

**MINUTES
THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NH**

Remote Meeting Via Zoom Conference Call

Per NH RSA 91-A:2, III (b) the Chair has declared the COVID-19 outbreak an emergency and has waived the requirement that a quorum be physically present at the meeting pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Order 2020-04, Section 8, as extended by Executive Order 2021-01, and Emergency Order #12, Section 3. Members will be participating remotely and will identify their location and any person present with them at that location. All votes will be by roll call.

6:30 p.m.

February 10, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; Members Reagan Ruedig, Margot Doering, Martin Ryan, and David Adams; City Council Representative Paige Trace; Alternates Heinz Sauk-Schubert and Karen Bouffard

MEMBERS EXCUSED: None

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
Chairman Lombardi said there were two petitions that had requests to postpone.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to **postpone** Work Session IV.A for the City of Portsmouth to the May 5 meeting, and Work Session IV.C for Raynes and Maplewood Avenues LLC to the March 3 meeting.*

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 58 South Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to replace the rear bay window with two double windows; add a bathroom window on the second floor; replace two double hung windows with two Marvin windows on the first floor; and replace a kitchen hood vent. Mr. Cracknell said all the work would be done on the side and rear and nothing would be seen from the front.

Ms. Ruedig asked that window screens be stipulated and that the vent be painted to match the siding. She asked if the windows on the side were old windows. Mr. Cracknell said he didn’t know, and he recommended that the two side, double-hung window replacements be postponed to the March meeting pending a more accurate description of their age and condition.

It was stipulated that:

- 1) Half screens shall be on the windows;*
- 2) The vent shall be painted to match the color of the siding; and*

- 3) *The two side double-hung windows shall be resubmitted as another administrative approval with more detail on their age and condition.*

2. 76 South School Street (continued from the February 03, 2021 meeting).

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant requested that the fence lowered to six feet. He said there were four types of existing fencing in different designs and conditions and that the applicant wanted to standardize them all with a new cedar fence that would be no taller than four feet in the front yard and six feet everywhere else.

3. 16 Porter Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant had a request for radon extraction piping and wanted to use a copper downspout to get radon from the basement to the unit's roof so that he didn't have to strap another set of pipes on the building. He said the owner also wanted blanket approval to do the same on the other units. The Commission asked how the piping would terminate at the top. The applicant Michael Street was present and showed how the housing for the radon pipe next to the downspout would look. He explained that there would be a separate housing with a copper look that would run up the building and stick up above the gutter. He said the top of the pipe would blend in with the shingles.

Mr. Cracknell said it was a big change from what was presented and that the Commission needed to understand what it would look like. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked how it would exit the building. Mr. Street said it would exit through the concrete wall section. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he could only approve it if another copper downspout went all the way to the height. Mr. Street said the existing downspouts were tarnished copper and that someone stole the bottom section, so he wanted to replace them so that they all looked like shiny copper. Mr. Ryan said it was a private alleyway, so a higher standard of copper downspout wasn't necessary and would look odd. He suggested a painted Schedule 40 of 2-1/2 instead. City Council Representative Trace noted that the pipe would stick straight up in the middle of nowhere. Mr. Cracknell asked if the gas could be directly vented into the alleyway instead of going up to the roof. Mr. Street said the radon had to exit a pipe above the living space windows. In response to further questions, he said the basement spaces beneath the eleven condominiums were separate and had drywall between them. He said he would ask his contractor if there was a way to channel a pipe across each unit internally so that everyone could tap into the pipe.

Ms. Ruedig said it was a serious health issue that had to be addressed quickly and that the condo association could figure out the best way to pipe the radon out. Mr. Cracknell noted that the applicant wanted blanket approval for all eleven units. Mr. Ryan said if one pipe was connected within one of the units, the air would have to be drawn from a rooftop vent because there couldn't be just one vent in the basement pushing all the units. He said there should be a master plan with a rooftop venting unit drawing from all the units. Ms. Doering suggested postponing the request to the March meeting to give the contractor, condo association, and owners a chance to solve the issue. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed and said the applicant should hire a firm that had experience with larger commercial buildings.

The item was pulled so that the Commission could vote on it separately.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the item to the March 3 meeting.*

4. 46 Maplewood Avenue

Mr. Cracknell showed a photo of the proposed corner awning and said it was five feet deep and had a glazing panel above it

5. 56 Dennett Street

The request was to install a compressor on the right side of the house. Mr. Cracknell said it had a few fences around it but that no screening was proposed. It was noted that there were pipes going up the side of the building and looping over the drip edge. The applicant was present and said the pipes would be tucked into the corner behind the house pending approval of the compressor and that he would place decorative screening around it. After further discussion, the applicant said he would screen it with a picket fence that would match the one in the front and that the conduit would be painted to match the house. There were questions about whether a picket fence as a screen would be suitable and it was decided that Mr. Cracknell would review it further.

It was stipulated that:

- 1) The conduit shall be relocated behind the front main house as presented and shall be painted to match the siding color; and*
- 2) The picket fence shall be replaced and the heat pump shall be screened with a fence or other screen pending final review with Mr. Cracknell.*

6. 82 Court Street (continued from the February 03, 2021 meeting).

Mr. Cracknell said the Commission previously asked the applicant to consider a flat standing seam roof for the addition instead of the proposed metal roof. He said the applicant had agreed and also wanted to replace the rubber roof on the main building with a standing seam roof. He said they wanted a bronze copper color or a light gray and that the roof on the main building wouldn't been seen because it was very shallow. The Commission said it was a much better roof and that either color was fine. Ms. Ruedig asked why the applicant didn't want a more traditional asphalt roof for the historic main house. Mr. Cracknell said it was a very shallow pitch, so asphalt may not work unless it was rolled.

It was stipulated that:

- 1) A dark gray or bronze color shall be used; and*
- 2) The SS 16-inch panel profile would be used as shown.*

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **approve** Administrative Approval Items 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 with stipulations as noted above. It was seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

II. 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 second 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.

The owner Frank Heitker was present and said he was requesting a second extension because of busy construction in 2019 and the pandemic in 2020. He said he had a new contractor and that construction would begin in September. He noted that the construction plan had not changed.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Ryan moved to **grant** the request for extension, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **OAL Properties, LLC, owner, and David Takis, applicant**, for property located at **103 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install Nano doors to outside seating area) as per plans on file in the planning department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 6-106 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5) and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the February 03, 2021 meeting).*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant David Takis was present and said he wanted to replace the windows on his restaurant with paneled Nano doors for fresh air and access. He said black metal fencing would protect egress and would match the patio metal fencing

In response to the Commission's questions, Mr. Takis said the fencing would be up against the outside of the rough opening like a Juliet balcony. He said there were no options to match the windows above that had a lighter trim because the doors were only available in black. He said the doors opened out to Vaughan Mall into a public right-of-way but that they had a City permit that they used for their regular patio season.

Chairman Lombardi opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Compliance for the petition as presented, and Mr. Ryan seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said it would promote the education, pleasure, and welfare of the District to the city residents and would be compatible with the design of surrounding properties.

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

IV. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **City of Portsmouth, owner**, for property located at **Marcy Street (Prescott Park)** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior construction to an existing structure (elevate, remove additions, and re-locate the Shaw warehouse on-site) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 104 as Lot 5 and lies within the Municipal (M) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the January 06, 2021 meeting).*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0, to **postpone** the work session to the May 5 meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **Anne Moodey, owner**, for property located at **180 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (expand front deck and rebuild (1) chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 101 as Lot 23 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the January 06, 2021 meeting).*

WORK SESSION

The applicant Anne Moodey and her architect Michelle Shields were present. They presented two options for the front deck, which included a wooden frame faced with stone with granite first and second landings, and either wood or wrought iron railings. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he had never seen that. Ms. Doering said she preferred the white wood railing instead of the wrought iron. Ms. Ruedig said she was concerned that the wood framing would rot away due to the lack of ventilation. She thought it would be easier to pour concrete and then face it in stone. Ms. Moodey agreed that a granite base made more sense than a wood frame. Ms. Ruedig suggested that the stone facing match the stone retaining wall. Mr. Ryan said he was okay with either version but thought the fieldstone approach didn't look appropriate.

The faux chimney was discussed. Ms. Moodey said her engineers confirmed that reinforcing the chimney on the inside and joining it to the roofline would allow them to build a box to withstand heavy wind. Mr. Ryan said that the amount of reinforcing and structural work just to have something artificial would be better spent keeping the real chimney. He suggested building a

back addition to get more space instead so that the authenticity of the chimney could be kept. He said he didn't think he could support removing the chimney. Ms. Moodey said inside space was a problem due to the chimney's size and that she didn't want to expand the house's footprint and take up what little outdoor space there was. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he would support the faux chimney as long as it was guaranteed to be exactly the same as the other chimney. He said the stairs should either be all wood with a wood railing, or a set of stone stairs going up into a stone landing with a black iron railing but that he preferred all wood. Ms. Doering said she would also have a hard time supporting the removal of the chimney. Ms. Ruedig said the Commission had approved faux chimneys in the past but that each application was considered individually. She said she would be okay with it if the applicant could have a mason show the Commission what the chimney would look like and that it would not look fake. Chairman Lombardi said the Commission's first charge was preservation and that he was less inclined to allow faux chimneys, especially on such a perfect house. He said the mix of wood and granite for the steps seemed strange and that he preferred either wood or granite. Mr. Adams said he had no confidence that the character-defining chimney could be replaced appropriately, so he couldn't support a faux chimney. Ms. Bouffard agreed.

Ms. Ruedig said it would be a difficult task to approve a faux chimney for that particular applicant, even though they had approved a lot in the past year, and she suggested that the Commission plan a separate discussion to talk about faux chimneys. Mr. Ryan said the faux chimneys that were previously approved were not instrumental to the exterior of the house but were for woodstoves and so on. City Council Representative Trace said it was an historic home and that the two chimneys were integral to the design elements of the home, from a historic preservation standpoint, so she could not support removing a chimney. She said the front steps should be either wood with a wooden railing or granite with a granite railing. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he would want to know what the original footprint was and when the addition was put on to justify why anyone would build two chimneys on one side of the house.

There was no public comment. Chairman Lombardi suggested continuing the work session to the March meeting to give the applicant time to consider an alternative to removing the chimney.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Ryan moved to **continue** the work session to the March 3 meeting, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Sauk-Schubert voting in opposition.*

C. Work Session requested by **One Raynes Ave, LLC, 31 Raynes LLC, and 203 Maplewood Avenue, LLC, owners**, for properties located at **1 Raynes Avenue, 31 Raynes Avenue, and 203 Maplewood Avenue**, where permission is requested to allow the construction of a 4-5 story mixed-use building and a 5 story hotel) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 123 Lot 14, Map 123 Lot 13, and Map 123 Lot 12 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the January 06, 2021 meeting).*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote, 7-0, to postpone the work session to the March 3 meeting.

V. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Work Session requested by **Mary H. and Ronald R. Pressman, owners**, for property located at **449 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (add 4th floor addition and roof deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 105 as Lot 6 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Architect Jennifer Ramsey was present on behalf of the applicant. She said the owners wanted to get 4th floor living space and an outdoor deck area. She said the roof would be reworked to get a small addition along the back of the building against the firewall. She said the materials would match all the details of the home on the lower floor.

Mr. Adams said the building was busy but that the front view of the building in the shadow of the existing firewall made it seem natural. He said he appreciated maintaining the symmetry and center lines and the cornice line of the additional building and that he could support the project. Mr. Ryan asked about the house's background. Ms. Ramsey said it was built in 2008 and was recently renovated for interior updates and maintenance. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he agreed with Mr. Adams' comments and thought the addition improved the elevation. Mr. Ryan said he liked what he saw, knowing that the house was a reproduction and could have liberties taken with it. He said that setting the addition back into the roof was unique and looked great, and that he could see the bays extending upward too. Ms. Ruedig said it did look busy on first sight but that it was a new building and wasn't very visible or showy, due to its angle.

City Council Representative asked if the deck would affect the privacy of the abutters or the sunlight of the buildings on the back side of State Street. Ms. Ramsey said the building in front was shorter so it would not be impacted and that no one's views or light would be affected. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he agreed with all the comments and thought it was a good design. Chairman Lombardi agreed. Mr. Cracknell said the 4-story building might need a variance to meet the height requirements of the District.

Public Comment

Jerry and Eloise Karabelas of 461 Court Street said they were abutters and had issues with whether the design related to the character of the neighborhood and the street or not. They thought that adding a fourth story to a neo-Federal building in the District was not feasible. They said the deck would overhang their property and affect their sunlight and privacy.

Ms. Ramsey said she could meet with the abutters and discuss it.

No one else was present to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to continue the work session to the March 3 meeting.

2. Work Session requested by **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner, and Michael Street, applicant**, for property located at **500 Market Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace brick dumpster corral) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 120 as Lot 2 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Property manager Michael Street said he wanted to install a composite wood enclosure to replace the brick dumpster corral. He said it would be vertical and would match the siding.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was fine with the design. Ms. Ruedig asked that the applicant bring back some drawings and a plan to show how big the enclosure would be for final approval. She said it would be a good idea to make the enclosure bigger so that the dumpsters were side by side. Mr. Cracknell said a site plan and elevation diagram were needed to show what the screen would look like. Ms. Doering said the structure was ugly and that she didn't see that it was big enough to cover two dumpsters. Mr. Ryan agreed and said he would need to see drawings and elevations. City Council Representative Trace said the design looked like it was from the 1970s or 80s. Mr. Adams said he didn't know whether glorifying a dumpster corral needed to be done but thought the idea of shabbier fencing seemed wrong. He asked if it could be made more suitable and perhaps have corners on it to give it more substance.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Adams moved to continue the work session to the March 3 meeting, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.

3. Work Session requested by **Stone Creek Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **53 Green Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the demolition of the existing structure and the new construction of a 3-5 story mixed-use building as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 119 as Lot 2 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Architect Carla Goodnight was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant, and the applicants Jeff Johnston and Rob Simmons were also present. Mr. Simmons briefly reviewed the site. Ms. Goodnight said the parcel played a significant role in the community space vision. She reviewed the building's massing and context.

Ms. Doering noted that the railroad vegetative buffer might not exist in the future. She said she found the comparison between the North End Vision Plan and the applicant's building interesting because the vision building drew one back in from the Mill Pond but the applicant had changed it so that there was some flanking that didn't draw one back, and there was a solid wall effect from the North Mill Pond view. She said she was concerned that the spine of the building moved through the center of the property instead of going along the edge of Green Street. She said a considerable change was made in the view from Market Street. Ms. Goodnight said the intention was to erode some of the solid wall shown on the vision plan.

Mr. Ryan said it was a lot to take it. He thought the Green Street side was a good approach but was concerned about the building sitting on a platform of parking. He said those areas could be done better yet still have a pedestrian feeling to them. He said the massing was fine and that he wanted to see more of what would be broken done on the back of the building slightly reflected on the front of the building. He said the flat decks would look better with some articulation. He said he liked the wood structure on the main portion and suggested doing something similar on the other two buildings so that they weren't so flat. He said he liked the arches. He said the arches looked Middle Eastern and unique and thought it would be nice to have architectural elements from the ground level to the deck level so that there was a connection. He said it was an opportunity to make some space back there and that he liked what it did to the side of the building. He said the balconies didn't bother him. He said he approved the massing but would like it to look less flat. In response to Mr. Adams' question, Mr. Johnston said the commercial space on Green Street would provide for public space on the first floor, and he showed how it would be accessed. Mr. Adams said it didn't look like a lot and whether there was another way to approach it so that people could feel that they belonged there. He also suggested a grand staircase going up to the flat arch platform. He said most of the balconies seemed to wrap around the corners of the building and that he was used to buildings having real corners and not open spaces on the corners. He said the building might be lacking structure.

Ms. Ruedig said it was a good massing start but was concerned about the Green Street frontage because it wrapped the corner and paralleled the railroad line a bit, and she thought more of that needed to be seen. She said the opening wasn't much better than the paved parking lot and that it looked like the hotel, with its huge paved entryway and lots of space to drive around, and parking underneath. She said it wasn't welcoming to pedestrians or residents and looked like strip mall construction to her. She suggested having more of the building wrap the corner to get a better face of the building and a better pedestrian view. She said the huge expanse of paving wasn't very attractive or pedestrian friendly and suggested putting a sidewalk there and stepping the building down so that it wasn't such a stark 5-story wall. City Council Representative Trace agreed. She said the building was a gateway one to the City and people would see five stories of massing, with the exception of where the building stepped down. She said it was like a long cavern of five stories on one side and five stories on the other and thought stepping down the two stories on the end of the building near the AC Hotel to match the other end of the building might go a long way. She said the side of the building seen from North Mill Pond looked like it was one story too high. She said the massing could be less abrupt.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he liked the two flanking 3-story structures with the arches in between on the back of the building. He agreed the Green Street side would pose a problem with its paved courtyard and exposed cars underneath the building, and thought that a building with 60 units or so should have more of a formalized entrance. Referring to the alley that was created between the building and the AC Hotel, he said it would be better to step the building back a bit on the upper stories. He said getting rid of 16 feet on the front of the one-story building was very important so that it would allow a real sidewalk. Chairman Lombardi said he agreed with a lot of the comments. He said he liked the arched view from the water but thought the parking area was terrible and needed to be further developed and more pedestrian friendly. He said there could be more commercial space and that the pathway could be wider and less enclosed. He said the massing was a sea of flat and that he would like to see it change a bit.

City Council Representative Trace said the parking could be made circular and have a green feature to soften the mass. Mr. Ryan said he didn't mind the alleyway because he felt that it wasn't really an alleyway. He said he didn't mind the height and thought the wall effect was needed to support what could be a beautiful pedestrian area within the City, so he didn't want to see it stepped back. He suggested bringing the arches back in front of the building to be more appealing. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he didn't see much difference between the building and the AC Hotel. He said that all options should be open at this stage of review, but that he didn't see any presented options that might have been pursued before arriving at the presented massing form. He said he didn't find the building outstanding and thought the only pleasing aspect was on the northern side with the arches. Ms. Bouffard agreed and she said wasn't excited about the building because it looked like any of the other buildings in that area.

Ms. Doering said the Maplewood Avenue project presented different shaped cubes on different locations on their lot, which she had found useful in terms of seeing how a building could fit on a site. She said the Vision Plan was an alternative shape that she could compare it to and that the Commission was missing the opportunity to see what the potential was. She said there was really no front of the building and asked if the front was supposed to be the Green Street façade or the Mill Pond or if the building needed two inviting entrance sides to it. Ms. Goodnight said they had that limited stretch of frontage on Green Street that supported the path to the park, the commercial frontage, and the vehicular entrance. She said those three functions were stacked in a limited stretch due to the property's shape and that she would look into it further.

Chairman Lombardi said he would welcome some creative thought in the massing, something very different than what was presented. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said a lot of the problem with massing was created ten years ago when people said the height of buildings should not be over four stories, so all the new buildings were the same height and had flat roofs because to maximize space. City Council Representative Trace said it was a mixed-use building and suggested putting in more commercial space or putting something on the back facing the pond. Mr. Ryan said a lot of good stuff was happening to the building and that he saw something to build upon. He said it wasn't a showstopper and shouldn't be. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said that three-quarters of the energy spent on the building should have gone into exploring alternatives and thought it was sad that the Commission was confronted with a fait accompli.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to *continue* the work session to the March 3 meeting, and Mr. Ryan seconded. The motion *passed* by unanimous vote, 7-0.

At this point, Ms. Ruedig left the meeting. Mr. Adams and Ms. Bouffard recused themselves from the work session, and Alternate Sauk-Schubert took a voting seat.

4. Work Session requested by **Ross D. Ellenhorn and Rebecca J. Wolfe, owners**, for property located at **279 Marcy Street, Unit #3**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct recessed deck on 3rd floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 45-3 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

The applicant Jeff Green was present. He said he submitted some rudimentary drawings and measurements because he just wanted to know if the Commission would approve the location. Chairman Lombardi said there was too little information to make a decision and also suggested that the applicant talk to his neighbor about the project, noting that the Commission received a letter from that neighbor. Ms. Doering said she would have a hard time supporting a recessed roof in that building and in that location because it wasn't appropriate. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the front of the building was very mixed up, with the placement of the windows and so on. He thought it had been a store many years ago and wasn't a historic structure, but he wanted to see more detailed plans. Mr. Ryan asked if there was a dormer in the adjacent house that would look into the space. Mr. Green said there was no dormer and that the deck couldn't really be seen from the abutter or from the street. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he needed more information.

Public Comment

Kate Cook of 17 Hunking Street said the back of her lot abutted the applicant's building and that the applicant currently had three decks on the back of his building that overlooked her yard. She asked what the proposed deck would look like and if it would have views of her yard and patio space, especially along the railing. She said the ash trees on her property were bare from autumn through spring and didn't afford much privacy.

Mr. Green said there would not be a railing on the edge of the deck and that the deck would come up to the existing roofline. City Council Representative Trace asked why another deck was needed in that case. Mr. Green said the resident had no deck for their unit and no outside space. Ms. Trace asked what would happen to the stormwater due to the recessed deck. Mr. Green said they would have to make an ADT bathtub under the deck and drain it out, and a downspout would go down that side of the building. Ms. Trace asked why it wasn't included in the drawing.

No one else was present to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

Chairman Lombardi said more detailed drawings should be presented and suggested continuing the work session. He said the other condo owners should also approve the project. Mr. Green said he had spoken to them and that they had no objections. The Commission discussed whether the project should be pursued, seeing that it was challenging.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Ryan moved to **continue** the work session to the March 3 meeting, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 4-2, with City Council Representative Trace and Ms. Doering voting in opposition.*

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary