

**MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**September 5, 2007
reconvened on September 12, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Richard Katz, John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Planning Board Representative Jerry Hejtmanek, Alternates Elena Maltese, Joseph Almeida

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Vice-Chairman John F. Golumb, City Council Representative Edward Raynolds

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

Chairman Dika welcomed new member Joseph Almeida to the Historic District Commission, who will be serving in the alternate capacity.

I. OLD BUSINESS

A) Approval of minutes – August 1, 2007

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as amended.

B) Request for Re-hearing – 47 Howard Street – submitted by David Adams

Chairman Dika explained that Mr. Adams asked that the Request for Re-hearing be postponed to the September 12, 2007 meeting and be placed as the last agenda item of the evening. Mr. Hejtmanek made a motion to postpone the Request for Re-hearing to the September 12, 2007 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Robert M. and Mary Lou McElwain, owners**, for property located at **259 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (12' X 17' addition with deck to rear of house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 34-1 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Robert and Mrs. Mary Lou McElwain were present to speak to the application. Mr. McElwain stated that he was seeking approval for an addition to the rear of his house. The size of the addition would be 12' X 17' with an attached deck. Mr. McElwain explained that they received Board of Adjustment approval for the project with one stipulation stating that the deck be moved inside of the side yard setback. He said that they were agreeable to that. He added that the plans presented were the same plans that were presented at their work session and that nothing had changed.

Mr. Wyckoff asked specifics about the deck. Mr. McElwain stated that it would be 14-16 inches off of the ground and would not have railings.

Ms. Kozak asked if the window and door detailing would match what already existed on the house. Mr. McElwain replied yes.

Mr. Wyckoff felt that what was missing on the drawing was that there was no window sill portrayed. Mr. Katz pointed out that on page 3 of the plans it indicated that the trim and siding would match the existing house. He said that if he felt that heavy sills should be used, the application could be amended to include that.

Ms. Kozak asked about the location of downspouts. Mr. McElwain explained that the downspouts will be relocated to the sides of the structure. Ms. Kozak asked if there would be a new gutter at the new eave. Mr. McElwain thought there would be. Ms. Kozak wanted to know what kind of gutter it would be.

Chairman Dika pointed out that if the applicant were to change material for the gutters then they would need to reapply for approval. If they replaced it in kind then they would not.

Mr. Almeida asked about the material proposed for the new door. Mr. McElwain replied that it would be a fiberglass door.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to approve the application with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the new gutters match the existing gutters.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that she felt that the design put forth maintained the current characteristics and architectural details noted in Section 10-1004 (B) 1.

Mr. Katz felt that it was a sympathetic design to the house's original configuration so he would support the motion.

Mr. Clum asked if the window sills should be part of the motion. Ms. Maltese stated that she felt the description on page 3 of the plans addressed that.

The motion to approve with the following stipulation passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

1) That the new gutters match the existing gutters.

2. Petition of **Anne E. and Alan G. Weston, owners, and Pickering Marine, applicant,** for property located at **43 Pray Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing pier) and allow a new free standing structure (new pier with seasonal ramp and float) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 39 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Glenn Normandeau, president of Pickering Marine Corporation was present to speak to the application. He explained that the existing dock was deteriorating and was currently unsafe. He said that they have gone through the appropriate permitting process and have gotten approval by the Conservation Commission and the Department of Environmental Services to build the structure with a modestly different footprint. He stated that it would be a basic dock and pier and would be very similar to Mr. Jim Sanders dock next door to the applicant's property. He added that they did not meet the side setbacks dictated by the State Wetland Bureau because of a narrow shorefront but both abutters signed releases stating that they were okay with the proposed dock.

Mr. Almeida asked if the dock would be illuminated at night. Mr. Normandeau replied no, that there was no power associated with the plans.

Chairman Dika asked if seasonal ramps and floats are removed during the off season. Mr. Normandeau said that they typically are.

Chairman Dika asked what the dimensions of the posts on the pier would be. Mr. Normandeau said they would use a 4" X 4" post as the railing post. He added that the structure would be exactly like the Sanders dock with the exception that the length would be different.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Hejtmanek made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff.

Mr. Hejtmanek said that it was a standard dock that fit the standards of DES, Conservation Commission, and the Army Corps. Of Engineers.

Ms. Maltese stated that she had been concerned about how far the dock would project out but she felt comfortable that there were very clear stipulations set forth by other boards so she would support the motion.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

3. Petition of **John L. and Jean M. Shields, owners**, for property located at **308 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace gutters, remove existing fence, replace with new fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 18 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

Chairman Dika stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote. Mr. Katz facilitated the proceedings.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. John Shields, owner of the property stated that he had two requests to bring before the Commission. The first one was to replace and repair a number of gutters around the house to prevent further water damage. He said that he planned to replace it with the same profile but would be using a new and better material. He brought a sample of the product for the Commission to review. In addition, Mr. Shields stated that at the back of his property was a stockade fence that was rotting and falling into his property. He said that he would like to replace it with the same type of fence that runs along the eastern border of his property. It is a plank fence with a scalloped top.

Mr. Katz asked if there were questions for Mr. Shields concerning the gutters.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the gutters would be installed the same way that the existing gutters are currently. Mr. Shields replied yes, and added that the profile would be the same before and after. He explained that they would not know the extent of the water damage until they began the job.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if he would be retaining the downspouts. Mr. Shields replied yes, to the extent that they are usable.

Ms. Kozak stated that she liked the product that was being proposed but wondered how he would be joining the pieces together. Mr. Shields replied that if he understood the contractor, the installation process would be the same as if it were wood.

Mr. Almeida asked if this project would be a complete replacement of the gutters. Mr. Shields answered that some of the gutters will be repaired if they are not rotting. Mr. Almeida asked if there would be a situation where a wood gutter would be fastened to a PCV gutter. Mr. Shields replied no.

Ms. Maltese asked a question about the fence. She wondered if he would be maintaining the same height of the stockade fence or have the new fence match the height of the plank fence. Mr. Shields said that it was his plan to just replace the stockade fence and maintain the same height.

Mr. Katz asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he 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 and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Mr. Katz asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt that the special and defining character of the property will be maintained and the architectural details will be exactly the same.

Ms. Kozak agreed and said that it was a great use of materials. She added that it would be an improvement and would benefit the property.

Mr. Katz called for the vote. The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Charles L. Lassen Revocable Living Trust, owner**, for property located at **75 Salter Street (Round Island)**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (rebuild west and south elevation one story ells, replace windows and doors) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two porches to connect west and south elevations with a one story roof, add dormers to existing roof, add ramp and landing on east elevation, add solar water collectors to south elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 1 and lies within the Single Residence A and Historic A Districts.

Chairman Dika stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote. Mr. Katz facilitated the proceedings.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Charles Lassen, owner of the property stated that he had some letters of support from families and businesses that surround the island. He felt that the Commission would value their input because they are heavily vested in trying to balance the best of the old Portsmouth while looking to the future of the new Portsmouth. He pointed out that Ned and Margot Thompson sent a letter directly to the Commission.

Mr. Lassen said that he wanted to achieve two things with the project – he wanted to respect the working waterfront heritage and wanted to incorporate energy sustainability into the design. He added that he would like to add seven solar hot water heaters that would be located along the front of the building. He said that they would not be too heavily angled because they would not only get the sun but would get the reflection off of the water as well. Mr. Lassen explained that they have had to accommodate a difficult footprint with regards to restrictions by the Board of Adjustment and the Department of Environmental Services.

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project walked the Commission through the drawings. She said that there were quite a few small decks and other structures that they planned to remove. She pointed out that the structure was entirely within the 50 foot buffer.

She said that the south elevation would have a simple roof line with three dormers. She added that there would be a roof line that wraps around the house. She plans to remove some skylights but will be adding new ones. At the grade line, she will be adding vertical board skirting and the solar panels will be mounted to the top of that skirting.

On the east elevation, Ms. Whitney explained she would be replacing windows and continuing to wrap the porch around the structure. There would be a ramp to grade. She added that they would be adjusting the pitch of the bump out because DES would not allow any additional square footage of living space.

Ms. Whitney said that on the north elevation, she would be expanding the size of the window and adding a dormer above.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he liked that the skylights were lined up with the windows below them. He asked about the detail on the front of the dormers. Ms. Whitney replied that she was trying to make the dormer as narrow as possible. She explained in detail how she planned to achieve that.

Mr. Almeida said that in the specifications for the Marvin windows, it showed mullions. Ms. Whitney clarified that all of the windows would be one over one with no mullions.

Mr. Almeida asked about the chimney. Ms. Whitney replied that there would be a wood stove and that she planned to build a box surrounding the piping and will clad it with thin brick, flashed with corner pieces.

Mr. Katz asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Ms. Skye Maher, a resident of Portsmouth, spoke in favor of the application. She said that she sits on the Conservation Commission and on the Mayor’s Blue Ribbon Committee for Sustainable Practices but was speaking as a citizen regarding the project. She stated that she hoped that this was just the first of many buildings in the Historic District to begin to incorporate solar energy and sustainable practices.

Mr. David Ewing of 44 Salter Street stated that Mr. Lassen did a wonderful job with his first house at 34 Salter Street. He felt that they would make something nice of Round Island and he supported the application.

Ms. Leanne McQuilken of 419 Marcy Street stated that she was also pleased with Mr. Lassen’s first project and was in support of the current proposal.

Mr. Bob Pollard of 294 Marcy Street stated that he sees the property daily. He said that this property is one of the gems of Portsmouth. He added that the house is currently a mess but fortunately it will be fixed up. Mr. Pollard said that he has seen the plans and thinks that it will be a wonderful piece of property.

Mr. Katz asked if anyone else from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to approve as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. There was no discussion. The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

5. Petition of **Kelly W. Warren Revocable Trust and Michael J. and Martha A. Mulhern, owners**, for property located at **132 Chapel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace front steps with granite steps and add iron rails, remove existing fencing, install iron rail fencing with gate along cement wall) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 6 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Scott Warren was present to speak to the application. He explained that the existing wooden fence and cement stoop were in need of replacing. He said that he would like to replace the fence with an iron fence that would look very similar to the fence at St. John’s Church, which is directly across the street from his property.

Mr. Warren reminded the Commission that he had a previous public hearing where part of the work was approved. He was now back before them to get approval for the rail and the fence.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the proposed stoop would be granite. Mr. Warren replied yes, they would be removing the cement steps and putting granite in its place.

Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that the applicant's plans showed two styles of fencing. He also asked about the fence posts and wondered how they would work. Mr. Warren said that the fence would be bored into the existing concrete wall. The gates affix onto the side of the concrete so that they are able to swing.

Ms. Maltese stated that she felt that she could not make a decision on the application unless more information was submitted. She did not know how the design would be handled at the corners, at the posts, and at the gates. She also said that she did not have a visual image of the current stoop and the current dimensions that would come into play in that area.

Mr. Katz said that the Commission had a fairly good idea of what the applicant wanted to do but they needed more information. He said that they would need to see an elevation with dimensions and more detailed fence and gate information.

Chairman Dika questioned whether the fence design was appropriate to the design of the house. She told the applicant that he might want to get some information on the background of the design he has chosen. Mr. Warren replied that he was not set on the design of the fence. Mr. Katz said that the safe thing to do was to go with a straight design.

Mr. Wyckoff told the applicant that more information about the posts would be helpful as well. He suggested a large post.

Chairman Dika suggested postponing the application until the October 12, 2007 meeting. Mr. Warren replied that that would be fine.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to the October 12, 2007 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. The motion to postpone the application to the October 12, 2007 meeting passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

6. Petition of **Thomas C. Shaw, Beth A. Eaton, and Christine Wirtanen, owners,** and **Dan Desrochers, applicant,** for property located at **213-215 Gates Street and 20 Mechanic Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove aluminum and vinyl siding, repair original siding, replace windows and doors) and allow new construction to an existing structure (add dormers on rear ell, add decks) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 8 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Carla Goodknight, architect for the project, was present to speak to the application. She stated that they were not aware that the building was in excess of the 30% lot coverage allowed so she asked that the rear elevation changes be removed from consideration at this time. They will need Board of Adjustment approval. She said that she would like to address the changes to the remaining three sides of the structure.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to hear the amended application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that this would allow the applicant to begin work on the two sides and the front elevations. Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to hear the amended application passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Ms. Goodknight explained that at the work session, they had talked about retaining some of the windows. She said that they have since decided to go ahead and replace all of the windows. They planned to use Majesty replacement windows.

Mr. Katz asked if the windows would have two over two configurations. Ms. Goodknight replied yes, except for the dormers.

Ms. Goodknight stated that the front door would be a craftsmen six light glass with panels below. She said that the other doors were not the same brand but were very similar in design. She also pointed out the drawings for the proposed dormers.

Ms. Goodknight pointed out the sill design in the historical pictures that were submitted. She stated that they would be duplicating that sill detail on the sunroom windows. Mr. Almeida asked if she would be duplicating it elsewhere. Ms. Goodknight replied that they were hoping to, they would try to match the detail in those areas where they find it.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that a lot of the windows are replacement windows so he was wondering if she would be using the existing sills. Ms. Goodknight replied yes.

Mr. Almeida asked if the new windows could be painted. Ms. Goodknight did not think so. Mr. Wyckoff thought they could be painted if they were sanded first.

Ms. Goodknight pointed out in the plans the windows that would be replaced. She added that they would have to repair the front steps and add railings similar to what was being proposed for the back deck. They would also be using wooden lattice.

On the Mechanic Street elevation, she said that the replacement windows continued around the box bays. She explained that the new windows that are four across will match the box bays in height.

Ms. Goodknight stated that she was proposing a dormer on both sides of the structure. Mr. Almeida asked about the design of the dormers. Ms. Goodknight responded that the ceiling is very low on the third floor where the dormer is proposed. Ms. Goodknight said that the other windows on the third floor are almost to the floor. Mr. Almeida suggested bringing the window head down so that it matched the other window heads.

Ms. Kozak asked about the proposed storm door. Ms. Goodknight replied that it would be placed on the front doors. Ms. Kozak asked about her choice of an arts and crafts style door. Ms. Goodknight said it was at the personal request of the owner. Ms. Kozak pointed out that the structure had a collection of styles on it and this just adds one more.

Ms. Kozak asked detailed questions about the dormers. Mr. Almeida suggested that since the dormers are a prominent feature on the rear elevation, would it be possible to review them when the rear elevation changes come back before the Commission. Chairman Dika thought that was an excellent idea.

Ms. Goodknight asked what needed to be clarified for the next meeting. Mr. Almeida said that taking it all the way to the ridge was awkward as well as carrying the corners all the way around. He said that he would like to see it similar to the other dormers. Ms. Goodknight replied that she could lower the pitch.

Ms. Maltese asked if there was a reason that the dormer did not extend further out. Ms. Goodknight replied that her concern was that it would alter the exterior of the building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the sun porch on the Mechanic Street elevation. Ms. Goodknight explained that it would be repaired and rebuilt. She added that there would be a shed roof in that location.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the dormers be redesigned and resubmitted.
- 2) That the back elevation changes be removed from the application.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the renovations are compatible with the area. He said that he was pleased to see the picture windows removed and the sun porch storm windows removed and replaced with windows of similar size. He added that the front doors were a mixed style but he did not see it as a deal breaker.

Mr. Katz agreed with Mr. Wyckoff on his observation of the doors. He said that the overall design of the building was non specific and reminded the Commission that there would be a wooden storm door covering them that will soften the effect.

Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to approve the application as presented with the following stipulations passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

- 1) That the dormers be redesigned and resubmitted.
- 2) That the back elevation changes be removed from the application.

7. Petition of **National Block II, LLC, owner**, for property located at **111 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace double entrance doors, replace single door, add screen door, replace (4) first floor windows with taller, custom, folding windows with screens, add copper gutter and downspouts, replace granite door sill, reposition sconce lights) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct portico over front entrance doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 50 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Arilda Densch, architect for the project, spoke to the application. She explained that they were before the Commission for a work session last month. She said that the owner is Mark McNabb and his goals for the project were to upgrade the appearance of the State Street elevation by replacing the doors, opening up the dining area to the street by reconfiguring and replacing the front four windows, add wood gutters and shutters, add a new entrance portico, add granite headers, replace granite door sills and reposition the sconce lights.

Ms. Densch pointed out that page 5 of the plans showed the proposed elevation. She said that the shutters proposed for the second floor would be traditional wooden shutters. The doors would be six panel mahogany doors with the top four panels having glass. She also explained that the portico would draw attention to the entrance and would protrude out about a foot. There would also be a recessed light in the portico. Ms. Densch said that the sconce lights would be repositioned as well.

Ms. Densch explained that at the work session, there was disagreement among the Commissioners as to whether the windows should go all the way down to the sidewalk. She pointed out that they have made the area of glass larger but are keeping it respectful of the façade. She suggested that a band of brick be located at the bottom of the windows. Ms. Densch explained how the windows would operate. They would fold open all the way to the side and a roll screen would be pulled into place when the window was open.

Ms. Kozak asked if the track for the roll screen was recessed. Ms. Densch replied yes, it would be recessed into the sill as well as the wood above.

Mr. Almeida recalled that a few years ago, they stained the brick. He asked if the brick and mortar would be put back to the current condition. Ms. Densch replied yes.

Mr. Almeida stated that he was thrilled to see the proposal for copper gutters and downspouts. He suggested some extra protection where the downspout meets the sidewalk. Ms. Densch said that she would mention it to the owner.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they were going to use existing window sills. Ms. Densch replied yes. Mr. Wyckoff said that he liked what they have done with the folding windows by lifting them up off of the sidewalk. Chairman Dika thought it was an excellent solution.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Katz stated that he was struck by the amount of effort that had gone into the application over many weeks. He said that it was a first cabin effort all the way.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he agreed with Mr. Katz. He thought that the current design of the portico was much more successful than the last one. He too commended the effort of the project.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Clum stated that there was currently a project going on at 145 High Street that the Commission approved. At the time of the approval, the Commission asked the applicant to submit a sample of the stone for final approval because it will cover much of the first story of the structure. He explained that the applicant brought the sample in today for approval.

Mr. Clum explained further that the Commission generally asks that the sample be available on site so that it can be seen in the context of the surrounding buildings. There is not a lot of stone in that area so he was asking the Commission to consider approving the stone this evening. He pointed out that it was certainly within the Commission's purview to request an on site sample if they so wished.

Mr. Katz asked if it was a cultured stone. Mr. Clum replied yes. Mr. Wyckoff said that he was much happier with this stone sample than what was originally proposed.

Chairman Dika asked the Commissioners if they have used this type of stone before. Ms. Kozak said that she uses it all of the time. She added that it was a great product but whether it looks real depends on how it is detailed at the edges and where it meets other materials.

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the stone veneer sample as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. There was no further discussion. The motion to approve the stone veneer sample passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Mr. Clum explained that in the past, the Commission had deferred to a former Commission member to go and look at brick and mortar samples and give either an approval or a denial. He said that there will be more applications where on site reviews of materials will be necessary. He asked if the Commission would like to appoint certain Commissioners to do that review.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he thought it would be awkward to ask an applicant to build a sample wall for the Commission to look at. He cited the Parade Office Mall project where many materials were reviewed and approved. Chairman Dika stated that she thought there was validity to seeing some materials on site. Mr. Clum added especially when it is an infill building. Chairman Dika gave an example of a project on Bow Street where the brick that was approved did not look right and it had to be changed.

Mr. Wyckoff, Mr. Almeida, and Ms. Kozak volunteered to review brick and mortar samples when necessary.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:20 p.m., it was moved seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on October 3, 2007.