

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**June 1, 2016
to be reconvened from June 8, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members Jon Wyckoff, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternates Richard Shea and John Mayer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chairman Joseph Almeida, Dan Rawling

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
Chairman Almeida was absent and Vice Chairman Gladhill was Acting Chairman. He read Petition A of Stephen Lichtenstein and Karen Jacoby, owners, for property located at 35 Wibird Street (Public Hearings-Old Business), into the record.

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** unanimously to postpone the petition.*

Acting Chair Gladhill also noted that the 2 Bow Street petition (Old Business/Work Session/Public Hearing, Petition C) was withdrawn.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. May 4, 2016
- B. May 11, 2016

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to approve both sets of minutes.*

II. REQUEST FOR ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

- A. 40 Bridge Street – requested by Tanner Bridge Development, LLC, approval granted on June 10, 2016

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the one-year extension, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

III. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 687 Middle Street
2. Atkinson Street (Strawbery Banke Museum)
3. 591 Middle Street
4. 11 Portwalk Place
5. 796 Middle Street
6. 131 Congress Street
7. 91 Lafayette Road
8. 640 Middle Street
9. 40 Pleasant Street
10. 38 South School Street
11. 540 Marcy Street
12. 138 Maplewood Avenue

Petitions 1, 5, 7, 10 and 12 were removed for discussion.

Mr. Cracknell briefly reviewed Petitions 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11 below.

2. Atkinson Street (Strawbery Banke Museum)**3. 591 Middle Street**

The Commission requested a stipulation that the conduit match the color of the house.

4. 11 Portwalk Place

Mr. Cracknell suggested a stipulation that the alteration meet the height requirement and that the louvers be painted to match.

6. 131 Congress Street**8. 640 Middle Street**

Mr. Cracknell stated that the house restoration petition had three requested items: 1) that standing seam copper roof be allowed on the shed dormer, 2) that the mullion pattern on the rear door be modified, and 3) that the front columns be changed from wood to fiberglass.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the front door was changed, and Mr. Lombardi said he thought it was completely redone. Mr. Ruedig said she wasn't thrilled about the fiberglass columns and didn't understand why they would be more structurally sound than wood. Mr. Cracknell read the owner's email that said the columns were rotted. Ms. Ruedig said it would be fine as long as the columns were painted and far enough from the road. Mr. Wyckoff said they would look exactly the same but would have a cast base and top that wouldn't be noticeable from the road.

9. 40 Pleasant Street

11. 540 Marcy Street

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval to Administrative Approval Items 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11, with the stipulations noted on Items 3 and 4. Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

Petitions 1, 5, 7, 10 and 12 were then reviewed. (Please note that they were not addressed sequentially and are listed in the order they were discussed).

7. 91 Lafayette Road

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to install a sash replacement in the bottom two windows to match the width of the dormer egress windows, and that there were two options: 1) remove the replacement window and install a full Andersen replacement window, or 2) do a sash replacement using a JELD-WEN window. Mr. Cracknell said the applicant preferred Option 2.

Mr. Wyckoff said Option 2 made more sense because it would make the bottom window appear wider and would replicate the original window better.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval to the application, using Option 2, the JELD-WEN sash kit. Mr. Mayer seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** (6-1), with Acting Chair Gladhill voting in opposition.*

1. 687 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell gave the history of the petition, stating that the applicant originally acted on recommendations from the work session. Six months later, the contractor mistakenly submitted the wrong set of plans to the HDC for the public hearing. No one noticed it until the project was completed. The Inspection Department recommended an egress window and Hardiplank but didn't realize the changes had to go before the HDC first. Several changes occurred on the property during construction. Mr. Cracknell emphasized that it happened more than a year ago.

Mr. Wyckoff said there were a lot of errors made, including the crown molding being chopped off and leaving a hole. Ms. Ruedig asked whether the Commission needed better detail on the crown molding because they didn't have a photo of the house and didn't know whether it would mimic it. Mr. Mayer noted that the trim design around the windows was different from the photograph and asked whether that was an additional change.

Mr. Cracknell suggested that the petition be postponed to the June 8 meeting. Acting Chair Gladhill asked for photographic evidence of the house and changes. Mr. Wyckoff asked that some of the Commissioners go look at the property. Mr. Shea suggested that the owner have the architect fix the problems. Mr. Shea briefly explained the construction mistakes and said it was

disheartening that the HDC approved the petition and then the project got built totally different. Mr. Lombardi referred to the blacked-out pictures and said they didn't show the elevation of the relationship to the rest of the structure, and he recommended something with more context.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **continue** the petition to the June 8 meeting, and Mr. Lombardi seconded. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

12. 138 Maplewood Avenue

Mr. Cracknell explained that the applicant was asked to put egress windows in the building, and the Planning Department had an informal agreement with the Inspection Department to accept the smaller opening. The applicant was not aware that the Planning Department was working on formalizing an informal policy and could go to a lower number for the floor for a historical building. The structure was approved more than a year before and it had been recommended that Andersen double hung casement windows be installed into the second-floor bedrooms.

Mr. Cracknell recommended that the windows not be addressed that night until the agreement could be formalized so that casement windows were not needed. He asked the Commission to address just the sliding door elimination and the wood siding.

Mr. Mayer asked about the entry door roof. Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to replace it, so he concluded that there were three items under consideration.

Mr. Shea asked whether the Hardiplank would be painted, and Mr. Cracknell said it would.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for all the items, with the exception of the egress window request. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

10. 38 South School Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the petition was a replacement of wood siding in kind and a crown molding would be added to the fascia.

Mr. Lombardi said it was a unique house, especially with the tight clapboards. Mr. Wyckoff agreed and said the crown molding made sense and that the clapboards were a quality product.

Mr. Shea asked about the difference in the exposures, noting that he had never seen it spread across the whole façade like that, and they further discussed it.

The contractor approached the podium and said he was making the clapboards meet the bottoms and tops of the windows. Mr. Wyckoff told the contractor that he had done his due diligence by sizing the clapboards to meet the sills and the heads.

Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

5. 796 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the petition was for a ground condenser installation that he didn't think would be visible, adding that the duct work would not be visible as well. He said it would be field painted to match the siding.

The contractor Ray Miller approached the podium and stated that it wasn't duct work and that it would be painted to match.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval with the following stipulation:
1) that the conduit be field painted to match the siding.

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Stephen Lichtenstein and Karen Jacoby, owners**, for property located at **35 Wibird Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace seven windows as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 134 as Lot 38 and lies within the GRA and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 11, 2016 meeting to the June 1, 2016 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to postpone the petition.

B. Petition of **Petra A. Huda and Kimberly A. Schroeder, owners**, for property located at **280 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear mudroom, demolish existing shed) and allow new construction (construct one story rear addition, construct new garage, install fencing) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate front door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 8 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 4, 2016 meeting to the June 1, 2016 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owners Petra Huda and Kimberly Schroeder were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Huda briefly went through the plans.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the footprint was the same, and Ms. Schroeder agreed.

Mr. Shea noted that the front elevations showed the doors but no trim, and he asked whether the shingles went right to the door. Ms. Schroeder stated that they could install trim. Mr. Shea then noted that the dimensions for the trim, details around the doors and windows, and the roof pitch were missing. He asked whether the window on the side elevation would be a double hung window as shown on the specification sheet. Ms. Schroeder said the window would be what was in the cut sheet. Mr. Shea also noted that the back windows, if drawn to scale, would be 6-7 inches off the slab and would have 10 inches of wood on the top and bottom. They further discussed it, and Ms. Schroeder said she had not considered the trim.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the window Ms. Schroeder had sized would not work, and he also noted that he was against the demolition of the existing garage. He said one of the saving graces of the plan as previously drawn was the fact that the right side had barn sash, but now that it was incorrectly drawn and would be a double hung window, he recommended an Andersen awning that would replicate the barn sash look. He then asked whether the applicant would put corner boards, and Ms. Schroeder said they might weave instead. Mr. Wyckoff said the 2" overhang would be a problem and concluded that the Board didn't have enough details.

Acting Chair Gladhill stated that the Board needed complete drawings and recommended postponing the petition so that the applicants could implement the discussed ideas. Ms. Schroeder said she and Ms. Huda weren't clear on what the Board needed. Mr. Cracknell suggested that the applicants hire a contractor or architect to complete the drawings. He summarized the items that needed to be addressed.

Ms. Ruedig said she was comfortable with the general design and thought it was better than the original but that the details were necessary for the Board and the Compliance Officer to see. Mr. Lombardi noted that the original plan's back addition and garage had corner boards, and he cautioned that weaving shingles were expensive and complex.

The Commission discussed the demolition option and whether or not the applicant should hire an architect. Ms. Schroeder stated that she and Ms. Huda would hire an architect. Mr. Shea suggested that the applicants could rebuild the garage in kind, and it was further discussed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig made the motion to **continue** the petition to the June 8, 2016 meeting, and Mr. Lombardi seconded.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

C. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **2 Bow Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **2 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace wood sills and lintels with granite) as per plans on file in the Planning

Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 23 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 4, 2016 meeting to the June 1, 2016 meeting.)*

*The petition was **withdrawn** by the applicant.*

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Habanero Holdings, LLC, owner,** and **Jay McSharry, applicant,** for property located at **107 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct fence enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 51 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

2. Petition of **NBO/TDK Family Trust Fund B, owner,** for property located at **70 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install two condensing units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 31 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITIONS

Acting Chair Gladhill read both petitions into the record.

Mr. Cracknell stated that Petition #1 was for an enclosure to clear up trash and clutter.

Mr. Shea asked whether it would be up against the structure, and Mr. Cracknell said it would be on the lot line. Acting Chair Gladhill noted that there was a window at the enclosure and asked whether a latch was required for the gate. Mr. Cracknell said he didn't know.

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Petition #2, saying that it was for two condensers in the side yard with landscaping screening.

Mr. Shea suggested stipulating that the shrubs that would screen the condensers would be the size of the unit. City Council Representative Pearson suggested stipulating that the shrubs would be evergreens so they didn't lose their foliage.

At this point, the owner Tasha Kostantacos approached and said there would be evergreens that would grow to cover the unit. Mr. Cracknell noted that the evergreens should be at least 2 feet.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITIONS

George Dodge of 14 Sheafe Street stated that he was speaking in opposition to Petition #1, the trash enclosure. He noted that the sidewalk was blocked by trash containers and automobiles, and he thought the applicant needed twice as many trash containers. He said the trash overflowed and caused problems with rodents and wanted to see an enclosure that had a real solution for the neighborhood.

Mr. Cracknell said the City had ordinances that addressed solid waste and health issues and was prioritizing how to deal with them. He said the enclosure was a step in the right direction and would improve an existing situation, even though it wouldn't solve all the issues in that neighborhood. He said the application might be a trigger to have secondary impacts such as rodents, drainage, and runoff addressed.

Erica Dodge of 14 Sheafe Street said that she supported the enclosure but thought it had to be bigger.

No one else rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMISSION

Mr. Lombardi recommended that part of the motion include that the enclosure needed to accommodate the amount of trash generated in that location. Mr. Cracknell agreed, saying that the applicant's intent was to enclose the solid waste that was currently on the property. Mr. Mayer said he assumed that the enclosure would include the dumpster.

*Mr. Lombardi made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Consent Agenda Item #1, with the following stipulation:*

- 1) In order to meet the spirit and intent of the application, all outdoor solid waste shall be located within the trash enclosure.*

Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Consent Agenda Item #2, and Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

*The motions for Consent Agenda Items #1 and #2 **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

3. Petition of **HH Wholesalers, LLC, owner**, and **Jay McSharry, applicant**, for property located at **601 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar panels) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 164 as Lot 7 and lies within the Business and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

No one was there to speak to the petition, so Acting Chair Gladhill stated that it would be moved to the end of the agenda. See page 14.

NOTE: The applicant did not show up by the end of the meeting, so the following motion was made:

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **continue** the application, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

4. Petition of **Eleanor C. Bradshaw, owner**, for property located at **21 Humphreys Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove, replace and re-configure misc. windows on rear and left side elevations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 42 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Charles Hoyt representing the owner reviewed the petition.

Mr. Shea asked whether the size of the existing windows on the rear second floor would be changed, and Mr. Hoyt said they would not. Mr. Shea asked about the details for the bay window. Mr. White said the details were done and that he had to do a shop drawing next.

Ms. Ruedig said the bay window addition was lovely and asked about the choice of casement windows on the side elevation instead of double hung. Mr. Hoyt said it was to match the rear elevation and also because of a kitchen counter. Ms. Ruedig asked about the small window above the bay window, and Mr. White said it was to replace an existing window and that he would replace it with a casement. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether Andersen casements replicating the double hung window would be used and whether the double hung windows on the second floor opened wide enough for egress, and Mr. Hoyt agreed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Joan Berman of 50 School Street stated that she was present on behalf of the School Street Condominiums and that they supported the petition.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig made the motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulation:*

- 1. Detailed drawings, including the trim, casing and materials, shall be submitted for Administrative Approval prior to issuance of the Building Permit.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig said the application was very appropriate, reflected the current style of homes, and would improve surrounding property values.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

5. Petition of **SJW, LTD, owner**, and **Jacqui Harmon, applicant**, for property located at **29 Vaughan Street (also known as 29 Vaughan Mall)** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install exhaust hood and associated venting and ductwork) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 4 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Jacqui Harmon stated that she wanted a market to sell local produce in the Vaughan Mall. She reviewed her presentation.

Mr. Shea suggested stipulating that it be painted to match the abutter's brick building.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the masonry wall needed maintenance. The owner Sam Winebaum of SJW rose to speak and stated that the wall was very thick and didn't require much reinforcement.

Mr. Winebaum distributed the approval letter from the abutter Michael De la Cruz to the Board.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Shea made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That it be painted to match the brick.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea stated that the petition was compatible with other technologies in the area. He said the painted duct would match and blend in with other duct work in the back area.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

6. Petition of **Shaines and McEachern Company, Portsmouth, LLC, owner**, for property located at **25 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new main entry with ADA lift, machine room, and stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Brandon Holben on behalf of the applicant reviewed the application.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Holben whether the metal around the perimeter of the building would be painted or replaced to tie it in with the new configuration. Mr. Holben said he wasn't sure whether it would be replaced in kind or with a different material, but he knew it would be painted. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the dark glass was privacy glass, and Mr. Holben said it was low-coat glazing. Ms. Ruedig said she liked the fact that the addition was very contemporary and felt it was appropriate. She said she appreciated that the bottom of the top fascia was continuous. She suggested trying to figure out how to tie the addition in with the building materially or with color to make it cohesive.

Mr. Shea said he liked the contemporary air of the addition. He noted that the original design intent had some horizontal elements and that the building was tied down in several places with brick to the ground. He suggested that the two elements could tie into the new addition to make it feel that it was part of the original building. He also said he liked that the addition was higher.

Mr. Lombardi said was struck by the fact that the addition was flat and rose above the other one and agreed that tying it in better to the band would help. Mr. Mayer said he thought it was a clever way to activate the building. Acting Chair Gladhill said the design fit well and had some 1970s influence.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Ruedig suggested that further work be done on the addition the building to incorporate the piece a bit more.

*Mr. Lombardi made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Mr. Lombardi said the design of the addition was compatible with the building, and the 1970s design improved upon it. He said the addition was clearly an advantage to drawing clientele because it made the building accessible. He said it was compatible with its surroundings.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

7. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **St. John's Church, owner**, for property located at **100 & 105 Chapel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove and rebuild retaining wall and stairs, remove existing shed at 100 Chapel Street) and allow exterior renovations (resurface and re-stripe pavement) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 2, 60-63 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Work Session:

Doug Greene on behalf of St. John's Church was present to speak to the petition.

Acting Chair Gladhill asked Mr. Greene if he had photographic evidence of the barn. Mr. Greene said he had drawings with more details of the barn. Mr. Lombardi said he took some photographs and sent them to Mr. Cracknell.

Mr. Wyckoff said the structure was a circa 1890s one that was leaning because it was insufficiently framed on the inside and was just vertical boards on the outside. He said it was historic and had evidence of 6/6 windows and felt that it was salvageable. Acting Chair Gladhill asked how expensive it would be to renovate it. Mr. Wyckoff said he thought it would be less expensive than tearing it down and building a new one.

Mr. Greene said he had a 1904 map that showed nothing in the back of the property, but Acting Chair Gladhill said the map was not conclusive because the barn could have been moved.

Mr. Lombardi said it was a unique structure and felt that it was far too easy to get rid of old outbuildings in Portsmouth. He said the barn was neglected but felt it wasn't a reason for it to be torn down. He said he agreed with Mr. Wyckoff that it could be renovated and that it was part of the historic fabric of Portsmouth.

Mr. Greene said the barn was not well maintained and that they wanted to create a handicap spot with a ramp in that location, which was why he wanted to replace it in kind. He suggested that the local vocational/technical schools use it as a project.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the deck on the back of the house was in rough shape, and Mr. Greene said it only needed paint and that they wanted to put the ramp onto it. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether it was the main entrance to the building, and Mr. Greene agreed. Mr. Wyckoff said the barn could be saved without spending what it would cost to demolish and build a new one, and he further discussed it. Mr. Mayer agreed, noting that outbuildings in Portsmouth were disappearing. He suggested that the vocational/technical schools get involved in preserving the barn instead of demolishing it. Acting Chair Gladhill agreed and said he couldn't support the demolition because it was one of the last outbuildings in Portsmouth and there were alternatives.

Ms. Ruedig said there was a lot of missing information about what was important about the outbuilding and thought it should be saved if it had enough integrity but also knew that people would want to save it because it was one of the last, if not the last, outbuilding left in Portsmouth. Mr. Shea said the outbuilding was representative of the previous old neighborhoods that were ripped out from the area, and he thought it was worth salvaging. City Council Representative Pearson suggested that the church members could find a new home for the outbuilding outside of the church.

Mr. Wyckoff recommended bifurcating the demolition from the petition. Acting Chair Gladhill agreed but thought the barn affected the design and the ramp. It was further discussed. Mr. Greene said the barn would have fallen of its own accord eventually, and Mr. Wyckoff said it was demolition by neglect, which he thought was responsible for the demolition of a lot of buildings in Portsmouth. Mr. Greene said they would bifurcate the barn.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to move to the **public hearing**, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Acting Chair Gladhill read the petition into the record. Mr. Greene reviewed his petition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the stairs going down to the Warner House property, and Mr. Greene said they were shown on the floor plan.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **bifurcate** the shed demolition into a separate item to be addressed at the June 8, 2016 meeting and to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the improvements across the street and around the church and chapel as presented. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff said he was very pleased with the rough texture and variegated sizes of the chosen block and thought it was a nice look for a commercial available block. He said it preserved the integrity of the District and protected the historical significance of the church. He said it was consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties, and thought the compatibility of design was well integrated with the surrounding properties.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

NOTE: The applicant for the 601 Islington Street petition did not appear.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **continue** the application to the June 8, 2016 meeting, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:50 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on July 6, 2016.