

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

**SCHOOL DEPARTMENT CONFERENCE ROOM**

**6:30 p.m.**

**October 14, 2015  
reconvened from October 7, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members John Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Vincent Lombardi, Reagan Ruedig; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Alternates Richard Shea and John Mayer

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

**ALSO PRESENT:** Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

**I. DESIGN GUIDELINES PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION – Dominique Hawkins, Preservation Design Partnership, LLC**

Ms. Hawkins reviewed the final four chapters of the Design Guidelines document consisting of the introduction, the architectural styles, the site elements and streetscapes, and the commercial development and storefront section. She went over the introduction section and noted that some states might offer tax breaks for historic preservation programs and that certain programs were available in Portsmouth. Ms. Ruedig said Portsmouth was about to become a National Historic District. Councilor Kennedy asked whether houses that were registered could be included in the document, but Mr. Cracknell remarked that the majority of property owners would have to buy into it and if so, 1600 properties in the downtown area were historic, although more than half were not in the Historic District. He said there would be a reference document in the guidelines. Ms. Hawkins reviewed the items that encouraged maintenance, repairs in kind, adaptable reuse of existing buildings, and contextual new construction.

Ms. Hawkins then reviewed the architectural style chapter. Mr. Mayer asked about the image of the Goodwin House, noting that it was built in the late Federal period but was classified as a Greek Revival. He asked whether another example of Greek Revival could be used. After further discussion, Chairman Almeida said he would send photographic suggestions to Ms. Hawkins. While reviewing the site elements and streetscapes section, Ms. Hawkins asked the Commission for input into design decisions and said that the chapter focused on materials such as fences, stone walls, and walkways, and that it also denoted a preference for patios rather than decks. Ms. Hawkins noted the list of recent exemptions and said they could be reviewed at the staff level. Chairman Almeida said that he always tried to convince applicants to build a terrace of patio instead of a deck and suggested encouraging it in the document.

Ms. Hawkins reviewed the commercial development and storefront section, saying that it dealt with anything more than two-family homes, like office buildings, hotels, and condominiums, and also described what they were and encouraged new businesses to come to Portsmouth. The chapter also touched on design principles for new construction and emphasized that they had to be contextual and mitigate massing. Ms. Hawkins said the chapter addressed rooftop additions for an existing building and storefront accessibility and compatibility. She noted that she may not have addressed building equipment sufficiently and that it might have to be modified. Councilor Kennedy asked whether awnings were included in the document, and Ms. Hawkins said it was in the signage section. Lastly, Ms. Hawkins said she needed comments from the Commission regarding criteria review. Chairman Almeida said the Commission would discuss all the details that an applicant needed. Ms. Hawkins also recommended that the guidelines be kept on-line because printing was expensive.

Mr. Cracknell asked the Commission to redline their copies and submit them to him before November 4 so that he could identify conflicts that could be discussed at the November 18 meeting. He hoped to submit a final copy to the City Council by the first week of December. Ms. Hawkins asked the Commission to send her any photos that they wanted to add.

With regard to Public Hearing #1, Vice-Chair Gladhill asked that Work Session/Public Hearing #1 for Joseph and Jennifer Almeida be postponed to the end of the meeting.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **postpone** the work session/public hearing to the end of the meeting, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

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

## **II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

### **1. 46 Market Street (This item was postponed at the October 7, 2015 meeting.)**

The owner Patricia Lonargen was present to speak to the petition. Chairman Almeida stated that the Commission had not fully understood the copper awning details and that the applicant had submitted a drawing resembling what she planned to put on the front façade. Mr. Wyckoff said he was concerned that the awning was more of a structure than a regular awning. Mr. Cracknell noted that awnings didn't normally require licenses, but structural ones did. He also thought Ms. Lonargen might need a license from the City Council but wasn't sure. Ms. Lonargen said she was simply changing the material and not the structure itself. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked if the existing awning was fixed, and Ms. Lonargen agreed, saying that the image was just an illustration of a different awning. In answer to the Commissioner's questions, she stated that the awning would weather naturally, had no gutter on the end of it, and would not oxidize.

Mr. Shea noted that canopies historically looked very temporary and were made of canvas, and Ms. Lonargen's awning seemed more like a building element. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked Ms. Lonargen why she wanted copper, and Ms. Lonargen said it was a classic New England style. Ms. Ruedig noted that copper was not traditionally used on Downtown storefronts and felt that it

would introduce a new style that looked more like a New England barn or farmhouse element. She did not think it would fit into the streetscape well and that it also seemed contemporary and more appropriate for a new building. Mr. Mayer remarked that nothing in the Design Guidelines spoke to copper as a material for an awning and suggested modifying the guidelines to include it. Mr. Lombardi said he found it difficult to see the copper awning as a consistent element along the street, noting that it was large as well. He felt that it was a significant element that was really part of the building and not an attachment that could be rolled back and opened or closed.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval as presented, and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion for discussion purposes.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the awning material was historically significant and that raised copper roofs were often used and approved in Market Square. He agreed that the awning was more of an element in the storefront, and if it was presented as such, a lot of people would think it was a quality item. He said it would complement and enhance the District and felt it would be a good addition to Market Street. Mr. Rawling commended Ms. Lonargen for the use and quality of materials but noted that the Market Street corridor was very traditional and that the copper awning presented a different characteristic that significantly altered the design characteristics of the existing storefront, making it seem like a more permanent structure. Ms. Ruedig noted that copper was wonderful and traditional for roofs and thought if it were for a roof-like structure or a porch, it would be more appropriate. Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the copper awning would be in a location with no historic precedent and that he would approve it if it was on a contemporary building in a different section of town, but because he had not seen an example of it in any other historic district to set a precedent, he could not support the motion.

*The motion **failed** to pass, with a 6-1 vote with Mr. Wyckoff voting in favor of the motion.*

## 2. 65 Washington Street, Strawberry Banke

Mr. Cracknell stated that the petition was for a picket fence that the applicant wanted to replace with a 6' solid board fence and a 3' gate. Mr. Mayer said he thought the design of the existing fence had a historic connection and precedent and would be useful for the Commission to have. Mr. Shea asked what the purpose of a 6' fence would be and wondered why it would replace a nice picket fence. It was decided that the Commission required more details.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **postpone** the Administrative Approval to the November 4, 2015 meeting, and Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

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

Note: Mr. Cracknell brought up the 420 Pleasant Street petition, saying that he received more information from the owner who informed him that the roof rafters were badly burned and that the roof would possibly need to be removed. He said the applicant would address all issues at the November HDC meeting and that the chimney might also have to be removed.

### III. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Middle Street Baptist Church, owner**, for property located at **640 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, add one window on right side elevation, remove and replace existing railing, increase door size of garage, replace garage door, remove lower half of chimney, rebuild main chimney, install sliding doors) and allow demolition to an existing structure (remove rear mudroom and stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 20 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the October 7, 2015 meeting to the October 14, 2015 meeting.)*

#### SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Ms. Lisa DeStefano stated that she wanted to discuss the existing wood windows and the chimney mass. She said she had evidence that the existing windows were manufactured ones, and she passed out her consultant's letter. Chairman Almeida confirmed that it was a sash-only replacement and would be the same thickness and that the casing wouldn't be pushed out. Mr. Wyckoff noted that the first-floor chimney would be replaced with sliding glass doors, but there were no details about the slider. He asked whether the slider was plain, and Ms. DeStefano said it was and that it was about 14' wide and would include the existing chimney's mass and the two windows next to it. Mr. Wyckoff said he was torn between the Commission's usual 'no-one-can-see it' rule and what he considered to be an inappropriate replacement, and he asked Ms. DeStefano for her rationale. Ms. DeStefano stated that it was about being respectful of making appropriate updates and that sliders were more superior than they were 20 years ago because they had thicker bottom rails and the mass of a French door.

Mr. Wyckoff confirmed that the proposed chimney was an esthetic adjustment to enjoy the porch but felt that it made the chimney a curious feature with no continuing masonry. He asked Ms. DeStefano if she would retain the chimney portion that was under the porch, and Ms. DeStefano said she would. Chairman Almeida noted that the back-of-the-house rule was done case by case and was not really a rule, and he said he had never seen the back of Ms. DeStefano's house. Mr. Lombardi said that the chimney was a significant feature of the house, and he felt that it was not consistent with the preservation ethics to replace it with a structure to support a piece of it up to the roof. He said the windows could be made weather-proof and that storm windows protected the historic fabric, so he was opposed to removing that fabric with a window clad in aluminum. Mr. Rawlings told Ms. DeStefano that she had proposed a conscientious window replacement package, but the Commission had always considered the preservation aspect of preserving intact windows, and if they allowed the windows to be removed, a layer of history would be removed.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that he would approve replacing existing factory-made windows with newer ones. Mr. Shea said he preferred to see the windows repaired because they were an important element on the house, and he read from the upcoming design guidelines to prove his point. He said he felt they were being replaced for energy efficiency. Ms. DeStefano reminded the Commission that the guidelines had not been accepted, and Vice-Chair Gladhill agreed.

Chairman Almeida stated that Ms. DeStefano wanted to mimic the existing pattern of the double hung windows and appreciated that she would add another century to the building. Ms. Ruedig said the current windows would last another 100 years and the replacement windows would probably last 20-30 years, at which time their components might not be manufactured.

Ms. DeStefano noted that she also wanted copper flashing instead of aluminum flashing in the roof and that she would remove the aluminum gutters around the building, so she asked that it be part of the motion. She also requested that the motions be separated into two parts, the chimney lower removal and the window replacements. Mr. Rawling asked Ms. DeStefano if she would replace the gutters, and Ms. DeStefano said she would come back if she did.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said she was speaking as a lay person regarding windows and that the Commission's discussions over windows drove her crazy. She said it was the year 2015 and 'green', and that people should be allowed to use energy-efficient windows. She said she thought storm windows were ugly, stopped working at some point, and blocked the view of the window behind it.

### **DECISION OF COMMISSION**

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval **for the windows only**, and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion for discussion.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant would visually preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character. Innovative technology would be used as well as compatibility of design with surrounding properties because the windows would be exact replicas. Councilor Kennedy noted that the Commission had been forthcoming on windows and did not want to be inconsistent. Ms. Ruedig stated that the building still had a high degree of integrity and that it didn't matter that the windows were manufactured because they were representative examples of their time and were designed specifically for the house. She said removing the windows would take away the historic material and she did not see a good reason for replacing them.

*The motion to remove the windows **failed to pass** by a vote of 4-3 with Mr. Rawling, Mr. Lombardi, Councilor Kennedy and Ms. Ruedig voting in opposition.*

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the modification of the chimney structure, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the application would preserve the integrity of the District because it was at the back of the structure and would not be seen and would be compatible with innovative technology because the visual aspect of the chimney would still be seen. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that maintaining the visual part of the chimney was important. Councilor Kennedy said she was concerned about the integrity because it seemed strange to have a portion of the chimney as sliding glass doors. Chairman Almeida said it was at the back of the house

and that he didn't see the harm in not allowing a modification to a chimney in a dark recess, nor did he see how it would violate the guidelines or Ordinance in any way.

*The motion to modify the chimney **failed to pass** by a vote of 4-3 with Mr. Rawling, Mr. Lombardi, Councilor Kennedy and Ms. Ruedig voting in opposition.*

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

*The motion to remove the gutters **passed** unanimously, with all in favor, 7-0.*

In summary, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) *The proposal to remove and replace all of the windows was denied as presented.*
- 2) *The proposal to remove any portion of the rear chimney was denied as presented.*
- 3) *The proposal as revised and presented at the October 14, 2015 meeting to remove the gutters from the structure and use copper flashing in place of aluminum flashing on the roof was approved.*

#### **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)**

1. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Joseph J. and Jennifer Almeida, owners**, for property located at **103/105 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (modify front elevation by adding a storefront, with access stairs and landing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 22 and lies within the CD4-L, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

*Note: This was postponed until the end of the meeting. See page 9.*

2. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **126 State Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Brian David Johnson, applicant**, for property located at **126 State Street, Unit 8**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (changes to the location of the piping and vent termination cap) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 57 and lies within the CD4, CD4-L, and Historic Districts.

#### **WORK SESSION**

Councilor Kennedy recused herself from the work session.

The owner Mr. Brian Johnson stated that when they installed the vent for the gas fireplace, they found that they needed an external line to be in code. He said that he routed it so that it would not be seen from the street and that it would match the house color.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the gas meter had always been outside, and Mr. Johnson said it was in the basement. Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Johnson to expand on the two handwritten options that he had submitted, which he did. Chairman Almeida noted that iron rusted and asked Mr. Johnson to prepaint it before installing it. Mr. Shea asked whether the person on the floor below could tap the Mr. Johnson's line, and Mr. Johnson said he could not because of the way the buildings were configured. Mr. Shea asked whether the line could be run off the back side of the property, and Mr. Johnson said it would be difficult due to the air conditioning units. Mr. Shea asked about Option 1 and whether Mr. Johnson would cross the soffit and get into the fireplace, and Mr. Johnson agreed. Mr. Mayer asked if there were chases in the house. Mr. Johnson replied that there was no option to find a run inside the building. Mr. Lombardi said he was concerned that the black iron would rust and asked whether there were newer materials for gas piping, but Mr. Johnson said the inspector allowed only a certain type.

Chairman Almeida asked for public comment, but no one rose to speak.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **move into the public hearing**, and Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

#### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant did not present any additional information regarding the application.

#### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

#### **DECISION OF COMMISSION**

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

- 1) That Option 1 shall be used and the pipe shall be properly primed and painted prior to installation.*

*Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the project was compatible with innovative technology.

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

**V. WORK SESSION**

A. Work Session requested by **Brick Act, LLC, owner**, for property located at **102 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a shed dormer addition and one and two story additions at rear of building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 52-1 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **postpone** Work Session A to the November meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

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

B. Work Session requested by **Kimberley A Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, Kimberley A. and James C. Lucy, trustees and James C. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, James C. and Kimberley A. Lucy, trustees**, for properties located at **127 and 137 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two new buildings at rear of buildings) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plans 118 as Lot 20 and 21 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **postpone** Work Session B to the November meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

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

C. Work Session requested by **Lori A. Sarsfield, owner**, for property located at **28 Dennett Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (raise roof structure by one foot) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, trim, details, doors, windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 140 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

The designer Mr. Bob Cook and the owner Ms. Lori Sarsfield were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Cook stated the saltbox portion of the original house was changed and that an issue was the back portion where the bathrooms at each end of the building were difficult to get into. They wanted to raise a portion of the house to make a powder room and a wash area. They also wanted to install three French doors on the back deck, replace a few windows and skylights in kind, replace rotting clapboards and restore the front door.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked whether the clapboards were original, and Mr. Cook replied that there were mixed portions. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked if the windows were original, and Mr. Cook said they were 20<sup>th</sup> century replacements. Councilor Kennedy asked what Mr. Cook was



replacing the trim with and what the deck material was, and Mr. Cook said he would use AZEK for the trim and wood for the deck. Ms. Ruedig asked about the rain screen. Mr. Cook said it was an element in the clapboards for a small airspace for moisture. Ms. Ruedig said it made her nervous to introduce different ways of hanging things on historic buildings and that she preferred to see real wood on the façade of the house because it was right up on the sidewalk. She asked whether there would be AZEK on the back of the house, and Mr. Cook agreed. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the front of the house would have only repairs, and Mr. Cook said it would. Mr. Wyckoff also brought up the issue of the corner board and asked whether the new roof would extend up higher than the original roof. Chairman Almeida asked why the Commission would want to leave remnants of the corner board; he felt it was a chance to get rid of it. Mr. Rawling felt that the AZEK was not appropriate due to the age of the house. He asked Mr. Cook to clarify what windows would be replaced. Mr. Cook said he would let him know. Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Cook to bring back details of the proposed window and not just a cut from the manufacturer. He said a sash-only replacement would be ideal. Mr. Shea asked whether Mr. Cook would move the floor up when he moved the roof up, and Mr. Cook said he would not. Ms. Ruedig asked whether there were other existing photos of the house, and Mr. Cook said he would do more research at the Athenaeum. Chairman Almeida asked whether the foundation was continuous all the way across, and Mr. Cook said it was continuous up to the seam area.

There was no public comment.

*The Commission voted to **continue** review of the application at the November meeting.*

## **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)**

1. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Joseph J. and Jennifer Almeida, owners**, for property located at **103/105 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (modify front elevation by adding a storefront, with access stairs and landing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 22 and lies within the CD4-L, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself from the vote and Vice-Chair Gladhill assumed his position.

### **WORK SESSION**

The applicant Mr. Joseph Almeida distributed additional photographs and referred to the historical context of High Street and the immediate area, noting that it was common to have small retail spaces below a residence. He showed a photo of a store that used to be across the street from his house that had an awning with a picture window, and he added that a lot of photos at the library showed many similar structures with retail spaces below. He said his house was complete surrounded by retail spaces and that he would not remove any historical material from it. Mr. Almeida referenced previous comments made by the Commissioners, one of which was to increase the glass size, and he said he did it as much as possible. As far as the comment about expanding the amount of storefront across the building to the right, Mr. Almeida said it was

designed to do so but the current residence didn't allow for it. He noted that there were slight differences in pages 1 and 2 and asked the Commission to consider page 2 for their decisions, saying that the two windows to the left of the door were similar to the ones that were across the street, adding that they were all wood and double hung. He also said that he had met another request to have the storefront taller and had placed an awning on it. He noted that the access steps were a complete replication. He also had documentation on the door and windows.

Councilor Kennedy noted that one door had partial glass and remarked that Mr. Lombardi had asked for more glass. Mr. Wyckoff said he had trouble with the storefront because there were no details provided. He confirmed that the pilasters were not columns and asked Mr. Almeida what he would do with the molding and the top board. He asked how far the roof area would project and also asked about the panels on the right side of the door. He found the 1'8" pilaster wide and awkward. Mr. Rawling stated that he was in support of the concept in general but agreed that there were missing details. He thought the storefront elevation's height was nicely proportioned with the existing building. He commented on the extra wide pilasters, asking whether the windows could be shifted to the left, but Mr. Almeida said they couldn't because of the wall behind it. Mr. Rawling said the treatment of the panels on the right side of the door seemed awkward and asked whether the window framing on the left side could be matched, but Mr. Almeida said it was a drafting issue and that they were signage panels. Mr. Rawling concluded that there were too many things that needed more organization. Mr. Shea said that he liked the design concept and the different proportions, and his only issue was that he felt the panel on the right side of the door should be the same as the one under the windows. The door surround was also discussed. Ms. Ruedig said she had no problem with the 8'5/8" but only needed to know how far it would project out. Councilor Kennedy asked about the flashing, and Mr. Almeida said he wanted to use traditional lead. The Commission also discussed the profile issue. Councilor Kennedy said that the Commission needed more details, and Mr. Rawling agreed, saying that he didn't feel they had drawings that represented something that could actually be constructed or a real developed plan.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked the Commissioners about design issues. Mr. Rawling said they didn't know what the crown moldings at the top were, as well as the profiles and canopy projections. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the entablature over the door would be flashing or crown molding, and it was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said she thought the design was fine because it was a traditional one and not one that copied. She thought the door surrounds were beautiful but didn't think the high profiles would be appropriate. Mr. Mayer said he appreciated that Mr. Almeida was not altering the original fabric and agreed that it was an acceptable design but also agreed with Mr. Rawling about getting the trim details.

Mr. Almeida stated that he would write a list of actual materials and address the lead flashing, change the 1'8" panel on the left, center a 12" pilaster on top of it to match the others, put the same crown on all four of them, remove the detail from the door surround, call out the profile of the 1" trim at the top, drop the top panel down on the right of the door surround, call out any moldings, address the door mantel and the large mantel for the future awning and bring a cut sheet of the light fixtures. He asked if there was an issue with replicating the details of the stairs, and Mr. Rawling said it seemed to be similar to the building around the corner from his.

*The Commission voted to **continue** review of the application at the November meeting.*

## **VII. HDC 2016 strategic plan discussion**

Mr. Cracknell told the Commission that they received \$150,000 from the City Council to do the design review models and tools but that it wasn't formalized in the matrix. He said that the four general categories from 2013 required more work and asked the Commission to review them for discussion at the November 18 meeting. Mr. Cracknell discussed the Exemption Form and said they had doubled exempt activities from 12 to 23 as well as tripled Administrative Approvals from 14 to 45. The Consent Agenda items had also shortened the meetings. He discussed the models and textures of the 'cubes' and said they were applying for a Disaster Mitigation Grant due to sea levels rising. He added that the 3D Model was expanded in a textured fashion. He noted that the Disclosure Form had not moved forward because it had to go through the Concord Legislative Delegates for approval. Lastly, he asked the Commissioners him know if they had any ideas for 2016.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 10:20 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on November 4, 2015.