

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**April 5, 2017
to be reconvened on April 12, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice Chairman Jon Wyckoff;
Members Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Richard Shea, John
Mayer; Alternates Martin Ryan and Molly Bolster

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Nancy Pearson

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. March 1, 2017

Ms. Ruedig, Mr. Shea, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff recused themselves from the motion.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (5-0) to approve the March 1, 2017 minutes.*

B. March 8, 2017

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to approve the March 8, 2017 minutes with a minor amendment.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 9 Congress Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the bagel shop's two gooseneck lights would be replaced with three lights. Mr. Shea asked whether the conduit would be exposed. Mr. Cracknell said it would be stipulated that no conduit would be exposed.

2. 56 Dennett Street

There were no comments.

3. 53 Green Street

There were no comments.

4. 250 Market Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that a change about a revised stairway was submitted to the Planning Department. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the sidewalk was still intact. Mr. Cracknell said it was, noting that the stairway was set back from the sidewalk.

5. 35 Park Street

Mr. Cracknell said the wooden garage door would be replaced with a raised metal panel door. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked if it would be field painted. Mr. Cracknell said it could be stipulated.

Motion

It was moved to grant Administrative Approvals for Items 2, 3, and 4.

It was moved to grant an Administrative Approval for Item 1 with the following stipulation: that no exterior conduit shall be exposed.

It was moved to grant an Administrative Approval for Item 5, with the following stipulation: that the new garage door shall be field painted.

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff stated that the changes were all minor in nature.

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to approve all of the administrative approval items.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Lombardi noted that the following petition was administratively withdrawn and that the petition for 9 Commercial Alley was also withdrawn.

1. Petition of **Rockingham House Condominium Association, owner, and Sean Tracey Associates**, for property located at **401 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free structure (install free standing sign) per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 3 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

2. Petition of **St. Jean Real Estate Holdings, LLC, owner**, for property located at **200 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install

two condensing units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 85-2 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Andrea St. Jean was present to speak to the petition and briefly reviewed it. Mr. Cracknell asked whether condensing units would be screened by the shrubbery and would fit between the existing hedge and the structure, and Ms. St. Jean agreed.

In reply to Vice-Chair Wyckoff's questions, Ms. St. Jean stated that the trim on the conduit cover was white, the conduit would enter the house at the corner and not run across the clapboards, and the cover over the tubes would be field painted to match the color of the house if the conduits had to be moved into a clapboarded section.

Mr. Shea asked the applicant whether she considered locating the condensing units at the back of the house where the stairs were. Ms. St. Jean said she had, but because there was a shared driveway, she didn't want the units to be visible to the neighbor.

Ms. Reagan asked for a stipulation stating that if, for some reason the existing shrub had to be removed, it be replaced to provide screening.

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 made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The external conduit shall match the trim color or, if it is located against the siding it shall be field painted to match the siding.*
- 2) The proposed HVAC unit shall be fully screened from Hancock and Marcy Streets with evergreen landscaping or a similar screening element.*

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

3. Petition of **Hart House Condominium Association, owner, and Jeffrey L. and Delores P. Ives, applicants**, for property located at **306 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (removing left front stairs) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new stairs) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 75 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The designer Brendan McNamara was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the owner. He reviewed the petition, noting that the windows would be replaced with Green Mountain all-wood windows with attached casements. He said the stair would also be replaced and that the deck flooring would be revised.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked Mr. McNamara how he came up with the 4-1/2" casing width on the Green Mountain units. Mr. McNamara said it was to match existing and that the windows were chosen to drop into the clapboard opening. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the casing seemed a bit oversized for the small window. Mr. McNamara said the original casing had storms, and it was further discussed.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the band seemed a bit undersized, and it was further discussed.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked about the choice of the premier kit for the rails. Mr. McNamara said the balusters were the premium rails and that they would not use the kit. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he felt that the rail, balusters and newel posts should be wood, primed and painted because they were so close to the street. It was further discussed.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the wrought-iron guard rail was necessary, and Mr. McNamara said that it was. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked why ceiling panels were being put beneath the decking material, and Mr. McNamara said it was due to the PT joists.

Mr. Rawling said he agreed that the railing should be wood. He asked Mr. McNamara to review the band molding. Mr. McNamara did so and noted that the molding wasn't chosen to match existing, though it was close. Mr. Rawling said it was important for the house that the dimensions be maintained and suggested that it be stipulated.

Mr. Mayer suggested that the original trim detail be restored. He asked whether the granite landing at the base of the stairs was necessary and whether the wrought-iron guard rail could be eliminated. Mr. McNamara said it was the owner's choice and noted that the wrought-iron was historic in nature. Ms. Bolster asked whether it stood out beyond the edge of the corner. Mr. McNamara said it extended beyond the corner of the building. Ms. Bolster asked whether the steps could be placed next to the edge of the building, but Mr. McNamara said they could not due to the driveway.

In response to Mr. Shea's questions, Mr. McNamara said the sash replacement would be on the entire house, the frames would not be replaced, and that some of the window sills were narrower than others. He said he would use the thicker profile on the new windows. He also stated that the third floor would have 6/3 windows, that half-screens would be used, and that the new granite stone would be in the same plane and go out to the edge of the curb. He said he would picture frame the steps and landing so that no cuts on the wood decking would be seen.

Ms. Ruedig said she thought the iron railing was an elegant solution but would like to see a wooden hand railing and balusters. She said the Azek under the stairs was fine.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested that if the landing were one step down, eight inches would be gained and a step could be eliminated.

Ms. Bolster noted that the wrought-iron rail would not prevent a small child from falling through. She asked about the paint scheme. Mr. McNamara said it was mahogany decking with black wrought iron.

Mr. Martin noted that the railing as drawn wouldn't make for a good one and would probably go past the baseboard. The railing and landing were further discussed.

Chairman Lombardi said he was more concerned about using Azek on the railings than he was about the wrought-iron railing. He said the bottom step was a significant safety concern. He said he agreed with the Commission's comments on the windows, using wood on the railings, and using Azek for the area below 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 made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The band molding, lintels and sills shall match the existing dimensions.*
- 2) The railings and balusters and posts shall be wood and shall be field-painted.*
- 3) The steps and decking shall be picture framed.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig stated that all the changes were improvements to the building and 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 **29-41 Congress Street, LLC, owner, and Gabriele Tise, applicant**, for property located at **37 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove awning, replace storefront facade with recessed wood panels, replace existing door with wood door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 10 and lies within CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant and project coordinator Gabriele Tise was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the owner. She reviewed the petition.

Mr. Shea said he thought it was important to maintain some of the original details, like the cornice and the old concrete, and that he preferred not to see the structure metal-wrapped. He asked whether a flat panel would be put in. Ms. Tise said it might be a framing panel detail. Mr. Shea asked if the material under the windows was painted corrugated metal. Ms. Tise agreed.

Mr. Rawling asked whether the applicant would consider a paint scheme that emphasized the column and tabulature instead of painting everything the same. The owner Phil Dube approached the podium. It was further discussed. Mr. Rawling suggested that a two-color scheme would break the structure up more and get away from the massive effect. Ms. Tise said that the frieze board would be proud of the panel and would be more of an architectural detail. Mr. Martin said he was concerned that when the canopy was removed, the air conditioner would have an impact on the appearance. Ms. Tise said she and the neighbors discussed sharing a condenser in the back at a later time.

Ms. Ruedig noted that some dimensions were missing, like the panel width and sidelights, and asked whether they could be submitted to be approved administratively. Ms. Tise agreed. Mr. Shea noted that the panel details were also necessary.

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 made the motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) Fully dimensioned and detailed drawings shall be submitted to the Planning Department for an administrative approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.*
- 2) The concrete crown at the top shall not be wrapped in metal.*

Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project would preserve the integrity and character of the District and conserve and enhance surrounding property values. He said it was a great improvement for the storefront and hoped that the air conditioning problems would be taken care of.

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

5. Petition of **Twenty Three Rue Du High Realty, owner**, and **Nelson Enterprises, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **9 Commercial Alley**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows and door on Commercial Alley side of building) and allow new free standing structure (install condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 32 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The item was withdrawn from consideration by the applicant.

6. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Ten Walker Street Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **73 Prospect Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish accessory structures) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two additions) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 142 as Lot 28 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Steve McHenry and Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architecture and the owner Glen Walker were present to speak to the petition. Mr. McHenry reviewed the changes made in response to the Commission's previous suggestions, which included window placement and removal, a weathered wood color for the asphalt shingles, band molding matching existing, the new concrete foundation having a brushed finish, and one attic window instead of two. He also noted that the brackets from the entry porch would be re-used, there would be historic window sills, and the chimney would be properly flashed,

Mr. Mayer said the clapboard exposure looked contemporary. Mr. McHenry said it was typical to have a 4" exposure, and it was further discussed. The Commission suggested that the exposure be either 3-1/2 or 3-3/4 inches.

Mr. Shea asked why the window over the door in the front elevation was shorter. Mr. McHenry said the center hall had a shorter window because it was a stairway hall. Mr. Shea said it was fine if it was the original window, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Shea asked about the dormers, the clapboards being continuous, and whether the Victorian porch would be saved, and it was further discussed.

Ms. Bolster asked what the material of the porch railings was. Mr. McHenry said it was a clad solid wood column with a vinyl finish and a paintable surface.

Mr. McHenry said they could submit a better detailed drawing of the dormer and could specify the color on the clad window. Mr. Rawling suggested that a dark-colored sash and a light-colored trim be specified.

Mr. Shea asked about the mulled windows and whether the double hung windows would match the casing, and it was further discussed. He also asked whether the bulkhead would be relocated, and Mr. Walker agreed and said it would not be in the front of the structure.

Chairman Lombardi asked where the bathroom and kitchen venting would go and also about air conditioning units. Mr. Walker said the venting would be in the back wall and/or in the back of the building on the new additions and that nothing would face the front or side streets. He said the air conditioning would be mini split systems.

Mr. Shea asked whether the white area under the decks would be open. Mr. McHenry said it would be close to the ground if it was open, but if it was more than six inches, they would infill it. Mr. Shea suggested stipulating that it would be a vertical lattice and also suggested Azek, and Mr. McHenry agreed.

There was no public comment.

Chairman Lombardi closed the work session and moved to the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture on behalf of the owner was present to speak to the petition. He referred to the work session conversation and asked that the Commission take into account the changes made in response to their recommendation. He stated that the project team agreed to keep the clapboards at 3-1/2"-3-3/4", that they needed to specify the clad window color and the mulled window color, that half-screens would be included, that the exterior bulkhead would be located to the rear elevation and that the detail would be submitted, that a mini-split air conditioning system would be used, that the location of mechanical equipment would go through administrative approval, and that any lattice work would be detailed.

Mr. Shea reminded Mr. McHenry that the center window over the front door had to be looked into to see if it matched in height with the adjacent windows on either side. He also asked that the dormer detail be submitted. He suggested that the clapboard be eliminated between the window casings and the clapboard.

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 made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The dormer detail shall be revised to be narrowed to show a wider casing and no clapboards below the lintels.*
- 2) The second floor center window size shall match the historical opening.*
- 3) The exposure for the clapboards shall not exceed 3 3/4".*
- 4) The jamb color on all windows shall match the trim.*
- 5) Half screens shall be used.*
- 6) The exterior bulkhead, if used, shall be located on the rear elevation of the new addition.*
- 7) All termination vents or stacks shall be located on the rear elevation.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig stated that the project was a major overhaul of the old house and a big improvement to the area. She noted that some historic elements were being demolished but said they were unsalvageable. She said that refreshing that corner of the neighborhood would conserve and enhance property values all around. She was disappointed with the loss of the Victorian porch because it was part of the house's history and spoke to the language of a farmhouse, but she noted that the restoration of the core of the house and the center chimney reconstruction would also enhance and maintain some of the character of the house and the District and would be compatible with surrounding properties.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the house was one of the oldest in Portsmouth and had made it through three centuries after having been recycled a number of times and then allowed to run down. He said it was being recycled again and hoped it would continue on for another 100 years.

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

7. Petition of **Stephen J. Boyle, owner**, for property located at **437 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove chimney, replace in-kind) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct tower element on south elevation) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace basement windows in-kind) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 36 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Shannon Alther of TMS Architects was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He reviewed each change by item number. The first three items consisted of replacing the existing chimney, replacing a basement window in kind, and installing a skylight. He said they had a new option for Item #4, the tower, Option E, which was a small tower element without the mass of the previous options. Mr. Alther also read a letter from the abutter Mary Anker who was against the petition and submitted it to the Commission.

Mr. Shea said he thought Option E was a much better approach and that the south façade was more successful than the east façade. He said the skylights were not an issue for him and thought the little tower was fairly minimal and didn't take away much of the old trim. He also noted that the tower could be removed in the future if desired.

Mr. Shea asked Mr. Alther to review the dormer on the south façade. Mr. Alther said the metal roofing was a funky shape, so the metal would help flash and get the water out. Mr. Shea asked whether the lower part of the metal panels was vertical and what the material was. Mr. Alther said the lower part was almost vertical and that they would try to match the existing roof color. He said he could bring samples to show the Commission. Mr. Shea asked whether the basement windows were insulated. Mr. Alther said they were currently true divided but that he would get simulated divided light (SDL) windows. Mr. Shea asked whether they were clad or wood on the outside. Mr. Alther said he preferred wood on the inside and clad on the outside. He said it would be painted.

Ms. Ruedig said that the first three items were okay. She said the tower option was a big improvement and thought it met the Commission's guidelines because it was a small addition, fit fairly well, and could be easily removed. She said it was a good solution to create a more useful space and that, even with the metal roof, it was consistent with other types of materials on the house and would also represent a different part of the house that wasn't original.

Mr. Mayer said he could not support the tower because he didn't feel it fit within the guidelines. Ms. Bolster said she also could not support the tower. She said she couldn't support the skylight as well because she felt that it would be a step backward.

Mr. Martin said he would support the tower because he felt the applicant made a good argument for the precedent of the Queen Anne style and the busyness of the roofline. He said he had no problem with the skylight because it was in the back and was a gentle solution compared to previous attempts. Mr. Rawling agreed that the latest design had a minimal impact on the back of the house and was in character with the house's style and said he would support it.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he would also support the petition. He said the Queen Anne by itself was eclectic and that the small tower element didn't really affect the rear of the house.

Chairman Lombardi said he agreed with the first three items but felt that the tower was awkward. He said he had trouble justifying it on the house because he didn't think it added anything to the historic value and didn't think it was compatible with the structure as designed. He thought the metal roof was an uncomfortable feature. He also noted that the Commission didn't have drawings, and he was hesitant to approve something without measurements and drawings. Mr. Alther said he had an outline of the house as well as dimensions. Chairman Lombardi said he still could not support the tower.

Mr. Rawling said there was a casement unit that he felt was inappropriate and could support double hungs instead. Mr. Alther agreed.

Mr. Mayer asked whether other windows would be added under the tower. Mr. Alther said they would add three new windows associated with the tower, and the skylight window.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff reminded the Commission that the tower was being used as egress for the third floor and had a function. He said it was a stairwell that was a traditional use for a small structure, especially on that particular structure, and that it was something that could have happened in the past. He said the Commissioners had to balance their opinions on a true function that was valuable for a third floor.

In response to Mr. Shea's questions, Mr. Alther said the half windows were awnings, that the Marvin window was wood with SDL, that the sash would be wood and painted to match the trim, and the casings would be reproduced. Mr. Shea suggested that they match the new windows as closely as possible so that they didn't stick out as new windows.

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 made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The Tower E is approved.*
- 2) The rear metal roofing shall match the color of the shingles.*
- 3) The windows in the tower shall be double-hung.*
- 4) The three new windows shall be solid wood sashes and painted to match the existing windows. The casing and muntin profile shall match the existing windows.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and conserve and enhance property values and that the renovation would do a lot for the contributing property on a corner of two important streets in the south end. It would maintain the special character of the District because it would maintain the character of a Queen Anne home, which he noted was usually so eclectic that no one could figure out what was going on with it. He said that, in relation to the historic and architectural value of the existing structure, he didn't think it would do any harm and that it would perform an important function by allowing a secondary egress to the third floor.

*The motion **passed**, with 5 in favor and Chairman Lombardi and Mr. Mayer voting against the motion (5-2).*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff left the meeting at this point.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Petition of **Rockingham House Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **401 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing side staircase) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new staircase) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 3 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Carla Goodknight of CJ Architects on behalf of the applicant was present to speak to the petition. She introduced Wayne and Robin Lehman, noting that Mr. Lehman was the President of the Rockingham Condominium Association. Ms. Goodknight reviewed the petition, noting that the existing 1980s stairway was deteriorating. She said the main building would not be touched. She pointed out that there was an infill piece that had an egress stair from the second-floor units that wrapped down to the pool area, where the stair was. She said they wanted something lighter and made out of metal that wouldn't be so noticeable. Ms. Goodknight showed an aerial photo of the pool and the stair and said the visibility from the road was minimal.

Mr. Shea asked why the horizontal baluster was chosen instead of the vertical. Ms. Goodknight said she felt the horizontal was a more modern element but was open to the vertical.

Ms. Bolster asked whether there were photos of the product. Ms. Goodknight said they would show them at the final presentation.

Mr. Shea asked Ms. Goodknight to explain what would be filled in underneath the stair. Ms. Goodknight said they would carry infill pieces similar to the pool fence to fill it in. She said it would be a see-through panel and shaped to fit in the openings under the stair.

Mr. Mayer asked about the structural elements under the stairs. Ms. Goodknight said they were posts that they would be in line with the fence. Mr. Mayer suggested that the fencing could be held down from the structure of the stairs to make some airspace.

Ms. Ruedig noted that the staircase would be simple and not very visible and asked that it be as minimal as possible. Mr. Martin said he felt that the applicant was going from a grand stairway to a back stair and that it seemed a shame to lose something that was a little graceful. He suggested that there be a bit of architecture in the new stairway.

Mr. Shea said it would have been interesting to just replace the brick part in metal and replicate what it was doing because the way the stairway came down was sort of sculptural, and he felt that the back stairway wouldn't be as attractive. Ms. Goodknight said it wasn't the grand entrance to the building and felt that it was appropriate that it be a lighter form. She said they could perhaps soften it, but she felt that the transparent feel was the right thing.

Mr. Rawling said he thought the vertical elements would be a lighter and more neutral piece. He liked the horizontal on the top of the brick wall because it gave a little interest to the vertical rail system and wasn't so industrial. He suggested adjusting the panels at the landing to work in some of the horizontal top or put some decorative metal piece in the metal pattern.

Mr. Shea asked whether the underneath had to be closed in. Ms. Goodknight said they had to provide some separation or an enclosure for the pool area.

Chairman Lombardi asked what the treads were, and Ms. Goodknight said they were concrete pan. Chairman Lombardi noted that it would collect snow and involve maintenance. He asked whether they would be noisy, and Ms. Goodknight said she didn't think so. Chairman Lombardi said he liked that the stair was open and thought it had a bit of a fire escape look. He said he thought the stairway was fine because it was light looking and functional and not in a main entrance, except for four units.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant indicated that they would return for a public hearing.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on June 7, 2017.