

SITE WALK – 206 COURT STREET– JUNE 6, 2018 – 5:45 PM

**MINUTES
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

6:30 p.m.

June 6, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman Jon Wyckoff; City Council Representative Doug Roberts; Reagan Ruedig, Martin Ryan, Dan Rawling; and Alternate Molly Bolster

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Richard Shea; Alternate Cyrus Beer

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
Chairman Lombardi was absent, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff assumed his seat as Acting Chair.

Deputy City Attorney Suzanne Woodland was present to give a short presentation on communications. She noted that a commissioner made statements on social media that suggested that he had potentially prejudged the McIntyre project. She said he had recused himself from participating in it, and she reminded all land board members that they sat in a quasi-judicial capacity when reviewing applications and that it was crucial that they not prejudge projects.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. May 2, 2018

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **approve** the May 2, 2018 minutes as presented.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

The Commission first addressed Petition # 8 and postponed it. Mr. Cracknell then addressed each administrative approval petition individually.

1. **238 Deer Street**

The petition was for the relocation of a dumpster to an enclosure that would be shared with the neighboring business.

2. **59 Sheafe Street**

Mr. Rawling moved for discussion. The applicant was present and said he wanted to install a 6/1 kitchen window on the first floor. Mr. Rawling said the 6/1 window was awkward in appearance and too small for the top sash. It was further discussed and stipulated that a 3/3 window would be used instead.

3. **1 Market Street**

The petition was for an additional condensing unit that would not be visible from the public way.

4. **180 Middle Street**

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to install a Townsend light, which the Commission previously recommended. He said the applicant would also rebuild the retaining wall.

5. **53 Humphreys Court**

Ms. Ruedig recused herself from the petition.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed to **pull** the petition for later discussion.*

The Commission returned to address this item.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the applicant requested running the duct system into the second floor.

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (5-0) to approve the petition, with the following stipulations:

1. The conduit shall be painted to match siding.
2. The conduit shall run across bottom clapboard.

6. **540 Marcy Street**

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to widen the stairs to the width of the columns to pick up the railing and that the same material would be used.

7. **29 Vaughan Street**

Mr. Cracknell said that the applicant wanted to replace seven retractable awnings with fixed ones. Acting Chair Wyckoff asked whether they would have valances on the front. The applicant was present and said there would be valances. Mr. Rawling said that fixed awnings were a negative feature for downtown and also pointed out that the awnings were only 36 inches.

The Commission decided to pull the petition for later discussion.

The Commission re-addressed the item. The applicant Sam Winebaum was present and stated that the retractable awnings needed to be replaced due to wear and tear after several years of use. He also noted that birds were nesting under all of them. He proposed fixed awnings with a loose valance and thought the green color with black stripes would be appropriate for the area.

Ms. Ruedig verified that there were seven awnings for seven storefronts. Mr. Winebaum said there were three wider columns, which would create some variation, and that more brick would be seen between those columns and storefronts. He said that each store would have its own valance and logo. In response to Ms. Bolster's questions, the applicant said the logo would be on the valance. He said he did not have a photo of what the awnings would look like open but said they had a scalloped look and were a stretched fabric.

Mr. Rawling said an awning had to enhance the pedestrian experience and provide shelter and cooling. He said the small fixed awnings that were simulated didn't do that and were more like signboards. Mr. Winebaum said the awnings measured close to six feet when open but that very few were fully extended. Ms. Bolster asked what the reason was for new awnings. Mr. Winebaum said he thought it had to do with the pitch that would prevent snow from falling.

City Council Representative Roberts noted that the sun was very strong in the summer and said he didn't know whether a 3-inch awning placed that high would shade the front of the building much. Mr. Winebaum disagreed, saying that the windows extended very high and that the valance would be near the top. City Council Representative Roberts said that made more sense. He asked whether the signs would remain and if the logo would be on the front of the awnings as well. Mr. Winebaum agreed. Ms. Ruedig said it would be nice to see a much wider awning that provided more shelter, but didn't see how a fixed awning could achieve that, so she thought the awnings were appropriate. She noted that the awnings were lightweight installations that could be removed if necessary.

Ms. Bolster said the Commission didn't have a visual idea of what the fixed awnings would look like when open. She asked whether the stripes would be overwhelming. Mr. Winebaum said they tried to pick a color scheme that was neutral. Ms. Bolster suggested that the applicant do a visual on the street with the fabric stretched out to see what it looked like.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the petition as presented, and City Council Representative Roberts seconded.*

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 4-2, with Mr. Rawling and Ms. Bolster voting in opposition.*

8. 179 Pleasant Street

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to **postpone** the item to the June 13 meeting.*

9. 414 State Street

Mr. Cracknell said the petition was for a second chimney to be restored using a waterstruck brick to match the mortar joints on the existing chimney.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** Administrative Approval Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 9, with a stipulation on Item 2 (59 Sheafe Street) that the window be a 3/3 one.*

*Mr. Ryan seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote.*

The Commission then addressed Items 5 and 7 that were pulled for separate discussion (see above).

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Mary A. Mahoney, owner**, for property located at **206 Northwest Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow construction of a detached two-car garage (with attic storage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 122 as Lot 6 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project architect Michael O'Brien was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He noted that it was originally scheduled to be a Work Session/Public Hearing but that he could go into the public hearing. Mr. Rawling said he felt that a work session was needed.

WORK SESSION

Mr. O'Brien reviewed the massing suggestions that the Commission previously suggested. He noted that the garage was reduced to 25'x25' and pulled back as far as possible. He said the height was reduced from 21 feet to 17 feet. He reviewed the other details in full.

Mr. Rawling said he struggled to see how the standard square two-car garage fit into the neighborhood's context and thought it looked very out of place. He suggested that the garage have more modulation or have a carriage house or shed look. Ms. Ruedig agreed and said the squareness made the garage look fatter and squatter than the original house. Mr. Ryan also agreed and said it felt like a prefab approach.

Acting Chair Wyckoff suggested reducing the width of the building to 22 feet, which would still provide the 9-ft doors and sufficient framing. He said it would reduce the overall width by 10% and might detract from the boxiness. Mr. Rawling recommended that the applicant consider the garage at 68 Cabot Street, which was more sympathetic to his prototype. Ms. Bolster agreed.

Ms. Ruedig recommended making the garage as narrow as possible and bringing back the rectangular form to make it match the proportion of the house more. Mr. Cracknell said the ridge

could be higher. Acting Chair Wyckoff agreed, noting that if the ridge were lifted and the roof had a higher pitch, the garage would have more District values.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Doug Greene suggested that the garage look more like a barn or a boathouse, with higher sides. No one else rose to speak, and Acting Chair Wyckoff closed the public comment session.

Mr. O'Brien said he could make the garage a foot longer to help with the proportions and that he could bring the ridgeline back up, like it previously was depicted. The pitch and the height were further discussed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. O'Brien stated that he would go into the public hearing.

Acting Chair Wyckoff closed the work session and went into the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Acting Chair Wyckoff read the petition into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Michael O'Brien said he was present on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed what was discussed during the work session.

Ms. Ruedig said it was difficult for her to picture the garage by just hearing the numbers. She asked where the three feet would be taken off and said she had no idea what the design actually looked like. Mr. Rawling agreed and said there were too many changes. Ms. Ruedig noted that some of the ideas of changing up the siding to make it look different was a plus.

Acting Chair Wyckoff suggested postponing the petition to the June 13 meeting as a public hearing. Mr. Rawling agreed and recommended that the applicant change the siding materials to shingles, which would distinguish the garage from the house.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*City Council Representative Roberts moved to **postpone** the petition to the June 13 meeting, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

2. Petition of **State 67 LLC, owner**, for property located at **76 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow the removal and replacement of a storefront and entry (including renovations to an existing first floor tenant space) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 44 and lies within the Character District 5, Downtown Overlay and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project designer Doug Greene of Port City Designs was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He reviewed the petition and said the use would go from a store to a restaurant. He discussed the storefront pushing out to the brick façade of the building and moving the entry to the side to maximize the seating area and segregate it from the restaurant ingress and egress. He also proposed to use columns and keep the wood panels.

Mr. Rawling said he was ready to let the storefront go into the future. He said he preferred the second design and asked whether it was possible to extend the sideboard across the front of the building but still keep the side entrance. Mr. Greene said they could do it but didn't know if the owner would approve. He said they liked the idea of differentiating the first-floor space from the second. Mr. Rawling said there would be more continuity. He said he wished to see the brick retained and not covered with painted wood. Mr. Greene said the existing brick was discolored and that they could paint it. Mr. Rawling said the panels on the bottom of the storefront could have some distinction. Mr. Greene said he researched all the downtown storefronts and found a variety of panels that were applied, recessed, basic, or elaborate.

Ms. Ruedig said she wasn't willing to let the storefront change that drastically because it an historic piece of early 20th Century storefront and building façade that had survived. She said she didn't want to see the unique storefront turned into one that blended in with everything else. She said she liked the offsetting of the door and so on, but felt that the building was a contributing one to the downtown and didn't want to see its character changed. Mr. Ryan agreed and said it was part of the downtown fabric. He suggested a compromise of pulling the door more toward the street. He said he was open to getting the storefront to a point where it was usable for the new use, and he suggested that the applicant see how much the entrance could be brought forward by cutting back on the raised left and right sections of the front façade.

Ms. Bolster said she leaned toward preserving the character of the current façade. City Council Representative Roberts said he was sympathetic to the applicant, considering that there was so little flexibility with the space. He said if the storefront were twice as wide, there would be more options to fix it. Acting Chair Wyckoff said the building was a commercial building that was meant to generate business and that the days of having a dress shop were gone. He said there was a new owner who wanted to change the space to facilitate his use, which he agreed with.

The applicant introduced Harrison Chenault. Mr. Chenault said they were proposing a health food café, which he thought would increase the property's value if the storefront could go up to the front, and he explained why.

Ms. Ruedig suggested bringing the doorway up half the distance to retain the angled glass, yet still have the look of the existing façade, and keeping the elevated display space. Mr. Ryan agreed, noting that it was a compromise that allowed someone to see the storefront as it was yet still make it usable. It was further discussed at length.

Acting Chair Wyckoff said the Commission could consider voting for a proposal that would preserve the angles of the storefront on both sides and bring the door up 2/3 of the distance of the existing opening. The applicant said it was fine.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

1. The existing storefront design (c. 1940's) shall remain with the exception that the entrance door may be relocated 8 feet closer to the street.
2. The elevated display cases shall remain in front of the new door location.

City Council Representative Roberts seconded.

Ms. Ruedig said it was a reasonable compromise to preserve the character of the District and maintain its present character by preserving the façade and several feet of the storefront.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

3. Petition of **Linda Preble McVay and John F. McVay, owners**, for property located at **42 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow the construction of a one story addition as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 8 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project designer Hubert Krahn was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He stated that he had followed the Commission's previous suggestions that the addition be moved back a few feet and that the height be increased. He then reviewed the petition.

Ms. Ruedig said the plan had improved, especially from the street front, and that the added windows and so on seemed to match fairly well with the existing house. Acting Chair Wyckoff noted that the Commission had previously suggested lifting the roof up on the addition a bit above the ridge line. Mr. Rawling asked whether the windows in the front elevation could be separated. Mr. Krahn said there was a shower behind the left window. Mr. Rawling said the separation would be more of a typical pattern for the house and suggested leaving the window on the left as it was and moving the other window over by 15 inches.

Ms. Ruedig asked about the windows. Mr. Krahn said that they were proposing Marvin Ultimate Wood double-hung Series windows with half screens. He said he would submit the window specification at a later date.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Rawling moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented, with the following stipulations:*

1. Shift the proposed new ground floor window 15 inches (2 shutter widths) to the right in the master bath.
2. Marvin ultimate wood double-hung windows shall be used.
3. Half screens shall be used.

City Council Representative Roberts seconded.

Mr. Rawling said the project was consistent with the surrounding properties, would enhance values in the area, and was sympathetic to its historic roots.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

4. Petition of **Christer and Laurie Ericcson, owners**, for property located at **99 Gates Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow the construction of a one story addition with attached porch and miscellaneous exterior renovations as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 95 and lies within the General Residence and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the owner to speak to the petition. She stated that they were proposing renovations to the exterior of the house by building a one-story addition to the rear and adding some outbuildings. She said they would replace the existing aluminum siding and recreate the trim. She said the existing windows on the main part of the house would be kept and that the attic windows would be replaced. She said that all the new windows would be Marvin wood with clad sash. She reviewed the petition in detail and showed the Commission a mock-up of the proposed Boral siding.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether two removed windows could be re-used for the attic. Ms. Whitney said they wouldn't have a storm but that she could do it. Acting Chair Wyckoff asked whether the back of the building was visible at all. Ms. Whitney replied that it was wooded in the back but that the building could be seen a bit from Hancock Street.

Mr. Rawling said he was comfortable with the project but thought the use of the picture window was an anomaly and that double-hung windows would be more appropriate. He said the clad Marvin windows should all have jambs that matched the trim color. Ms. Whitney said that they

were considering historic green and that the trim, siding, and so on would all be the same color. Mr. Rawling said he was leaning away from Marvin clad windows because the frame projected out past the thickness. Ms. Whitney said the frame would not project from the side trim.

Ms. Ruedig said she was comfortable with the project, noting that the wrap at the back of the house was kept minimal. She said she was always hesitant about new products but that it was helpful to see the Boral material in the mockup.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting Chair Wyckoff 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. Except for the E & F windows the frame and jambs match the trim color. Sashes can be an accent.
2. Half screens shall be used on the new windows.
3. Boral Siding may be used to match the original wood clapboards.

Mr. Ryan seconded.

Ms. Ruedig said it was a well-designed addition that was smaller and tucked in around the corner of the main house. She said the replacement of the aluminum siding by Boral and cedar was an improvement that would enhance the surrounding property values, and that all the miscellaneous outbuildings fit into the historic center. Acting Chair Wyckoff added that new technology was being used by the Boral siding, which he thought was very convincing as a wood siding.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 5-1, with Mr. Rawling voting in opposition due to the lack of window stipulations.*

-
5. Petition of **Goodwin Hospitality, owner**, for property located at **100 Market Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the addition of a new exterior louver as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 6 and lies within the Character District 4, Downtown Overlay and Historic Districts.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (6-0) to **postpone** the petition to the July meeting.*

IV. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **161 Deer Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 17-3 and lies within the CD 5, Downtown Overlay and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

The architects Tracy Kozak and Mark Mueller were present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. Ms. Kozak stated that several changes were made from the previous work session, which she summarized. She emphasized that the massing was reduced and that there were two schemes for the tower. She said the building was simplified as much as possible, with more regular window patterns and consistent details. She reviewed the floor and roof plans, elevations, materials, and details. Mr. Mueller added that there were two building design options and that Option 1 brought relief to all the masonry and had more consistency.

Ms. Kozak continued to review the elevations and details and discussed the two tower options. She emphasized that the tower was tilted up and exceeded the height by the cap, which would need a variance to get the slight lift on the roof. She reviewed the canopies.

Acting Chair Wyckoff asked whether structural metal held up the canopy, and Mr. Mueller agreed. Ms. Kozak said steel pipes held up the awnings. Ms. Kozak further discussed the windows and said she would bring samples at the next meeting.

Mr. Rawling commented on the Maplewood Avenue elevation and the tower. He said the design enhanced the building quite a bit. He said he favored the glass tower but thought it needed a 3-light division and more texture to it to make it more robust. He said the elevation had a friendlier feel to it and wasn't as institutional and stark as the previous versions. He said he liked the added detail to the roof but felt that it could be enhanced by adding outriggers. He remarked on the simple light and shadow detailing and suggested bookending the window units. He thought the top level could be enhanced by something similar to other parts of the building and felt that the tilted roof of the tower was a unique element.

Mr. Ryan said he supported the height and mass and felt that it was right for the location. He said he liked the tower and the tilting cap and could approve either version, the brick or the more transparent. He said that everything was well done.

Ms. Ruedig said there were a lot of improvements and thought the building looked less institutional. She said she was pleased to see the Maplewood Avenue/Railroad corner look nicer. She said she thought the project was okay overall but felt that it was still very similar to so many of the other buildings that had a sandstone base and brick. She noted that a lot of added details helped make the building less boring than some of the other buildings and that it seemed set apart from the others, but she said she was looking for a more exciting building. She said she appreciated the southwest corner and thought a lot of elements were very successful.

City Council Representative Roberts said he thought the previous chaotic windows were simplified and that the building was more restful to look at. He said he agreed with Ms. Ruedig

about the back corner and that he was ambivalent about the tower's cap. Ms. Bolster said she didn't disagree with any of the comments. Acting Chair Wyckoff said he preferred the metal and appreciated the details. He said he thought the building would be of good quality and one of the better modern buildings downtown.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant stated that they would return for a **public hearing**.*

B. Work Session requested by **PNF Trust of 2013, Peter N. Floros, trustee and owner**, for property located at **278 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovation of an existing structure (to discuss rehabilitation options for 278 State Street and its relationship to future reconstruction of 266 & 270 State Street) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 80 and lies within the CD 4, Downtown Overlay and Historic Districts.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0) to **continue** the work session to the July meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **James C. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, James C. and Kimberley A. Lucy, trustees and owners**, for property located at **127 & 137 High Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear additions to both structures) and allow a new free standing structure (construct single family dwelling at rear of #137) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations to both structures) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 20 and 21 and lies within the CD 4-L1, Downtown Overlay and Historic Districts.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0) to **continue** the work session to the July meeting.*

D. Work Session requested by **Portsmouth Housing Authority, owner**, for property located at **140 Court Street** and **Ed Pac, LLC, owner**, for property located at **152 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (partial demolition of building at 152 Court Street) and allow a new free standing structure (construct a new free standing residential structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 37 & 38 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the April 11, 2018 meeting to the June 6, 2018 meeting.)*

Ms. Ruedig recused herself from the work session.

WORK SESSION

Executive Director of Portsmouth Housing Authority Craig Welch and the architect Carla Goodknight were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Welch gave a brief summary of the history and purpose of the Portsmouth Housing Authority and noted that they already owned the land on public deed of trust. He said that HUD would have to approve the disposition of the parking lot and that its use would be approved for public benefit only and not for a boutique hotel or so on.

Ms. Goodknight reviewed the petition. She said they were successful in their height variance of 58 feet and then decided to pull out a level of parking and would try to eliminate the upper level of the parking deck. She said the pedestrian way had been introduced as an open green space that would be accessible to the public and that the access to the single parking deck below grade would stay. She said the building sat significantly lower than before and that the massing had also changed considerably, with the reduction of the parking deck. She reviewed the elevations, views and floor plans. She pointed out that they did the full glazing storefront wraparound, kept the entrance on the front of the liner building, developed the Kearsage enclosure with a hardscape, and reduced only the size of the top windows. She then discussed the materials and said the windows were Integrity fiberglass clad ones that were very durable. She said the siding was a new product called Smart side siding and showed a sample of it.

Mr. Rawling said he was generally in support of the project. He asked why the Kearsage enclosure wasn't glass. Ms. Goodknight said the simpler look was more affordable and fit in better with the fire station. It was further discussed. The window fenestration was also discussed.

Mr. Rawling noted that the liner building was a Federal style and that the front elevations could be enlivened, perhaps by a balustrade on top of the porch roof to break up the line. He said the shutters helped but thought it might be odd to have them on the front. Ms. Goodknight said she would tweak the window spacing to make it more balanced. Mr. Rawling asked about having hip roofs on the mechanical enclosures. Ms. Goodknight said that mechanical appurtenances were added, and it was further discussed. Mr. Rawling suggested changing the rhythm of the upper-floor windows and spreading them apart more. He suggested that the building have more texture in that location to give more variation to it.

Mr. Ryan said he still didn't see much of a base. He asked whether the back could be made more symmetrical, noting that it looked like the back of a public housing area. He asked whether the back balconies were accessible to the public and whether they could be larger. Ms. Goodknight said that each balcony was for that particular floor's residents and that they were limited to the present size. She said there was also a top space on the liner building that the public could use.

Acting Chair Wyckoff said Ms. Goodknight did a good job of designing a large 'small' building, which he compared to a triple-decker on steroids. He said that making the balconies larger would require posts and thought it wouldn't be an appropriate sight. He said the liner building could be tweaked a bit but thought overall that it was a good design job.

Mr. Rawling discussed the siding and said he had imagined more of a horizontal siding with a recessed roof and had a hard time imagining the whole building in clapboard because it was so

big and uncharacteristic. Ms. Goodknight said they looked at a 7-1/2" exposure, with a smaller exposure on the liner building. It was further discussed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant stated that they would return for a **public hearing** at the July meeting.*

E. Work Session requested by **P.F. Jax Real Estate, LLC, owner**, for property located at **159 Middle Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (misc. additions and renovations to existing structure to allow for three residential units) and allow a new free standing structure (construct a two unit townhome at the rear of the property) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 4 and lies within the CD 4-L1 and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the April 11, 2018 meeting to the June 6, 2018 meeting.)*

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0) to **continue** the work session to the July meeting.*

F. Work Session requested by **Unitarian Universalist Church, owner**, and **206 Court Street, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **206 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two story addition at rear of building) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to the existing structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 34 and lies within the CD 4-L1 and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the April 11, 2018 meeting to the June 6, 2018 meeting.)*

Ms. Ruedig resumed her voting seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architects Steve McHenry and Jeremiah Johnson were present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. Mr. McHenry said they responded to the Commission's feedback and had design changes. He reviewed the petition, noting that the garage was removed, the new building's mass was pushed over five feet closer to the old building, and the current design had three apartments, one on each floor, making a third-floor wing. As a result, he said the addition's massing was minimized. He said the rooftop deck was smaller and accessible by only the third-floor tenant. He said the exterior cladding would have a contemporary feel and that the windows and doors were similar in scale. He said all the windows in the historic house would be replaced with historic ones and aluminum shutters would be added. He reviewed all the details.

Ms. Ruedig said she was generally positive about the changes, like the massing and the scaling of the addition. She said that removing the garage would allow the historic building to be seen more. She thought it was good that the roofline of the third story was smaller and felt that the addition's dark tone was appropriate because it let the historic building stand out more. She said

she liked the proportions of the window openings. She thought the contemporary addition to the historic structure was well done and didn't overshadow or detract from the history building.

Mr. Rawling said he liked the revised design better, especially the massing, and that he liked the hip roof along the back. He noted that the entrance on the addition seemed stark and suggested a trellis across the front of it or a covered entry to soften it. He said he supported the siding and even the flat detailing on it but said he still struggled with the use of the blank-looking casement windows. He said he liked a contemporary design but thought it came off as lifeless and wasn't comfortable with seeing sheer sheets of glass. For the rear elevation, he encouraged the applicant to study the fenestration pattern a bit more because he felt that the first and second floors had no relation to the third floor. He said the volumes could play together a bit more and that he supported separating the windows more. He said he was open to more glass. Mr. McHenry said they were maxed out in the amount of glass allowed in the rear and that the window openings were a function of what was happening in the interior. Mr. Rawling said it was the part that he felt needed work, and it was further discussed.

City Council Representative Roberts said the revisions were a big improvement and in the direction needed for the Historic District and that he agreed with Ms. Ruedig's comments. Ms. Bolster said she still felt the same as she did before and found the historic building to be so untouched and in its original form that she wished it didn't have to change.

Mr. Ryan said he supported what was presented and liked that the current home would be restored. He said he had liked the previous design because it was contemporary and an opportunity to show how an abstract modern addition and an existing historic house could work out, but he thought the new design was safe and that it was a shame because the City would end up with a lot of safe architecture. He said the contemporary architecture had to be bold, but that he was afraid that the Commission wouldn't allow it. Acting Chair Wyckoff agreed that it wouldn't work in that location. He said he had not found the previous design bold or modern. He said that if the architect came up with something in the 21st century, it had to be a lot different than what was presented. He said he was happy with the design and felt that the renovation of the historic building was very important. He also noted that he had finally accepted the flat roof on the back after realizing that it couldn't be seen very well from the street.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant stated that they would return for a work session/public hearing.

V. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Work Session requested by **Steven Craige, owner**, for property located at **490 Marcy Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the addition of a single dormer to the left side of the front elevation as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 58 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

The applicant was not present.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0) to **postpone** the work session to the July meeting.*

VI. ADJOURNMENT

*At 11:00 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to adjourn the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary