

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

December 04, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; City Council Representative Doug Roberts, Members Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Martin Ryan, and Cyrus Beer; Alternates Heinz Sauk-Schubert and Margot Doering

MEMBERS EXCUSED: N/A

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department; Peter Stith, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
The Commission thanked Doug Roberts for his service as City Council Representative. Mr. Rawling was not yet present at the meeting.

Chairman Lombardi read the requests to postpone for 95 Mechanic Street, 14 Mechanic Street, and 100 Islington Street into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **postpone** the three petitions to the January 8, 2020 meeting.*

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. November 06, 2019

City Council Representative Roberts recused himself from the vote.

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **approve** the November 6, 2019 minutes.*

B. November 13, 2019

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **approve** the November 13, 2019 minutes.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to pull Item 1, 401 State Street, Unit 204, for separate review.

1. 401 State Street, Unit 204

See below.

2. 129 Daniel Street

The request was to adjust the window heights on the addition and historic structure on the driveway and alley sides; remove and replace a window on the Chapel Street side; and change the addition's entry door on the side alleyway.

3. 303 Pleasant Street

The request was to add an exhaust vent for a gas fireplace.

4. 410-430 Islington Street

The request was to increase the height of the water table on 410 Islington Street as well as modify patio doors and add some trim details. Mr. Cracknell said the changes for 422 and 424 Islington Street were similar and also minor.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **approve** Administrative Items 2, 3, and 4. Mr. Beer seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Rawling arrived.

1. 401 State Street, Unit 204

Mr. Cracknell explained that the mansard part of the building had 2/2 windows and the main building had 1/1 windows, even though the Commission at that time had approved 2/2 windows, resulting in a blanket approval for other applicants. He said the applicant already bought the 1/1 windows and that the 1/1 windows were appropriate, but he suggested revising the blanket approval to re-stipulate the difference between the mansard building and the main building. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed to change the blanket approval to 1/1 windows and use the 2/2 window blanket approvals for the mansard. He said he didn't mind the two different types of windows due to the building's esthetics. Mr. Rawling agreed.

5. 401 State Street, Unit 405

The request was to install three double hung windows in the bay with Andersen 400 series windows. The Commission discussed it and decided to support the applicant's choice of window.

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **approve** Items 1 and 5, with the following stipulations:*

1. *5-Story "Rockingham Hotel" Building - A blanket approval is granted for the main 5-story "Rockingham Hotel" building to have double-hung windows throughout the building. The windows shall either be Andersen Woodwright 400 Series or Pella*

Architectural Reserve series (or equal) and shall be 1/1 windows with a Terratone (bronze) color with half screens. Any replacement windows shall be placed in their original location with the same glass plane, profile and with the exposed brick return. The bay windows shall be double-hung windows with single-pane transom windows to fill the opening and to match the design and profile of the approved windows for the remainder of the building.

2. ***3-Story Mansard Building** - A blanket approval is granted for the secondary 3-story building setback from State Street to have double-hung windows throughout the building. The windows shall either be Andersen Woodwright 400 Series or Pella Architectural Reserve series (or equal) and shall be 2/2 divided light windows with a spacer bar and be a Terratone (bronze) color with half screens. Any replacement windows shall be placed in their original location with the same glass plane, profile and with the exposed brick return.*

III. CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL- EXTENSION

1. Petition of **Frank G. Heitker Revocable Trust Agreement, Frank G. Heitker Trustee, owner**, for property located at **37 Sheafe Street**, wherein a 1-year extension of the Certificate of Approval granted by the Historic District Commission on January 02, 2019 was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct second story addition over the existing kitchen at the rear of the structure and enlarge the existing mudroom) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 19 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4) and Historic Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the extension, and Mr. Beer seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. (*Work Session/ Public Hearing*) requested by **202 Court Street Property Group, LLC, owner**, for property located at **202 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (new dormer addition to the north elevation) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, roofing, windows and doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 35 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD 4-L1) and Historic Districts. (*This item was continued at the November 06, 2019 meeting to the December 04, 2019 meeting.*)

The Commission entered into the public hearing and did not do a work session.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Matt Silva of Profile Homes was present on behalf of the applicant and reviewed the changes. He noted that the front façade would revert to its original fire station look, the garage doors would reflect the original style, the wood siding would be painted a historic color with a Boral trim, and the solar panels would go on the building's south side.

In response to the Commission's questions, Mr. Silva said they would use a composite door as a replacement for the existing garage doors. He said he would return with the door specifications for an administrative approval. He said the sign would be 12 inches tall, the brick would be removed, and the dental molding would probably be wood.

Mr. Silva reviewed the trim details and railings. Mr. Rawling said the dormers were improved and the original building form stood out stronger. He recommended stipulating that the jambs match the trim color and that clapboards be used for the lower level infill panels of the garage door and treated the same as the siding. Ms. Ruedig said she didn't feel that clapboards should be added on the sides of the garage doors because it would look barn-like or residential, and she suggested flat trim instead. Mr. Ryan agreed and also asked that a plan for the garage doors be submitted. The grade and clapboard were further discussed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Silva confirmed that the roofing would be a composite slate and a single color.

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

- 1. The product specifications for the signs and solar panels shall be submitted for Administrative Approval prior to construction.*
- 2. The window jambs should match the trim color.*
- 3. Flat and flush boral boards shall be used between and beside the garage doors.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the Board had done its due diligence on the project, seeing that it was the fifth review. He said the project would preserve the integrity of the District by bringing the building back to life. He said it would be consistent with the special and defining character of surrounding properties and would have compatibility of design with surrounding properties as well as innovative technologies. He said he was in full support of the project.

*The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

B. Petition of **33-47 Bow Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **35 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace second and third floor windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 49 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 13, 2019 meeting to the December 04, 2019 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Rob Sensinera was present on behalf of the applicant and said he wanted to use a Marvin product with 6/6 windows, sashes, and the same color. He said there was a total of 11 windows.

Ms. Ruedig said the 6/6 windows were more appropriate than 1/1 windows, and she suggested a spacer bar and half-screens. Mr. Rawling said he could not support the project because the insert windows would add another three inches or more of pane to the inside. He said replacement sashes should be considered instead. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was fine with the proposal as presented because of the lack of wooden trim around the windows.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

1. *Spacer bars shall be used with half-screens.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded.

Ms. Ruedig said she agreed with Mr. Rawling that the Board usually didn't encourage that type of replacement window, but she felt it would be acceptable in that situation because it wouldn't be that noticeable and it wouldn't be placed on top of a wide wood frame. She said the project would complement and enhance the architectural and historic character of the District and would have compatibility of design with surrounding properties because it would match the neighboring building better.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Rawling voting in opposition.*

C. Petition of **City of Portsmouth, owner**, for property located at **95 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the demolition of an existing structure (3-family structure at LaCava Wharf) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 39 and lies within Waterfront Business (WB) and the Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 06, 2019 meeting to the December 04, 2019 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the petition to the January 8, 2020 meeting.*

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **111 Maplewood Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (penthouse redesign and exterior design changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 124 as Lot 8 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD-5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Haril Pandya of CBT was present on behalf of the applicant to review modifications to the mechanical systems, the penthouse, and the lobby layout and also building materials.

Chairman Lombardi said the penthouse looked closer to the edge and resembled a shipping container. It was further discussed. Mr. Pandya said the texture was a fluted system. City Council Representative Roberts thought the area from the corner of Maplewood and Raines Avenues to the main entrance required a door every sixty feet. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he thought the penthouse should be one solid color and dark instead of the proposed tonality.

Mr. Pandya said they added doors on the balcony for access, removed the trellis, and would submit further details on the fin system. He said louver panels would resemble spandrel panels and that the main entry glass was pulled forward for more dimensionality. He showed before-and-after renderings of the building.

Ms. Ruedig asked if the rendering of the fins was accurate. Mr. Pandya said it wasn't the most current one. Ms. Ruedig she was disappointed that the design had 'gotten away' and said she couldn't vote on it because she didn't know what was replacing it. Mr. Rawling said the Maplewood Avenue elevation was bleaker and boxier than before. He pointed out that he had previously discussed the mechanical screening penthouse incorporated into the building as an architectural element and skyline, but that it had regressed significantly into the huge black box on top of the building that he had spoken against. He said making it black would not make it go away. He noted that the building's rooftops were very prominent from many places in town, especially in that area which was turning into a prairie of flat-topped buildings with metal boxes on them. He said the applicant's building just expanded that and make it significantly worse and that he could not support the changes. Ms. Ruedig said she was disappointed about the Raines Avenue side because the architectural aspects that added detail and quality to the building were gone. She said that removing the trellis canopy from the third story on Maplewood Avenue took away enough of an interesting piece on that elevation and made it much more boxier and starker. She said she wanted as much texture interest and detail as possible brought back because it made the building less stark and angular. She said she was also disappointed to see that the penthouse was enlarged and encouraged the applicant to figure out a way to screen it. She said the vertical pieces helped line up with the columns below in the rendering, but in reality, she didn't think they would ever line up. She said she had no problems with the other changes and thought that lowering the granite made the building look less heavy.

Mr. Ryan said he wasn't seeing constructability issues as much as value engineering and eliminating items due to budget numbers. He said the canopy took away from the quality of the

architecture and suggested that the applicant go back to the heavier frame. He recommended a horizontal band on top of the building so that it didn't look like a glorified fence. He said it was still a great building but that he couldn't approve it the way it was currently presented. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed. He said he changed his mind about having the penthouse in a dark color, and he thought the canopy had to stay. He said he was okay with making the bay smaller and thought the fourth floor was more successful by having eight feet added to it and extending it.

Mr. Beer suggested something more architecturally interesting for the metal mechanical screen and thought that bringing down the granite base would be a mistake. Ms. Doering that enlarging the mechanical penthouse would make the view of it more prominent to the buildings across the way on Maplewood Avenue and from the Congress Street intersection. She said she couldn't support the new siding and thought it looked like cargo containers, noting that the original treatment had reflected the overall architectural style of the building. She said she was unhappy with the loss of the unique character, the trellis, and the fin system. City Council Representative Roberts said he agreed with comments about the fin system along Raines Avenue and the removed overhang, which he thought had added a lot to the Maplewood Avenue side of the building and were details that enhanced the building's appearance. Mr. Sauk-Schubert pointed out that the sill levels on various elevations were all different. Chairman Lombardi said he was disappointed that the things the Commission thought made the project exciting disappeared and ruined the design. He said the fourth floor was overgrown and thought the utilities could be placed into a well instead. He said the project seemed more value engineering than anything else.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Eric Nelson, Chief Operating Officer of the Kane Company, requested a continuance.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **continue** the application to the January 8, 2020 meeting, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

2. Petition of **Karen B. Leon, owner**, for property located at **284 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (expand existing front porch) and allow the construction of a new free-standing structure (garage) and as per plans in file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 207 as Lot 73 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Project architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the applicant. She distributed a revised sheet to the Commission and reviewed the petition.

Ms. Doering thought that covering the porch changed a lot of the house's character. Mr. Beer asked about the materials. Ms. Whitney said all the trim boards would be Azek or Lifespan and

that the vertical board skirting would be Lifespan. Mr. Rawling said he was fine with the porch but thought the garage was very visible and didn't look anything like the house. He thought the garage's massing and proportion seemed awkward and wondered why everything was detailed to match the house. He said the way the gable was turned toward the street emphasized the difference between the garage and the house.

Ms. Ruedig said the simple porch was consistent with that type of house and that the garage was straightforward and appropriate to the house's design, even though it was squat in proportions. Vice-Chair Wyckoff and Mr. Sauk-Schubert agreed. Mr. Beer recommended stipulating that Lifespan be used for the trim and the vertical board siding and that the four posts be larger. Ms. Whitney said the garage doors would be painted.

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 stipulation:*

- 1. The porch trim, vertical skirting, wood treads, and decking shall be the lifespan pine product as presented.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded.

Ms. Ruedig said the project would preserve the integrity of the District, conserve and enhance surrounding property values, and would be compatible in design with surrounding properties.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Rawling voting in opposition.*

- 3. Petition of Port Owner Harbor, LLC, owner, for property located at 250 Market Street, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace existing siding and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 119 as Lot 1-1C and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.**

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

David Brennock of ATM Exteriors was present on behalf of the applicant and reviewed the petition. He said they wanted to remove the existing siding and trim and replace it with Hardy siding and PVC trim. He said there would be no changes to the windows.

Mr. Rawling said the change in materials wasn't significant because it was a contemporary building and would maintain the same appearance from a distance. Ms. Ruedig agreed and

verified that the Hardiboard siding was the smooth kind and everything would be field painted. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he supported the siding system, especially at that height.

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 **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulation:*

1. *The hardieplank siding shall be installed with the smooth side exposed.*

Mr. Ryan seconded.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project would conserve and enhance surrounding property values and maintain the special character of the District.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

4. Petition of **Viking Properties, LLC (1/2 Interest)**, owner, for property located at **54 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace front entry door, 2nd floor roof deck door, rear 3rd floor deck and door, and install an A/C condenser on the roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 18-1 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Dan Moore was present on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the petition, noting that they wanted to replace the front door with a Delwin product to match the historic look of the original door, in addition to replacing several other doors. In response to Vice-Chair Wyckoff's questions, Mr. Moore said the posts and all the code-required hangers and caps would be painted. He said they also wanted to put a third condenser on the wall under the deck.

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, with the following stipulations:*

1. *The proposed exterior duct line shall be painted to match the brick wall.*

2. *The first floor door shall be wood.*

Mr. Beer seconded.

Ms. Ruedig said the minor changes would be improvements and that the project would preserve the integrity of the District and have compatibility of design with surrounding properties

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

5. Petition of **Perley Lane, LLC, owner**, for property located at **55 Lafayette Road**, wherein permission was requested to allow the construction of a new free-standing structure (single family home with attached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 151 as Lot 10-1 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and Historic Districts.

City Council Representative Roberts recused himself from the petition.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Joe Caldorola was present. He reviewed the changes to his petition, noting that the front door would be a wood one with a wooden storm door stained to match. He presented survey information about particular houses in the neighborhood. He said the front entrance would be lower and that the transom window would be deleted.

Mr. Ryan said he couldn't follow the differences between one elevation and the other and felt that the house was still a jumble of stylized features. He said the house was supposed to fit into the neighborhood context but the numbers presented still didn't show how the house would look in context with the houses to the left and right of it. He said the Commission was getting just surveys and no answers to their questions and that he could not support the project.

Mr. Rawling said he was comfortable with the scale of the house and the way it was set in the neighborhood because it followed the pattern of houses that went down the street. He said that 6/1 windows would be more compatible with a Colonial-style entry, and if prairie-style windows were used, a simpler porch design would be more compatible. He said that, overall, the design had been refined and that the elements on the house were compatible with the neighborhood. Ms. Doering said she was still concerned about the mass in that context, noting that it was a significant living area compared to the lot's size.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the house was a standard Foursquare like twenty others on Middle Street. He said the tension between the front entryway and the windows could be solved by having 1/1 windows with no grids or replaced with a different window design. He said he previously thought that there were too many details from a variety of ages of architecture but felt it had been simplified because everything looked flat. He said he was comfortable with the design as presented but thought the windows could be simplified. Ms. Ruedig said the design had not changed enough for her. Mr. Rawling said it was the block of early-1950s houses on the street that were out of character with Middle Street. Mr. Beer said the porch was simpler and the size

of the house fit into the streetscape, and he thought the anomaly was the house next door. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said all the elevations were working better than before, and he pointed out some differences in dimensions for the front entry.

Ms. Doering said a lot of the other similar-sized buildings surrounding the applicant's building were complicated ones, with porches and planes that broke up the mass, whereas the applicant's building was big in mass because it didn't have a lot of elements to break it up and read as a large house in spite of its square footage. Mr. Ryan noted that Mr. Rawling thought the building was appropriate and fit the streetscape, but he said the Commission didn't have the proof. Chairman Lombardi said the design was still a conglomerate of things and felt that the applicant hadn't really done anything different. Mr. Rawling said the building might seem bigger than it would in reality, and he recommended scaling the roofs back. Mr. Ryan asked the applicant to get representations of the houses next to him to see what his house would look like in context.

SPEAKING AGAINST THE PETITION

Tim Malinowski of 91 Lafayette Road said the Commission had yet to see the streetscape elevation that they kept requesting.

Sandy Rodriguez of 60 Lafayette Road and 229 Willard Avenue said the design was ugly and looked like patchwork. She said the house was massive and would overshadow her house on Willard Avenue. She said the design did not address waterflow, which was a problem in the area.

Georgina Rodriguez of 229 Willard Avenue said she had concerns about the ledge. She said she agreed with all the comments and was opposed to the petition.

Kent Lepage of 229 Willard Avenue said the property was below an area of rock, which would cause the drainage to drastically change due to the water runoff. He said the house was also uncharacteristic of the neighborhood and would not look right.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant asked for a continuance.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed to **continue** the petition to the January 8, 2020 meeting.*

At this point, Mr. Cracknell left the meeting and Mr. Stith took his place as Planning Department Representative.

VI. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **John J. Roese Revocable Trust of 2016, John J. Roese Trustee, owner**, for property located at **14 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the partial demolition of an existing structure (removal of additions and 1 chimney), new construction to an existing structure (relocating house to new foundation and adding a 1-story addition), and exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, windows, and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as

Request to Postpone

Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the November 13, 2019 meeting to the December, 2019 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the petition to the January 8, 2020 meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **100 Islington Street Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **100 Islington Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the demolition of an existing structure (two-story commercial building) and to allow the construction of a new 2 ½- story multi-family residential building as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 16 as Lot 25 and lies within the Character District 4-L2 (CD 4-L2) and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the November 13, 2019 meeting to the December 04, 2019 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the petition to the January 8, 2020 meeting.*

VII. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **Argeris and Eloise Karabelas, owners**, for property located at **11 Meeting House Hill Road**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (redesign the existing garage with new windows, doors, and roof-line) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 59 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Project architect Jennifer Ramsey was present on behalf of the applicant and said they wanted to change the window patterns, move shutters, and replace garage doors. She said there would be no change in the footprint. She reviewed the changes in detail.

Mr. Rawling said the design could be simplified in several ways. He said he didn't think the building was enhanced by the Dutch hip roof and that a regular flat gable look was more characteristic of the neighborhood and would allow for the windows on the garage door elevation to be separated. He said the center transom window could be pushed up into the gable and three simple windows could be run across the front. He recommended a simpler version for the canopy over the door. He didn't think the band and change of materials on two levels did anything for the side elevation and made it uncharacteristic of the desired simple barn shape. For the two different types of double hung windows, he recommended something asymmetrical by pushing the awnings to the back side or just doing a repeat of the three windows above to simplify it. Ms. Ruedig said the roof was too 'matchy-matchy' and suggested a hip roof. She recommended simplifying the garage doors and toning down the verticality.

Mr. Ryan said he had no problem with the Dutch gable and thought the roof above the garage was fine. Mr. Salk-Schubert suggested that the Dutch gable be a triangle shape. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he didn't like the separation of the first and second floors and the different siding. He said the garage looked like a big Monopoly piece and needed overhangs. He said the larger windows over smaller windows was an awkward look but that his main concern was the horizontal board that was seen so much lately on modern cookie-cutter houses.

Ms. Doering recommended replacing the boards with clapboards. She said the building was either a garage or a barn, and that making it look like a barn made the hip roof look stuck on. She said if the applicant wanted to go with the hip, then the rest of the building should have matching details, and if not, they should go with something straight and plain. She said she was fine with the small overhangs and thought putting a third window up on the gable would be a good idea. She suggested that smaller windows could also be put up for some asymmetry and a small barn effect. Chairman Lombardi agreed and suggested making it look like a garage and not a barn.

Public Comment

John Singer of 306 Marcy Street said he liked the design, especially the one for the main house.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant said she would return for a public hearing.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 10:50 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary