

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

January 5, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena (Maltese) Whittaker; City Council Representative Anthony Coviello; Alternate Joseph Almeida, George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....
A site walk was held prior to the meeting at 6:30 p.m. at 79 Daniel Street.

I. NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of officers – Chairman, Vice Chairman

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to re-elect Chairman Dika and Vice Chairman Katz to their respective positions for another year.

II. OLD BUSINESS

B. Approval of minutes – November 3, 2010

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to approve the minutes as presented.

Approval of minutes – November 10, 2010

It was moved, seconded, and passed by a vote of 5-0 with two abstentions (Councilor Coviello and Mr. Wyckoff) to approve the minutes as presented.

C. Petition of **Franklin C. Grossman Revocable Trust and Katherine R. Grossman Revocable Trust, owners**, for property located at **170 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 7 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the December 8, 2010 meeting to the January 5, 2011 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. John Grossman, representing the property owner was present to speak to the application. He stated that in 1989 he received HDC approval to put vinyl siding on the house which was still there today. At that time, all of the old windows were removed and replaced. He said that they would now like to replace some of those windows with Andersen windows. Mr. Grossman pointed out that currently there was no slope to the sills and they would like to put a 14 degree slope to match the sills in the newer part of the house.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the windows were replacement windows. Mr. Grossman replied yes. Ms. Whittaker asked if the windows would have simulated divided lights with a spacer. Mr. Grossman replied yes and added that the grill pattern would remain six over one.

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. Almeida made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilor Coviello. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Almeida stated that it was a very straightforward and appropriate application.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

D. Petition of **Kaffee Von Solln, LLC, owner**, for property located at **79 Daniel Street, Unit 1**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace front window with sliding window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 9 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the December 8, 2010 to the January 5, 2011 meeting for a site walk and work session/public hearing.)*

WORK SESSION

- Chairman Dika stated that the Commission had a site walk of the property prior to the meeting. She said that there were a number of thoughts as to what could be done to rectify the problem. She asked Mr. Kaya what his suggestions would be to correct the problem.
- Mr. Kaya said that this situation has definitely been a lesson for him. He told the Commission that he admired what they do; however, he was looking at it from a different perspective. He explained that this was a German coffee house. The coat of arms he displays as his sign was his family’s actual coat of arms. He said that the sliding window was a part of the European look. Just as a Chinese restaurant displays items showing

what they are. Mr. Kaya thought that if it was looked at in that way, it was not really changing something but instead bringing something to Portsmouth. If it was removed, it would be taking something away from the business. It would make it more Portsmouth instead of a German coffee house.

- Chairman Dika stated that one of the options discussed was to paint the window trim. Mr. Wyckoff said that paint has to be part of the decision. The rest of the Commission agreed. Mr. Almeida pointed out that although the Commission did not have purview over color, this was something that needed to be corrected.
- Chairman Dika also mentioned the window ledge and whether what was added was appropriate. Vice Chairman Katz stated that he thought that if the lower piece of aluminum was removed, it would mirror the sill detail on the angled side. Ms. Kozak said she did not think it could be removed. There was considerable discussion concerning this detail.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested just allowing the applicant to paint the window trim. Vice Chairman Katz said he would support that. Ms. Kozak said she would too.
- Mr. Wyckoff also pointed out that the contractor needed to take some responsibility for doing something without the proper approval.
- Ms. Kozak stated that she was not opposed to sliding windows in the downtown area. She said that this particular building was in a very important location but it was not a masterpiece of architecture. She did not feel the window, when painted to match the existing storefront would destroy the streetscape.
- Ms. Whittaker told Mr. Kaya she understood what he was saying about bringing German flavor to Portsmouth but she pointed out that they have not allowed other restaurants to bring a different flavor into the District.
- Mr. Kaya said that he would definitely paint the window trim the same color that it was before. He also said he would remove the sill and put a wood covering in its place. He would also build up the side window to match the front windows. Vice Chairman Katz said he would support that.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to move into a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Kaya stated that he would be willing to paint the window trim the exact green color that it was before. He would also remove the vinyl [sic] sill and replace it with a wood covering. The right side window would be built up to match the front windows.

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. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the window trim will be painted a green color to match the existing storefront.
- 2) That the aluminum sill will be removed and a wood sill will replace it.
- 3) That the side window trim will be built up with wood to match the front window trim and will be painted a green color to match the existing storefront.

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

Mr. Wyckoff said that if this were brought to them before as a sliding glass window, it would not have been approved. He added that the applicant may not have understood that they were adding a different system. He said that it was two panes of glass which was what was there but it was a door and there was no getting around that fact. Mr. Wyckoff felt that this was a good compromise and was in the best interest of the applicant and it would do no harm to the surrounding properties.

Chairman Dika stated that she did not think the fenestration was in keeping with the surrounding structures nor did it enhance the existing structure which was part of their review criteria. She pointed out that Agave spent hours with the Historic District Commission for their folding glass window. She added that she could not support this motion.

Vice Chairman Katz said that he was distressed that a new business person has come into the City and has found himself in this cadre. He was led to believe that the window would be replaced in kind. He felt that this violation did not rise to the level of making the applicant remove it and put it back to the way he found it. He did not think the slippery slope argument applied. Every situation was different and so he would be supporting the motion.

Ms. Whittaker commented that she did not think that the applicant felt he was getting away with something. She felt he was misled. She did not see this as a sliding window. It was a door. She could see the rollers underneath it very clearly. It had a handle system rather than the internal locking system of a window. She felt this was too much and so would not be voting in favor of the motion.

Councilor Coviello stated that he would support the application but he did not think someone should support the application if they would not have supported it if it came to the Commission ahead of time. He said that they run the risk of having different rules if someone comes in ahead of time or after the fact. Councilor Coviello felt that having the open window would help to draw the pedestrians into the building. There were some minor details at the bottom of the window that could be better but he would support it.

Ms. Kozak pointed out that the thicker sashes and frames were more typical on a building of this type. She felt that what was there now was more typical than what was there originally. She did not think the proportions were too far off.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulations passed by a vote of 5-2 with Chairman Dika and Ms. Whittaker voting in opposition:

- 1) That the window trim will be painted a green color to match the existing storefront.
- 2) That the aluminum sill will be removed and a wood sill will replace it.
- 3) That the side window trim will be built up with wood to match the front window trim and will be painted a green color to match the existing storefront.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **CWAE, LLC, owner**, for property located at **41 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace slate roof with asphalt roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 29 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Chris Clement, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that he was looking to replace the existing slate roof with an architectural shingle roof that was similar to other buildings on Market Street. He pointed out the submitted photos showing those other buildings. He said that the roof could not be seen, even from the top of the parking garage as his building was the tallest one on the street.

Ms. Whittaker explained that some applicants come to the Commission proposing shingles that have a slate look. Mr. Clement said that they looked at what was replaced around them. He added that his contractor replaced the roof across the street. They based their proposal on other roof replacements in the area. He said that he did not even think of a different material that looked like slate.

Chairman Dika asked if this was his roofer's recommendation. Mr. Clement said it was his roofer's as well as his own looking at what fellow business owners have used over the years.

Councilor Coviello asked which product they would be using. Mr. Clement said they would be using the CertainTeed Landmark series. Councilor Coviello felt that in this case, color mattered. He said that someday, a taller building could be built across the street where the roof would be in view. Mr. Clement said they did not have a color choice but would try to match what was across the street.

Mr. Gladhill asked if the roof on the front was being replaced. Mr. Clement replied no.

Mr. Almeida commented that in the past he has been very reluctant to lose a slate roof but in this case he thought he could be convinced due to its limited visibility. He said that the best example of a replacement of slate to a fiberglass shingle was the North Church. Mr. Almeida pointed out

that this was a residential shingle. Ms. Whittaker pointed out that all of the roof replacements that she could think of were shingles that had the appearance of slate.

Chairman Dika told Mr. Clement that she was hearing that the Commission was a little uncomfortable with the proposed look. She asked him if he had an option of doing something else. Mr. Clement replied not at this moment but commented that if other buildings on the same street had similar types of shingles and they are following that same protocol why would there be a problem. Ms. Whittaker stated that she did not think the other roofs were approved. Mr. Almeida pointed out that there are existing slate roofs on Market Street as well.

Chairman Dika wondered if the application should be postponed to a work session.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he remembered the Commission approving one of the roofs two years ago. He remembered asking the contractor to put the snow guard back on when the roof was finished. Mr. Clement said that his contractor confirmed that he did both of the roofs in question and they were in the very recent past.

At this point in the meeting, there was considerable discussion concerning the roof and its angles. Mr. David Swett of Hall Brothers Roofing answered the roofing questions.

Mr. Almeida asked Mr. Swett if his company has used the shingle that had the dimension of a slate. Mr. Swett said that it is a lifetime shingle and is very expensive. He said there was also an artificial slate which was just as expensive.

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. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not think this was the place to draw the line in the sand. He said that this was a very low pitched roof hidden behind a parapet of which a majority of it was metal. He did not think it would do any harm to the surrounding historic properties and felt it was appropriate for the way the building sits.

Mr. Almeida said that when he first reviewed the application, his initial reaction was to support it because the visibility was very low. He added that there was a lot of other work to be done on the building that would have a much larger impact and they would have to come back at some point.

Chairman Dika stated that she would prefer to see a shingle that looked more like slate; however, in this case, the roof would not be seen. She added that she hoped that future applicants would consider using a shingle that has the appearance of slate.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a vote of 6-1 with Ms. Whittaker voting in opposition

2. Petition of **Benoit R. and Andrea M. St. Jean, owner**, for property located at **54 Humphrey's Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 46 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Roe Cole, representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. He stated that the owner would like to put in an outdoor heat pump condenser unit for supplemental heat and air conditioning. The unit would be placed close to a hook up line running to the inside of the home. Mr. Cole said that the unit would be hidden by a holly bush that would be planted once it was installed.

Ms. Whittaker noted that the unit was 3'x 3'. She asked how far the unit would sit from the building. Ms. Kozak thought it was about 8 inches.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the tubing that would connect to the unit and wondered if it would be running down the building. Mr. Cole said that it has been already run down the side of the structure. He pointed it out to the Commission on the submitted photo. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the tubing had been painted. Mr. Cole said that it would be painted the color of the house. Mr. Wyckoff commented that from a distance it looked like a downspout.

Mr. Almeida stated that it was a very beautiful house and the unit was located in a very hidden spot.

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. Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilor Coviello. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Kozak stated that this was a small unit that was discretely located and would not be a detriment to the surroundings.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

3. Petition of **Worth Condominium Association, owner, and Ahadi Realty Trust, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **123 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add window to rear elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6-102 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Councilor Coviello stated that he would be recusing himself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. John DeStefano, construction manager for the project was present to speak to the application. He stated that they received an approval in 2007 for the project. At that time, several windows were approved for the rear of the building but the changes have never taken place. He explained that the applicant would like to install one window (7'x 7') on the rear of the first floor. Mr. DeStefano pointed out that windows have previously been approved for the businesses on both sides of the applicant and so the proposed windows would match those approved windows.

Mr. Almeida asked for confirmation that the applicant would use the exact specifications. Mr. DeStefano said that it might not be the same manufacturer but it would be a thermal anodized aluminum window. He pointed out that the window would be the same size as the Portsmouth Baking Company's windows.

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. Whittaker made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Whittaker stated that they were starting to see care being taken with this big block by turning it into smaller sections. She felt this proposal added to the appearance and usefulness of the building.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Donald S. and Beth S. Margeson, owners**, for property located at **24 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow changes to an existing structure (move house to

Withdrawn

new location on lot) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 8 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic Districts.

This item was withdrawn at the applicant’s request.

5. Petition of **McIntosh Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **90 Fleet Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 14 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Councilor Coviello stated that he would be recusing himself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. David Osterhoudt, representing the owner was present to speak to the application. He stated that between 2002–2005 all of the windows facing the back of the building had been replaced with the exception of the one window in the owner’s unit. That was the window that he would like to replace. He pointed out that all of the other windows are vinyl replacement windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the vinyl cladding would be a bronze color. Mr. Osterhoudt replied yes.

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. Whittaker made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Whittaker stated that although it was not within the Commission’s purview, she used to live in the building and said the new windows have helped with the sound of the downtown area. She was in support of the application.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

6. Petition of **233 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **233 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (add new balconies, reconfigure existing balconies, revise misc. windows and openings, changes to the rooftop structures) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown

on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 14 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Councilor Coviello recused himself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Chairman Dika informed the public that the Commission recently had a work session on this application.

Ms. Carla Goodknight, representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. She stated that she was looking to amend the approval. She pointed out to the Commission that the list of proposed amendments was on the front page of the submitted plans. She said that many of the changes were brought about by the change in use of the building.

Ms. Goodknight pointed out that there was one change from the work session. It was that the tower had to be raised to accommodate the large scale elevator to access the roof top. The change was shown on page 3 and 3A of the submitted plans. She explained that the pitch of the roof was steeper and there was an upper piece of transom glass at the top. Mr. Almeida noted that the glass tower increased by 2 1/2 feet. He thought it was a good change as it was reestablishing itself as the high point of the building.

Ms. Whittaker commented that the addition of the balconies on Deer Street made the façade look less like a back wall.

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

Mr. Wyckoff stated that this was an improvement to the building and he would support the motion.

Ms. Whittaker commented that the changes have resolved a lot of the issues she initially had with the project. She said she would also support the motion.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

7. Petition of **Worth Condominium Association, owner, and Friends of the Music Hall, applicant**, for property located at **131 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install back lit signage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6-101 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Chairman Dika stated that the applicant has requested to postpone the application to the February meeting.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application to the February 2, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill. There was no discussion.

The motion to postpone the application to the February 2, 2011 meeting passed by a vote of 5-0 with Councilor Coviello and Ms. Whittaker abstaining.

8. Petition of **Islington Street Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **239 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct shed roof structures over six entryways) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 45 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. David Culkin, contractor for the project and Mr. Ross Kramer, president of the condominium association were present to speak to the application. Mr. Calkins stated that they were seeking approval to add awnings overhangs on the building. He said that the awnings would help protect the steps from snow and ice and repeated rain wash off. He explained that the building was constructed in 1981 and had very clean and simple lines. They would use Azek that would be painted to match the existing trim details. The support boards would be wrapped in Azek and the roofing material would match the existing roof.

Councilor Coviello pointed out a discrepancy in the drawings. Mr. Calkins apologized for the error and said that the 3D drawing was the accurate drawing. Mr. Coviello asked what would be on the underside of the awning. Mr. Calkins said it would be Azek bead board.

Ms. Whittaker asked how the new awnings would tie in with the existing masonry detail on the building. Mr. Calkins gave a detailed explanation as to how it would be handled.

Ms. Whittaker asked if the Azek trim would be white or dark in color. She had a concern that white would stand out. Ms. Kozak pointed out that the existing fascia board was white. Mr. Kramer said that they were thinking of painting the trim white and possibly painting the support

pieces brown. Mr. Almeida thought that if the trim were more of a bronze color it would be a more successful look. Mr. Kramer said they were open to that suggestion.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how the awnings would interact with the existing light fixtures. Mr. Clum said that the specification sheets were in the packets. Mr. Wyckoff asked what it would look like once the light fixtures were removed. Mr. Kramer said that the vertical support posts would be placed over those openings. There was discussion as to how the light fixtures would work with the existing bay windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how far out the bay windows projected. He commented that the overall projection of the awning was 64 inch projection. Mr. Calkins told him the overall length of the roof was 67 1/2". Mr. Kramer added that the goal was to cover as much as the landing as possible. He said it has been an unsafe situation for the owners.

Mr. Almeida pointed out that with this design; the applicant was simply relocating the ice to the steps. Mr. Calkins said they were thinking of using diverters but had hoped to add them at a later date if they needed them. Councilor Coviello asked if the diverters would be angled or would they follow the eave. Mr. Calkins said the diverters would be at the end of the awning roof and would run in a straight line.

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

Prior to making a motion, Councilor Coviello asked if the rain diverter would be part of the application. Chairman Dika asked Mr. Calkins if he intended to have the rain diverter included in the application. Mr. Calkins said that they would definitely like to explore that option so they would like to include it.

Councilor Coviello made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff.

Councilor Coviello stated that he did not have a problem with the overhang but the rain diverter was what was troubling him. He felt it cheapen the project even more.

Councilor Coviello amended his motion by removing the rain diverter from the application.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt the overall size of the awning was totally inappropriate for what was on the building. He thought they were awkward projections on the front of the building no matter what color they were. He felt more thought needed to be put into the project.

Councilor Coviello pointed out that the 3D sketch was not representative of the project.

Councilor Coviello rescinded his motion leaving no motion on the table.

Mr. Almeida stated that this was a real opportunity to do something special on this building and increase its value and its beauty. He thought the proposed design was very utilitarian and that they could do better.

Ms. Whittaker said that she was not against the proposal but that the drawings were not to scale. She felt that a good scaled drawing would help them to determine how large the structure was and how far out it would project.

Mr. Almeida stated that he would be in favor of a better, more appropriate design.

Chairman Dika told Mr. Calkins and Mr. Kramer that what they were hearing from the Commission was that they might want to get some professional help to discern what was appropriate for the building and to address the safety concerns.

Mr. Kramer said that he was a little bit surprised that the Commission was looking for an aesthetic change or something that was more architecturally advanced for this building. Chairman Dika cautioned Mr. Kramer not to misinterpret what they were saying. She stated that they were seeing problems with the design.

Mr. Wyckoff stated the importance of photographs of all four sides of the house. He said that the Commission had an obligation to the City and Islington Street to make sure that whatever is placed on buildings is appropriate for itself and its neighbors.

Ms. Kozak commented that she thought the applicant was correct in trying to keep with the language of the building. She recommended that they look at the scale and proportions.

Councilor Coviello said that the rules and application requirements recommended drawings to scale. He felt the applicant was capable of doing that. Ms. Kozak said a roof plan with the footprint of the building, a side elevation drawing, and some photos would be all that they needed.

Ms. Whittaker stated that everyone understands that a change has to come but she could not see what it was that they wanted to do and so she could not approve it at this time.

Mr. Kramer said that they would like to do more with the building but as a result of having injuries because of the ice problem, they wanted to get something done.

Ms. Whittaker suggested that the applicant come with some designs that can be reviewed and talked about at a work session.

Vice Chairman Katz explained that the Commission's attitudes are driven by appropriateness. He said that whatever they propose, it has to look like it belongs on the building.

Mr. Calkins said that the real challenge with this comes from the marriage of functionality and aesthetics. He added that he understood what the Commission was saying and that more thought needed to go into the design but it was going to be difficult to get the entire landing covered.

Chairman Dika explained to the applicant that they could postpone the application to next month or the Commission could go ahead and vote on it. Mr. Kramer said that they should postpone it.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Whittaker made a motion to postpone the application to a work session/public hearing at the February 2, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilor Coviello. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

9. Petition of **David A. and Regina H. Schirmer, owners**, for property located at **241 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows on front elevation, replace misc. trim with composite material) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 36 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Zeb Bogdanich, representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. He stated that he would like to replace the frieze board and the corner boards on the structure with Azek material. He would also like to replace the five front windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what type of window Mr. Bogdanich was proposing. Mr. Bogdanich said he was proposing Andersen windows and pointed out the submitted brochure in packet.

Mr. Almeida asked if a stop cover would be used. Mr. Bogdanich said that he was planning to use it but this was the first time he was using this brand of window.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what sill angle he was proposing to use. Mr. Bogdanich said he would use a 14 degree sill. Mr. Wyckoff stated that if there were a gap at the sill, he should caulk it

Mr. Almeida asked if the window was a replacement window or a new construction window. Mr. Bogdanich said that it was a replacement window.

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. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval of the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the window proposed has been proven to be an excellent replacement window and he felt the use of Azek in that location was appropriate.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval of the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

In other business, Vice Chairman Katz asked for a clarification as to whether the Commission could review color. He pointed out exception #2 in Section 10.633.20 of the Zoning Ordinance. There was considerable discussion regarding the topic. Councilor Coviello suggested that a clarification come from the city attorney. Mr. Clum stated that he would discuss it with Attorney Sullivan and Rick Taintor, Planning Director and report back to the Commission.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:00 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 February 9, 2011.