

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

**7:00 p.m.**

**JULY 12, 2006**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman John Rice, Vice-Chairman David Adams, Richard Katz, John Golumb, and Alternates Sandra Dika and John Wyckoff

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** City Council Representative Ned Reynolds, Ellen Fineberg

**ALSO PRESENT:** Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman Rice called the reconvened meeting to order at 7 p.m. He stated that there was a request to table work session B. Mr. Adams made a motion to table work session B to the August 2 meeting. It was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion to table the work session passed by unanimous vote.

**I. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

10) Petition of Harold **J. Henry, owner**, for property located at **235-245 Islington Street** wherein clarification was requested that the Certificate of Appropriateness (as extended at the September 7, 2005 meeting of the Historic District Commission) as advertised for a 20' x 38' structure will apply to a structure drawn on the original site plan as 20' x 40' and to a corrected application listing the structure as measuring 20' x 40' per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 45 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Harold Henry spoke to the petition. He stated that the effort he was making that evening was to straighten out the records. He said that there was a 2' discrepancy in the paperwork that he filed with the HDC and with the Planning Board. Mr. Clum interjected that what was advertised to the HDC and to the Planning Board were two different things. It is a two foot difference in the length of the building. He added that the Planning Director decided that since there was the discrepancy, Mr. Henry would need to come back before the HDC for clarification.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions in the subject. He then asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Adams made a motion to accept the application as presented. Mr. Golumb seconded the motion. The motion to grant the petition as presented passed by unanimous vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

11) Petition of **Dennett-Prospect Realty Investments, LLC, owner**, for property located at **69-73 Prospect Street** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing free standing one story structure and construction of a new free standing two story structure as previously approved and shown on plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 142 as Lot 29 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Steve McHenry spoke to the petition. He pointed out that the package before them was a plan that has already been approved for changes to a small outbuilding associated with the property. The original intent was to renovate the building. He stated that he would like to make changes to the original plans. He said he does not plan to change anything from what was approved in the past. Mr. McHenry explained that it was proposed by the builder to demolish the structure instead of renovating it and build a new on the same footprint with the same design. They discovered that the building was in worse shape than previously thought. The building is a combination of concrete block and wood frame.

Chairman Rice asked for questions for the applicant. Ms. Dika asked how old the building was. Mr. McHenry responded that it functioned as a bakery at one point but he was not sure how far back that went. Because it has some block construction as well as wood construction, it may go back to the 1920's or 1930's. He stated that the building is sitting close to the property line, so in order to do the new construction and demolition; it will require a variance which the owner is currently seeking.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they were going to use the existing foundation. Mr. McHenry replied yes. He stated that they had a structural engineer look at the foundation and it will require some repairs. Ms. Dika asked what the foundation material was. Mr. McHenry responded that it is a combination of some poured sections and some block.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Ms. Janice Turner of 25 Winding Brook Drive in Stratham spoke against the petition. She stated that she owns the property directly behind the building (a barn) that is in question. Her property is 71 Prospect St. and is currently a rental house. Ms. Turner stated that she has some concerns about the project. She has talked with Mr. Dennett and offered a suggestion. He has not gotten back to Ms. Turner with a response. She stated that there is a driveway that goes down beside the building which provides access to 71 Prospect Street. It is 12' at the edge of the road, narrows to 9'6" (at the edge of the barn) and then widens out which belongs to Mr. Dennett. She indicated that she has asked Mr. Dennett to move the barn to widen her driveway for better access to the demolition and building process. She said that if he rebuilt the foundation about 6', it would benefit her with a wider driveway and it would benefit him since the current location of the barn is hit regularly by cars because of the driveway's narrowness. She asked if the Historical District Commission had any objections to it being

moved. She realizes that it is an expensive engineering problem. Ms. Turner stated that she has offered to exchange land which she said Mr. Dennett wants for the widening of her driveway.

Chairman Rice interjected that the Commission is a design review commission. He stated that this would be something that Site Review would handle. Chairman Rice said that they don't have any issues with the current design.

Ms. Turner said that the biggest negative in buying her house was the existence of the barn and zero lot line down the driveway and along the barn. She also voiced concern about the height of the building. Currently it towers over her property and she feels it will significantly impact her in the future.

Mr. Adams asked if any part of the building is on her property. Ms. Turner responded no, that it is a zero lot line. Mr. Adams asked that when she says that there is hardly any room for her driveway, does she mean on her own property. She responded yes. Mr. Adams asked that in conversation with the owner, he made no understanding that he wanted to trade property to make her driveway larger. Chairman Rice interjected that they were getting into an area that was not within their purview. He added that the core of her objections lie in Site Review. He suggested that she voice her opinions when the application comes before the Planning Board.

Mr. Katz asked that if this came to be, would the Commission object to the residing if the footprint were to be moved. Chairman Rice stated that as far as the siding is concerned, they would have to deal with that when the time comes. As for the design, the Commission has approved where it is.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the design of the building is very compatible with the period of the house and typical of the kind of outbuilding that one would find, even to the point of being built along the lot line. Given all of that, Mr. Adams said that it all made architectural sense. Mr. Adams pointed out that the applicant is making no changes from a previously approved plan other than for a bit of time, the building will not be there. They will have to go before the Board of Adjustment.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. It was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Rice asked for discussion. Mr. Adams said he was going to vote in favor as it remains the same application at the beginning and at the end, except for some interesting information that came up during meeting. He said that he felt that the building, its siding, and its reconfiguration will be appropriate for the area. Chairman Rice agreed.

The motion to grant the petition as presented passed by unanimous vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

**II. WORK SESSIONS**

A) Petition of **Market Wharf Condominiums, owner** and **Thomas Magruder, applicant** for property located at **59 Deer Street** wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, decks, and railings with new composite materials) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 1B and lies within the Central Business B, Historic District A and Downtown Overlay Districts. *This item was tabled to a work session at the June 21, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Adams made a motion to take the application off of the table. It was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion to take the application off of the table passed with a unanimous vote.
- Mr. Patrick Crothers of C & L Construction in Greenland, spoke to the petition. Two condo board members were in attendance as well. Mr. Crothers stated that at the last meeting, they proposed cementitious siding as opposed to the existing cedar clapboards and pine siding that is on the building. They presented samples of the proposed siding and rails. He said that they plan to stay with the same exposure (41/4" – 41/2"). The end of the building has a radius to it so since it is a rigid project; they are proposing a cement shingle. The engineer has redesigned it to make the breaks evenly with a termination trim on both ends.
- Mr. Adams pointed out that at the last meeting one of the items that stuck with him was the way that the siding changed on the façade. He felt it made for awkward forms. A change was requested on the areas of the building that bear the breaks.
- Chairman Rice stated that they were looking to see that the shingle portion be clapboard.
- Mr. Adams said that it is now.
- Mr. Crothers said that the shingles would be at the same exposure of the clapboards.
- Chairman Rice said that the Commission feels that it is not an appropriate look for the District.
- Mr. Katz stated that on the Russell Street side, the break is awkward. By going all the way over, he felt that it was treating the end of the building almost as a separate building. He said that if it were townhouses, the structure should be different. He felt it is leading into more decisions that have to be made. Mr. Katz said that there is no vertical trim board coming down. What comes down there now is a downspout.
- Mr. Crothers proposed putting a piece of 1 x 4 to divide it.
- Mr. Katz said that it should come up and interplay with the soffits. He felt it should be some sort of change and that will require more decisions on the Commission's part.
- Mr. Golumb asked how long the clapboard has been on.
- Mr. Crothers replied since 1987.
- Mr. Golumb stated that he feels like he is going through a lot of work to change everything when the clapboards have lasted almost 20 years. He asked why he doesn't just re-clapboard. Mr. Golumb said he did not feel that the design was appropriate.
- Mr. Adams asked why the clapboards went.
- Ms. Carolyn McGee, a condo board member, answered Mr. Adam's question. She said that she has been on the condo board for 10 – 12 years. They have spent a great deal of money maintaining the building. She said that the clapboards are popping off of the building. She also said that one of the reasons they were looking to go to a product that would last longer is because the constant traffic of the salt trucks and the consistently windy conditions. As an association, they are trying to get ahead.
- Chairman Rice asked why the Moffatt-Ladd does not have this problem. It is in the same area.
- Mr. Katz replied that the Moffatt-Ladd house is 240 years old and they do paint it frequently.

- Chairman Rice said yes, but they are not replacing clapboards every 20 years.
- Mr. Adams interjected that this is his area of expertise. He said that the clapboards at the Moffatt-Ladd house were all hand split. The grain of the wood runs consistently from one end to the other. He said that it is probably the most durable piece of wood that could ever be. In addition, for 200 hundred years, the Moffatt-Ladd and many other historic buildings were painted with a very toxic type of paint, which really did a great job. Ingredients that made paint really durable were removed over the years. He stated that they are looking at things that can no longer be done.
- Chairman Rice asked if exposure had anything to do with it.
- Mr. Adams said no. Mr. Katz added that the outer surface of cedar constantly wears away. He said that cedar left naturally will last 50-60 years. The cedar clapboards, even though they are stained, do the same thing. And the finish falls right off. Mr. Katz said that he has cedar clapboards on his house and has to touch them up every four years. He said that he sees the problem the condo association is having.
- Chairman Rice asked what would be good compromise.
- Mr. Katz stated that he can see nothing but a continuous run with the clapboards because of the original design of the building.
- Ms. Dika asked about an all shingle building. Mr. Katz said that's essentially what he's going for. Mr. Wyckoff stated he felt that that made sense.
- Mr. Adams pointed out that one of the issues with the smooth, curved section that makes it look unkempt is how the clapboards pop at the corners. Mr. Adams asked that if a 12" shingle was applied on that radius did he think that it would have that same look. Mr. Crothers said no, he thought that it was a large enough radius, the length of the curve is almost 40' and it wouldn't be noticed.
- Mr. Adams asked about the price difference. Mr. Crothers said there is definitely a higher installation cost.
- Mr. Adams noted that the sample shingle had no holes punched in it. Mr. Crothers replied that they are not needed. Mr. Adams asked about the exposure. Mr. Crothers answered it will be a 7" exposure. Mr. Adams asked if a 5" exposure could be achieved and Mr. Crothers answered yes, he believed it could. Mr. Adams stated that 5" is a common exposure for typical white cedar shingle siding that has been around for a couple hundred years. East Coast red cedar shingles have a 7" exposure and they don't see much of that in the District.
- Mr. Adams mentioned that the wider the exposure, the smaller the building will look.
- Mr. Adams asked who the applicant was. Mr. Crothers answered that Tom Magruder is the applicant and property manager for the building.
- Mr. Adams recommended that before they come back to the Commission with an application, they do a mock up and then a 15 minute site walk could be scheduled.
- Ms. Dika mentioned that a good architect could redesign the exterior of the building in a pleasing fashion although it would be an added expense.
- Mr. Adams pointed out that this is not the only building on this site.
- Mr. Crothers said that the other building does not have the radius that this one does.
- Mr. Adams asked if the Commission was ready to move on to other parts of the application.
- Chairman Rice asked about the proposal for the railing.

- Mr. Crothers showed a sample of the railing material. He mentioned that they are looking for low maintenance. He pointed out that on Deer Street there are three short balconies that are 10' long.
- Chairman Rice said that the proposed railings (vinyl) would not be appropriate for the District. He pointed out that in cities you see steel rails.
- Mr. Katz stated that there probably wouldn't need to be a post in the center of the railing.
- Mr. Adams pointed out that most of the kits come in 10' so there would have to be a post.
- Mr. Katz thought that a rail with balusters would look reasonable.
- Mr. Golumb disagreed with that idea. He said that he didn't feel it was appropriate for the building. Metal or wood would be more appropriate.
- Chairman Rice said that there has been a lot of effort on the other side of the street to build buildings of character. He felt this should be a concession on the applicant's part to fit the building into the neighborhood.
- Mr. Crothers asked for the Commission's opinion on the railings on the courtyard side. He asked if they would still object to this railing system since these railings are in an area that is more private.
- Ms. Dika said she wouldn't vote for that material. Mr. Adams agreed with Ms. Dika.
- Mr. Adams pointed out that safety comes into play and he feels that metal is a safer alternative. He added that the Commission is also comfortable with different types of wood railings as well.
- Mr. Katz said that aluminum would work also.
- Mr. Crothers said that they would do some more homework on the project and come back to the Commission.

\*\*\*\*\*

C) Petition of **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **7 Islington Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure and a new free standing structure (renovate existing building and add new building on adjacent site). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126, Lot 51 and lies within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts. *This item was tabled to another work session at the June 21, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Steve McHenry spoke to the petition. He introduced Jen Ramsey of Somma and Brandon Holben who works in the McHenry Architecture office. Mr. McHenry stated that they have gone through many different types of buildings in the past couple months. He pointed out that while it is on a prominent site it is on the edge of downtown. It abuts different zones and uses. He stated that he feels that their newest design is a winner. The building acts more like a background building rather than a signature building. They want it to fit into the neighborhood. Mr. McHenry highlighted areas of interest in the presented plans. In the plans, page two takes a look at the lot. Page 4 has more detail as to the footprints of the neighboring property. Page 5 has a series of sketch renderings from various angles that try to present the feeling and style of the building. Page 6 looks down Bridge Street. Page 7 is a straight on view with retail mercantile style stores on the first floor. He pointed out a heavy eave line and a series of bays that represent the look of a three story building and then set back at various distances behind that is a smaller footprint of an addition to the top of the building, the fourth floor. Mr. McHenry pointed out that the building would be wood trim, wood clapboarding and wood details along the first floor. He added that due to code constraints it may not be actual wood, but it

will be clapboard and wood details. Page 10 gives a pretty good idea of scale. Pages 11 – 12 have the straight on views. On page 13, there is an enlarged portion of the center bay of the building with the beginnings of their assumptions on materials. He pointed out that the building has the feeling of a residential row house in a residential neighborhood. Mr. McHenry confirmed that it would be all clapboard but they would like to vary the color to help break it up a bit and adds variety to the street.

- Mr. Wyckoff said that the plans were an improvement over the last plans. He asked what was on the left of the garage door. Mr. McHenry replied that it is a bay that protrudes. It is the base of the bay window above but it's an opening because there are parked cars behind it. They needed to create large openings for the carport area.
- Mr. Katz asked if the building would have a partial parking garage and partial outside parking. Mr. McHenry said yes. He pointed out that if you went through the opening, you would be able to exit out of the Bridge Street side. And by taking a building down on Tanner Street they propose to create parking there.
- Mr. Golumb stated that he thought the design was very interesting. He asked if the design was pulled from San Francisco. Mr. McHenry said that if you go down Hanover Street there are a series of triple deckers that are wood framed and a variety of colors. They are tucked quite nicely into the neighborhood.
- Chairman Rice commented that the garage to the street was an element that they had problems with in the past. Chairman Rice asked if any of the Commissioners had any trouble with the newest parking ideas.
- Mr. McHenry said there are five parking spaces inside the building. He felt it was important to note that the garage opening is set back so it is not as much of a safety hazard. He pointed out that there is only one way to go in, on Tanner Street and out on Bridge Street.
- Mr. Golumb asked if there was going to be any grading. Mr. McHenry said that they should either have a garage door that goes up and down or an opening.
- Mr. Adams asked if the residents had to go out that way and Mr. McHenry responded that it just doesn't fit any other way.
- Ms. Ramsey interjected that the City encouraged the traffic to go in one way and out the other to negate heavy traffic on Tanner Street.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that cars exiting this way would be dangerous to pedestrians walking up the sidewalk. He thought that coming in that way would seem to be safer. Mr. McHenry said that they are dealing with this issue in site review.
- Mr. Katz said he likes how the second floor overhangs the first floor.
- Chairman Rice asked if the Commissioners were comfortable with the garage element.
- Mr. Golumb pointed out a garage design on Islington Street, across from the VFW. He asked if a garage door like that would soften the entrance versus nothing.
- Mr. Adams thought a gate would be better than just an opening. He stated that he is having difficulty with the opening as it is presented in the current design.
- Mr. McHenry said they have tried to make it as small as possible.
- Mr. Adams asked why the face of the building has so much articulation.
- Mr. McHenry answered that he lived on Beacon Hill for a while and really became aware of the variety of the buildings. He added that you don't really see the variety unless you are a pedestrian. He mentioned that when you are in those buildings, you have a tremendous advantage of the site line down the street.

- Chairman Rice said that he likes the concept of the idea. He expressed concern that they might be faced with cementitious siding or vinyl like the previous work session.
- Mr. McHenry replied that it is their intent to make this a wood exterior. They have not done a complete code review yet.
- Mr. Adams said he is struck by the excessive floor to floor heights. He asked if they could work through an assumption that the floor thicknesses aren't so great.
- Mr. McHenry said they would love to. He said that the more it can be compressed, the better.
- Mr. Adams said that it would reduce the scale of the building.
- Mr. McHenry said that what they are trying to achieve tonight is to get a good indication of the building concept. He said that because they have a series of preliminary elevations, the next drawing that they do is a "section through" building. That drawing gives them a determination of the bay sizing and the materials that they will be using.
- Mr. Adams said that where the Commission has stumbled in the past is on losing track of the floor to floor height issues. He felt they failed at 100 Market Street, for the five floors of too much floor to floor space.
- Mr. McHenry said that taking a section through the building tells you an assumed spacing of structure but all of the coordination of utilities, such as large ductwork has to be taken into account also.
- Mr. Adams said that it won't pass muster with him. He felt that it is a problem and it has got to be addressed. He also added that he has done a good job of fitting the building into the streetscape.
- Mr. Wyckoff wondered if the garage door should mirror the bays.
- Mr. Katz also stated that he would like to go on record saying that he is in favor of this concept. He said it looks like it belongs there and he likes it a lot.
- Ms. Dika agreed that she too is comfortable with the design. She asked about the three buildings that will be taken down.
- Mr. McHenry replied that they will bring more information about the demolitions to the next meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

D) Petition of **Exxon Mobilcorp, owner, Ayoub Engineering, Inc., applicant**, for property located at **201 Islington Street** wherein permission was requested to allow a new sign (attached, internally illuminated) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (reface panels on freestanding sign) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 33 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts. *This petition was tabled to a work session at the July 5, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Adams made a motion to remove the petition from the table. It was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion to remove the petition from the table passed by unanimous vote.
- Mr. Anthony Guba spoke to the petition. He mentioned that he didn't understand that when you go to a work session, there cannot be a vote. He stated that in the discussions he has had with Mobil, he has determined that they are fairly happy with the signs that they have. They are asking to reface the sign. They want to leave it the way it is except that the new logo would be added. It would remain the same size. He added that they want to keep the signs that are presently illuminated. The yellow band on the building they want to keep as well. He stated that they are proposing to put a light around the building. He added that if these changes cannot be approved, they will just leave it as it is.



- Chairman Rice said that they can approve the changing of the signs but not have them be internally illuminated.
- Mr. Guba said that they are illuminated now so they won't change this if they have to lose the illumination to do it.
- Ms. Dika asked if Exxon has a written policy on how they enter into Historic Districts. She also asked how Exxon supports historical restorations and these types of issues.
- Mr. Guba replied that it is on a case by case basis. He pointed out that he is not an employee of Mobil so he does not know their corporate wide policy.
- Ms. Dika asked if he was an attorney for them.
- Mr. Guba answered no, he is a civil engineer.
- Mr. Adams asked about the proposal for refacing.
- Mr. Guba said that the internal illumination arrived long before the building was in Historic District A. Islington Street used to be in Historic District B where the only concern was demolition and therefore, internally illuminated signs were not addressed. Mr. Guba stated that he believes that the existing internally illuminated signs are grandfathered.
- Chairman Rice said he begged to differ. He stated that he was on the Commission when the building was built. He said they approved the design. He added that there had not been a gas station there before.
- Mr. Adams interjected and said there had been. It was called Gibbs Gas and they had illuminated signs.
- Chairman Rice said he saw this as a real step forward for Mobil to create a really nice gas station that could be an asset to the character of the district.
- Mr. Chairman said that nothing can be done about the grandfathered signs. He asked the Commissioners if the banding of light around the building was appropriate.
- Mr. Adams thought it was dangerous material.
- Chairman Rice said that to illuminate the "On the Run" logo, it would have to be done externally.
- Mr. Clum interjected to let the Commissioners know how the City staff feels on this issue. He said that they felt that any change in signage, even though it was grandfathered, would be subject to the Commission's review. In addition, he said that internally illuminating a band was much more than painting a band on the building.
- Mr. Guba said that they were not looking to internally illuminate any bands. He also stated that there was not going to be any changes to the canopy. He said that on the building, they are not looking to internally illuminate the band, instead to put a light that would be recessed underneath the edge of the roof and it would down light the building.
- Mr. Clum said that that is not within the Commission's purview. He said that it is not a sign; it is paint that is externally illuminated.
- Mr. Katz said that they would have to cut the soffits in order to put the lights up in the soffits.
- Mr. Clum said they have never put recessed lights before the Commission's review.
- Mr. Katz asked if they would need a building permit.
- Mr. Clum said that they would need an electrical permit.
- Mr. Guba stated that what they are trying to do at all of the locations, is build a cabinet all along the building, stretch a yellow film over it and internally illuminate it. He pointed out that that is not what is being proposed for this building.
- Mr. Clum stated that the Commission is here for whatever they want to internally illuminate or whatever is currently internally illuminated and they want to change.
- Mr. Guba said that that is what his understanding is. They are not looking to illuminate anything that is not already illuminated. They just want to change the logo on the already illuminated signs.
- Mr. Golumb asked if the sign over the door is internally illuminated now.
- Mr. Guba said yes.

- Mr. Golumb said that most of the time when he goes by the building, it is not illuminated. He said it was his understanding that that was one of the stipulations when they approved the building that the sign not be illuminated.
- Mr. Guba said he went by the site and he too noticed that it was not illuminated.
- Mr. Golumb asked Mr. Clum to look into it.
- Mr. Guba said that if that was the agreement then Mobil will adhere to that. He added that the people in the store tell him that the sign is internally illuminated. If it is allowed to be illuminated then Mobil doesn't want to lose it. If it is not allowed to be illuminated, then all they are looking to do is change it with something that would not be illuminated.
- Mr. Clum answered that that is not something the Commission would concern themselves with. It is considered signage.
- Mr. Golumb asked if lighting that goes around the building is something that the Commission should concern themselves with.
- Mr. Clum said recessed lights have never been before the Commission. They have taken large light fixtures on the face of a building because they were substantial to the façade of the structure. He added that he only remembers two instances, the old Fleet Bank and Temple Israel, when the Commission reviewed external light fixtures.
- Mr. Katz pointed out that Mr. Guba said they have been willing to drop that part of the lighting aspect from the very beginning.
- Mr. Guba said that if this is something that does not requires the Commission's approval he would like to know that. He said that he was certain that Mobil would want to make that change to the building.
- Ms. Dika asked if there is a station in the region that has already made these changes.
- Mr. Guba said no because what they are asking to do at this station is on a much smaller scale than what they are doing at other stations.
- Mr. Clum said that if they have a permit for an internally illuminated sign and they want to change the copy on that sign, then they would not be before the Commission. Mr. Clum also said that if they want to make the fascia look different than it does now, then that should be something that the Commission should review.
- Mr. Katz stated that the installation of the shield would have to be determined if it was appropriate for the building.
- Mr. Katz also said that they have gotten signals that Mobil does not want to lose their illuminated signs so they may just be wasting time with this issue.
- Mr. Adams asked if there is a way that they could resolve the need for exterior washing of the side walls with units of lighting. He said that he does not think that it is the illuminating of the exterior of the building that is the issue; it is the strip of lighting.
- Mr. Guba responded in regards to "up" lighting, if the building was set in a landscape bed it is feasible but he didn't think logistically it would work with this building. He added that they are really using most of the land and to add landscaping would probably put them in violation with parking requirements.
- Mr. Guba said that he could present to Mobil the option of "down" lighting.
- Mr. Clum stated that holes in the fascia for down lights are not really a façade change unlike an added structure that hides strip lighting.
- Mr. Guba asked for clarification that if Mobil wanted to go ahead and do recessed lighting inside the existing overhang, then they wouldn't have to come back to the Commission for approval.
- Mr. Clum said that is his opinion.
- Mr. Clum stated that he will need to look into whether the original sign was approved to be internally illuminated.
- Mr. Adams made a motion to table the petition to a future meeting if necessary.

\*\*\*\*\*

E) Petition of **Deborah Phillips, owner** for property located at **92 Pleasant Street** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (one-story addition) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate and conceal existing condensers) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 76 and lies within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts. *This petition was tabled to a work session at the July 5, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Adams made a motion to remove the petition from the table. It was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion to remove the petition from the table passed by unanimous vote.
- Mr. David Witham spoke to the petition. They are proposing an addition off the back of The Clip Joint Barber Shop. He stated that they have already been granted a variance from the Board of Adjustment to build a structure less than 20 feet in height. He said that now they are coming before the Historic District Commission to get approval to extend the building. He stated that the proposed site is not an area where you want to make an architectural statement but they just want to clean it up a bit. The door will be removed and they will be relocating air conditioning compressors. There is one existing window that they will use to set the pattern for the rest of the face of the building.
- Chairman Rice asked why he chose windows that were so small.
- Mr. Witham pointed out that the window on the far right is an existing window. The other windows will be located in front of cutting stations. He mentioned that it is difficult for the hairstylists to have too much light come through and there are mirrors there as well. The window on the far left is a storage room.
- Ms. Deborah Phillips interjected that the storage room has an additional window but it is currently covered by siding.
- Mr. Witham said that the size of the window is appropriate for the building and the area.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the windows would open.
- Mr. Witham answered that they will be awnings, they will tip out.
- Chairman Rice asked for confirmation that the length of the addition was 91/2 feet, not out to the full length of the abutting building.
- Mr. Witham replied yes.
- Mr. Adams asked about an existing roof. He wanted to know who it belonged to.
- Mr. Witham thought it was the abutter's roof, located on the applicant's property. He indicated that they would be removing all of that roof.
- Mr. Golumb asked about the material that is presently on the building.
- Ms. Deborah Phillips, owner and applicant, responded that it was aluminum.
- Mr. Golumb asked what type of material they were planning to use on the building.
- Mr. Witham said he would like to use hardiplank clapboards.
- Mr. Adams asked if he were to put hardiplank clapboards on would he try to match it to the existing siding that is on the Pleasant Street side.
- Mr. Witham said that that is aluminum sided also and it is set with 4" spacing. He said they would try to line up with the sills and the trim.
- Mr. Katz asked about the materials for the window trim, rakes, and soffits.
- Mr. Witham said they would all be wood.
- Chairman Rice asked about the condensers on the roof.
- Mr. Witham replied that they would be relocating two condensers and wanted to put them inside screening.
- Mr. Adams asked what the screening would be made out of.
- Mr. Witham answered cedar lattice with hardiplank on the side.
- Mr. Adams stated that the way the plan was drawn; it did not appear to have enough air flow to accommodate the requirements for the coolant.
- Mr. Witham said he would look into it.
- Ms. Phillips pointed out that one condenser is presently located behind a lilac bush and the other is behind a small shed.

- Mr. Adams asked who would using the entry way and the door.
- Ms. Phillips answered that it is an entryway into a storage area.
- Mr. Adams said that the entry way seemed to be in an awkward place in an area that is parking.
- Mr. Witham replied that he didn't see the use to be more than once or twice a week. It is not for public access.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that the addition does a nice job of cleaning up the back of the building.
- Chairman Rice added that he would like to see a little character to the building since it faces the street. He suggested three larger windows with window boxes to make it look less like a warehouse and give it more personality.
- Mr. Witham said his intention was to keep it simple and clean.
- Ms. Phillips pointed out there is a large garden in front of the lilac bush.
- Mr. Katz said that maybe just more landscaping will achieve the effect that Chairman Rice is looking for.
- Chairman Rice asked about the size of the windows. He asked if they could do a 6 over 6 window.
- Mr. Witham replied that double hung windows would work but if they just went with a taller awning, which would accommodate a different window size.
- Mr. Adams asked if the windows would have mullions in them.
- Mr. Witham replied yes.
- The Commission felt they have done a good job of dressing up the building.

\*\*\*\*\*

**III ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:25 p.m., a motion was made and seconded to adjourn to the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good  
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on September 13, 2006.

