

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**September 6, 2017  
to be reconvened on September 13, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; Dan Rawling, John Mayer; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternates Martin Ryan, Molly Bolster

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Reagan Ruedig, Richard Shea

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

.....  
A site walk was held prior to the meeting at 5:45 p.m. at 73 Prospect Street.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. July 24, 2017
2. August 2, 2017
3. August 9, 2017

Mr. Cracknell moved to approve the three sets of minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Mayer. The motion passed unanimously (7-0) vote.

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

1. 37 Congress Street
2. 77 State Street
3. 249 Islington Street
4. 64 Mt. Vernon Street

Mr. Cracknell provided a brief overview of each item.

Mr. Mayer moved to approve items #1, 2, and 4 as presented, seconded by City Council Representative Pearson. The motion passed unanimously (7-0) vote.

Mr. Mayer moved to approve Item #3, seconded by City Council Representative Pearson with the following stipulation:

1. The window trim matches the existing window trim.

The motion passed unanimously (7-0) vote.

### III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Worth Development Condominium Association, owner**, and **The Friendly Toast, applicant**, for property located at **113 Congress Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (replace storefront windows with retractable windows with screens) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6-104 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(At the applicant's request, this item was postponed at the August 2, 2017 meeting to the September 6, 2017 meeting.)*

#### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Due to the repeated postponements the Board decided that the applicant would need to re-advertise when they are ready to come present. No motion was needed.

B. Petition of **Kristina Logan, owner**, for property located at **220 South Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, remove asbestos siding, replace with cedar single siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 1 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 2, 2017 meeting to the September 6, 2017 meeting.)*

#### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote to **postpone** the petition to the October 2017 meeting.

C. Petition of **Michael De La Cruz, owner**, for property located at **75 Congress Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (remove roof top cooling tower and supporting structures, extend roof top dormer) 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 the application to the October 2017 meeting.)*

#### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote to **postpone** the petition to the October 2017 meeting.

### IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **82 Court Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **82 Court Street**, wherein permission was 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 116 as Lot 48 and lies within the CD4-L1 and Historic District.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Attorney Bill Scott, one of the owners of the building, spoke to the application. The plans are adequate. The only mistake made here is that the project may require replacement of eight windows on the front of the building. Seven were improperly replaced and the eighth was not replaced, but may need to be replaced after closer inspection.

Mr. Cracknell questioned why the eighth window would need to be removed. Mr. Scott replied that it may not need to be, but wanted to raise that possibility now just in case.

Mr. Mayer commented that all the work with the fencing was appreciated. These windows are not original to the building, so is this just a sash replacement. Mr. Scott responded it was difficult to lose the chestnut tree, but it had to be done. The windows were replaced with Marvin windows and do not appear to fit correctly. The new windows will be hand made with wavy glass. Mr. Mayer questioned if the sash was going in the Marvin frames. Mr. Scott replied that the frames would be new as well. Nothing from the Marvin windows will be left.

Mr. Cracknell noted that it was understood based on what was submitted to the HDC that these windows would be solid framed windows. The City saw the work that was being done by the contractor and stopped it. The windows have not been replaced. The understanding is that this is a sash replacement. The current inserts don't fit well and didn't come through the HDC for that replacement. Mr. Cracknell feels positive that the applicant came here to replace these windows in kind. The waviness of the glass should be very easy for the fabricator to match. These are not replacement windows or new construction they are just sash replacement with wavy windows. Mr. Scott confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Rawling noted that these should match the profiles with the replacement. Mr. Cracknell assumed the building had been measured to create the drawings.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if these were going to be single pane windows. Mr. Scott responded yes, they would be single pane. It will take time for the contractor to make the windows. The estimated timeline for that is about one month.

Chairman Lombardi expressed concern about the eighth window. Mr. Scott responded that it does not need to be discussed tonight. If it needs to be replaced then this will be worked out with the Commission. Chairman Lombardi responded that if there is the chance, then it's preferred that the applicant restore the original window instead of replacing it.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Wyckoff moved to approve the application as presented, seconded by Mr. Rawling, with the following stipulations:

1. The wood window sash replacement shall match the existing muntin profile and the existing casing and trim shall remain the same.
2. The glass transparency (waviness) shall match the existing windows.
3. The windows shall be single pane with interior storms.

The motion passed unanimously, (7-0) vote.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that the applicant was replacing the windows in kind and thinks it's a perfect match.

Mr. Mayer commented that the owner is going the distance on this and working to do this right.

2. Petition of **Thunderbolt Realty Trust, owner, John K. Bosen, trustee**, for property located at **180 Washington Street (also known as 39 Gates Street)** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two story addition with other misc. changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 30 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Joe Almeida and Lauren Vorwald from DeStefano Architects spoke to the application. Based on the last work session, there was a list of feedback items from the HDC. They have been addressed. This is a very significant and high quality historic property. The new owners are looking to add a small one-story addition on the back, and extend it up two levels. The intent is to match the quality and detail of all the trim work, flushing, and gutters. All of those items have been talked through in the work session and the specifications have been included in the packet. The shaded copper roof is a very shallow roof. There was a lot of discussion about trying to simplify the rooflines in the session. It has been adjusted and is shown on the diagrams. There is very little to no impact on the proposed south elevation on Gate Street. The Washington Street elevation is also barely impacted. The material selections and product specifications are outlined in the packet. There was a lot of focus on certain details that are character defining in the original building to recreate for the addition. The window trimming and banding is shown to match the existing. The window selections are specified in the packet. The doors and roofing materials are also outlined.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff clarified that the applicants were attempting to match the molding. Mr. Almeida confirmed that was correct. Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that the window type B appeared to be regularly divided double hung window, but it was not outlined as that in the specifications. Mr. Almeida directed Vice Chairman Wyckoff to a table that better outlined what

was going to be put in. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned why the manufacturers were switched in the middle of the project. Mr. Almeida responded that the Marvin windows would only be in the conservatory. The intent is that the Green Mountain windows would be single paned windows. The conservatory needed double paned glass, so that is why they will be Marvin windows. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned how much of foundation would be seen. Mr. Almeida responded that it would be the required eight inches.

Mr. Mayer questioned how old the addition that is being altered was. Mr. Almeida responded that the dates were stated last month; it was some time in the 1980s. Mr. Mayer clarified that the project involves adding on top of the 1980s addition and extending the conservatory out. Mr. Almeida confirmed that was correct. Mr. Mayer questioned how the portion of the addition that's on top of the 1980s addition would be connected. In the work session it was talked about part of the exterior wall would need to be removed for conservatory. Mr. Almeida clarified that there is a substantial existing foundation right there and the intent is to use that. The goal is to not touch the existing structure from the outside. Mr. Mayer questioned how much of the original material will be retained and how much will be removed. Mr. Almeida responded that there is a very unique addition on the backside of the house and the roof eaves don't line up. It's been altered in a significant way already. Mr. Mayer questioned if the doors would be put where the windows are now? The two windows are above the 1980 addition, so it's assumed they are part of the original house. How will the interface inside be designed? Mr. Almeida responded that yes those would easily be the openings through. By default there will be some original material left. The intent is not to have it be an open space. Mr. Mayer noted that there might be some uncertainty, so maybe the design isn't thought out that far. It is not HDC jurisdiction, but the clarification was just trying to understand the impact of the addition.

Mr. Ryan commented that it was a little difficult to understand the elevations because the massing is not disturbing what's already there. Mr. Ryan commended the fact that this is a very sensitive well done addition and approved of the approach.

Chairman Lombardi agreed that it was well done. It is impacting original material, but there is no other way to do it.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Rawling moved to approve the application as presented, seconded by City Council Representative Pearson.

Mr. Rawling commented that a lot of thought had been put into the plan. There are a lot of modern and contemporary improvements to the building, but it's still sympathetic to the history of the building. This project will help to extend the life and vitality of the building and is consistent with the character of the surrounding properties. It is a successful design.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that the addition is going on top of a relatively new addition. This is in a very sensitive area, but no one has come out to speak against it.

Mr. Mayer commented that the design is working to honor what is there now. It is also understood that this is a family looking to expand into a new house, but hopes that when people move in to houses they work to honor the house.

Mr. Ryan noted that this is a living and active city. As the city grows things change and the HDC is here to manage the change.

City Council Representative Pearson noted that the applicants were very sensitive to historic features and it is important to them. This project has gone to great lengths to work with a team that has helped preserve those features.

Hearing no other discussion, the Chairman called for the vote. The motion passed in a 6-0-1 vote. Mr. Mayer abstained from voting.

3. Petition of **Louis F. Clarizio Trust 2000, Louis F. Clarizio, trustee and owner**, for property located at **566 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (new exterior trim, awnings, light fixtures, sign lighting, parapet detail, and applied graphics to windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 156 as Lot 24 and lies within the CD4-L2 and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Joe Almeida from DeStefano Architects spoke to the application. This project was discussed at a work session last month. The owner would like to make needed improvements. The property is in need of modernization and beautification. At the work session façade changes were talked through. There would be no change to the footprint other than potentially adding two parapets; that could change the height. All of the fabric awnings will be replaced with metal ones. Trim banding and metal cords will be added to give it some more interest. The addition of a decorative feature on the glass is a subtle way to add more interest. The drawings are lacking one change. After applying to replace the awnings, it was noticed one small awning was missed. Mr. Almeida asked to include that awning in this change with the exact same specifications. Mr. Almeida walked the Board through the plans, and showed the proposed changes to the building. Most of the changes are color and paint changes. The addition of the small parapet is the same shape as the site sign. A very heavy Cornish trim detail will be added and it will go all the way around the building. This will probably be the most note-able change to the building. All of the dimensions are provided. The intent is for the window decal to be very similar to what is shown in the plans.

Mr. Rawling questioned if metal flashing would be needed with the Cornish detail addition. Mr. Almeida confirmed there would be a small piece of counter flashing.

Mr. Mayer noted that this project seems like all decorative improvements.

Chairman Lombardi clarified that the window sign would be decal instead of etching. Mr. Almeida confirmed that was correct, and clarified the additional awning should be added as a stipulation.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Wyckoff moved to approve the application as presented, seconded by Mr. Ryan, with the following stipulation:

1. The rear door shall have an awning that shall match the proposed awnings.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that the changes would be consistent with the surrounding properties and there is no harm doing this improvement.

Hearing no other discussion, the Chairman called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously, (7-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Colaco, LLC, owner**, for property located at **74 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (complete exterior renovation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 43 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay District.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Brandon McNamara, residential designer, spoke to the application. The historic survey says that the contents of the building dates back to 1730. There was no mention made of the shed dormer, which is responsible for the generous sag in the ridge. The intent is to restore the front two-story section and demolish the rear first floor section and rebuild. The goal is to make the building a one retail three residential space. Today it is one retail one residential. The retail is currently a photography studio. The lane is part of the property. The proposed Congress Street elevation is to create two picture windows into three double hangs. All new windows will be from Green Mountain. The front windows will be wood sided and rear will be non-combustible. The signboard will be slightly reduced in size. The property will be sprinkled. The packet shows the proposed floor plans. There is no change to the footprint other than the rear metal stairway. It will be a classic city fire escape.

Mr. Mayer appreciated the project and plans. It was surprising to learn the date of the building. How much of the original material will be impacted. Mr. McNamara responded that it could be a wildcard. The goal is to try not to impact too much. A post will definitely need to be tracked down to the foundation. Footings will be added in the basement. The intention is to make it

look a little rickety because that's what it is today. There is no intention to make it a gut job, however, it won't be clear what's there until the project is started. Mr. Mayer commented the proposed front elevation on the signboard does not look like it's centered. Mr. McNamara responded that it is centered on the corner board. It doesn't look like it because of the down stair. Mr. Mayer questioned if the window systems would be half screens. Mr. McNamara confirmed they would be.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that putting in the big picture window has already compromised the second floor framing. This will have to be done all over to put in the three more appropriate windows. It's amazing this building has survived with all the fires. Mr. McNamara commented that this building has already been modernized a little probably around the same time the retail was added.

Mr. Cracknell questioned what the roofing material would be. Mr. McNamara responded that it was re-roofed two years ago, so the roof will be retained. Mr. Cracknell commented that cedar would look great.

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

Donald Coker representing the abutting McIntosh Condominiums spoke. He felt it was a wonderful project, however, there were concerns. It was stated that there is no change to the footprint, but the drawings make it look like the building is moving out more into the alley. The windows as portrayed in this drawing have the new stairway completely blocking out a window on the abutting building. This window today can be used as an emergency exit and provides light. The second question is drainage. This has always been an issue. The prior owners added a drainage system that directs water into the alley that seeps into the McIntosh Condo foundation. Mr. Coker requested clarification on the window, and the foundation impacts.

Mr. Ryan clarified what the window in question is used for today. Mr. Coker responded that the first two to three windows are a laundry room, so it's not a residential window.

Mr. McNamara responded that there is no expansion to the building except for the stair assembly. The alignment is the same as it is today. The window will not be blocked. The landing platform is cleared above the window and it is to the footprint of the building. The window would still be accessible. As for the water situation, at the moment it all goes to the rear. The intent is to have a large gutter at the rear and direct it to the city storm water drain. Whatever is there now will be done in a better manner. There will be no change to the storm water, but it will be more organized. This is one of those windows that should be sprinkled, so a sprinkle head will be added to the side of the building to protect the McIntosh building.

Mr. Coker admittedly looked at this quickly, so could have made a mistake. Mr. Coker will take another look, but believes the concerns have been addressed.

Chairman Lombardi commented that if there are changes to the site plan, then it would go through site plan review.

Mr. Mayer questioned if there was concern about a second floor window. Mr. Coker responded that it is a first floor window. Mr. Mayer noted that it looked like the first floor window would be unobstructed. Mr. Coker agreed that from the angle of another drawing the window is not obstructed and it should be all set. Mr. Mayer commented that the drainage sounds like it would improve the McIntosh building as well. Mr. Coker agreed.

Ms. Bolster questioned Mr. Coker's relationship to the building. Mr. Coker responded that he is the property manager.

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

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Rawling moved to approve the application as presented, seconded by City Council Representative Pearson.

Mr. Rawling commented that the proposed modifications are sympathetic to the building, and consistent with the character of the district.

Hearing no other discussion, the Chairman called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously, (7-0) vote.

5. Petition of **57 Market Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Michael J. Quinn Revocable Trust, Michael J. Quinn, trustee and applicant**, for property located at **55 Market Street, Unit 2**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace five windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 25-2 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Bob Dockham from Dockham Builders spoke to the application. Mr. Dockham clarified that he is the owner of the second floor of 55 Market Street, not 57 Market Street as said above. The only bay window on Market Street, at least in that section, is on the building. The goal is to replace all five windows with Anderson wood windows. Nothing will be changed on the outside. It will simply be windows out windows in. All the trim will remain.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if these windows will be half screened. Mr. Dockham responded that could be done.

Chairman Lombardi asked about the condition of the existing windows. Mr. Dockham clarified that they are definitely not in right today.

Mr. Rawling questioned if the windows were going to be one over one. Mr. Dockham confirmed they were. Mr. Rawling questioned if there was intent to move to the direction of the original

style of the building that would have been six over six there. Mr. Dockham responded that the goal was just to recreate what is there now. There is not a grill pattern on the third floor. It could be a change in the looks in the appearance of the building. Mr. Rawling responded that it would be a positive move.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that the angles are smaller on the sides, so they would have to be four over four and then center could be six over six. Mr. Dockham agreed.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Wyckoff moved to approve the application as presented, seconded by Mr. Mayer, with the following stipulations:

- 1) A half screen shall be used.
- 2) A 6/6 single divided light window with spacer bar shall be used on the two side windows on the second floor as well as the center bay window.
- 3) A 4/4 window shall be used on both side lights within the bay window.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted this project would help to maintain the district and would be compatible with the surrounding properties.

Hearing no other discussion, the motion passed unanimously, (7-0) vote.

6. Petition of **Ten Walker Street Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **73 Prospect Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct 4 unit residential building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 142 as Lot 28 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Glenn Walker, owner of the property, spoke to the application. Certainly the goal was not to demolish the property. The property was brought before this Commission in the spring of 2017 to renovate. The property backs up against the bypass and is the last in the historic section. The project has been moving forward and the outside elements were approved already. Once the project moved into the interior, serious structural issues within the building were found. When the last petition was approved it was understood that it would have been a representation of what was there not a recreation because of the level of repair that was needed. Now instead of the building on top of the existing foundation it will be a concrete poured foundation. Then a representation of what is there now. Structures North completed a review of what was there and their opinion was that the building was in very poor condition. Structures North has been there twice to put together the report. Page 2 of the report finds that the sills should be replaced at all

points and prior to that the foundation should be repaired as well. The wall studs have been rotted, and the biggest hurdle is the lack of proper foundation under two thirds of the building. These are just some of the things Mr. Watnhe, from Structures North, has identified; the report outlines more. Sometimes issues can't be identified until the project begins. Mr. Walker did not start this project in the spring with this intent, but has found way more damage than anticipated. Mr. Watnhe's conclusions were while it's possible to restore this building a significant amount of repairs would be needed. The extent of repairs may not be financially feasible or practical to move forward with the work within the building. That's why Mr. Walker is asking to demolish the house, as well as complete a 100% window replacement. The applicant would not try to save the one attic window.

Mr. Mayer commented that this is an inverted sequence of events. Normally there would be a request for demolition, and then a design would be approved. Would the design have changed if it were known demolition was needed upfront? Mr. Walker responded that the design fits within the location, so it probably would not have changed. Mr. Mayer noted that Mr. Walker talked about recreating the building that's there, but wondered if there was thought to enhance any features. Mr. Walker responded that it would not have been financially feasible to restore what's there, but the colonial site is prominent. Mr. Mayer questioned if the history of the site was known. Mr. Walker noted there is no documented history of the building. Mr. Mayer commented that generally if a building is going to be removed it is requested to understand what's been lost. Mr. Walker responded that was fair.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that the applicant is totally correct that what was approved in the spring was a total outside representation of the colonial building. It essentially would have been a new building anyways. This is a tough decision because with the exception of the Jackson House this building could be one of the oldest buildings in the area. There have been many requests for demolitions lately.

City Council Representative Pearson agreed that there have been a lot of demolition requests but this applicant has been before the Commission already and the HDC has been to the location twice. The first time with sincerity to restore including trying to save the one original window. That goes a long way. The applicant has worked with a great team to try to honor the building and make the financial investment. This is not the type of application where someone is coming to HDC saying this is not what they wanted. This applicant has come in good faith.

Mr. Rawling commented that going through the building, the original structure including the framing could be seen. Everything in the house has been altered, pieced together, or patched none of the pieces seem to end with the original intent. So many sections are rotted or deteriorated that it would all need to be replaced. All of the roof framing, and the first floor needs to be replaced or has been significantly altered from the original. Under these conditions it does really only make sense to allow for the demolition. That said there is hope that work is done to preserve as much as possible and work it into the new building. The structure of the building is so deteriorated that Mr. Rawling does not see how it could be put back together.

Mr. Ryan agreed with what had been said so far. It's a balancing act and a matter of recognizing what the tipping point is. This building is well past the point of saving and it's sad. Mr. Walker

agreed and explained every time something was opened there was hope to find something good, but it's all bad. Mr. Ryan noted the Commission saw evidence of that with the patch works. Sadly, Mr. Ryan would have to support the demo.

Chairman Lombardi agreed that this is a loss and it's a shame. It is deferred maintenance at it's worst and lesson to be learned. These properties have to be maintained to make sure they last. If it was maintained properly, then it would have been preserved. This property is a gem of Portsmouth in many ways and it's difficult to think of losing it. There are some people who would argue against building a replica. That in a true preservation mode it would be preferable to not build a replica to fool people that this still exists. Would the basic framing techniques of the old house be used? Mr. Walker responded that it would be standard modern construction. Chairman Lombardi clarified that it's a replica in its skin only. Mr. Walker responded that even if the project moved forward today the majority of the framing would have been replaced. This proposal is not to move backward, but kind of moving sideways. Chairman Lombardi questioned if this is a total demolition, is it the best value to Mr. Walker and to the City to build a replica? Or is this just something that is lost and Mr. Walker should use the property in a way that is more advantageous. This is not advocating; just asking. This is a difficult process to embark on.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff could not see anything else being acceptable in that location other than a historic looking building. The map drawn up in the 1930s and has an arrow pointing to the house as the beehive house at the time. The replication has to move forward. It was decided that it was ok through numbers of work sessions to convert the house into a four unit building at that point. The apartments before were more haphazard. The applicant wanted four nice condos that may have led to this point. The problem is that not every building in the historic downtown is suitable for a restaurant because of code compatibility. Not every building is meant to be changed that dramatically. Someone could save this house, but it would not be able to be condos. It would have been a single-family home.

City Council Representative Pearson pointed out that replica was not the original idea. The applicant wanted to save the house. It has turned into a replica. The applicant wants to take a house with things stuck on it that looked pretty terrible and make it look way better than what was there. The applicant is doing his best to take what is there and make a better version of it. City Council Representative Pearson had sympathy for the applicant.

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

Rick Beckstead, 1395 Islington St, this is a heartbreaking and discouraging application. 102 State Street is now a day care with residential units above. It was attempted to take that building down multiple times before. The current owner restored it. It wasn't replicated; it was rebuilt. This building was under similar pressure and HDC held their ground. It's still there today. That's a part of history. This building was built in 1800. Mr. Beckstead has admired this building from afar. It's contributing to the community. Not all projects are made for other projects. This could this be a duplex. In 2015 this building was sold for 225,000 it's assessed at 325,000. This is prime real estate in the Portsmouth market. This is literally one of the oldest buildings in Portsmouth. It is something that's do-able, but is it do-able for a four unit? Could it

be a duplex? From a financial standpoint this is do-able and it can be saved from what's there. In the past Mr. Beckstead completely rebuilt two cottages in New Castle. One wall had to be salvaged because it was falling down. Every time a wall was touched there was something wrong. To this day the back wall of the house has some part of the original wall. At least if nothing else hold on to something tangible so that there was something original left. At least add that as a stipulation.

Paige Trace, 27 Hancock Street, most of the commission knows Ms. Trace stared a structure like that right in the face, and can pretty much guarantee that it was two-three times worse. Ms. Trace restored a private residence to live in, and knew that it was going to implode within 12 months. Different people buy structures for different reasons. The foundation could be pieces from the first period. If there is an agreement to look at it further take the opportunity to look at the shed. This structure was probably the start of the neighborhood. There is no harm no foul if it needs to be demolished and then a replica is built. But before that route it taken look at the shed. Maybe Mr. Beckstead is right that looking at a duplex or single family home is the right route. This whole city is going through tremendous growth and value. Ms. Trace is just a homeowner standing in front of the commission that went through restoring an old building. Make sure the right decision is made. Maybe the correct decision is to demolish it and the public may not like it. Use your heads and hearts and understand that first period is first period.

Esther Kennedy, 41 Pickering Avenue, This is a tough time. It's a beehive and who's going to get stung. If Mr. Beckstead is correct about the finances, then this owner stands to make a lot of money. It's the obligation as HDC to save parts of Portsmouth. People are coming here for the arts and the historical pieces. This is what makes Portsmouth different from Portland and Boston. This was important enough to put in a walking tour from Dorothy Vaughn.

Mr. Walker corrected one point, he has owned the property for eight years. It was purchased in 2008 or 2009 and it did cost 250,000 dollars.

Mr. Beckstead, 1395 Islington Street responded that the tax card in the assessors office does say 2015. The property was bought in 2015.

Mr. Mayer commented that one thing that is challenging with this is that the Commission does not have a full history of the building. In the past it has been asked for some sort of record before a decision was made. It may be helpful to have more context to make an informed decision.

City Council Representative Pearson responded that Steve McHenry provided the Commission with a history of the building at the first work session. It showed that the house started as a farm and all the iterations it's gone through since.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned what has been done in the past with a demolition. Is a photographic record is completed. City Council Representative Pearson confirmed that is part of the demolition ordinance today.

Mr. Walker confirmed that Steve McHenry did do some of that work in the first application. That was part of some of the discussion.

Mr. Ryan visited the site and is not sure where to start on saving things. Should the rotten beams or sills that are crumbling be saved? Not sure there is anything worth saving. The additions are all 20<sup>th</sup> century additions. Yes, portions of the building would be saved, but it would be saving rubble. If the demolition is approved it will not be due to lack of consideration from the HDC of what could be saved. The engineer from Structures North cares very much about historic structures. It's not about what everybody wants to have; it's about what the reality is.

Ms. Bolster admitted that she was at somewhat of a disadvantage because she missed the site walk. Many pieces of the story and proposal have been heard, but not the voice from a contractor with the attitude to restore the building and honor what is there. Is there room in this process to get that perspective?

Chairman Lombardi commented that many of the Board members are really torn. One thing that could happen is that the discussion could be continued and more information could be collected before the commission decides what should be done.

City Council Representative Pearson reminded the Commission that the applicant is asking to demolish the building and put up something that has already been approved. Ms. Bolster responded that the difference was that application was to try to work with what was there and could be saved. This is a different proposal.

Mr. Mayer commented that Steve McHenry did provide some history, but not to the extent that it could be. There's a lot of material that would be lost in the demolition that is history to Portsmouth. There is some opportunity there to give back to the community when the building is altered. Mr. Walker responded that to some extent that makes sense. Are you looking for the history of what was on the site? Mr. Mayer responded that there is value to being informed of what exactly is being lost. Mr. Walker responded that would be ok, but would also like to try to move forward with the project. There is a timetable. It would make sense to document what is there.

Esther Kennedy, 41 Pickering Avenue, if it's true that this is a 1690 building, then that building has been around 300 years. This decision should not be made if it's not based on all the information.

City Council Representative Pearson commented that the opening description from Mr. Watnhe states the building was built circa 1690, but it is believed that another building was built at 1690 then a new house was built with original framing. Mr. Walker confirmed that it is Mr. Watnhe's opinion that this building is later than 1690.

Mr. Rawling commented that there is not original material there. There is one side that is the oldest material, but it's also the area that basically nothing can be saved from. The other parts of it have all been so burned out that it's just fragments and pieces of things. The amount of

material that could be saved from the original building is so slight. It's doubtful it would make up one room.

Rick Beckstead, 1395 Islington Street, noted that he would like to hear Reagan Ruedig's perspective on this because she is a professional preservationist. It is understandable that there's a timetable, but give it a few weeks to make a true assessment of this.

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

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Ryan moved to approve the application as presented, seconded by City Counsel Representative Pearson.

Mr. Ryan commented that wanting to save this building is not enough. The condition of this building is piecemealed from many decades. It is not original. There are very few elements that are salvageable. There is not a lot of the foundation that could be saved. The attic window could be added as a stipulation.

City Council Representative Pearson noted that so many people have stated a lot of reasons why this building should be saved. Nobody wants to see old buildings in Portsmouth go, but there is a tipping point. There is a difference between wanting something to happen vs. the reality of what can happen. People are easy to spend other people's money. This decision is based on reason and looking at what's before the Commission.

Mr. Cracknell noted that someone should reference the review criteria and some potential stipulations may need to be added.

Mr. Ryan assumed other approvals would be upheld.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned what the difference between parged and regular foundation was. Mr. Cracknell responded that parged has markings on it.

Mr. Ryan responded that none of the criteria fits the motion. Unless both the demolition and the new building are being approved.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if the attic window should be stipulated.

Mr. Mayer commented that he would not be able to support the motion. This has become a really different project. It was first accepted as a replica project, but now it's being talked about a demolition. There is not enough information to approve tearing this building down. The dilemma is that putting the onus on the owner or the board to do the research on the history of the site. It would be very hard to decide to demolish something without understanding what is being lost. The McHenry and Watnhe reports have made arguments in the direction to demolish, but not sure it is enough.

Mr. Ryan added stipulations to record existing conditions, a photographic inventory, and the history of the building if it exists.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff agreed with Mr. Mayer. Mr. Watnhe's report could be read that it's possible to restore the building. It is not unreasonable to expect these repairs to be expensive. Many of the decisions the HDC makes are not the most economical way to do a building. A lot of people walk away wondering where their money went. Vice Chairman Wyckoff cannot accept that it is more expensive to restore the building and that should not be considered in the decision.

Chairman Lombardi agreed with Mr. Mayer and Mr. Wyckoff, and is very hesitant to just approve this. It is a tough call that can't consider the cost. It is hard to say what is reasonable or not reasonable at this point. It would be very informative to have a cost estimate on the restoration of this building. The construction of a whole new building is a significant cost and demolition is a significant cost.

Mr. Rawling questioned if the demolition was denied and to restore the building 80% of it will need to be removed for the repair, how would the applicant get an approved reconstruction plan? Mr. Cracknell responded that the applicant would remove 80% of the building if that were what was needed and the outside would be built to approval.

Mr. Rawling noted that right away the applicant would need to put in a new foundation. Would it have to be a stone foundation in kind? Mr. Cracknell responded yes, unless that's altered here. Mr. Rawling questioned what if the applicant had to put foundation in places that is not there right now? Mr. Cracknell responded that as long as what's above ground looks the same.

Mr. Mayer commented that the condition of the structure is really fatigued, but in order to have perspective on making this decision it may be helpful to have someone from the preservation office weigh in.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff commented that in order to do this project and save the outside of the building knows the foundation and the whole first floor would need to be saved. The front steps and chimney are gone. The whole inside of the building is going to be changed. It should make that easier to restore the perimeter of the building. This house is not trying to be saved as a historical monument for touring.

Mr. Ryan noted the major concern is that what is being restored or saved would be to make the Board feel better. All of what is saved would be covered in dry wall. Is the Board doing this to feel less guilty or is the Board using common sense to understand that there's not much to be saved. Some pieces in the house are not even more than 20 years old.

Ms. Bolster noted there is more than one way to approach a building like this and there have been examples where contractors have come in to make it a different outcome. If a decision is made to not demolish is there an opportunity to stop and reevaluate the approach to this building. Where do should the line be drawn?

Chairman Lombardi noted that every application to this commission stands by itself. No one application sets precedence. That being said it is sometimes hard to defend decisions.

Hearing no other discussion, the Chairman called for the vote. The motion to approve as presented was denied in a 3-4 vote.

7. Petition of **Walker's Place Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **151 Lafayette Road**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add egress window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 21 and lies within the GRA and Historic Districts. *(The applicant has asked to postpone to the October 2017 meeting.)*

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

It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote to **postpone** the petition to the October 2017 meeting.

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

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

8. *(Work Session/Public Hearing)* Petition of **The Provident Bank, owner**, for property located at **25 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct a three story mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

Lisa DeStefano and Joe Almeida from DeStefano Architects and Contractor Steve Wilson were present to speak to the petition. Ms. DeStefano walked the Board through changes made since the last work session. The generator location will be hidden behind the elevator. There are a few other mechanical units located central to the building. The bathroom vents are clustered to have as little clutter on the roof as possible. Chairman Lombardi asked clarification on what the units are. Mr. Wilson clarified that they are air conditioner units among other units. The goal is to get them all in that area and put them in a tower. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned if there are requirements for the space around units. Mr. Wilson responded that the requirement is one foot between them. Stacking the units will make it the cleanest rooftop in the city. The smaller pipes are bringing together dryer vents and plumbing. The applicant's plan on using concentric kits where the furnace is that can mount directly to the masonry wall. They can be painted the same color as the wall. Mr. Cracknell questioned why it was so large. Mr. Wilson responded that they make up air and blow out exhaust.

Ms. DeStefano commented that the shape of the corner was looked at and the ellipse is more attractive. The goal was to keep the oval continuous, so hints of it could be seen coming down Maplewood Avenue. Mr. Rawling questioned if that worked effectively from Maplewood, but could it be visible on the other side. Mr. Wilson responded that it would be seen going up Islington toward the Friendly Toast. From the parking garage the whole roof would be visible. Ms. DeStefano noted that of all the projects worked on recently, this one has done the most to screen the units. Mr. Rawling responded that it's appreciated.

Ms. DeStefano walked the Commission through the updates made to the plans. Sheet 8 showed a few changes including a corner change and the roof of the balcony has been lightened up. The guardrail on the balcony now compliments the guardrail below. The awning has been simplified and screening was added to the tower. The Board of Adjustment (BOA) has given approval on the vertical height on the corner. Page 13 shows the original design of the tower cap with the screening in the center. The one on the left shows what the maximum is allowed for with the BOA approval. The one on the right gets the ventilation and allows for stacking units two high. That one doesn't go anywhere near the maximum allowed by BOA. Vice Chairman Wyckoff clarified what the black part is on the picture. Ms. DeStefano clarified that's the screening system. Chairman Lombardi asked if a residence is underneath and if there would be a noise issue. Mr. Wilson responded that there is not a noise concern. They would be mounted on isolation buffers and are low noise anyway. The intent is to get away from scattering them all over the place. Instead of just screening the condensers they would be hidden. Vice Chairman Wyckoff commented they wouldn't be pulling a lot of heat.

Ms. DeStefano pointed out that all of the elevations for the site plans were side by side on page 8. Chairman Lombardi clarified that bays on the second floor go over the sidewalk. Ms. DeStefano confirmed that was correct and it would be similar to the Provident copper bays that stick out over the second floor.

Mr. Rawling clarified that people won't be looking up and seeing the bays. Ms. DeStefano confirmed that was correct. The bay would also allow for recessed lighting to be installed. It will be dark sky friendly.

Ms. DeStefano explained that sheet 9 showed revisions on Hanover Street. Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that the elevator was simplified. Ms. DeStefano confirmed that was correct. Sheet 10 showed an edge of continuous green. Chairman Lombardi questioned if there was open grading for the parking. Ms. DeStefano clarified those are glass blocks. Page 11 has a number of changes on the ground floor. An exit door was painted out and in the center got a recess that helped define the retail space. There is a mechanical vent for the parking. Chairman Lombardi questioned if that would be blasting out air. Mr. Wilson responded that it would be constantly fanning a little. Occasionally if a car is idling, then it will increase the blow then ramp down. If it doesn't the fire department is called.

Ms. DeStefano showed the entrance to Provident Bank had been lightened up by making it thinner and more vertical on page 12. The major corner entry to the right shows dimensions and details and the final corner entrance is the chamfered corner. The retail that's on the corner there will be very inviting. Mr. Rawling questioned if the Provident Bank entrance is curbed. Ms.

DeStefano responded that's showing the projection of the provident awning. The whole landing will be covered from weather, so that's what is being shown there.

Ms. DeStefano explained that the next three images show the difference in perspectives of the rooflines. The First is the preferred with the screened units. The look of the building was considered from all four sides. The intent is for the corner to be very inviting as people walk down the street. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned the perspectives. Ms. DeStefano clarified that the first perspective was preferred. If it went higher, then the building could look top heavy.

Ms. DeStefano commented that page 19 calls out all the materials. The team brought materials to show the Commission. They are all organic colors. The brick is a Morin brick; it has a cleaner square edge. The mortar has some warmth to it. The cast stone is a buff color, so the base will be more of an earth tone. The picture frame brick compliments as a darker color. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned if the cast block would be stain resistant. Mr. Wilson responded that would be a consistent color and have a seal finish so it won't stain. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned why other buildings stain. Mr. Wilson responded that it's because granite is so porous. Vice Chairman Wyckoff noted that this should be put in as a stipulation for future projects. Mr. Wilson commented that even if the granite is sealed, it still needs to be resealed. This material won't need to be resealed. Ms. DeStefano showed the painted surfaces. It's dark but not black. The entry doors will be solid wood. The light fixtures material for all the major entrances were shown, as well as the upper screen pattern that would be for surrounding the mechanical.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned if there would be flashing. Mr. Wilson responded that all of the embedded will be copper and most of the downspouts as well. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned if it would be matte finish. Ms. DeStefano confirmed that was correct.

Ms. DeStefano presented two options for the roof. Mr. Rawling questioned if it was real slate. Ms. DeStefano responded that it was not, and asked the Board for their thoughts on the two options. Mr. Wilson noted that one of them is a blend with some green in it. It is probably too much color, but it would be a good mix if the green were switched to a darker gray. That would make it look salt and pepper looking but not overly colored. It would be more interesting than just straight black. There is a chiseled edge, but the sample that would be used would have a little bit less of a chiseled look. The roof would have a more refined edge. Mr. Rawling noted that the subtle variations were more attractive than the extreme variations. There won't be enough roof to make the variation look right. Vice Chairman Wyckoff agreed that it's a very well designed building and there is already so much other detail. The more consistent sample would be better.

Ms. DeStefano noted a lot of relief to the façade of the building. There is a lot of information to take in, but as design professionals it is important to make sure that everything can be put together as it was drawn.

Mr. Rawling asked for clarification around the detailing of the stone. Ms. DeStefano pointed Mr. Rawling to a page with further detailing that shows the cast base. The team went back and forth between a chamfer and a square edge. Ultimately the square edge was chosen because it

would hide the stone base joints better. Mr. Wilson commented that because a mock up is required on site, the team could have both stones cut to show and the decision of which looks better could be made then.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff asked for clarification on the raised canopies. Ms. DeStefano walked the Commission through the details of the glass canopies and specified that they have been simplified. Mr. Ryan questioned if it was clear glass. Ms. DeStefano commented that it has not been fully decided. Frosted glass has been discussed to provide some protection, but it has not been fully decided.

Mr. Rawling asked what the support brackets were made of. Ms. DeStefano commented that they will have a piece of structure in between, but is not sure what the material will be. It will be painted out to match the cast color.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff commented on glare that comes off other buildings in Portsmouth, and talked about how blinding it could be. Mr. Wilson confirmed that this building would not have that problem.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if guards would be put on the roof for ice. Ms. DeStefano confirmed that it is in the plans to have guards. Mr. Wilson commented that these guards would allow the snow to melt and run into the gutters.

Mr. Rawling thinks it's a very nice building the sticking point is the units on the roof. Mr. Wilson responded that 14 units would be required. Right now there are 12, but the goal is to hide every one of them. Mr. Rawling appreciated the gesture of the team working with that, but does not feel that it's solid yet. Ms. DeStefano responded that the generator is going on the roof and it will be completely hidden. Mr. Wilson commented that he does not have a solution for the problem, but is open to suggestions. Putting on a false peak would draw more attention to it. The units could be pulled a little closer, but they have to be in a symmetrical pattern. The units could be ordered in black, so they blend in better. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned why everyone is doing white on roofs now. Mr. Wilson responded that it's a different kind of roof. It's an apoxy membrane. It's expensive and deflects heat, but also protects from things like the fryer at McDonalds. Mr. Almeida commented that when the mechanicals are treated as an afterthought it could be damage to a design. The mechanicals have not been an afterthought with this project. There has been great care to minimize visibility.

Ms. DeStefano thanked the commission for four work sessions. Part of the application is asking for demolition of the existing building. The goal is to make this a landmark building and an entrance to the city. The team is thrilled with the massing, scale and materials in this project. It's a unique building with no backside. The goal was to provide a pedestrian experience. The plans have incorporated durable materials and will be compatible to the surrounding buildings. The applicants requested approval to the project with two stipulations. One for the cask base for mock up will show a chamfer and other one would be square cut so a final decision could be made then. The mechanical units would be ordered in a dark finish to blend with the roof. The coachman roof tiling will be selected. Vice Chairman Wyckoff added a stipulation to do

photographic measured drawings and any other history of the building that will be demolished could be included in a package.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if there were any screens on the windows. Ms. DeStefano confirmed there would be screens.

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

John Ducey, 172 Hanover Street, had a chance to review the plans and listen to the session. Inspired by the thoughtful consideration given to these applications. Think it's a wonderful project. Mr. Ducey has owned his building since 2007 and seen a lot of buildings go up. What is offered here today will enrich the area. It's a nice blend of history and architecture.

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Wyckoff moved to approve the application as presented, seconded by Mr. Ryan, with the following stipulations:

1. The Coachman style synthetic slate shingle (with a more refined edge treatment) shall be used;
2. A mock-up of the brick joints, mortar, and edge treatment for the cast stone shall be submitted for Administrative Approval prior to installation;
3. The final HVAC plan shall be submitted for Administrative Approval;
4. The preferred tower design shall be used;
5. A photographic inventory shall be prepared for the existing building and submitted to the Planning Department prior to demolition;
6. Half screens shall be used; and
7. All easements and/ or license agreements with the city shall be obtained for any encroachments into the public right-of-way and any design modifications shall be approved by the HDC.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff commented that this project maintains the special character of the district and the surrounding properties. For those reasons Vice Chairman Wyckoff supports the project.

City Council Representative Pearson noted that since the Board had a long discussion about another demolition tonight, then they should take a minute to appreciate the building that is going to be demolished.

Vice Chairman Wyckoff commented that this decision was not taken lightly. The Board took a lot of time in a work session going back and forth about this.

Hearing no other discussion, the Chairman called for the vote. The motion to approve passed unanimously in a (6-0) vote.

## V. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Portsmouth Savings Bank/Bank of NH (TD Bank), owner**, for property located at **333 and 340 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 5 & 10 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(The applicant has asked to postpone to the October 2017 meeting.)*

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote to **postpone** the petition to the October 2017 meeting.

B. Work Session requested by **Eric and Johanna Landis, owner**, for property located at **540 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (expand and enclose porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 79 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Sarah Hourihane from DeStefano Architects with owner Eric Landis spoke to the application. The depth has been reduced from 6 feet to 4 feet 8 inches. Ms. Hourihane presented a context photo to show more around the neighborhood. The house was built in 2005. Mr. Landis commented that the staff notes say that the house was built in 1875, but it was an empty lot. Ms. Hourihane showed the previously approved elevation on the top of the page and the proposed on the lower page. The project proposal includes a double hung window. Vice Chairman Wyckoff commented that they would need to have full screens. Ms. Hourihane responded that roll down screens can be an option. Then pointed out a corner on the building with a 6-foot post wrapping and patio door next to it. The far bay would have recessed trim panels. A gas fireplace would potentially go there. Mr. Cracknell questioned if it would be direct vented into the wall. Ms. Hourihane responded most likely it would. Vice Chairman Wyckoff commented that it could be vent less.

Ms. Bolster asked for clarification on the panels. Ms. Hourihane responded that based on the conversation from last month the goal was to make the porch feel like it had been enclosed. Chairman Lombardi commented that the panels are confusing. Ms. Hourihane responded that they are laid out to accommodate the gas fireplace.

Ms. Bolster clarified that a window would not be covered up. Mr. Landis confirmed it would not. Vice Chairman Wyckoff questioned if it was two panels or one. Ms. Hourihane responded that it's two panels on the side.

Ms. Bolster questioned if that was the only wall the fireplace could go? Ms. Hourihane responded that one of the challenges was considering the existing house there were existing windows and a door that would remain. Mr. Rawling suggested the whole wall should be glass and the applicant should explore other options for the fireplace perhaps a freestanding stove. Ms. Hourihane clarified if the plans were for all glass, then the project would be able to come back for final hearing. Vice Chairman Wyckoff agreed the panels are awkward. Chairman Lombardi commented the back wall could be solid.

Mr. Landis questioned if the screens could be approved if the screens were removed in the winter.

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

The applicant indicated they would move forward with a public hearing in the near future.

#### **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Bolster moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:25 pm, seconded by Vice Chairman Wyckoff. The motion passed in a (6-0) vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Frey, Acting Historic District Commission Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on October 4, 2017.