

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

June 8, 2016
reconvened from June 1, 2016

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 687 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell gave a brief synopsis of the history of the petition and noted that there were three design issues raised by the Commission that consisted of the pigeon shelf on the garage, the crown molding termination and gutter, and the three windows on the back of the garage.

Mr. Wyckoff said he had visited the site earlier and noted some changes that didn't reflect what the Commission had asked for, but he thought that, because of the back-of-the-house rule, the details could work themselves out if the Commission approved a K-style gutter on the house.

Chairman Almeida agreed that the square picture frame on the window would necessitate modifying the trim. Mr. Rawling also agreed that sills were needed to restore proper detail. Mr. Cracknell suggested two stipulations, as referred to in the motion.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **approve** the changes and **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) a K-style gutter shall be used, and*
- 2) an AZEK sill dimension to the existing sills on the front of the house shall replace the bottom.*

*City Council Representative Pearson seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

2. 131 Congress Street
3. 138 Maplewood Avenue
4. 18 Court Street
5. 76 Congress Street

The rest of the Administrative Approval petitions were briefly discussed in random order.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Administrative Approval Items #2, 3, 4, and 5. Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

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

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. 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 June 1, 2016 meeting to the June 8, 2016 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owners Petra Huda and Kimberly Schroeder were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Schroeder said they had a new proposal and had submitted the architectural plans. Chairman Almeida noted a picture frame window with no sills and said it would need a stipulation. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked why the applicant made the change to awning-style windows. Ms. Schroeder said it was because the Commission previously suggested that it would be more appropriate.

Mr. Rawling recommended changing the awning windows to a 9-light window to be compatible with the building's design. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked the applicants whether they would accept a stipulation stating that, because of the demolition, the interior and exterior would be documented with photos and submitted to the City before final approval. Ms. Schroeder agreed.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the garage doors were prefinished. Ms. Schroeder said they were painted to match the house. Chairman Almeida noted that the neighboring garage had an appropriate wood door and that the applicants' door appeared to have muntins, with white overlay, which he didn't think was as appropriate as the one next door, especially in such a prominent location. He also noted that the drawing showed 4-light windows and the photo showed 8-light windows. He said the designs on the drawings were okay and could come back as an administrative approval. The issue was further discussed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) A sill shall be used for all windows;*
- 2) A 9-light window shall be used in the west elevation;*
- 3) The screens shall be internal;*
- 4) The existing garage shall be documented with photographs (both exterior and interior) and submitted to the Planning Department and the Portsmouth Advocates; and*
- 5) The garage door detail shall match the detail shown on the elevation drawing and shall be field painted, include exterior muntins, and shall be submitted for Administrative Approval prior to installation.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said he could not approve the application because it was a historic structure that was once a barn. He said it went against the purpose and intent of the Ordinance because tearing down an historic structure did not preserve the integrity of the District. Demolishing the structure would also not promote the education of the District because it would not be able to show an older structure and its uses from its past.

Ms. Ruedig said she respected Vice-Chair Gladhill's comments about the demolition and would love to retain any historic structure in Portsmouth, but she knew they could not all be saved and felt that the garage was not particularly historically significant. She said the design that replaced it preserved the integrity of the District and was consistent with the defining character of surrounding properties, and it was also compatible with the house and the neighborhood.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 4-3, with Vice-Chair Gladhill, Mr. Wyckoff, and Mr. Lombardi voting in opposition.*

B. 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. *(This item was postponed at the June 1, 2016 meeting to the June 8, 2016 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Jay McSharry reviewed the building's history and said it was a good opportunity to apply solar panels. He said they were black to blend in with the roof. He introduced Karen Cannizzaro of ReVision Energy, who showed and described a sample of the 40"x65" panel.

In response to Mr. Wyckoff's questions, Ms. Cannizzaro said the racking was also black and that the panel would sit on the pitch of the existing roof. Mr. Rawling noted that the silver parts seemed prominent in the illustration and asked whether there were other options. Ms.

Cannizzaro replied that the panel stood out more than what was seen in the photo. Ms. Ruedig asked about the background of the building. Mr. Cracknell said it was a 1960's building.

Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that solar energy was relatively new for the District but was increasing, and he referred to the HDC guidelines, which included a statement about property owners being encouraged to hide solar panels so they wouldn't be visible. He said that a large array of solar panels that were highly visible on a major thoroughfare went against the guidelines and the Ordinance. Mr. McSharry noted that the business four doors down had solar panels. Vice-Chair Gladhill said the business was outside of the District.

Mr. Shea stated that the building wasn't necessarily historic because of its age, and he didn't feel that the panels detracted from it. He also noted that panels could be removed. Mr. Rawling said the panels were not a high pitch and that the back building was set back quite a distance from the road, so the panels would not stand out. He felt that the panels would be a much lower impact to the District than power poles or transformers.

Ms. Ruedig asked why the panels were not put across the pitch of the back building's roof. Ms. Cannizzaro said it was the engineer's design and had to do with the wiring. It was further discussed. City Council Representative Pearson said she felt the panels added to the unique character of that part of the District, which she felt was the 'Innovation District'. Mr. Mayer agreed, but said if the building was historic, he would feel differently.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said he wasn't against solar energy and felt that the Commission should come up with a policy for solar panels in the District. Mr. Lombardi said the Commission did a lot of things case-by-case and that he didn't have a problem with it.

Chairman Almeida noted Mr. McSharry was the first person to get approval for solar panels on top of his restaurant Jumpin' Jay's and felt it was an ideal location for solar panels in the District. He said that, if installed properly, solar panels were something that should be used. Mr. Wyckoff said he supported all solar panels if they were not on significantly historic buildings.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That the solar panels match the same pitch (slope) as the existing roof.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff said the application enhanced the surrounding property values and maintained the special character of the District because the west end was an innovative district. He said it was compatible with innovative technologies.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Vice-Chair Gladhill voting in opposition.*

C. (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. *(This item was postponed at the June 1, 2016 meeting to the June 8, 2016 meeting.)*

The applicant was not present, so Chairman Almeida postponed the petition to the end of the meeting. See page 9.

III. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by the **City of Portsmouth, owner**, and **Friends of the Music Hall, applicant**, for **City right-of-way located on Chestnut Street between Congress and Porter Streets**, wherein permission was requested to allow street improvements within the right-of-way (safety and aesthetic improvements including the installation of a wayfinding arch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 7 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

City Council Representative Pearson recused herself from the work session.

Mr. Cracknell said that the application was unusual because the changes were in the City's right-of-way and the City Council recommended that the applicant submit an application to the HDC for a work session only, with no public hearing. He said the applicant was only seeking a non-binding advisory recommendation to bring to the City Council for their right-of-way changes.

Ben Auger, trustee of the Music Hall and Chairman of the Facilities Committee, was present to speak to the petition. He introduced the Music Hall Executive Director Patricia Lynch and the architect Terence Parker. Mr. Auger said they were in the review process and had met with the City Council, Artspeak, Trees and Greenery, and Traffic and Safety. He showed context photos and photos of the overhead lines and utility pole on Chestnut Street. He said the pole prevented large vehicles from making a left-hand turn, and that eliminating it would allow safer access and also get rid of the unsightly lines. He noted that school buses had to go down Porter Street to drop the kids off. He discussed the proposed pedestrian connector extending to the African Burying Ground Memorial Park, which he said would be a separate project. He said they would connect the Burying Ground to the Northern Tier.

Mr. Auger said the project would make Chestnut Street pedestrian-friendly and improve access for emergency vehicles and school buses. It would create visibility to historic archways and doorways and would tie into the Master Plan for increasing the number of community gathering places. He noted that the NH Preservation Office and the abutters were enthusiastic about the project. Mr. Auger reviewed the floor plan and discussed the arch, saying it would create a focal point and make two of the City's historic treasures more available to the public.

Mr. Shea asked whether the road would be open to any vehicle and, if so, whether there would be issues with people forgetting that cars could go up Chestnut Street because it was so pedestrian friendly. Mr. Auger said it would be open to any vehicle and that he had discussed the issue with Public Works. Mr. Shea suggested that it might be better if it was restricted access instead of open to all vehicles. Ms. Ruedig asked about raising an area of the crosswalk, and Mr. Auger said the issue had been brought up. Mr. Wyckoff said he was shocked that children going to the Music Hall had to go up Porter Street because it was the back end of a lot of buildings. He thought making the street capable of having a bus turn was a great thing.

Mr. Rawling said the project was exciting but didn't care for the placement of the arch because it interfered with the sidewalk, and he suggested that it be moved toward the street edge. Mr. Parker said the City wanted it to be eight feet from the sides of the corresponding buildings to work better with the vehicular patterns. Mr. Rawling further discussed the scroll design on the arch, noting that it detracted from the sources of its inspiration. Ms. Ruedig said she agreed with several of Mr. Rawling's comments and thought that the streetscaping and landscaping would greatly improve the street. She said her major concern with the arch was its scale and placement and thought it would detract from the two historic buildings.

Mr. Lombardi said he was excited about the streetscape and would also like to see a speed table. He agreed with Ms. Ruedig that the arch seemed intrusive on a historic structure and thought it would be better to be placed at the opening of the Vaughan Mall because it would be an entranceway to the City. He said there was more space on the Vaughan Mall and the arch wouldn't present the kind of problem it did against historic buildings. He also thought it would activate the Vaughan Mall. Mr. Mayer said he agreed with the streetscape comments but was troubled by the archway because it seemed to have superficial elements. He thought the arch would be more appropriate at the Vaughan Mall or the African Burying Ground and felt that the Music Hall needed something more understated to reflect contemporary issues. Vice-Chair Gladhill suggested placing the arch over Congress Street, the center of the Downtown area at Market Square. Chairman Almeida thought the arch was wonderful but that the bases seemed high and could be brought down. Mr. Wyckoff said the bases would be used as signage and didn't think they were too big. Mr. Rawling said he supported the idea of using arches for getting attention to the Vaughan Mall area.

Mr. Rawling asked what the material for the benches was, and Mr. Parker said they would be granite. Mr. Lombardi asked whether there was a right-of-way across the property to the African Burying Ground, and Mr. Parker said there was a paper street and that the City was exploring the connector. Mr. Rawling also suggested that the bases be round.

Public Comment

Michael LaCroix (no address given) asked whether the surface was pressed compound stone. Mr. Parker said it was a smooth surface with stone chips. He asked whether the arch would be lit and was told that it would. He cautioned about birds defecating on the arch.

Brian Murphy said he was a Portsmouth resident and architect and thought it was a fantastic project that would build community. He thought the design could look more historic. No one else rose to speak, and the public comment session was closed.

Mr. Auger said the project team would be back before the Commission at a later date.

IV. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

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 property located at **127 & 137 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to existing structures (construct new building at rear of 137 High Street, construct roof deck at rear of 127 High Street, both with associated parking and landscaping) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 20 and 21 and lies within the CD 4, Historic and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the May 11, 2016 meeting to the June 8, 2016 meeting.)*

City Council Representative Pearson resumed her seat. Chairman Almeida recused himself from the petition, and Vice-Chair Gladhill facilitated the work session.

The owner Jim Lucy was present to speak to the petition and introduced Galen Doscher and Kevin Roy of Kevin Roy Builders. He reviewed his changes, which included simplifying the railings, keeping the chimney in place, keeping the existing foundation and wall, and structurally reinforcing the second story by rebuilding it with a similar gable view.

Mr. Doscher presented different view of the project. Mr. Lombardi asked whether the height would be raised, and Mr. Lucy said it would not. Mr. Wyckoff pointed out a horizontal mud sill-type element above the garage doors and asked about the horizontal element of the other sections, suggesting that it would be better without it. Mr. Shea said the horizontal mud sill made the piece feel a lot more separate from the garage. He suggested bringing the corner board down and recessing the garage doors more. It was further discussed. Mr. Wyckoff said the panel under the triple windows was awkward. He suggested getting a historic-looking window sill and clapboarding the bay to simplify the front of the building.

Mr. Rawling said the detailing on the bays could be improved because it felt flat, and they further discussed it. Mr. Mayer suggested doing more to preserve the other two buildings on the property and asked whether the chimney would be replaced. Mr. Doscher said the chimneys were removed circa 1950 and that they would do some preservation with the front structure. The extended rakes, boxed-out bay, and sliding glass doors were discussed.

Ms. Ruedig asked about replacing windows with casing windows on the second floor on the front façade and the side elevation. Mr. Doscher said they were very small windows, and it was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said she preferred to keep egress windows off the street and she thought the front door looked like a Craftsman style. Mr. Wyckoff said the brackets on the hip roof seemed to be very thin. Mr. Lucy said they would look into it.

Mr. Rawling discussed the window trim elements, noting that the gable end frieze board was heavy. Mr. Lucy said they would refine it. Mr. Rawling also said he preferred 6/6 windows instead of 9/9 ones. He recommended bringing the gables down to the ground.

Mr. Cracknell asked whether the siding was made of HardiPlank and Azek trim, and Mr. Doscher said it was. Ms. Ruedig asked about the little lights and was told they were landscape lights. The type of shakes used was discussed. Mr. Lombardi asked about the mechanical units and Mr. Doscher said they would be placed in the back of the new building.

Public Comment

Michael Lacroix of 145 High Street said he was a direct abutter and was concerned about the project's mass and scale. He said he walked around the neighborhood and looked at all the subordinate buildings, and he gave several examples of percentages of the subordinate structures to their main homes. He concluded that Mr. Lucy's subordinate structure had the highest percentage in the neighborhood. He also said the new style of the red house was not historic.

Edie Lacroix of 145 High Street said she and her husband faced the back of the structure, which they compared to a wall, and asked the Commission to consider the awful view.

Mr. Cracknell recommended that Mr. Lucy put the photos of his structures into the 3D Model.

No one else rose to speak, and the public comment session was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was decided that the application would be **continued** to a work session/public hearing at a future meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use, 4 to 5 ½ story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 11, 2016 meeting to the June 8, 2016 meeting.)*

Chair Almeida resumed his seat.

The designer Jennifer Ramsey on behalf of the applicant said she met with the Planning Department and would pursue a variance to either push the half-story to the street edge or to get a 4-story building. Ms. Ramsey said it was a shorter building but that the change in height was addressed to lessen the look of the roof. They were also looking at different materials. She said they were considering more modern wood on parts of the structure to make it warmer.

Mr. Mayer said he thought the top corner had a different feel from the other elevations and suggested a treatment to make it feel more horizontal. He also suggested making the top floor step back more. Ms. Ruedig suggested that the curve corner be more vertical to make the building appear taller and agreed with setting back the top floor, as did Mr. Lombardi. Vice-Chair Gladhill said the façade was so prominent that he wanted to see something project against the roof and catch his eye, like an artistic feature.

Mr. Shea said he liked the lower building but wasn't comfortable with contemporary construction in that neighborhood and preferred seeing traditional material. He asked what the first floor contained, and Ms. Ramsey said it would be a restaurant and commercial retail. Mr. Shea suggested making the storefronts more imaginative, but thought the scale was good.

Chairman Almeida said he found the treatment of the larger windows interesting and thought there was an opportunity for some traditional materials to be used with the contemporary expression opening. Mr. Rawling said he liked the way that some of the original elements were kept and that the building had a cleaner top.

City Council Representative Pearson noted that there was a 5-story parking garage across the street and asked how tall the buildings were allowed to be in that area. Mr. Cracknell said they were in the 50-60 foot range and said there was no discernible difference between a 45-ft building and a 65-ft building, but that it was the corner treatment that everyone was trying to emphasize, which he thought would be taller than 45 feet. He suggested that the penthouse be brought out to the edge, or that there be a four-story building that exceeded 50% and came out to the edge, or that a skyline element be placed on the corner and go up another 10 feet.

Mr. Rawling said that parts of the building were lower than allowed and could be help calculate the volume of the building within the allowable limits and redistribute part of it. Mr. Cracknell said Ms. Ramsey would not get a variance doing that. Chairman Almeida noted that the Commission was recognizing the consequences of losing variations in height. Mr. Wyckoff said he preferred seeing a sloped roof so the height was calculated from its midpoint. Ms. Ruedig said she liked the direction the project was taking and thought it accomplished the difficult goal of combining the contemporary and traditional. The Commission further discussed the corner piece. Mr. Mayer suggested some sort of digital clock or art piece.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was decided to **continue** the work session to the July meeting.*

Note: The applicant for the following petition that was delayed from the beginning of the meeting was present to speak to the petition.

C. (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. *(This item was postponed at the June 1, 2016 meeting to the June 8, 2016 meeting.)*

WORK SESSION

Doug Greene on behalf of St. John's Church was present to speak to the petition. He said a significant amount of site work had to be done under the barn and up to the building to level it out. He proposed demolishing the barn to do the site work and then rebuilding the barn in kind.

Ms. Ruedig clarified that Mr. Greene was proposing to copy the barn. Mr. Greene said the barn was deteriorated. Ms. Ruedig said Mr. Greene might as well build something new if he wasn't going to save the entire structure because she didn't see the good in just replicating something that was there for the simple reason that it was there. Chairman Almeida asked whether the new barn would exceed Mr. Greene's needs. Mr. Greene agreed, saying that the church didn't need a barn that size. Mr. Mayer noted that if Mr. Greene rebuilt in kind, the City Ordinance would not allow windows on the property line.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the barn had to be on a concrete slab. Mr. Greene said they wanted a gravel floor. Mr. Wyckoff said it wouldn't be complicated to stabilize the building, and he discussed how it could be lifted up with concrete piers. He said the siding could be repaired and new windows installed, and it would be cheaper than tearing it down and building a new one. He emphasized that Mr. Greene had an existing structure that the Commission wanted to see preserved. Mr. Greene reiterated the fact that site work had to be done and that it would be convenient and less expensive to level the site.

Chairman Almeida said he wasn't sure how successful raising the barn could be because the structure was very distressed. If it were rebuilt in kind, with some materials preserved, he thought it would be a significant repair in the same location with the same design. City Council Representative Pearson noted that the church had limited resources in energy and time. Mr. Lombardi said it was too easy to lose outbuildings downtown and agreed with Mr. Wyckoff said the structure could be easily righted. The Commission further discussed it. Ms. Ruedig said she didn't feel that the structure had to be saved just because it was the 'last outbuilding'. She said it wasn't a very old structure and wasn't built to last, and it was hard to see all the time and energy put into saving it because it wasn't a very significant building.

Mr. Greene said the building was gifted from a parishioner and the structure was not part of their project. Vice-Chair Gladhill said the structure should be preserved because it was a piece of the community fabric and historic architecture.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the structure could be restored without worrying about the windows, and Mr. Cracknell said it could. Mr. Greene said it would be logistically and financially more of a burden. The Commission further discussed it. Mr. Cracknell said there was a difference between an accessory and a main building and felt that there must be an easier process for an accessory building. Chairman Almeida said he wanted to ensure that the Commission didn't want to restore the building simply because it was the 'last outbuilding' in Portsmouth.

Mr. Greene decided to go into the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Chairman Almeida read the petition into the record. Mr. Greene briefly reviewed his application and stated that he wanted to keep the barn and rebuild it in place. Mr. Wyckoff recommended single pane 6/6 windows.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That the existing accessory building shall be preserved and restored as amended and presented at the meeting;*
- 2) That the replacement windows shall be 6/6 single-pane, double-hung, all wood windows.*

Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.

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

D. Work Session requested by **Michael De la Cruz, owner**, for property located at **75 Congress Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild historic parapets, add series of flat roofed dormers, add series of roof walkways and decks, add series of windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 5 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 11, 2016 meeting to the June 8, 2016 meeting.)*

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to postpone the application to the July 2016 meeting.

E. Work Session requested by **355 Pleasant Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **355 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct a two unit dwelling) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 64 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 11, 2016 meeting to the June 8, 2016 meeting.)*

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to postpone the application to the July 2016 meeting.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Cracknell said the Commission should make time at the July meeting to review the draft Egress Window Policy, the proposed zoning amendments, the working list of window restoration

contractors, the Historic District Disclaimer Form, and the HDR project review request concerning State permits. Mr. Cracknell recommended that the presentation by DHR concerning the Downtown Historic District nomination be attended by the Commissioners on July 22. He said that he and Chairman Almeida were preparing a new Power Point presentation on the design guidelines and zoning amendments for the June 20 City Council meeting

Chairman Almeida said he asked Mr. Shea to help him and Mr. Wyckoff with the window modification worksheet that would be handed to people going to the Planning Department so that they would know what information the Commission needed.

Mr. Cracknell also noted that other items to be added to the list for discussion were the demolition delay ordinance, the appeals process for the BOA, the 3D Model, and the design guidelines infill and survey.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:00 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.