.
- The trim around the lattice will give it a more period look.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the pressure treated lattice work that comes in squares should be used and does not want to approve the acrylic lattice as this is a special order and would not know where to get it.
- Mr Katz stated that heavy duty cedar would be okay and would not like stamped vinyl PVC
- Mr Wyckoff suggested heavy duty pressure treated as an alternative
- Mr. Adams suggested that the applicant get a manufacturer's sheet with the square lattice dimensions and send to the Planning Department
- Mr Anderson stated that this would leave an option for the homeowner but they would have to maintain it
- Mr. Adams asked how the stairs are going to change if don't meet code
- Mr. Anderson noted that on the top level the deck is cut up to incorporate a stairway

A motion was made and seconded to move to a public hearing and was unanimously approved.

Chairman Rice asked what is being done regarding the lattice.

Mr. Anderson stated that the lattice will be of good quality and they will use maintenance free material.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions for the applicant, hearing none, the Chairman asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve with the stipulation that the applicant bring in a cutsheet to show the dimensions of lattice to be used. The motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb and passed unanimously.

3. Work Session for Folsom-Salter House, LLC, owner for property located at **105 Court Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (build an exterior deck/egress for second floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 22 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts. *This petition was tabled at the January 4, 2006 meeting to a work session at the reconvened meeting on January 11, 2006.*

A motion was made and seconded to take the application ff of the table and passed unanimously.

- Paul Jambor, Abenaki Building and Contracting spoke on behalf of the petition
- Mr. Wyckoff was concerned about the ballisters at the last meeting
- The ballisters will be maintained
- Mr Jambor noted that the other concern expressed by Mr. Adams was the size
- Mr Adams stated that he looked at the site and other buildings in the area. He stated that there is one jungle jim of buildings that is skeletal in nature and much larger than this plan
- Mr Jambor noted that the majority of properties on that block do have these type of decks and this is the least number of square feet on this property and the least obtrusive on that whole block
- Mr. Jambor noted that they will be lagging into the building and using posts
- Concern was expressed about the windows and doors. Mr. Jambor noted that this is the best solution for aesthetics
- Mr Katz asked about the 4 x 4 wood post
- Mr. Jambor stated that they would be pressure treated
- Mr. Jambor stated they will be installing a fiberglass door but it will match the door that is downstairs
- The frame of the deck related to the skeletal structure will be pressure treated and after one year it will be primed and painted.

A motion was made and seconded to move to a public hearing and passed unanimously.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions for the applicant, hearing none, the Chairman asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve and Ms Dika seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Rice stated that the new mayor has requested a thumbnail description of what the HDC does and the criteria of what a member of the Commission should be.

Chairman Rice noted that Mr. Katz came up with a starting point and the other Commission members can add to it. Chairman Rice asked the Commission members to e-mail their descriptions to him.

Chairman Rice suggested that the Commission consider where they stand regarding heights within the district. Precedent set before still stands. He feels the Commission should have a

discussion with the City Attorney on this matter and he has gone ahead and scheduled a meeting with the City Attorney in February on the second Wednesday of the month at 6:30 p.m. provided there is a meeting at that time.

Mr Wyckoff quoted from the zoning board the four criteria that should be on all applications.

B. Work Session requested by **Melissa Bicchieri, owner and Sonny Iannacone, applicant** for property located at **206 Northwest Street** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (detached garage) and new construction to an existing structure (additions to house). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 122 as Lot 6 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

A motion was made and seconded to take the application off of the table and passed unanimously.

- Wendy Welton spoke on behalf of petition
- She is not satisfied with the scale of the windows and the drawing does not show the detailing
- She stated she moved some of the volume
- She indicated that more ground floor space is needed
- Her clients was to put a deck over the garage
- There would be two garage doors
- The back has access to an invoking port
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that the proposal is very horizontal and is unflattering
- Mr. Wyckoff has reservations about breaking up the siding and treating it as a carriage house
- Mr. Wyckoff indicated that because the arch section is vertical it warrants siding
- Ms. Welton indicated that the footprint and height are an extra 2 feet
- Ms. Welton stated that her clients would love a pop dormer
- Chairman Rice stated he would not entertain that here
- Chairman Rice suggested that they diminish the extension in height by a foot or so
- It was suggested that the connection shed be made larger
- Chairman Rice noted that the applicant wants to diminish the importance of the building and the Commission is trying to preserve character
- Mr. Adams stated that the proposal is not as successful as it can be. He stated that the single window is a problem and that making connection larger makes more sense
- Mr. Golumb stated he is troubled by the gamble end
- Ms. Welton stated she agreed.
- Ms. Dika expressed concern about the importance of the original building
- Chairman Rice noted that there is a lot of fenestration in the back of the property by the garage and boat house
- Ms. Welton indicated that she will be taking out the top window
- Ms. Welton also stated that there will be more differentiation with the railing

- Mr. Wyckoff stated that the rail is going over the post much like the window in the gable part
 - Mr Golumb stated his concern about the amount of glass
 - Ms. Welton stated that the windows in the middle will be changed
 - The Juliet Balcony will change
 - The windows will be brought down in size.
 - The bedroom windows are the egress
-

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:15 p.m., a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail McDowell
Acting HDC Secretary

/gm