

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

February 1, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Richard Katz; Vice Chairman Joseph Almeida; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena Whittaker; City Council Representative Jack D. Thorsen; Planning Department Representative William Gladhill; Alternate George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Planning Consultant

A small gathering was held prior to the meeting in the Portsmouth Room in honor of prior Chairman Sandra Dika who recently resigned from the Historic District Commission.

Chairman Katz called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. NEW BUSINESS

1. Presentation – in recognition of service – Sandra Dika, former chairman

The Commission presented Ms. Dika with a gift in appreciation for her eight years of service to the Historic District Commission.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Approval of minutes – December 7, 2011

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

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Bessie Sheppard, owner**, for property located at **311 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct handicap ramp) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 2 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Dan Hartrey, Facilities Manager for the City of Portsmouth, was present to speak to the application. He stated that Ms. Sheppard, who was approximately 90 years old and using a walker, was in need of a ramp to get in and out of her home. This would allow her to be able to stay living in her home. The proposal was to place a modular ramp out her front entrance. He said that they would have to ramp down 42 inches which would involve a switch back. The ramp would run first towards Marcy Street and would then switch back toward the driveway. Mr. Hartrey said that this would allow for a safer slope. He added that the ramp would be a black painted metal.

Ms. Whittaker commented that it appeared from the application that the ramp would not be permanent so she was wondering why the application was before them. Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that the Commission had to give their permission for a temporary display board at Strawberry Banke that has since been taken down. He asked if the existing stairs were to be left in place and covered over. Mr. Hartrey said yes and added that the landing would be at the threshold level to make it easier for Ms. Sheppard to enter and leave her home.

Mr. Cracknell stated that he did not see any exemptions in the ordinance for temporary structures. He also said that it was not specified on the application that this was a temporary structure and so it could be in place for quite a while.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Katz asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Kevin Murphy, an interested party, stated that he felt it was a good idea and it would help to keep Ms. Sheppard safe.

Seeing no one else rise, Chairman Katz 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. Almeida. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

2. Petition of **Rockingham House Condominium Association, owner, and Paris Khavari, applicant**, for property located at **401 State Street, Unit M401**, wherein permission was 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 116 as Lot 3 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Gladhill stated that he would be recusing himself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Christopher Nelson, representing the owner, was present to speak to the application. He stated that the owner would like to replace the existing windows in the fourth floor unit with Andersen Woodwright 400 series windows, one over one pattern in a terra tone exterior finish.

Mr. Almeida said that he seemed to recall granting a blanket approval for windows on this building at a prior meeting. Ms. Good offered clarification on the discussion by saying that she reviewed the minutes of that prior meeting, and the minutes suggested that Mr. Belanger, the condo president at the time, represent the homeowners by presenting the same Andersen 400 series window.

Mr. Almeida stated that he was now remembering that what kept them from granting a blanket approval at that time was that there were several windows types on the building, particularly on the rear elevation.

Mr. Nelson stated that Mr. Belanger has since stepped down as condo president and now Gene Fisk and Associates was representing the association.

Mr. Wyckoff said that if the Commission was going to issue a blanket approval, then they should be specific and say that approval was for the double hung windows only. He pointed out that there were a variety of window styles on the Porter Street side of the building. Mr. Almeida added that there were original stain glass windows as well so he felt it was important to clarify that it was for double hung windows only.

Chairman 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 grant a Certificate of Approval of the application as presented with the following amendment:

- 1) That a blanket approval is granted for all double hung windows throughout the building provided that they are consistent with the June 1, 2011 HDC approval (Andersen Woodwright 400 Series, full divided light with spacer bar, Terratone (bronze) color, half screens) and replaced in kind. Furthermore, the replacement window shall be placed in its original location, with the same glass plane, and the brick return exposed.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Whittaker. Chairman Katz asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was a good window with the kind of profile that the Commission looks for. He felt it was appropriate for the building.

Ms. Whittaker added that this was also the same window that was approved for another application for this building and so that was why the Commission did not have many questions for the applicant.

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

- 1) That a blanket approval is granted for all double hung windows throughout the building provided that they are consistent with the June 1, 2011 HDC approval (Andersen Woodwright 400 Series, full divided light with spacer bar, Terratone (bronze) color, half screens) and replaced in kind. Furthermore, the replacement window shall be placed in its original location, with the same glass plane, and the brick return exposed.

3. 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 (changes to the Maplewood Ave. elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects was present to speak to the application. She stated that they received Planning Board approval recently which required some programming changes. This application was a result of those changes. She pointed out that they have included the stipulations from the previous HDC approval in this submission.

Ms. DeStefano stated that previously they had located the trash and recycling area on the Maplewood Avenue elevation. She explained that they have been able to relocate it to the Hanover Street elevation where it would be housed internally. She added that all doors would now lead to a public space. She pointed out that the Maplewood Avenue now had a three bay one story warehouse style storefront. The green wall with the resting spaces was still in place.

Page six showed the program changes that were internal to the building. Page seven showed the stipulations that were part of the prior approval.

Ms. DeStefano stated that the brick wall located behind the green wall would now be all brick instead of brick and metal. She also talked about the rear of the wall, pointing out the transom windows that would give some light to the retail space.

Mr. Almeida asked if the new doors on the Maplewood Avenue side would be centered. Ms. DeStefano replied yes. Mr. Almeida also asked what the reasoning was for infilling the brick arches. Ms. DeStefano said it had to do with comments from previous board presentations and the comments and concerns about car lights shining through into the interior space.

Ms. Kozak asked what the coursing patterns would be on the new retail space on Maplewood Avenue. Ms. DeStefano said it was a running bond.

Ms. Kozak also stated that the difficulty with the whole project was that the Maplewood Avenue façade should look like the front of a building and not the back side of a building. She said that a lot of progress had been made with the green wall and the relocation of the dumpster but she felt that with the addition of the new retail space, the formality had been lost. She added that she was having trouble understanding the project as a whole in the same way she once did. Ms. DeStefano explained that it was the best place for the retail space in order to meet the requests of the Planning Board and Planning Department.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the green wall would still be set back three feet. Ms. DeStefano replied yes. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was lighting in each bay. Ms. DeStefano replied yes and said that there was no change to the lighting.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt the addition of the new retail space was added to address concerns about getting people to walk around the building. He felt it was successful.

Mr. Gladhill pointed out that the hotel building had been elongated by one bay. Mr. Almeida commented that he thought that was beneficial because it added more building on Maplewood Avenue.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the location of the internal dumpster area. Ms. DeStefano explained that it would be located at the parking level. There was considerable discussion about requiring a wall to screen the view of looking down into the parking below.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Katz asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Kevin Murphy, an interested party, suggested adding an entrance on the Maplewood Avenue elevation so that it would look less like the back of a building.

Seeing no one else rise, Chairman Katz closed the public hearing and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff asked for clarification about adding an amendment to the motion regarding the wall. He noted that the Commission was not in total agreement about the addition of a wall but that he had strong feelings about it. He felt that a brick wall should be placed behind the grill. Councilor Thorsen asked if it was sufficient to stipulate that the dumpsters are to not be in view and leave it up to the designers to figure out how to make that happen. Chairman Katz suggested that if there was strong feeling on this subject then a motion to approve with a stipulation should be offered.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that the additional bay was not called out on the plan so he wondered how that was to be handled.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the stipulation that one bay of Hanover Street would have a wall built behind the metal grill to cover the dumpster area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Katz asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt this was the only weak spot in the plan. He felt that the addition of the retail space was very successful.

Ms. Whittaker said that she would like to support the application but she did not support the motion. She felt the motion should be that the owner has the opportunity to make the decision. She had questions about whether she would be voting on the motion or the amendment.

Chairman Katz asked the applicant to weigh in on the amendment to the motion. Ms. DeStefano pointed out that this design element was similar to what was approved and standing on Bow Street where they have a screen on a door system and where the dumpsters are rolled out. She said that was the direction they were going. She added that if it was the desire of the Commission to put a wall up and paint it a dark color, they would do it and do it in a manner that did not require maintenance because it would be difficult to get to.

Ms. Whittaker stated that what she was hearing that the applicant did not want to do it but would do it if that was what the Commission required.

Chairman Katz asked the maker of the motion if he would be willing to withdraw it or adjust it. Mr. Wyckoff said that he would withdraw the stipulation because he was not feeling that there was overwhelming support for it.

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

Councilor Thorsen commented that if this motion would have been made first and then the stipulation made, it would have made it a bit easier because he explained that he was in favor of some answer of taking the trash containers out of view but he did not think it was necessary to stipulate a wall or any other method, but just a simple stipulation to keep them out of view would be enough. That would then be a separate vote as an amendment and then they would fall back to the general motion.

Chairman Katz stated that there was a motion on the floor that had been seconded. He called for the vote.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a vote of 6-1 with Ms. Kozak voting in opposition.

IV. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **North Mill Realty Trust, owner**, for property located at **319 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add windows, canopy, doors, and cladding). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 9 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the January 4, 2012 meeting to the February 1, 2012 meeting.)*

Ms. Whittaker stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion.

- Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture and Mr. Chris Greiner of 3S Artspace were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry stated that the project was working its way through the site review process and had successfully made it through the review of the Technical Advisory Committee. He said that they wanted to show the Commission further thoughts on exterior treatments, especially the public entry area.
- Mr. McHenry pointed out that the new plans showed changes to the signage and the materials on the canopy. He explained that the series of slats and translucent material would allow light down through the canopy. The landscaped area would be reworked as well. He said that they were trying to tie in the movement of water and the function of the canopy system with some type of water feature, drainage system or rain garden in the plaza area. He also pointed out the synthetic stucco system that they were proposing on the second floor.
- Mr. McHenry showed the Commission an area of the building where they would be incorporating a green wall system. He explained that they would be using a translucent material for the walls since it was an area of the building that would be utilized as the art gallery so they wanted to control the light in that space. There would be a couple windows and a door but they did not want them to be confused as a public entry so that was why they were covering it with the green wall system.
- There was discussion about a section of the roof being a great location for a solar array.
- Ms. Kozak commented that it was a very handsome project. She said that it was a peculiar one for the Commission because it was not a historic type of building. She wanted to make sure they did not become the “historic taste” Commission because there was not a lot of historic reference in the area to compare it to. It was just a building of its own and the scale was what was appropriate to what was around it. She felt that any of the proposed themes would work but pointed out that she did not have anything to base that opinion on. Mr. McHenry said that they felt the same way and that was why they were here. He felt it afforded them the freedom to think about it in the abstract. They had a very simple box form to work with and they were trying to keep it simple and honest because they did not have a huge budget to work with.
- Mr. Almeida stated that he thought any of the schemes would work. He agreed with Ms. Kozak’s comments and felt there was a desperate need for contemporary architecture like this in this area.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that his only concern was that he did not want this be a little island of playfulness that was inappropriately sized. He felt there was going to be more

development in the area. He added that he did not have a problem with modern architecture; however, he felt this was a little inadequate.

- Mr. Almeida reminded the Commission of the 233 Vaughan Street project which was a very contemporary building with a glass silo. He felt there was a new language sprouting in the area.
- Mr. Gladhill asked Mr. Wyckoff if he was concerned with the design or about setting precedence in the area. Mr. Wyckoff said that he was more worried about the design.
- Mr. Almeida pointed out that art centers and museums are very different in architecture and design as to what was around them.
- Chairman Katz asked the applicant what it was about the design or the concept that communicates that this is in Portsmouth, NH and not in Sandusky, OH or Boca Raton, FL, both of which are seaside communities and about the same size as Portsmouth. Mr. McHenry said that was an excellent question that did not have one answer. He said that the three things they were talking about as a group was a new skin, a new public entry, and a new public urban space and those things should say something about Portsmouth. Mr. Almeida pointed out that Portsmouth is an artisan community with many artists living here.

B. Work Session requested by **General Porter Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **32 Livermore Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild rear dormer) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add period shutters) and allow new free standing structures (add fence post and fencing, change driveway column details). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 20 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item is continued from the January 4, 2012 meeting to the February 1, 2012 meeting.)*

- Chairman Katz informed the Commission that a site walk was held last Saturday morning, January 28, which was very helpful. He pointed out that his observation of the building was that something had to be done with the rear elevation of the building as it was in a state of decrepitude.
- Mr. Almeida stated that the window in question at the last meeting, while not being original to the structure, has been there for a long, long, time.
- Mr. Gladhill asked if the age of the dormers had been determined. Mr. Almeida said that the applicant was going to bring information concerning that.
- Ms. Kozak stated the east side of the gable was an addition that came later than the original structure.
- Mr. Joe Paquet of Portsmouth Builders and Mr. Jon Merkle of TMS Architects were present to speak to the project. Mr. Paquet listed the various parts of the project: changing the upper slope of the front roof from asphalt to cedar, adding historic shutters to the driveway side of the structure, adding a matching fence post on one side of the driveway, change the railing details on units 1 and 4, remove the fire escape if allowed, rebuilding the existing dormer, and changing various windows.
- Mr. Almeida commented that the fire escape was thrown on at some point and probably should go.

- Mr. Merkle stated that their client would really like to see the gambrel on the side of the building reestablished. He also said that the dormer was quite old and was probably added when the building was moved to its original location. He pointed out that the windows in the dormer were original and dated to somewhere around 1860. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the dormer was stick built. Mr. Merkle said that was something they were trying to figure out and pointed out that the roof was in a state of failure.
- Mr. Merkle stated that they were asking to replace various windows in kind. He added that they were a bit quirky but the photos that they had showed them that way. Mr. Wyckoff said that they would have to be reframed. He said he had hoped that they would replace the windows with ones that matched the existing sizes.
- Mr. Paquet asked because it was quirky did that make it right. Ms. Whittaker explained that it was because it was an old historic house. Mr. Almeida added that given the home's history and prominent location in Portsmouth, it required close scrutiny. Mr. Wyckoff commented that he has renovated many historic homes and when he bumps into a situation like this he always goes back to the past, fix what needs to be fixed, and allow it to continue. Mr. Almeida said that this was a perfect example of what the Historic District Commission is supposed to do. Ms. Whittaker commented that the house was on the National Registry and wondered if the applicant had to work with the State as well. Mr. Merkle said that the project did not fall under that requirement.
- Ms. Whittaker stated that she had a fear that as the Historic District Commission, they were going to try to prove that something is old and therefore, it cannot change. She said that they do not own these houses and she did not want to stop the owners of buildings from having a conversation about what they feel would be best.
- Mr. Paquet stated that he wished to refocus the discussion on a hierarchy of points as to what was important to his client and what was important to the Commission. He said that he wished to put the windows aside for the moment but stressed that they wanted to make the windows operable and as well insulated as they could with a historically appropriate window. He explained that the main piece that they wanted to discuss was the roof line as it was viewed from Pleasant Street down Livermore Street.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the dormer could be repaired. Mr. Merkle replied yes.
- Ms. Kozak commented that it was part of the vernacular of Portsmouth to have these additions and ells on the back of buildings.
- Mr. Almeida pointed out that this is a very important profile in Portsmouth and that you do not see many of them. He felt that showing an artificial board line would be a mistake in this case.
- At this point in the work session, Mr. Merkle passed out an elevation drawing of the project. He explained that they would like to have the dormer extension follow the upper part of the gable out to the rear wall and install two dormers. Mr. Almeida asked why they were doing the false gambrel line on that plane. Mr. Merkle said that he needed to retain the plane. He said that if they could fix the roof and replace it with a second dormer, it would probably be acceptable to his client.
- Mr. Almeida suggested connecting the two dormers and making one large dormer and leaving the roof alone on one side. Mr. Merkle said that he was hesitant to do that because the roof was almost flat.
- Chairman Katz asked the Commission if they felt this concept was unacceptable. Mr. Paquet stated that there was already precedence for this concept on a building in

Strawbery Banke on Gates Street. Mr. Almeida suggested that they bring a photo of that building to the next meeting for their review.

- Chairman Katz asked the Commission to communicate their objections to the application so that the applicant would have a clear understanding of the issues. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not see that the new addition on the back of the building had a relationship to any other part of the building. He also had a problem with the massing. Mr. Merkle pointed out that the addition already existed. Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that if the addition was built exactly as it is then no HDC approval would be necessary. He added that it was not proposed to be built as is and that was his objection. Mr. Melchior said that he agreed with Mr. Wyckoff and added that he was not inclined to change any of the original features. Mr. Almeida commented that the applicant was proposing several great changes. He said that he was still struggling with the loss of the historic roof line. Mr. Gladhill asked when an addition becomes part of the original structure. He felt this addition had become part of the building and he would like to see the roof line stay the way it was. Mr. Melchior stated that 50 years was the measure that determined if something was historic. Ms. Kozak stated that she supported the application as presented. She did not think that any of the proposed changes would detract from the historic nature of the building. She added that she did not think back ells were sacred. She said it was helpful to go on site to see the situation. Councilor Thorsen said that he was not able to attend the site walk but he understood that the property has gone through a lot of growth which was part of the character of the houses around it. He did not think it was necessary to preserve the exact dimensions. Ms. Whittaker agreed with Ms. Kozak and said this was a wonderful thing to be happening to the building.
- Mr. Merkle said that he was comfortable asking his client to maintain the original pitch of the shed dormer if they could have the two dormers. Mr. Wyckoff thought that was a fair trade. Mr. Merkle added that as for the window replacements, they were planning to replace them as they were.
- Chairman Katz suggested a work session / public hearing when the applicant comes back.

C. Work Session requested by **General Porter Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **32 Livermore Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 20 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

- Mr. Joe Paquet of Portsmouth Builders and Mr. Jon Merkle of TMS Architects were present to speak to the application.
- Mr. Merkle informed the Commission that the applicant would probably be withdrawing the application from consideration since it was learned that a City statute existed that prohibited building within twenty five feet of a cemetery.
- There was no discussion on the application.

D. Work Session requested by **DiLorenzo Real Estate, LLC, owner**, for property located at **33 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing balcony structure and move to floor above, add new balcony on second level on rear elevation). Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 48 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture was present to speak to the application. He stated that the proposal was to remove the balconette from the fourth floor, move the third floor balcony up to the fourth floor and construct a new, larger balcony on the third floor. The new balcony would be wider and deeper by about two feet.
- Ms. Whittaker said that her first reaction was that the proposed balcony would have quite a presence. She pointed out that the building was not very wide and that the massing on the proposed balcony was not quite right.
- Mr. Almeida agreed and said that it looked like the building could not support the new balcony.
- Mr. Wyckoff agreed that the massing was extreme. Mr. Melchior also agreed.
- Mr. Almeida commented that they did an amazing job with what was currently there
- Mr. Gladhill also agreed.
- Ms. Kozak agreed and added that she had a concern for the other buildings down the row.
- Councilor Thorsen wondered if they were going to see these types of balconies popping up on all of those buildings. The Commissioners agreed that yes, they were. Councilor Thorsen said that they might want to set a standard. He did think it looked like it projected out too far.
- Ms. Kozak commented that she liked the way the back of the building was right now. She felt it worked well.

E. Work Session requested by **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct a mixed use multi-story structure). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture was present to speak to the application. He explained that there was quite a bit of history with this project. In the end, it got its approvals but the decline in the economy had caused the approvals to lapse. He said that they now wanted to update the project and gave a brief history of it. They received their HDC approval in April of 2007 and a lot line approval in January of 2009. Mr. McHenry said that he was not sure whether there would be parking inside the building. The plans did not show any parking inside the building or on the site. It would be a 3-4 story building with retail space on the first floor and residential units on the other floors. He then guided the Commission through the submitted plans. He said that it was the essentially the same package as before.
- Mr. Wyckoff recalled asking for wood doors on the front of the building. Mr. McHenry said that Page 11 of the plans showed a custom wood door. Mr. Wyckoff also noticed

that the windows on a portion of the bays were lost because of the absence of cornerboards. Mr. Melchior said that he did not share Mr. Wyckoff's concern and thought it looked the way it did because of the graphics. Mr. Almeida agreed and added that he remembered the details from before and he looked forward to having the project come back to life.

- Mr. Gladhill explained that he was not on the Commission at the time the application first came to them. He said he would look forward to seeing more.
- Ms. Kozak stated that she thought it would be a great addition to the district.
- Councilor Thorsen said that he liked the building but was concerned about all of Islington Street looking like this building. He asked whether the building would stand alone or would it reflect well with some of the other surrounding buildings. Chairman Katz told Councilor Thorsen that the project went through many work sessions where those aspects had been considered and discussed at length.
- Ms. Whittaker said that the project seemed to work better now than when it was first presented. She was glad that it was back and was happy with it, with or without the parking.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discuss next steps for establishing design standards

Mr. Cracknell asked if a few members or the whole Commission would be willing to work with him to build a repository of background information to begin to establish some design standards and guidelines. He explained that if a few members wished to participate, they could report back to the full Commission periodically because it was going to take some time. Mr. Almeida, Mr. Wyckoff, Ms. Kozak, Ms. Whittaker and Chairman Katz volunteered to work with Mr. Cracknell.

Mr. Cracknell also suggested scheduling a work session to discuss potential amendments to the ordinance with regard to the HDC review process. There was considerable discussion on some possible amendments.

Councilor Thorsen stated that some members of the Council are looking at what can be done to migrate from land use ordinances to a form based code. He said he would keep the Commission apprised of the progress.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:20 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 May 2, 2012.