

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**August 10, 2016  
reconvened from August 3, 2016**

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

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Chairman Joseph Almeida, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi

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

.....  
Chairman Almeida was excused for the evening, and Vice-Chair Gladhill assumed his seat.

Vice-Chair Gladhill reminded the Commission that the petitions for 10 Humphreys Court and 75 Congress Street were postponed to the September 7 meeting. He noted that the applicant for the 46-64 Maplewood Avenue petition requested that his petition be postponed.

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the 46-64 Maplewood Avenue petition to the September meeting.*

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

1. 29 Vaughan Street
2. 2 Bow Street
3. 5 Portwalk Place
4. 379 New Castle Avenue

Mr. Cracknell read Petitions 1 and 3 into the record and briefly discussed each one. He noted that Petition #4 for 379 New Castle Avenue was withdrawn by the applicant.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for Petitions 1 and 3, and Mr. Shea seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Petition 2, 2 Bow Street.

The owner Keith Frizzell was present to speak to the petition and said he wanted to address only the lintel sill and brick materials and would return for other issues. Mr. Frizzell passed out some photos to the Commission and discussed a third-floor window area where the bricks were

beginning to come out. He said he pulled the rotted wood out and discovered that the outside layer of brick was not attached to the inside. Mr. Frizzell said the Chief Building Inspector and the project engineer recommended that the brick be torn down to just above the first floor where the granite stopped and also recommended that no wood go back into those lintels. He also noted that he had submitted a letter to the Commission regarding it, which Mr. Cracknell acknowledged. Mr. Frizzell passed around samples of the existing brick as well as two types of brick that were generally approved for downtown buildings.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the mason had considered re-using the old brick. Mr. Frizzell said the issue was the large loss of a number of bricks and added that the older bricks allowed water into them because they were porous, which would also allow water into the bricks behind them. He said he wanted to go with a newer brick because it would tie all the bricks together. Mr. Wyckoff asked how the mason would attach the bricks to the inner layers. Mr. Frizzell said he didn't know, but noted that they would have to tear it down and look behind it. He discussed it further. Mr. Wyckoff said a lot of it had yet to be determined and felt that the Commission would be giving blanket approval for the engineering company to come up with a plan to construct the building. He said if the outside layers were removed and the two inside layers were compromised, the lintels would be compromised as well and could result in losing the upstairs floor. However, he said he was willing to go with whatever the structural engineer suggested and felt that the only decision the Commission should make was the color of the brick.

Mr. Mayer agreed. He said the two new brick samples looked so regular that they would stand out, and he asked for another option that would represent the softer shape of an older masonry-style brick. Mr. Frizzell said it was in transition.

Mr. Rawling said he felt that the new bricks would not be appropriate because they were extruded and would look too harsh and new. He said he could support the change to granite lintels as long as they matched the exact size, profile and detailing of the wood. He thought that granite was in keeping with the building style and hoped Mr. Frizzell would match the colors below. Mr. Shea said he was convinced of the structural issues but was concerned about taking the whole façade down because it was an important corner. He said the brick choice would be important, as would the mortar color and thickness. He asked whether a panel could be made that would be as close to what would be put in. He also noted that if the granite was allowed, he'd want to ensure that it was the right color, cut and finish. Mr. Shea asked what would happen to the windows. Mr. Frizzell said it was too soon to tell. Mr. Shea gave the new building next to the Athenaeum as an example of a façade that was replaced and looked like the original building. Mr. Wyckoff agreed with Mr. Shea and urged Mr. Frizzell to research what type of brick was on the original building. Mr. Rawling noted that the building was significant enough that, even if something happened to the existing windows, the new windows should be reproduction ones and not a contemporary design.

Acting Chair Gladhill said he agreed with Mr. Shea that he didn't want the building to look brand new. He was also concerned about the granite because the replacement would look new, and he recommended that the applicant find a similar color.

Mr. Frizzell asked the Commission to forward information on brick options to him.

Mr. Cracknell recommended that the petition be continued to the September 7 meeting so that Mr. Frizzell could obtain the right brick as well as the granite specifications.

The Commission then discussed whether the applicant could move forward with the construction, while keeping in mind that the bricks were yet to be approved. Mr. Cracknell said it was difficult to authorize anything because the Commission didn't know about the granite or brick. Mr. Frizzell said the construction wouldn't start until mid-to-late autumn and didn't think the September meeting would slow it down.

Mr. Shea recommended that Mr. Frizzell address what he planned to do with the windows at the September meeting. Mr. Wyckoff said he would prefer to see repetition of the third-story windows on the second story, 6/6 windows. Mr. Mayer and Mr. Shea agreed.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **continue** the petition to the September 7 meeting so that additional information could be submitted. Mr. Rawling seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

## II. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **Jason Lander and Justus C. Bergweger, Jr., owners**, for property located at **34-36 Highland Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 3, 2016 meeting to the August 10, 2016 meeting.)*

No one was there to speak to the petition. Acting Chair Gladhill noted that some of the Commissioners had done a site walk and he asked them to recap what they observed.

Mr. Mayer said it appeared that the original sash was still in place in the front façade and the two sides, and that the aluminum storm system was in different degrees of repair. He said the sash seemed to be original and restorable and recommended that the original sash be retained and renewed and that the storm system be replaced. Acting Chair Gladhill asked whether there was any rot. Mr. Mayer said one window had fiberglass packing, which seemed to create the decay. He said it needed attention but felt that it could be reproduced or repaired. Mr. Shea and Mr. Rawling agreed with Mr. Mayer that it was salvageable.

The Commission had further discussion. Mr. Mayer said the building was beautiful, and he encouraged the applicant to recognize the original material and renew it. Mr. Wyckoff said most of the problem was with the storm windows and suggested either replacing them in kind or with wooden storm sashes. Acting Chair Gladhill said that, in order for him to vote in favor of removing original windows, he'd have to hear a strong argument as to why the original windows should be removed. He noted that the applicant could watch the video or read the minutes to get an idea of what the Commission wanted.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Shea made a motion to **postpone** the petition to the September 7 meeting, and Mr. Mayer seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

B. Work Session requested by **Thunderbolt Realty Trust of 2011, owner**, for property located at **17 Gardner Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolition of two rear additions, removal of rear deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a two story rear addition, relocate front gate and fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 14 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the July 13, 2016 meeting to the August 10, 2016 meeting.)*

Juli MacDonald of DeStefano Architects and the owner Allison Jewett were present to speak to the petition. Ms. MacDonald reviewed the package, noting that the 2" Garrison-type overhang was pulled back and the massing was a simple symmetrical gable, and she addressed the changes that included larger windows, shingle siding, and triple windows on the north elevation.

Mr. Shea said the structure looked appropriate because it was simple, the scale was good, and it stepped back nicely. He said he would be open to more glass in the addition but thought it was appropriate. He noted that the pane size was very different and suggested making them 9/12. Mr. Wyckoff agreed with Mr. Shea and said that if it was new construction, the wall with the window could be saved and padded out to a 2/6 thickness. He said the changes were a vast improvement and appropriate for a modern addition.

Mr. Rawling said he agreed with the comments and suggested that the pane sizes be proportional if more glass wasn't added. He asked whether the windows would be wood, and Ms. MacDonald said they would and would also be painted to match.

Mr. Mayer said the addition was more consistent with the house. He asked whether the elevations were really from the 1950s, and Ms. MacDonald said they were from the 1990s. Mr. Mayer suggested that the insurance maps be consulted to make sure.

Mr. Rawling asked about the air conditioning duct on the rear elevation. Ms. Jewett said it would be painted to match the house. She added that it should be included in the application, and Ms. MacDonald agreed.

Acting Chair Gladhill said the addition respected the historic aspect of the house and that he didn't have a problem with the larger-sized windows and panes because it was a newer addition that would let in more light and the location wouldn't be that visible.

Mr. Wyckoff said the Building Inspector would provide more feedback. He suggested a hood of some sort over the door, or a gutter for the soffit above so that water didn't run down. Mr. Rawling agreed. He said it looked stark and that an angled hood would help.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Rawling advised the applicant to be careful about the track system, e.g., white or silver tracks, and to use something that blended in.

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to **continue** the work session to the September meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **Brian J. Bednarek, owner**, for property located at **10 Humphreys Court**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new garage and mudroom) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 43 and lies within the General Residence and Historic Districts. *(The applicant has asked to postpone to the September 2016 meeting.)*

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*At the applicant's request, this item was postponed to the September 2016 meeting.*

D. 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 postponed at the July 13, 2016 meeting to the August 10, 2016 meeting.)*

The owner James Lucy and the designer Galen Doscher were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Lucy stated that the packet contained what he had presented to the Board of Adjustment (BOA). He distributed copies of the packet to the Commission. Mr. Doscher said there were a few new changes, including the window item and the roofing that were suggested by the Commission.

Mr. Shea asked whether there were elevations in the packet. Mr. Cracknell said they were on the website, and he asked Mr. Doscher to describe the changes.

Mr. Doscher reviewed the existing windows on the 127 High Street structure and said the main entry façade had a mix of trim on it, which he said they wanted to redo in a more historic manner. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the hip roof. Mr. Doscher said it had a metal bracket but they wanted to give it more life. Mr. Wyckoff advised the applicant to be careful about the entry

assembly. Mr. Doscher said he wanted to remove the existing casement windows and replace them with wooden double hung windows with an appropriate trim and sill. Mr. Wyckoff agreed.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the window pattern was existing, and Mr. Doscher agreed. He said they were existing locations and would not be changed, but there might be a change in casement for the upper windows. Mr. Wyckoff noted that it could have been a one-story structure. Mr. Doscher said it was a post-1800s building and used to be the original location of the Whipple house, which was moved.

Mr. Cracknell recapped items from the June meeting, noting that the window restoration was significantly different and not as simple, so they were better; the cedar roof from the fiberglass shingle seemed appropriate; and the two veneer brick chimneys that remained seemed odd on a building that small. Mr. Doscher said they wanted to give the building a historical context. Mr. Mayer asked whether the chimneys shouldn't be higher to maintain the original height and suggested that Mr. Doscher research it.

Mr. Shea asked whether the siding would be replaced. Mr. Doscher said it was repairable.

Mr. Doscher said they wanted to simplify the back railing, which would be simple wood with a composite decking surface that wasn't visible.

Mr. Doscher then addressed the building entry on the 137 High Street structure, saying that they would put on a new roof and repair the existing clapboards. He discussed the window sidelights.

Mr. Rawling asked what the roofing material was. Mr. Doscher said it was asphalt with a less aggressive profile. He said the existing foundation would be kept as well as the first-floor structure and chimney. The second-floor structure would be rebuilt. He discussed the chimneys and said the third chimney would be left as it was.

The ridge was discussed. Mr. Doscher said the roof pitch could be lowered to make it look more subordinate. Mr. Shea suggested that it be lowered two feet from the other ridge. The porch area was discussed. Mr. Doscher said that wood trim and materials would be used on the entrances as well as new windows. The egress windows were discussed. Mr. Doscher said they would go to a casement window on the gable end.

Mr. Mayer asked about siding. Mr. Doscher said they would use the existing siding as much as possible and would match new materials. Mr. Rawling asked about the porch details. Mr. Doscher said it was a square post similar to the front entry but not as decorative, with a wood trim and composite decking with wood trim on the sides. The Commission discussed the deck material options and said they would prefer a smooth painted finish.

Mr. Doscher then discussed the main façade. He said the detailing comments from the Commission were addressed by tightening up the frieze board and the gable end details, taking care of the overhangs, and bringing the brackets in between the garage doors. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether pilasters would be simulated on each side. Mr. Doscher said what looked like pilaster was just a recessed wall between the two trim boards.

The bump outs were discussed. Mr. Shea asked whether the windows would have sills. Mr. Doscher said they would and that they would encompass the picture frame trim below the sill in the vertical element of the window. Mr. Shea said it looked busy because they looked like individual doors. Mr. Shea said the horizontal look at the window sill was lost and suggested continuing the window sill all the way around the corner. Mr. Rawling agreed.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the rake trim detail was developed. Mr. Doscher said the pork chops were not going to happen and said it was an incorrect view. He said they wanted to take a similar profile as the 137 High Street front building but not return the gable ends.

Mr. Doscher asked what he needed to bring to the next work session. Acting Chair Gladhill told him to bring specifications on materials, windows, and anything else that he could.

### Public Comment

Edie LaCroix of 145 High Street stated that she was a direct abutter. She addressed the historical value of the 127 and 137 High Street properties, noting that they dated back to 1800 and not 1861, as the applicant had said. She said it would be a shame to conceal the tall chimney on the saltbox roof on the 137 High Street structure. She noted that the original foundation of the 127 High Street property was slate and that renovation took place in 1830, not the 1900s. She asked where the rendering was for viewing the property from the south and her front door. She also noted that the window placement on the back of the house faced her home. She asked where the trash would go, addressed the HVAC units, and asked whether there would be a retaining wall to keep soil from her garden space. She said she wanted to see a 3D model of the project.

Acting Chair Gladhill said the trash, retaining wall and water runoff would be addressed on the site plan at the Planning Board. Mr. Cracknell agreed, saying that it would also include advisory review from the City Staff, Public Works, Engineering Staff, and the Technical Advisory Committee and that it was not covered under HDC jurisdiction. He said the applicant was required to submit a 3D model to put into the HDC system.

Mike LaCroix of 145 High Street said he was a direct abutter and felt that the square footage of the new house was greater than the front structure. He compared the cubic feet of volume of other High Street properties and their additions with the project. He said the mass and scale were too large and aggressive for the area.

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

Mr. Rawling said that the two cantilever elements still existed and were problematic, and that the layers, the bump out entry, the bracketing and the other added pieces to mitigate it were cluttered, and it seemed like the side of the building was hanging over. He said the Commission had discussed ways of addressing it but saw something similar at every work session, and he felt it was a very disconcerting element of the project. Mr. Wyckoff agreed and felt it was still very busy on the front and that the two cantilevers were part of the problem. Mr. Mayer said he had suggested ways to reduce the scale, but the project's design criteria still seemed to be in conflict.

Mr. Cracknell said it was helpful that they had six or more work sessions and suggested providing a summary of the review process for the BOA, who may not be aware of what had transpired during the last ten months. He said the HDC could provide guidance on their review process, the primary issues, and how the design for the three buildings evolved. He noted the amount of flexibility the project had in incorporating comments from the HDC, the public, and the Portsmouth Advocates, which would also be helpful to the BOA. He said he drafted a memorandum, to which he could add that evening's comments to.

Mr. Shea said the rear addition to the main house had been an issue for the Commission and thought a smaller roof could bring the addition down. Mr. Doscher agreed and said he would bring information for the next meeting.

Mr. Wyckoff noted the cantilevers, bringing the door out, and putting the brackets underneath the window. He asked what the reason was for the garage doors. Mr. Doscher said it was to address the turning radius.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what it would take to bring the second and third floors of the whole structure back a foot and eliminate the overhang. Mr. Doscher said it would reconfigure the interior.

Mr. Wyckoff said the cantilever complicated the front façade and he was trying to think of how to simplify the front and get rid of the top heaviness. Mr. Rawling said it was an issue from the beginning and had not been resolved. They discussed it further.

Mr. Wyckoff said that, if 137 and 127 High Street were appropriately restored, and said if something could be done with the roof on the back of 137 High Street and the ridge, he would be happy to trade the restoration of those two buildings for the mass of the project.

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that he would return for a work session or a work session/public hearing.*

E. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission is 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 July 13, 2016 meeting to the August 10, 2016 meeting.)*

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petition to the September meeting.*



F. 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. *(The applicant has asked to postpone to the September 2016 meeting.)*

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petition to the September meeting.*

### III. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

G. Work Session requested by **Portsmouth Housing Authority, owner**, for property located at **140 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 38 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic District.

The architect Alyssa Murphy on behalf of the Housing Authority was present to speak to the petition. She said the Housing Authority wanted to replace all the windows, which were previously replaced in the 1980s and were vinyl and in terrible condition. She said one of the biggest problems was that some of the residents had air conditioners of all types, and because the windows were sliders, the staff built custom panels to hold the units in, but they looked terrible and made the windows inoperable. She said she wanted to find a replacement window that met three criteria: egress operable, dedicated space for an air conditioner, and large enough to maximize air flow for those that didn't have air conditioners. She suggested an awning window where an air conditioner could appropriately fit and have a dedicated spot.

Mr. Rawling said the changes in the window pattern added some interest to the building by breaking up the scale and giving it more texture. Mr. Mayer agreed, noting that it humanized the building. Mr. Shea said he thought Ms. Murphy solved the three issues. He asked whether the tenants would have to purchase new air conditioning units to make sure they fit. Ms. Murphy said they wouldn't due to the standard opening size, but an infill would have to be created around it. She also thought the Housing Authority might buy air conditions for everyone to ensure that they were standard. The Commission also discussed the safety of the windows.

#### Public Comment

Juli MacDonald asked how about the ease of the window and removable sash and who would do it. Ms. Murphy said she spoke with a few manufacturers who would do it and said the design was based on an integrity fiberglass and would work.

No one else rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public comment session. City Council Representative Pearson asked whether anything would be painted. Ms. Murphy said the sister building had dark brown because of the building's era, and she thought the fiberglass may be in a darker color. Acting Chair Gladhill asked her to bring a color sample with her the next time.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*The applicant indicated that she would return for a public hearing in the near future.*

H. Work Session requested by **Nicole R. Gregg Revocable Trust, Nicole R. Gregg, trustee and owner**, for property located at **13 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear and side additions and deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new rear and side additions and deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 28 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic Districts.

Juli MacDonald of DeStefano Architects and the owner Zac Gregg were present to speak to the petition. Ms. MacDonald said the project had been approved by the HDC in 2010 as originally submitted and that the applicant was finishing the project. She said the two-family home would be made into a single-family home. They wanted to remove the existing infill piece and the rear miscellaneous items in the back and add an infill piece and a 2-story addition with a deck. She noted that they wanted similar pane sizes as the existing house. She reviewed her packet.

Mr. Gregg said they had gotten rid of two out of six units, but would eventually have a mother-in-law apartment on top of the garage as part of the single-family home.

Ms. MacDonald discussed the connector piece and making the windows on the addition into smaller window panes to match the northwest elevation. Mr. Shea said he thought the front elevation kept the simplicity of a historic gambrel but felt that the back didn't show the simple gambrel form anymore, nor the historic age of the home, which was visible from Marcy Street. He said the addition should be simpler and more respectful of the old home. Mr. Mayer agreed, noting that the back seemed like a different project. He suggested scaling it back.

Ms. MacDonald said the approach was more contemporary than the original gambrel and picked up on the original's detailing and massing. Mr. Gregg said the HDC had previously advised them to bring it away from the edge, so they moved it in quite a bit.

Mr. Mayer suggested lowering the ridge line of the addition's side elevation. He noted that the sunroom added a degree of activity that was in contrast to the simplicity of the other side. Mr. Wyckoff, who was present at the 2010 meeting, said he remembered that the connector between the gambrel looked very busy, but he realized how dark historic homes were and how they needed more light. He noted that the structure was inland and the owner had the right to gain an advantage. He said the back had a York Harbor look, which the Commission had to decide was appropriate or not on an ancient gambrel. He asked Mr. Cracknell whether the applicant would

still have approval for the back. Mr. Cracknell said he couldn't answer that, but advised the applicant to see whether they could diminish the floor area of the gambrel addition to lower it a bit and pull back the sunroom on the back from the edge so that the historic gambrel remained the dominant structure.

Acting Chair Gladhill said there was no back-of-the-house rule involved but that the Marcy Street view would be the most prominent one. He asked the applicant whether the sunroom could be flipped so that it was not seen from Marcy Street. Mr. Gregg said it would be an enormous change but that he was open to suggestions. They further discussed it.

Mr. Rawling said he was comfortable with the front but felt that the gambrel was too large and detracted from the existing gambrel. He suggested that the gambrel be made into a Dutch Colonial, with the top sections pulled back. He suggested that the big centered windows have some sort of horizontal roofline over them and project a bit of the bay to break up the flatness of the gambrel and reduce its scale.

Mr. Wyckoff recommended that the applicant check on the building permit to see if it was still valid. He said the problem was the sunroom because it was very busy and took up the corner of the gambrel addition.

Mr. Shea suggested that the applicant simplify as much as possible. He said the second-floor sunroom took away from the gambrel, and he recommended showing more of the gambrel at that end. He also suggested a simpler roof. Mr. Mayer agreed.

Acting Chair Gladhill recommended that the applicant look at the Buckminster House.

Councilor Pearson said she had trouble with the scale and thought the structure looked like three separate houses put together when one came in from South Street.

#### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to **continue** the work session to the September meeting.*

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

*At 9:30 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on September 7, 2016.