

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**April 14, 2010
reconvened from April 7, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Alternates Joseph Almeida; George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Anthony Coviello, Elena Maltese

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – March 3, 2010

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

9. Petition of **Martingale Wharf Limited Partnership, owner**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc. changes to all elevations) 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, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Mark McNabb, representative for the property owner was present to speak to the application.

Mr. McNabb stated that two sets of plans were submitted. The set with “TSM” in the upper title block on the pages were the plans that were approved on November 4, 2009. The other set showed the proposed changes and had “JSN” on the title block.

Mr. McNabb highlighted the changes on the north elevation. He said that the changes included changing various areas from granite to brick, changing the configuration of various windows, a change to the banding of granite, and a change from granite veneer to brick.

Mr. Almeida commented that more windows openings on the left side of the building were an improvement. Chairman Dika and Mr. Wyckoff agreed.

Mr. McNabb explained that they have enlarged a room on the fifth floor and reduced the size of the original deck. Those changes would be seen on every elevation.

Mr. McNabb said that on the Bow Street elevation (south elevation), the structural plans did not align with the architectural plans. This elevation also showed changes to the window patterns. Mr. Almeida pointed out that the changes caused them to take away the features beneath the windows. He did not see it as a problem but he wanted to point it out. He felt the two window openings instead of the three window openings was better. Mr. Wyckoff thought that having windows sills at eye level was awkward.

Mr. McNabb pointed out that the fifth floor area was the same as the north elevation. He also said that they have changed the location of the first floor door because it was not buildable in its current location. They have switched the original door location with a window. Mr. Wyckoff felt they have lost the quality that they originally had in that section. Mr. McNabb said that the original double doors were the main entrance to the building but that was no longer the main entrance. He also pointed out that this entrance would be handicap accessible. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was having trouble with Mr. McNabb's rationalization. He said that function was now driving the design and he was more concerned with the design.

Chairman Dika wondered if a work session was needed. Mr. Almeida and Ms. Kozak said that they did not feel the need for a work session at this point in the presentation.

Mr. McNabb continued to point out additional changes to the south elevation. He said they were proposing to put a continuous granite base on the east end of the building. The chimney would be removed. Also the granite band that wrapped the corner would be removed as well.

On the west elevation, Mr. McNabb pointed out the change at the wharf level. A Ceres Street entrance would be added at the lowest level of the building. He also said that the arched opening above it would be removed because it could not be constructed the way it was originally drawn. Steel cross bracing would run right through it.

Mr. McNabb stated that on the east elevation, the existing chimneys were intended to be kitchen hood ventilation. The chimneys are no longer needed as other chimneys have been approved.

Mr. Almeida asked about the mechanical units and how they would affect the building. Mr. McNabb said that they were finalizing the redesign of the mechanical systems. He explained that the units would be much smaller than originally proposed. He thought that the mechanical equipment would be behind a parapet wall. Mr. McNabb also said that the restaurant ventilation would go up a center shaft within the building. Ms. Kozak asked if there would be a mushroom cap on top of the masonry cap. Mr. McNabb replied no, it was their plan to have only the false chimney visible.

Mr. Almeida had a concern with the right side of the building at street level. He said that they were losing the features at the pedestrian level. Mr. McNabb said that he was sympathetic to Mr. Almeida's comments and was not opposed to putting in some type of spandrel glass in that area. He also said that he was willing to pull this element from the application and come back at another time with alternatives. There was considerable discussion concerning this issue.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he had a problem with the loss of the two center doors on the Bow Street elevation. Mr. Melchior agreed. Mr. Wyckoff suggested leaving the double doors and adding a granite step.

Mr. Ricci suggested taking the two items in question out of the application so that the application could move forward.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the changes highlighted on the south elevation drawing (left side of the building, first floor level, plans dated March 19, 2010) are removed from the application.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt some of the changes on the back of the building were more appropriate for the waterfront.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulation passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote:

- 1) That the changes highlighted on the south elevation drawing (left side of the building, first floor level, plans dated March 19, 2010) are removed from the application.

10. Petition of **New Hampshire Legal Assistance, Inc, owner**, for property located at **154 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install aluminum gutters and downspouts) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 26A and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Joe Terravecchia, representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. He stated that they would like to install gutters on the east and west elevations of the building. He pointed out that there are very small eaves on the property and as a result, the window sills are rotting.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how the gutters would be installed. Mr. Terravecchia explained that custom brackets would be installed to fit against the angle of the crown. The brackets would be mounted every six inches.

Ms. Kozak asked if the bottom of the gutter would stand off from the building. Mr. Terravecchia replied yes, it would stand out about 4-5 inches.

Chairman Dika asked if wooden gutters were considered. Mr. Terravecchia said yes, but the owner would prefer not to use wooden gutters because of the maintenance issue. Chairman Dika pointed out that the Commission recently approved wooden gutters and downspouts on a property on Gates Street because the house was right on the street. Mr. Melchior commented that that was a slightly different situation because the Gates Street property already had wooden gutters.

Mr. Terravecchia stated that the gutter and brackets would be painted the same color as the trim on the building, Andover Cream.

Mr. Almeida wondered if it would be possible to put a board beneath the gutter to minimize its standing out from the building. Ms. Kozak thought it would cause a heavy shadow line. Mr. Almeida thought that painting the gutter and brackets the same color as the trim would help.

Ms. Kozak asked if they would consider a piece of aluminum break metal to match the gutter. Mr. Wyckoff was concerned that water would get behind it and create a new problem.

Mr. Almeida commented that he has seen this building go through some very high quality renovations. He said that the current drip line was going to re-damage the building to what it was before the renovations were started.

Mr. Terravecchia said that he had concern with adding a piece of trim under the gutter. He did not want water to back up and start rotting the crown molding. He also pointed out that they were not altering the building in any way. Mr. Almeida commented that that was worth considering.

Mr. Terravecchia stated that there would be four downspouts running down the corner boards. They would be painted cream as well.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika if there any other 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

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that this was a problem with any number of solutions and none of them ideal. He felt this was a reasonable compromise and the most reasonable approach that did not result in any permanent damage to the building and its roof line.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

10. Petition of **Parade Office, LLC, owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (window and material changes to all elevations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was surprised that the applicant was not having a work session for this application. Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that the Commission cannot require a work session; it must be requested by the applicant.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects, Mr. Jeff Johnston of Cathartes Private Investments, and Mr. Matt Labonte of Pro Con Incorporated were present to speak to the application.

Ms. DeStefano stated that the main reason they were before the Commission was due to changes in window patterns. She said that the catalyst for some of the changes had to do with a program change. Previously, the building was designed for eight condominiums per floor. It will now be nine apartments per floor so windows locations needed to change. She pointed out that the size of the building, the proportion, and the footprint remained the same.

Ms. DeStefano walked the Commission through the submitted plans and very carefully pointed out the changes and the reason for the changes. In addition to those changes, she explained that the materials on the base of the building would remain the same. The Flemish cap would be removed as it was now not needed to hide mechanical units.

Mr. Wyckoff had concerns about the changes. Chairman Dika did also. Mr. Almeida commented that he saw some positive changes as well. He pointed out that the removal of the brick passing through to the upper floors was a loss but having less glass was a positive feature. Chairman Dika agreed about the brick and she missed the cap as well. Ms. Kozak stated that she liked this design better.

Ms. DeStefano pointed out that the patio doors were reduced from eight feet wide to 6 feet wide. The cap and the corner pieces would be a cementitious material. Mr. Wyckoff said that there was no information on the cementitious material in the packet. He asked Ms. DeStefano if it was EFIS. Ms. DeStefano replied no. Mr. Almeida asked what the previous material was. Ms. DeStefano said that it was a zinc material. Ms. Kozak wondered where the seams would be. Mr. Labonte explained that on the hotel, they detailed it with a batten system. On this building, a flashing system would be installed in between the panels which would minimize any appearance of seams. Mr. Almeida asked if this was the same material that was going up on the Marriott hotel. Mr. Labonte replied yes.

On the Hanover Street elevation, Ms. DeStefano pointed out that they would be wrapping the corner with an awning. Mr. Almeida thought the positive changes on this elevation were the cap on the tower and less glass. He was not sure about the mulling of the windows together between the two towers. He felt it was very repetitious. Chairman Dika agreed. Mr. Labonte said that they have done their best to break up the façade as much as possible. The unit layouts are not very large so that dictated the window layouts.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant's functions are their problems. He also said he was having trouble with the repetition. He said that his biggest disappointment was that they are now duplicating the hotel. The original design had lots of details that made the building stand out. Vice Chairman Katz said that he did not take such a cavalier attitude toward what was driving the design. He added that because it was living space that was driving the design was not something he felt the applicant needed to apologize for.

Ms. DeStefano explained that if this building was to remain condominiums, it would not be moving forward right now. They are finding that they can rent apartments in this economy. Chairman Dika said that was true but she pointed out that the Commission approved one building and now as they are trying to modify it, a lot of the details are being taken away and they are not having the option to sit down at the table and going through a work session.

Mr. Johnston passed out an option to the design that was submitted for this meeting. Ms. DeStefano felt this option was a more formal opening. It was recessed as well. Mr. Wyckoff said that he missed the horizontal banding. He felt that the new option for the door was better than the original design.

Ms. DeStefano explained that Option B looked at the idea of keeping the material change over the entry. Mr. Wyckoff thought that Option B helped. He added that he preferred the Option 1A door with the Option B tower.

Ms. DeStefano talked about the pedestrian way elevation. Ms. Kozak asked what the distance was between the two buildings. Ms. DeStefano said it was 20 feet between the pedestrian way and the Marriott.

Mr. Almeida commented on the blank wall on this elevation. Mr. Johnston explained the grade change on this elevation was what was driving the blank wall. Ms. DeStefano said that a number of trees would be planted on both sides of the pedestrian way.

Mr. Almeida asked if anyone else had a concern about the blankness of the wall. Chairman Dika and Mr. Melchior both indicated they had trouble with it as well. Mr. Melchior commented that the presentation was disappointing. He said the applicant has taken away the details that made it interesting and have made a bland, sterile, cookie cutter box that reads like a hotel. He did not think it looked like Portsmouth. He strongly recommended a work session.

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.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Don Petersen, representing Harborside Associates, an abutter across the street from the property spoke in opposition to the application. He said that the changes in use program and the number of units were significant as compared to the previous project. He asked the Commission to determine whether they felt they had sufficient information for full consideration of these changes.

Ms. DeStefano requested that the application be postponed to a work session at the next meeting. She said that prior to that decision; she would like to get a read from the Commission on the use of hardiplank panel system on the fifth floors and the corners of the building. Mr. Wyckoff said that he did not have a problem with the material but he was not sure about the smooth finish. Mr. Melchior agreed and said he would like to see some texture. Mr. Almeida did not have an issue with the material and thought it looked great on the Marriott but he did not want this building to mimic the Marriott in any way.

Ms. DeStefano asked if a site walk would be helpful. Chairman Dika said that one could be scheduled.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application to a work session/public hearing at the May meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested having a variety of options to review at the work session.

The motion to postpone the application to a work session/public hearing at the May meeting passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

10. Petition of **Northern Tier Real Estate Acquisition and Development, LLC, owner**, for property located at **172 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new

construction to an existing structure (install projecting sign) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 1A and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Attorney John Dussi, a principle in Northern Tier Real Estate Acquisition and Development, LLC and Mr. Dan Hutchins of N.H. Signs were present to speak to the application. Attorney Dussi stated that they would like to install a projecting sign on the building. He explained in detail the history of the building. He also said that they have been before the City Council and have received Planning Board approval subject to HDC review.

Chairman Dika stated on behalf of the Commission, how much they appreciated the work they have done on the building.

Mr. Almeida asked if consideration was given to a wood carved sign. Mr. Hutchins replied no. He pointed out that the proposed sign had raised panels and raised letters. He said the finish would be a satin or matte finish and would be externally lighted.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the greenhouse entry would be staying because the answer would drive his opinion of the sign. Attorney Dussi said he would like to remove it and rebuild something more appropriate to the age of the building but it was on City property and the City did not want anything permanent. He said he would revisit the issue with Rick Taintor but the issue was not going to be solved any time soon.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that with the greenhouse entry there, the sign was appropriate in his opinion. If it were removed, the sign would not be appropriate.

Mr. Almeida stated that he felt the proportion of the sign was correct. He commented how important signs are and this type of sign was one that they do not normally see. He appreciated the amount of effort that went into designing it but it was not quite there yet. He added that he would like to see a hanging wood sign like all of the other signs in the historic District. Attorney Dussi pointed out that there was a lot of metal on the building.

Mr. Hutchins said that they could revisit a carved sign. They could use a sign foam because it would last longer than a wood sign.

Vice Chairman Katz thought the colors were very forceful and the slanted word format was not anything they were used to seeing. He said he did not have a problem with the hardware and the lighting but he would like to see a more traditional sign.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the sign were a carved sign, would the same bracket be used. Mr. Hutchins replied yes, they did not want the sign to swing.

Mr. Melchior stated he could go either way. He pointed out that the streetscape was different from other areas of the district.

Chairman Dika asked if there any other 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. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the sign is made of a carved material.

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

Mr. Wyckoff said that he could go either way on this application but if the building were ever to be brought back to its historical standards, the sign would probably change. But he felt the sign was appropriate for the area at this time.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulation passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote:

- 1) That the sign is made of a carved material.

11. Petition of **Robert R. and Pearl F. Kennedy Irrevocable Trust, owner**, and **Stephen Kennedy, applicant**, for property located at **175 Fleet Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 8 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Chairman Dika informed the public that the Commission has had several work sessions regarding this project.

Mr. Stephen Kennedy and Mrs. Gina Kennedy, owners of the business, were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Kennedy walked the Commission through the submitted plans. He pointed out that the addition will be one solid structure rather than two adjoining structures.

Ms. Kozak asked about the trim. Mr. Kennedy said that they would match the trim on the new addition to the existing structure. Ms. Kozak asked if there would be a fascia board. Mr. Kennedy said that it would match what was there now.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be gutters. Mr. Kennedy replied no. Mr. Wyckoff wondered about the details. Vice Chairman Katz said that the details would match the existing details. There was significant discussion concerning various details.

Mr. Almeida commented that this building was so unique that it was difficult to overlay any HDC guidelines on it. He said it was a unique building.

Mr. Melchior stated that he was satisfied with requiring that the details match the existing details.

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

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that they have sat with the applicant a number of times and he commended the applicant for requesting the repeated work sessions. He thanked the applicant for providing a very complete set of plans.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

V. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

A. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood Avenue Trust, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (new trim work, eave banding, storefront, and fenestration). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Jen Ramsey of Somma Studios was present to speak to the application. She reminded the Commission that at the last meeting they talked about the potential uses for the building such as something like Faneuil Hall and also a downtown market.
- Ms. Ramsey presented three different elevation drawings. The top drawing was named "Farmers Market" and was a very subtle and simple approach to the project. The second option was named "Warehouse Conversion" with a grittier look. The third option was titled "Foodie Boutique" and showed a more refined look. Ms. Ramsey explained in detail the features of each option.
- Ms. Kozak commented that she liked all of the options. Mr. Melchior and Mr. Almeida stated that they liked the third choice the best. Mr. Wyckoff agreed but he liked the idea of the iron shutters on the second option. Vice Chairman Katz liked the concept of gathering merchants. He also liked the third option.
- Mr. Almeida thought the color scheme on the third option was great. He also thought the iron shutter idea could be used on this option as well. Ms. Ramsey said it was possible to pick and choose aspects of the other options. She said she would now look to develop the other elevations.

B. Work Session requested by **111 Market Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Ryan D. Abood, applicant**, for property located at **111 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add roof dormers and roof deck additions). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 39 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Brandon Holben and Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture and Mr. Ryan Abood, owner of the property and Ms. Carrie Burns were present to speak to the application.
- Mr. Holben stated that the Market Street proposal was to replace the existing windows and add a dormer.
- The Ceres Street proposal was to add a walk out roof deck and reconfigure the windows below the proposed roof deck.
- Mr. Abood pointed out that the roof has not been draining properly and has resulted in rot. He said it was important that they have gutters.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that he was perfectly happy with the Market Street side.

- Mr. Almeida asked if a structural analysis has been done on the building. Mr. Holben said that they have talked with a structural engineer but an analysis has not been done. Mr. Almeida said that these buildings are fragile and this seems to be a lot of weight on the building.
- Mr. McHenry pointed out that the building has firewalls on either side of it and they might need to be rebuilt to some degree.
- Vice Chairman Katz thought that the solution to gain head room on the Market Street side was a good one. Mr. Almeida was not in favor of any changes on the Market Street side. He felt they were too important of a cluster of buildings to alter in any way.
- On the Ceres Street elevation, Mr. Wyckoff stated that he liked the window pattern on page 6. Mr. Holben said that they would retain the existing sill heights.
- Mr. Almeida commented that the changes on the Ceres Street side appeared to be very forced on the building. Mr. Wyckoff said that the entire streetscape on Ceres Street had a variety of decks, cut ins and window configuration. Mr. Almeida stated that there was still a lot of symmetry remaining on the Ceres Street side.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that all of the buildings have been altered on the back. Mr. McHenry commented that it was an interesting concept on the waterfront and that was what people are drawn to. He said that the beauty of this block was that it had a history of layering of diversity. He felt it gave the building a lot of its liveliness and its grittiness factor.
- Vice Chairman Katz said that the challenge has been to know where to draw the balance of being a curator of a museum and having a place to live. He felt it was an ongoing compromise. It needs to be made livable and he did not think that it harmed the streetscape.
- Mr. Almeida pointed out that the proposal would make the ceiling height 9'11" tall and currently at its lowest point it was 6'5". He said that it was currently livable.
- Mr. Melchior thought that a very common view of the Market Street side would be as one exits the parking garage. He felt the roof line of the building would be very visible.
- Vice Chairman Katz said that not everyone comes to Portsmouth to critique the buildings. They come for the liveliness and the ambiance.
- Mr. Almeida said that on the Ceres Street side, the loss of the repetitive roof plane bothered him. Chairman Dika worried about setting precedence.
- Ms. Kozak stated that she would not want to see the firewalls go higher.
- Mr. Wyckoff did not have a problem with the Market Street proposal as long as it was pulled back from the front of the building and possibly painted a different color. He did not think it would stand out. He pointed out that on the Atrezzi building; the fifth floor has a greenhouse on top of it. He did not think people would be looking up at roof lines. Mr. Almeida disagreed and said that this building would be seen from all angles. Mr. Wyckoff also pointed out that the building next to 111 Market Street had been compromised as well.
- Mr. Melchior thought there was a solution to the Market Street side but he did not think this proposal was it. He said he was not as opposed to changes on the Ceres Street side as he was the Market Street side. He agreed with Mr. Almeida that the row of buildings on Market Street was a very distinct and defining characteristic of Portsmouth.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that three Commissioners were not in attendance this evening so their opinions were not known.
- Mr. McHenry asked if it would be a good idea to have a site walk. Mr. Almeida said that they all walk that way frequently.
- Mr. Aboud mentioned that they really needed to get moving on this because the unit was really unlivable with a sagging roof and mold infestation.

C. Work Session requested by **Jon Schroeder, owner**, for property located at **324 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations to garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 1 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

- Mr. Chris Wright, representing the property owner was present to speak to the application. He stated that they have had three Board of Adjustment hearings on this property to convert the property to a single family dwelling but they were unsuccessful each time. He said that the only way to deal with the dwelling was to leave it the way it was but dress it up. He told the Commissioners to disregard the skylights as their previous version had a pitched roof that they were told was not allowed.
- Ms. Kozak asked why a pitched roof was not allowed. Mr. Wright said it was determined that they would have a vertical expansion on a non-conforming structure and would require another appearance before the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Wyckoff thought they could probably get the variance because he wondered who would speak against it. Mr. Wright said that the neighbors would as it would apparently block light from one of the abutters at the Franklin School Condominiums. He added that the neighbors wanted it to stay as it was. Chairman Dika stated she was surprised by that and added that the Commission liked good architecture so she asked Mr. Wright to show him his latest plans.
- Mr. Wright explained that on the Dennett Street elevation, he was proposing to remove the two garage doors and replace one with a bank of windows and the other with a carriage style garage doors. They were also proposing to side it with cedar shakes. Mr. Wyckoff commented that it was already a vast improvement. He asked if it would be a wooden garage door. Mr. Wright said that they had not decided that yet.
- Mr. Wright stated that the windows would be Andersen 400 series simulated divided lights with a spacer bar. He added that the windows would be mulled together.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked the size of the garage door. Mr. Wright said it would be a 9' by 7' door.
- Mr. Wright said that the roof could be either a standing seam roof or a rubber roof. Mr. Wyckoff felt it would probably have to be rubber. He was not sure if the neighbors would like that.
- Ms. Kozak thought that it was a strange combination to have wooden shakes on such a modern form of building.
- Mr. Wright said that they would have to check the ordinance about building the rake out and adhering to the setback requirements.
- Mr. Wright asked the Commission about the inclusion of the sign. Chairman Dika asked if it would be carved wood. Mr. Wright said that it could be of a carved material. Ms. Kozak asked why it was not centered on the building. Mr. Wright said that it could be centered on the building.
- Chairman Dika asked the Commission if they would have objections to including skylights. The Commission did not have any objections.
- Chairman Dika asked if the side door was inset. Mr. Wright said that it may be inset a bit.
- Mr. Wyckoff thought the plans were wonderful.
- Mr. Wright asked if there was a preferred garage door. Mr. Almeida thought that something with glass would be appropriate.
- Mr. Wright told the Commission that the garage door area was used as a bay for storage with office on the side.
- Mr. Clum offered information from the ordinance about the exclusion of gutters, cornices, and eaves projecting not more than 30" from a vertical wall. He added that the ordinance did not intend to let someone hang their building over someone else's property line. Mr. Wright said that they would not go over the property line.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:35 p.m. it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on June 2, 2010.