

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**August 12, 2015
reconvened from August 5, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members John Wyckoff; Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi and Alternate John Mayer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Esther Kennedy, Alternate Richard Shea

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL

A. 35 Portwalk Place (postponed at August 5, 2015 meeting)

The Portwalk representative was not present but Mr. Cracknell said that he had spoken to Ben, the operator of the Green Elephant restaurant. There were two components to the administrative approval. The rooftop HVAC heat pump was installed a few feet from where it was supposed to be, but since it wasn't visible from the street, there was no need to relocate it. The second component involved a stipulation and a request from the landlord Tim Levine to include frosted glass or a film on the doors and windows along the Deer Street elevation. The HDC previously rejected that proposal and included a stipulation that the film not be applied to two windows and the door. The landlord installed it anyway, but the tenant was currently in control and had a trash room behind that door. Mr. Cracknell said he talked to Ben about looking at the other frosted glass applied to the hotel section of the building, where half the glass was covered and, in some sections of the gym, had a wave pattern. He showed a photo of a half-size film applied to the bottom of a door that was on a building down the block, which the applicant was willing to do.

Ms. Ruedig said she preferred to see film because she preferred to have a film halfway covering up trash and it was reversible. Chairman Almeida noted that there was so much glass on the building and felt that it should be done sensitively. He thought the Commission could be accused of setting a precedent because the frost had some décor to it. Mr. Rawling said they needed a more creative solution than having a block and a half of frosted glass panels on a main street. He also felt that the Commission had given the developer a lot of liberty on things that were implemented without permission, and for the developer to continue to do it was a slap in the face and he could not support it. Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that he had historically voted against frosted glass and would not vote for just a solid panel.

Mr. Wyckoff noted that frosted glass was used on doors a hundred years before. He felt that the developer probably shouldn't have big windows because it wasn't an appropriate location for storefronts due to the amount of sun it got, but he had no problem with frosted glass. He suggested that it be stipulated that the developer use the same design as the gym's wave design. Mr. Rawling stated that the original motion was made to deny the frosted glass, in part to the Design Guidelines, which discouraged the use of frosted glass panels on storefronts. Chairman Almeida said that it was simply a vinyl-applied sticker on the inside of the glass and not truly frosted glass, and that it was removable.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Administrative Approval for the petition as presented, with the following stipulation:*

- 1) that a wave design be used on the frosted glass.*

*Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1 with Mr. Rawling voting in opposition..*

B. 426 Middle Street

Mr. Rawling recused himself.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the project had come before the Commission a few months before and had been approved. It was to convert an accessory structure, a former shed barn small carriage house, to a commercial use. The applicant wanted to add a small, ground-mounted condenser unit 10 feet off the property line, and he was also proposing landscaping around it.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Administrative Approval and Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

Mr. Rawling resumed his voting seat.

C. 687 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the shed/garage had been approved a few months before, and the applicant had submitted construction drawings because the Inspection Department had requested that a door be added to the garage portion in the front. The wooden door would have a design consistent with the two doors shown on the same elevation.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Administrative Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Lombardi seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

II. DESIGN GUIDELINES REVIEW

Mr. Cracknell stated that Ms. Dominique Hawkins would be at the September 3, 2015 meeting and that the Commission could review the next chapters before then. He gave a brief summary of Ms. Hawkins's credentials and the guidelines framework and said that the remaining chapters would be presented in draft form at the September meeting and a meeting would be scheduled with the working group to review it. He expected the final draft to be completed in early November and a possible submittal to the City Council in January.

Mr. Wyckoff noted that the City of Portsmouth had their 400th anniversary coming up in 2023 and asked if there had been an effort to write an updated history. It needed to be funded, and he said several people thought it should be paid attention to. He asked whether there was money left over from the Design Guidelines budget. Chairman Almeida thought the only way to get more funding from the City Council was if it were part of the survey funds. Ms. Ruedig stated that the Commission could update the existing survey, which would foster a more comprehensive understanding of the history of Portsmouth. Mr. Wyckoff asked who would stand behind it if the Commission didn't, and Ms. Ruedig said the Historical Society would, and she suggested that the Commission ask them to start fundraising. Mr. Cracknell suggested scheduling a strategic planning session for the HDC to discuss reprogramming funding or asking the City Council for more. He noted that \$50,000 would not go far, and 300 buildings had been added to the District since 1982 without a full inventory form, which made it challenging to administer the guidelines.

Mr. Mayer said he had shared information about the Certified Local Government Program, which was a funding mechanism to enable cities to do more survey work, and that Portsmouth wasn't considered one. It would require a motion from the City Council for Portsmouth to accept that status and he thought that the Commission could consider it. He said one of the staff personnel had offered to do a presentation for them. Chairman Almeida said it was a great idea.

III. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Eport Properties 1, LLC, owner**, for property located at **173-175 Market Street and 65 Ceres Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a second one year extension of the Conditional Use Permit originally granted on August 7, 2013 and again on September 10, 2014, as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 3 & 4 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Cracknell explained that the Certificate of Approval had mistakenly been transposed for the Conditional Use Permit (CUP), so the Legal Notice had been republished. He asked the Commissioners to review the draft approval and Letter of Decision that had the same findings and appropriate for the second one-year extension.

The owner Mr. Chris Erickson was present and stated that he was officially requesting the second one-year extension for the CUP.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE COMMISSION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the second extension of the CUP with the four findings from the original approval as follows:*

- 1. Other than minor changes to the roof design, the façade of the existing historic building at 175 Market Street is being restored to its original period;*
- 2. The overhead utility lines on and immediately adjacent the properties are being buried which will provide less visual clutter and removal of an adverse visual impact on the neighborhood;*
- 3. The proposed parking for the building is being relocated from the exterior surface spaces behind the building to the basement level which will provide less visual clutter and removal of an adverse visual impact on the neighborhood; and,*
- 4. The applicant is providing a publically accessible sidewalk along the rear of the building.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

He stated that it was determined that significant restoration of the former Frank Jones Building qualified for the CUP.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Lombardi voting in opposition.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

2. Petition of **Kristen J. Campbell, owner**, for property located at **31 Cabot Street**, 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 136 as Lot 40 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Rawling recused himself.

The owner Ms. Kristen Campbell stated that she replaced the windows. She went through her packet, showing nearby houses that had similar replacement widows. She said that she put wooden windows on the house, with the exception of a vinyl window on the front side.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the large vinyl window was on the first floor. Ms. Campbell agreed and said it was to maintain the width. Mr. Wyckoff said he had a problem with the choice of windows because they were aluminum extruded and did not feel that the window was anything the Commission should use frequently in the Historic District. However, he said he would vote for it, especially seeing that it was set back from the street.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked what the material was of the removed windows, and Ms. Campbell said they were original wooden ones. Vice-Chair Gladhill noted there were no external grills, which was not appropriate. Ms. Ruedig said her biggest problem was that the window in the front was removed and that it had been a vertically divided top sash window and would have been worth restoring. She did not think a vinyl window was appropriate because the window was the showcase window. Ms. Campbell stated that she could put muntins on the top to separate the panes and do a wooden window on the bottom. Ms. Ruedig said there were ways to be creative in restoring the window and that the lower half might have to be rebuilt. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether there was an exterior muntin applied to the glass in the rest of the windows, and Ms. Campbell replied that it was just a divider in between. Mr. Wyckoff replied that the Commission would have to stipulate that it be a simulated divided light window. He also said that half screens would have to be used. Ms. Ruedig asked Ms. Campbell if she could get an all-wood custom window for the first-floor window. Ms. Campbell said her contractor would trade out the window at no cost for an all-wood window that would match the original design.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE COMMISSION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That a wood window, either the original or a replication thereof as presented thereof shall be reinserted into the first floor picture window opening.*
- 2) That exterior muntins shall be applied to simulate a divided light window (reflecting the original window design) on all the replacement windows.*
- 3) That a half screen shall be used on all windows.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig stated that the petition met all the criteria and that it somewhat replicated what was there before. The original windows were removed without the HDC's approval, but she could make some consideration because the house was away from the street and on the edge of the District and the first-floor picture window would be replicated. Chairman Almeida told Ms. Campbell that she had done a great job restoring the house and that he appreciated that the pane of glass was behind the casing, but he didn't like the loss of glass area in the window. He would support the motion but would not support something like it in the future.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

3. Petition of **Timothy R. and Alison E. Malinowski, owners**, for property located at **91 Lafayette Road**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct one story addition and a two story addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property

is shown on Assessor Plan 151 as Lot 11 and lies in the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

Mr. Rawling resumed his voting seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Tom Emerson representing the owners told the Commission that the project had not changed much and the main thing was the front elevation. The clapboards to the dormer were previously Hardiplank but would now be wood and would retain the Azek trim. Three exterior lights would replicate an existing one, and there would be a water table around the lower side of the addition in the back. He also explained that, even though some of the Commissioners had thought the eave height looked quirky, he would have to leave it alone because if he raised the eave, it would raise the height of the addition and would prevent a bathroom window. He could narrow down the addition but it would affect the basement access and the structure's symmetry.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what the height of the eaves was, and Mr. Emerson replied that it was seven feet at its lowest. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked about half screens, and Mr. Emerson said that all the windows had half screens except the ones with the awnings and casings. Ms. Ruedig confirmed that the windows would be 2/1 and then asked whether there was information on the type of decking composite. Mr. Emerson said it was Trex or something like it, and Ms. Ruedig said she preferred not to see any composite at all, but if it was necessary, she'd prefer that it be wood that matched the earlier side porch. Mr. Emerson said he would picture frame all the edges. Mr. Lombardi asked whether the front dormers were going to the ridge, and Mr. Emerson replied that they had considered several dormers but went with a shed dormer.

Mr. Mayer questioned adding dormers in the front façade, which seemed to be intact from the original construction, and he asked Mr. Emerson if he was making a change to that façade. Mr. Emerson agreed, noting that the house was redone in the 1880s, so the façade had gone through a significant change then. He also wanted to get more light and air as well as an egress window in the two bedrooms. Chairman Almeida stated that he didn't believe the Commission had discussed any changes at all on the front façade, and Mr. Lombardi thought they had talked about not having dormers. Mr. Emerson said the dormers were essential. Mr. Wyckoff noted that it was 2015 and the Commission had a new code relating to egress-accessible windows.

Mr. Rawling said that he had noticed several similar buildings in the south end with a centerpiece and dormers on the side and felt that it was a common adaptation. He thought it was in keeping with the adapted style of the house. Chairman Almeida said he wasn't afraid of changing the front as long as it was done properly, which it was. The only improvement he could see would be not extending the dormers to the ridge.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE COMMISSION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented, and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded it.*

In assessing the historical significance of the building, Mr. Wyckoff stated that, even though the building could be a later rebuild, it was a Gothic Revival with stick-style elements and was used to base the design for the addition, which he felt was successful. It would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character. Mr. Rawling agreed.

Ms. Ruedig stated that she would vote in support but had concerns about adding dormers and changing an intact façade too much. She was hesitant about accepting dormers on the front, but the building wouldn't end up being a focal one due to its location, and the rest of it had changed a lot. Also, it was on the edge of the District and not in an intact late 19th century neighborhood, so she was willing to be lenient. Mr. Lombardi said he wasn't a fan of the dormers and wouldn't call it a restoration but rather an adaptation. He felt that the house was unusual in its location, and he struggled with accepting the change to the front façade. Mr. Rawling said that the original house was much simpler, so it was already an altered façade, and he thought it was an improvement to the existing building and followed the character that had been introduced.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Lombardi voting in opposition.*

4. Petition of **Clayton M. Emery and Susan L. Therriault, owners**, for property located at **114 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing steps and landing) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new stairs and landing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 24 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Tom Emerson representing the owners stated that they wanted to replace the front steps and that the deck was falling apart. He showed a photo of the Lowd House at Strawberry Banke that had a similar deck expression. His project had a concrete stairway and wall on which the new wooden deck would sit. They wanted to narrow the deck at the top to make it more elegant and make the rail like the one in the Lowd House. They would enclose the other side of the deck with a vertical board expression to screen items like firewood. The railing would be slightly taller to meet code and that the ball finials on the posts would be replaced.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked what was meant by the statement 'open to beyond' in the packet. Mr. Emerson said it meant the downstairs door. Mr. Wyckoff asked if a person could fall through the opening, and Mr. Emerson said it was possible, so Mr. Wyckoff suggested a handrail. Mr. Lombardi asked how deep it was, and Mr. Emerson replied that it was three steps down. Chairman Almeida asked why there were cut ends rather than mitered sides, and Mr. Emerson said it was to give it a rustic look. Mr. Wyckoff commended Mr. Emerson and hoped that people would pay attention to the bottom rail when the new guidelines were published.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE COMMISSION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented, and Ms. Ruedig seconded it.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the deck would have a conservation element of property values and would maintain the special character of the District because the south end had a lot of front stoops. Ms. Ruedig said it was a very thoughtful and compatible design.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

5. Petition of **Richard and Janice Henderson, owners**, for property located at **284 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two story left side addition, replace existing porch, entry and deck, construct angled bay addition on front elevation, construct detached garage, window and door changes on rear elevation, add two skylights) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 73 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Ms. Anne Whitney representing the owners stated that they were proceeding with the same plan that was presented in the work session. She went through the packet, noting among other things that the Andersen Series A windows would remain and that the windows in the addition would match the size.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the addition's siding and trim would match the existing wood, and Ms. Whitney agreed. Mr. Mayer stated that Ms. Whitney had done a full Greek Revival treatment and it seemed more of an interpretation of a design that wasn't present rather than a restoration, and he asked whether if there was a possibility of simplifying the trim treatment. Ms. Whitney replied that the windows had seemed oversized for the house and she had discovered that they were replaced eight years before. She thought that they could have been upsized to fit the rough openings but felt that the look worked with the scale. Mr. Mayer said it was a nice design but made for a very different building. Ms. Whitney said that in order to retain the original qualities, the windows would just be floating and the return would be lost.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the continuous pediment was frieze, saying that it must be much wider than the smaller one on the broken returns. Ms. Whitney replied that it was probably 2" deeper. Mr. Wyckoff felt that Ms. Whitney was going a little far in the Greek Revival style with the round columns, especially the second redundant one. Ms. Whitney said she felt it was

necessary for the symmetry of the façade. Mr. Wyckoff thought it awkward and suggested a half of the column. Ms. Whitney said she could use a half column pilaster instead and shift to the center line. Ms. Ruedig said she agreed with Mr. Mayer about the design, even though it was simpler than the one previously proposed, but she appreciated that it was stark. She thought the corner boards made a big difference and asked whether they were the original width. Ms. Whitney said they would be 7-1/4" instead of 5-1/2-6 inches. Ms. Ruedig thought it was fine and said they just had to figure out the columns on the porch. Ms. Whitney said she'd do the half column and shift to the right. Mr. Lombardi said he liked the design of the return better but thought the frieze was heavy and might look better with clapboard between it and the windows.

Mr. Rawling said he was still troubled by the false history of the design by making the house look like it was 50 years older than it was. Vice-Chair Gladhill confirmed that there would be half screens. He felt that the split doorway allowed the Greek Revival feeling, but he had a problem with the upgrading of the Greek Revival style because it could have been simplified to the early 20th century. Chairman Almeida said he thought it was a beautiful design and liked the exposure of the existing door. The trim package gave the house a different look, and he felt the wide frieze mantel was well done, but he thought the height of the garage doors seemed too low. Ms. Whitney said they could get 7'6" doors. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the frieze board was continuous around the house, and Ms. Whitney agreed and said it would have a 2-1/2" bed mold.

Ms. Ruedig asked if the existing corner board on the rear elevation would be continued, and Ms. Whitney said she eliminated it due to constraints with window locations. Mr. Wyckoff felt that picture framing the deck was not necessary and he asked Ms. Whitney to specify more detail on the bottom rail with the bevel on top. Ms. Whitney said the columns would be Polystone with caps and bases as well as field painted. Mr. Mayer asked why the original corner board on the rear façade was eliminated, and Ms. Whitney said it was pinched and they were trying to fit a bedroom in. Mr. Mayer said the design was beautiful but didn't preserve the historic structure. Chairman Almeida noted that the Commission was not truly a preservation organization. Ms. Whitney mentioned that they wanted to continue a cedar fence that went to the back corner so that it would line up with the 4-ft section with the gate. It would replace a chain-link fence.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE COMMISSION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The column shown (on sheet 2 of 5), next to the building wall on the front porch shall be changed to a pilaster (half column) and the windows shall be centered between the columns.*
- 2) Half screens shall be used.*
- 3) The Azek will be field painted.*
- 4) The deck shall be wood and final railing details shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.*

- 5) *The columns shall be polystone structural columns that will be field painted.*
- 6) *The fence shall be designed and installed as presented on the proposed fence plan.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project would enhance and improve property values and the design would fit in with the District and preserve its integrity.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 5 to 2, with Mr. Mayer and Ms. Ruedig voting in opposition.*

6. Petition of **Katherine Siener, owner**, for property located at **170 Gates Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 19 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Note: the following petition was taken out of sequence.

8. Petition of DiLorenzo Real Estate, LLC, owner, and Lori Corrao, applicant, for property located at 47 Bow Street, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install wall mounted condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 50 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Ms. Corrao was present and stated that she was a new business tenant on the third floor of the building. They had no air conditioner, and she wanted to install a mini-split system consisting of a compressor and an indoor unit. She showed a photo of the deck.

Chairman Almeida asked if the taller unit would be placed up against the building, and Ms. Corrao agreed. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it would be wall mounted, and Ms. Corrao said no.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE COMMISSION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that it would be a great use of innovative technology because the place would be cooler. It would not be detrimental to the Historic District because it wouldn't be seen from the ground.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

7. Petition of **Mark A. and Deborah Chag, owners**, for property located at **404 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (upgrade foundations, modify door and window openings, add side porch, rear deck, reconstruct shed, shift location of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 21 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Rawling recused himself.

The architect Mr. Dan Rawling and the owner Ms. Deborah Chag were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Rawling passed a mock-up of the structure to the Commission and also submitted a product information supplement. He went through the packet.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked whether or not there were windows and doors from the original carriage house that wouldn't be used. Mr. Rawling said the carriage house doors would either be used in the interior or donated. Vice-Chair Gladhill also requested that photos be taken of the four sides of the unique structure and given to the City and the Athenaeum, including a written description. Ms. Chag agreed to do so. Mr. Wyckoff noted that there were not many original carriage houses left, and he felt that the design retained the feel of a carriage house. He thought the transom windows over the garage looked awkward because the transom seemed high, and he asked if it had a projecting rain guard above it. Mr. Rawling said there would be a 5" projecting hood, with the top piece being an angled slope piece. Mr. Wyckoff then confirmed that there would be a sliding door cover from corner board to corner board and asked if the projecting sill on the transom windows would be cut off. Mr. Rawling said that he wanted to minimize the impact of the horizontal line and would paint it a dark color to emphasize the height. Mr. Wyckoff said he was pleased with the bracket detail that was taken from the front of the original house. Ms. Ruedig stated that the design was nice because it fit in with existing spacing, size and structure, but she was still concerned about the increase in the amount of windows and doors, which made the structure seem like more of a secondary one. She thought the façade design and street elevation were appropriate and that a good balance was reached.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the Commission received a letter dated August 12, 2015 from Historic New England and read a paragraph that referenced reviewing construction phase impacts regarding an historic fence and asking that the owners coordinate with the staff on construction sequencing methods prior to beginning the project. Ms. Chag read the letter and said she would comply.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE COMMISSION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented, with the following stipulations:

- 1) That a photographic inventory of the building's exterior be taken prior to the construction and shall be provided to the Planning Department.
- 2) That the request of Historic New England (letter dated August 12, 2015) requesting communications for construction phasing and potential impacts on the historic solid board fence) shall be met.
- 3) That a sliding garage cover (5" exposure) shall be installed over the front garage doors.

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the design of the carriage house would preserve the integrity of the District and the structure would still have the appearance of a carriage house barn. It would not be detrimental to the District and would maintain the special character of the District.

The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.

V. WORK SESSION

A. Work Session requested by **Joseph J. and Jennifer Almeida, owners**, for property located at **101-105 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (alter roof line and front façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor 118 as Lot 22 and lies within the CD4-L, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the July 15, 2015 meeting to the August 12, 2015 meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida recused himself and Vice-Chair Gladhill assumed his seat.

The owner Mr. Joe Almeida stated that he had gone through two work sessions and heard feedback regarding the added level. He went through the historical context of the neighborhood again for the benefit of the new Commissioners. He noted that he removed the change to the roofline from the application and that the storefront was significantly reduced to a very simple one that replicated others on High Street. He had a lot of old area photos showing how common it was to have storefronts and stated that the storefront would be an all-wood construction.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the storefront would project out, and Mr. Almeida said it would project out 6 feet. Mr. Mayer asked if the building had an existing commercial use, and Mr. Almeida said there was a small garden shop in the back. Mr. Rawling said he was glad to see that the form of the building recognized the building that was once there but felt that the storefront didn't need to be so historic and that he wouldn't mind seeing more storefront. Mr. Wyckoff said he was pleased that Mr. Almeida hadn't changed the form of the structure but disagreed about the storefront, thinking that it should have more of an early 19th century front. He wasn't sure about the double hung windows and said he could see a large commercial window divided into panes. Mr. Almeida said he wanted to stay away from replicating the rest

of the windows and that all the storefront photos he had found had a 2/2 pattern. Mr. Wyckoff thought the frieze looked too small and Mr. Lombardi thought the storefront could be bigger. Mr. Almeida said he had to consider the firewalls and separate tenants, but the plan was to renovate the center part of the house, which could be expanded in the future.

Ms. Ruedig said she had faith in Mr. Almeida's attention to detail and quality and thought that he could figure out a way to make it more store-worthy by expanding the glass and making it stand out more. Mr. Rawling suggested that the scale be increased. Mr. Almeida said he could bring the glass lower to the floor so that more of the inside would be seen. Mr. Rawling said the railings could be lightened because the storefront should be prominent. Mr. Almeida noted that increasing the upper bands would allow for more of an awning and that there would also be a beautiful iron sign that used to be on the house.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested not making the panels under the windows plain, and Mr. Almeida said he could do a raised panel. Mr. Rawling suggested glazed panels. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether Mr. Almeida would use the basement, and Mr. Almeida said he would not, adding that the original floor structure would remain. Mr. Lombardi asked whether the stairs could be moved over further so that people could see through the windows or whether the porch front could be in front of the windows. Mr. Almeida said he wanted to keep a 6-ft rise in the stair to make the climb easy and that there was a substantial gas meter to the left of the gate. Since he would retain the residential uses on both sides, it wouldn't be a good idea to have customers walk by the living room window. Mr. Rawling suggested reversing the entrance to the other side and reversing the stairs to make it more inviting, and Mr. Almeida said he'd look into it.

Mr. Almeida asked the Commission if he was ready for a public hearing. Vice-Chair Gladhill said they needed more detail and images and suggested a work session/public hearing.

Mr. Mayer mentioned a company that offered storm window refurbishment as an alternative to removing original windows and thought it could be a resource for property owners in the future. Mr. Cracknell asked him to email him the information, saying that it would be very helpful.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 10:00 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary