

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**November 1, 2017
to be reconvened on November 8, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Richard Shea, Martin Ryan

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Alternate Molly Bolster

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

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

Chairman Lombardi read the request for postponement, Public Hearing A, 220 South Street into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved (6-0) to **postpone** the petition to the December 6, 2017 meeting.*

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 4, 2017

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously **passed** (6-0) to **approve** the October 4, 2017 minutes as amended.*

B. October 18, 2017

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously **passed** (6-0) to **postpone** the approval of the October 18, 2017 minutes to the November 8, 2017 meeting.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL

1. 55 Market Street
2. 172 Hanover Street
3. 180 Gates Street
4. 77 Daniel Street
5. 1 Webster Way

6. 121 Mechanic Street
7. 490 Marcy Street

Mr. Cracknell addressed Items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7 first.

Item 1, 55 Market Street

Mr. Cracknell read the changes. Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that there were no specifications for the outside condensers. Mr. Cracknell said the applicant met the dimensional requirements of the Ordinance and would install one more conduit that would not be visible from the street.

Item 3, 180 Gates St

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to replace the garage doors with a new design. He said he would look at the building permit to ensure that the design was consistent.

Item 4, 77 Daniel Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to replace the door on the rear third floor and delete a window. Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that the specifications designated a wall art installation on the back, and he said it should be part of the plan. He suggested a stipulation that the wall art installation actually occur.

Item 5, 1 Webster Way

Mr. Cracknell said the request was to replace the aluminum glide storm windows with Brosco, which was a replacement in kind.

Item 7, 490 Marcy Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to install two bulkhead enclosures on existing openings in the basement. Mr. Shea said there was no detail provided as to what the door would look like.

The project architect Jennifer Ramsey stated that the structure would look like a metal bulkhead and would be Azek painted to match the house color and the foundation. Mr. Shea said it would look better as a board door instead of a flat panel, and Ms. Ramsey agreed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested that the Azek door be lightly scored and field painted to get the requested look.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** Items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7, with the following stipulation on Item 7:*

The bulkhead door on the South School Street elevation shall be scored AZEK (to resemble wood) and be field-painted.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous (6-0) vote.*

Item 2, 172 Hanover Street

Mr. Cracknell read the changes.

Lauren Vorwald of DeStefano Architects was present on behalf of the applicant. She reviewed the window and door installations. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said a detail was required of what would be done with the awning going across an opening that had a recess. Ms. Vorwald said she could provide it as they moved forward. She said the entry door system would be one component and the awning would be installed on top of it. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the previously-approved petition had two sidelights and a door in the middle, and now it had one sidelight and a door. Ms. Vorwald said it was part of the new storefront system and would fit into the existing opening, with the door located on one side and the light on the other.

Ms. Vorwald said they wanted two vents on the west elevation, one in the left window and one in the right, and were now showing vent louvers instead of the exhaust pipe. She said the middle window would have the same light pattern as the windows above. She said the simple railing was on the Vaughan Mall side and would protect the curb.

Mr. Cracknell suggested a stipulation that the railing would be subject to permitting from the City to have it installed in the Vaughan Mall. Ms. Vorwald said the railing was aluminum.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the item subject to any licenses or easement required by the City. Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

Item 6, 121 Mechanic St

Mr. Cracknell stated that the Planning Department spent time with the applicant on the seawall system and approved it, and that it would be replaced in kind with wood timbers and piers. He said, however, that the Planning Department hadn't realized that the applicant proposed to demolish two accessory structures and replace them in kind, which also needed approval. He said he asked the applicant to consider upgrades and put them on the site as new buildings, with the same height and dimensions, but with the stipulation that either clapboards or shingles be installed and that the 3-tab shingles be updated to asphalt with a weathered look. He said he also told the applicant that if any windows had to be replaced, he had to return. He said the applicant would salvage all the windows if he could.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the buildings were structurally sound and could be moved aside. The applicant Jason Brewster was present and said he had to remove them to build the chain wall. Mr. Shea asked how old the buildings were, and Mr. Brewster said they were from the 1930s. Mr. Shea asked whether the applicant had photos or dimensions if it was stipulated that they be replaced in kind. Mr. Cracknell said they had photos but needed tighter dimensions, and said it would be cedars or shingles and hoped the applicant could return with better window suggestions if the existing ones couldn't be salvaged. Mr. Shea asked whether the concrete chimney would go back in. Mr. Brewster said it would not. Mr. Cracknell said the Commission needed to know for sure. Mr. Shea asked about the French doors, and Mr. Brewster said he would re-use them. Mr. Cracknell said it would also be stipulated that the chimney would not be reconstructed.

Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the item, with the following stipulations:

- 1) Both accessory buildings will be reconstructed at the same locations and dimensions (including height);
- 2) All existing windows (including the sills) will be retained and reused in the same location and profile as the existing structure. If other windows are preferred, they will be presented under a new application to the HDC;
- 3) Cedar siding or shingles shall be used to clad both buildings;
- 4) The existing three-tab asphalt shingles will be upgraded to a weathered wood architectural asphalt shingle; and
- 5) The existing chimney is not included in the reconstruction of the building.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous (6-0) vote.

Commissioner Rawling arrived at this point in the meeting.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. 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 shingle 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 applicant has asked to postpone review of the application to the December 6, 2017 meeting.)*

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved (7-0) to **postpone** the petition to the December 6, 2017 meeting.*

B. Petition of **110-112 Court Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Beth Goddard**, applicant, for property located at **110 Court Street, Unit 3**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (restore five original windows, remove and replace six windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 39-3 and lies within the CD4-L1 and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the October 4, 2017 meeting to the November 1, 2017 meeting.)*

Mr. Shea recused himself from the petition.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Beth Goddard was present to speak to the petition. She said the windows were vinyl coated and matched the existing window styles. She said four of the windows she wanted to replace were replaced in 2002, but she didn't know when the other two were replaced.

Ms. Ruedig said the two windows in the side entryway looked older. Ms. Goddard said they weren't original windows. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was disturbing to see a variety of windows on an 1820 Federal building. It was further discussed. Chairman Lombardi concluded

that the Commission's best practice would be to do the most historically accurate thing for the building with its multiple owners. He said they generally asked applicants to upgrade windows and not match windows that didn't meet the standard. Mr. Cracknell said there were guidelines that discouraged vinyl clad windows in the District because they were inappropriate unless the building was fairly new. The windows were further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said there were several low-maintenance replacement windows that didn't have to be wood and suggested a Fibrex-clad replacement window was preferred. Mr. Cracknell said the window casing should be wood, according to the previous stipulation, and that there should be no vinyl flange or protection against the wood.

Ms. Goddard said she was amenable to the Andersen Fibrex 400 Series, 6/6 windows.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one was resent to speak to the petition, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The Andersen 400 Series windows shall be used for the replacement and shall be simulated divided light and have fibrex cladding.*
- 2) The window casing shall be field applied.*

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous (6-0) vote.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

Mr. Shea resumed his voting seat.

1. *(Re-hearing)* 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

The owner of Ten Walker Street Realty Glenn Walker was present on behalf of 73 Prospect Street to speak to the petition. He said they resubmitted a report on the condition of the building and noted that a site walk was done before the meeting. He said they wanted to move forward with removing the structure and reconstructing it per the previously-approved plans.

Ms. Ruedig noted that Mr. Wathne was an experienced structural engineer and that she appreciated his report and walking the Commissioners through the structure. She said that her

view of the project from the very beginning, however, was that the house would be a brand new house in the form of the historic house because everything was being replaced and there wouldn't be much left to say that it was a restoration rather than a total rebuild. She said the building had a lot of history and was very significant but had been neglected for the last 100 years. She said the Commission had to recognize when a historic structure was too far gone to save it and that she could accept the demolition. She asked that the historic beams and paneling be re-used. Mr. Ryan agreed that the house was well beyond the tipping point and that he couldn't see any fundamental construction or preservation techniques for it unless it was a relic or museum piece. He said he was in support of the demolition.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff gave a few examples of other historic houses in the area that were saved and said that it was upsetting to approve the house to be torn down. He indicated that he was against the demolition. Mr. Rawling said he supported the demolition because if the building was reconstructed, he could see only 25% of it being present and the rest rotted away.

Mr. Shea said he was torn but realized the amount of rebuild that would be necessary, and that there would be nothing left of the old structure by the time it was brought up to code, so he felt that it probably couldn't be saved. He suggested a stipulation that the house be photographed and the photographs submitted to the Athenaeum, that there be documentation of the framing, and that a couple of pieces be saved if possible and incorporated into one of the rooms and also documented. He said that maybe a few beams could be re-used decoratively. He also recommended that stone veneer be placed on the visible part of the foundation.

Chairman Lombardi said that, after the second site walk and listening to the structural engineer, he felt that the house needed a full replacement. He said that, no matter what was done to the building, people would see a complete re-creation. He noted that Portsmouth had a wealth of historic fabric and that it would be a shame to lose the house, but it would be very challenging to save it. He agreed with Mr. Shea about saving historical pieces from the house and asked whether Jim Gardner had looked at the house. Mr. Walker said he would reach out to him about the documentation. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the house should be respectfully taken apart, beams set aside, and so on. He asked whether the beams could be incorporated into the structure. Mr. Walker said that was the goal.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1. A photographic inventory and other associated historic information shall be submitted to the Planning Department and Athenaeum prior to demolition;*
- 2. The exposed foundation shall be veneered on three sides (including the street side) with field stone to match the existing foundation; and*

3. *The heavy timber beams within the frame and the raised panel walls and the fireplace surround shall be salvaged and cosmetically reused within the previously-approved building.*

Councilor Pearson seconded.

Ms. Ruedig said it was a tough call and that the Commissioners had all wrestled with it. She said the plan that was previously approved was still going forward but there would be all new construction on the inside as well as the outside. She said the overall design would preserve the special character of the District in terms of the building looking like the one it was replacing, so it would be compatible with the design of surrounding properties as well as increase their values.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Vice-Chair Wyckoff opposed.*

2. Petition of **Brenda J. Bouchard Revocable Trust of 1999, Brenda J. Bouchard, owner and trustee**, for property located at **33 Holmes Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, change window configuration on front porch, install two HVAC units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 12 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ken Davis on behalf of the owner was present to speak to the petition. He said he wanted to remove all the existing windows because there was a fair amount of rot in the sashes and trim and replace them with Marvin Integrity windows. He said the building inspector wanted a fire-rated cement trim on the windows next to the adjacent property. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the inspector said the material had to be put on the side of the house. Mr. Davis said it was a strong suggestion and that he would get clarification. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the Commission would make it a stipulation that the building inspector's recommendation had to be part of the approval. Mr. Cracknell said it had to be made clear that the Commission wasn't really supportive of the recommendation. The windows were further discussed. Mr. Shea concluded that the trim would be replaced and a historically accurate window sill pattern would be installed. He asked whether everything would be done in pvc and painted, and Mr. Davis agreed. He said the only three windows in question were the firewall separation from the adjacent house and would be painted to match the rest of the house.

Mr. Davis discussed the porch and the windows in detail and said they would probably leave the ellipsis. Ms. Ruedig said there were two window options on the side that were shown on the drawings. Mr. Davis said they would probably do the two double hung windows to keep the original look but shrink them a bit, with a 3" space between them. Mr. Rawling said he didn't know how the aesthetics would work with the window changes on the porch due to the different sizes and types of windows on the other elevations. He said it was necessary to keep the same porch rhythm. It was further discussed. He said he could support putting two double hung

windows where there were the triple casements, with a wider post in the center and repeat what was in the front elevation. Mr. Shea agreed.

The short windows on the porch were further discussed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested larger windows. Mr. Rawling said a drawing would have to be submitted to reflect those changes. Window heights were further discussed.

Mr. Davis discussed the condenser and the two locations it could be installed in. Ms. Ruedig said it would be preferable to put the condenser in the back because it would be viewable on the side. It was further discussed.

Mr. Davis said the chimney might have to be taken down but that they could rebuild a fake chimney using old brick. It was further discussed. Chairman Lombardi and Mr. Rawling said they would not encourage removing the chimney as part of the solution for interior planning.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

John Davis asked why it mattered if the chimney was replaced in kind because it couldn't be seen from the outside. Ms. Ruedig said the replacement would not be authentic. Mr. Shea said the house might not sell if the original fireplace was missing. It was further discussed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1. Subject to approval from the BOA, the condenser shall be located at the rear of the structure;*
- 2. All PVC shall be field-painted;*
- 3. A stud-pocket shall be inserted between all paired windows;*
- 4. The porch shall have two, 48 inch, double-hung, SDL windows with a stud-pocket under the ellipse;*
- 5. A final shop drawing for the porch shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to construction; and*
- 6. The existing chimney shall not be removed above the roofline.*

*Mr. Shea seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote.*

3. Petition of **Blue Star Properties, LLC and Forum Group, LLC, owners**, for property located at **67 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace two windows on front elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 53 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant was not present.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved (7-0) to **postpone** the petition to the end of the meeting, and if the applicant still was not present, then **postpone** it to the November 8, 2017 meeting.*

4. Petition of **299 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **299 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (add a roof deck/terrace and minor façade adjustments) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 123 as Lot 10 and Assessor Plan 124 as Lots 10 & 11 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Jeff Johnston and Carla Goodnight were present on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Goodnight reviewed all the proposed changes, noting that the biggest change was the rooftop terrace.

Ms. Ruedig said she loved the idea of a rooftop deck terrace but couldn't support the design and the amount of mass on top of the roof. Ms. Goodnight said the open deck was set back on all four sides. Ms. Ruedig said the addition would be very visible because of the space in front of 3S Artspace. She asked whether it could be minimized. It was further discussed. Councilor Pearson asked how far back the deck was from the edge. Ms. Goodnight said it was set back almost the entire depth of the building. Ms. Ruedig asked how tall the screen wall in front was. Ms. Goodnight said it was the same height as the building but could be lowered. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the screen wall should be as short as possible. He asked how tall the deck was, and Ms. Goodnight said it was 11-1/2 feet but could be reduced by five feet.

Mr. Rawling asked how wide the opening for the drive to the parking area was. Ms. Goodnight said it was about 30 feet or less. He said a pedestrian in the courtyard might not pick up the new addition on the roof. Ms. Ruedig said it would still be seen from Maplewood Avenue. It was further discussed.

Mr. Ryan said he was pleased with the roof deck and thought that the building was a far better one than before. He suggested that the applicant provide a 3D street level plan.

Mr. Shea agreed with Ms. Ruedig that there was too much mass. He said he liked the building before because it was stepped down, and felt that the simplicity of the two brick bookends was lost. He said it felt heavy over the front door and suggested that having no brick on that level might make it lighter. Ms. Ruedig asked whether the first double bay chunk of the building had to be brought all the way up to the façade and thought pushing it back to the entrance of the hallway would help. Mr. Johnston said there was an egress door. It was further discussed.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was in favor of the rooftop deck but thought there should be a work session because there were lots of changes and new construction. He said there was a lack of measurements and detail. Mr. Rawling said he liked the added dimension of the shadow box and the fact that the HVAC equipment was cleaned up. He said there was merit in considering lighter material on the top floor. Ms. Goodnight showed the Commission the larger format drawings that had documentation and dimensions, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Ryan said that using similar materials like the rest of the building would tie it all the way across and make a better approach, but he said a 3D version would be beneficial to show how it was set back. He said he was happy with the massing. Mr. Shea said he liked the earlier version because of the way the glass between the structures expanded. Ms. Goodnight said that continuing the metal material might help. Mr. Rawling said he thought the modifications around the ground were improvements. Chairman Lombardi said the trim on the proposed window pattern detracted from the cleanliness and said he preferred the earlier version. Ms. Ruedig said she wanted to see a 3D rendering to better understand the proposed changes. She asked that there be refinements and that the top structure be minimized as much as possible.

Mr. Johnston asked for approval on all the changes except for the rooftop deck, which could be addressed at a future meeting.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **bifurcate** the application and to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the changes, except for the rooftop deck. Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a modern building and that the changes were needed for construction. He said he felt the application should be approved.

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

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **continue** the rooftop deck review to the December 6, 2017 meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote.*

V. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **James C. and Amy M. Baker, owners**, for property located at **75 Humphrey's Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear addition) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new rear addition, replace/relocate misc. doors and windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 37 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Ms. Ruedig recused herself from the work session.

Jennifer Ramsey was present on behalf of the applicant. She reviewed the changes and said they wanted to remove the sunroom structure and rebuild a similar-shaped structure that would run the entire back of the home. She said it would need new windows, doors, siding, and a metal roof. She also said they wanted a full dormer and an improved eave line.

The Commission discussed the roofline and the metal roof. Mr. Rawling noted that metal roofs were glossy and too colorful. Ms. Ramsey said the roof would match the one on the garage. Mr. Shea said the home didn't look like a 1950s home anymore but more of a cottage-style one, which bothered him. He said some of the home's history would be erased and that he was totally opposed to the metal roof because it would be very visible from Marcy Street. He said the other changes and the shed dormer were fine and liked the double hung window proportions better, but struggled with changing the home from a 1950s one.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he wasn't against the metal roof because it was 2017. He said he wasn't at all upset that the home's style would be changed because he felt that it didn't have a 1950s style. He said the applicant did a good job of simplifying the details, and that he liked the new clean approach and was in support of it as shown. Mr. Ryan said he wouldn't be against the metal roof. Chairman Lombardi said the metal roof was a distraction but that he liked everything else. He noted that there were a lot of combined windows in the rear elevation. Ms. Ramsey said they got more light into the house. The metal roof was further discussed. Mr. Rawling said it wasn't characteristic of Portsmouth. Councilor Pearson said she could go either way but thought it would look strange to have that much metal roof in that corner.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that she would **continue** the work session to a future meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **Simchik-McGovern III, LLC, owners**, for property located at **8 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (modify the storefront for ADA accessibility, remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 22 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Ms. Ruedig resumed her voting seat.

Steve McHenry and Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architects were present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. The owners Corrinne McGovern and Michael Simchik were also present, as was the potential tenant David Martou.

Mr. Johnson distributed a new packet of information to the Commission. Mr. Martou briefly addressed the bank and the ADA accessibility. Mr. Simchik said he was pleased to have the opportunity to buy the building. Mr. McHenry said the main goal was to make the building safe and make the top floor more usable.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the packet with the Commission in detail. He showed some historic photos and said the storefront was from the 1860s. He showed documentation of existing window locations and proposed window replacements of Pella Architectural Reserve series, 6/6. He said they wanted to widen the entry door by six inches, replace the wood sills with granite, and move the cornice line to allow more views.

Mr. Shea asked whether the storefront would be replaced. Mr. McHenry said it would not because it was in good shape. He briefly discussed the neighborhood's history. Ms. Ruedig said it was a significant location and used to be the center of town in the 1860s. She said she could not support adding a third floor to the façade because it was a historic view and documented a long time. She said the storefront was wonderful and in a prime location. She said the other improvements were fine but was hesitant to change the storefront entry because it was so intact. Mr. Rawling said the storefront changes were good and kept the character of the original. He said the side door was already an oddity. He said he had difficulty supporting the third-floor addition on such a distinct and documented corner of the street and felt it was a big change to the historic building.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he supported changing the storefront and asked that some 3D models of the building be presented, with perhaps a few dormers as a way of improving the third-floor apartments. Mr. McHenry said the problem was the location of the skylights. He said if they installed a dormer, it would be 5-6 feet in the air and not conducive to enjoying the views. Mr. Shea asked whether one could enter the building on the side, and it was discussed. Mr. Shea asked whether there was room for a small ramp. Mr. McHenry said they already had to rebuild a stair case. Mr. Johnson noted that the accessibility was for anyone with mobility issues, like the elderly. Councilor Pearson asked about parking and was told that it was a downtown branch with no parking. The sidewalk grading was discussed. Mr. Rawling said it seemed different than the existing. Mr. Johnson said they couldn't change the grade of city sidewalks.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether some of the window glass could be re-used. Mr. McHenry said they wanted to put insulated glass into the existing storefront. They further discussed re-using historic materials and putting wave glass in the storefront.

Mr. Rawling said he had to know more about the conditions for the sill changes and wasn't so supportive of changing from wood to granite. Mr. McHenry said they could do a study on the sills. Mr. Johnson noted that the headers were granite.

Chairman Lombardi said he had trouble with the third floor, but otherwise thought the plan was probably the best that the applicant could come up with. Mr. Ryan said he had no trouble with widening the door because it would make it safer. He asked about the graphic, and it was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said the middle option of the angled corner worked best and said she

would be more supportive of larger skylights. Mr. Rawling said he would have trouble supporting the windows.

Mr. McHenry said they would look at storefront materials, glass choice, brick, headers and lintels for original windows, and window additions. He said he would discuss the third-floor eave line with the client and come up with the most accurate accessible entrance on the storefront.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that they would return for a **work session/public hearing** at a future meeting.*

VI. ADJOURNMENT

*At 10:30 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (6-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on Dec. 6, 2017.