

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**MAY 3, 2017
to be reconvened on MAY 10, 2017**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
*It was moved, seconded and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to postpone Petition #4, 113 Congress Street, and Work Session D, 206 Court Street, to the June 7, 2017 meeting.*

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 133 Islington Street
2. 39 Mt. Vernon Street
3. 459 Islington Street

Mr. Cracknell gave a brief description of each petition. There were no comments.

*Mr. Shea made a motion to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the three petitions as presented. Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Mr. Shea said the requests were all minor in nature and compatible with surrounding properties.

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

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Gus Holdings, LLC, owner**, for property located at **38 Chapel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace 14 windows on front façade, replace existing clapboards) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 26 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant and owner Ryan Patrick was present to speak to the application. He said he wanted to replace 14 windows with 6/6 Colonial-style, double-hung windows, and that the only difference from the existing windows was that the windows were aluminum clad.

In response to Vice-Chair Wyckoff's questions, Mr. Patrick said the windows would be the architectural style with butted ends, would have a spacer bar between the glass, and would be new construction. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was surprised to see old casings around the windows and suggested that Mr. Patrick use flat-stock. Mr. Patrick agreed.

Mr. Shea recommended that Mr. Patrick use a window that came with a real sill and casing, especially since it was the front of the house. It was further discussed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested carpentry instead of a snap-on trim. Mr. Rawlings suggested 5/8" mullions for a lighter look. He also asked that the jamb liners match the siding colors.

Mr. Rawlings asked whether the screens would be white. Mr. Patrick said they would be black and that he preferred to have the screen on the inside. It was further discussed, as well as the jambs and trim. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested that Mr. Patrick either get a different color for the jamb liner or put in a white window with white trim. Mr. Patrick said he would do it in white. Mr. Rawlings also suggested half-screens.

Mr. Mayer asked what the design for the replacement molding would be, and Mr. Patrick explained it. Mr. Cracknell stated that an administrative approval for the molding design would be sufficient. The sash color was also discussed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street recommended that the window and siding be at a higher standard and explained why. He also discussed the band molding with the Commission.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) An historic Azek sill shall be used and it shall be field painted white to match the windows.*
- 2) A half screen shall be used.*
- 3) A 5/8" mullion shall be used.*
- 4) The final molding design shall be submitted for Administrative Approval.*
- 5) The clapboards shall be replaced in-kind with the same profile material and appearance.*
- 6) A "B608" band mold shall be used.*

7) *A 1" x 4" casing shall be used and shall be field painted white to match the windows.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed**, with 6 in favor and Mr. Shea opposed.*

2. Petition of **Rachel Kurshan, owner**, for property located at **33 Humphrey's Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (enclose right side porch for living space) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 41 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Anne Whitney on behalf of the applicant was present to speak to the petition. Ms. Whitney said her client wanted to enclose the porch and add Integrity double-hung windows.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether a foundation would be poured, and Ms. Whitney said no.

Ms. Whitney discussed the railings and said the existing roof wouldn't change.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the wooden railing system could match the rail on the front, with the round top on the posts, and Ms. Whitney agreed.

Mr. Shea asked why Ms. Whitney wanted a shorter window in the bay. Ms. Whitney said she thought it would be nice to have more wall in that space. In response to further questions from Mr. Shea, Ms. Whitney said the trim details would be the same, the window would be Integrity with a 5/4 band mold trim and painted PVC, and the white fiberglass windows could be painted.

Mr. Rawlings asked whether the existing windows were replacements, and Ms. Whitney said they looked original. She also said they had storms. Mr. Rawlings suggested that 5/8" mullions be specified, but Ms. Whitney said they only came in 7/8". It was further discussed, and Mr. Rawlings said Ms. Whitney should match what was on the house.

Mr. Mayer asked about the existing full screens. Ms. Whitney said they could go to a half-screen but preferred full screens.

The vertical board skirting was discussed. Mr. Mayer suggested having a skirt similar to the one in the bay. Ms. Whitney said they could repeat the mud sill on the porch.

Ms. Ruedig said the porch added an element of interest to the house and was sad to see it go. She asked Ms. Whitney if she had considered making it look more like an enclosed porch rather than an addition. Ms. Whitney said she did, but too many windows would have to be added and it didn't read as a three-season porch. Ms. Ruedig said that having the water table board at the bottom would work to show that the structure used to be a porch.

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

- 1) A rounded top post shall be used.*
- 2) The mud sill on the porch shall match the existing mud sill on the bay window.*
- 3) The railings shall match the existing railing on the front of the house.*

Mr. Rawlings seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project was consistent with the special and defining character of the surrounding properties and had a compatible design.

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

3. Petition of **Friends of the Music Hall, owner**, for property located at **28 Chestnut Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing signage, replace with new lighted signage and blade sign) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 7 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The Chair of the Facilities Committee Ben Auger was present to speak to the petition. He introduced the Director of the Music Hall Patricia Lynch and Attorney Tim Phoenix.

Mr. Auger stated that they went before the Board of Adjustment and received a variance. He said the Commission's previous concern about flashing lights on the marquee had been addressed and that there would be no flashing lights. He reviewed the application, stating that they wanted to replace the substandard marquee and four banners with a new marquee and blade. He noted that they had several letters of support, and he read excerpts from each one, which included the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources, Discover Portsmouth, and four abutters and neighbors.

Ms. Ruedig asked how the color scheme was chosen. Mr. Auger said it was tied to the historic colors inside the Music Hall and reflected neon marquees of previous eras. It was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said she wanted to ensure that the colors, once installed, would not be bright, blinding colors. Mr. Auger said the brightness was discussed through the variance process and that they met the Board of Adjustment's regulations. He noted that the colors were Italian green, violet, and gold.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked where the roof drain went. Mr. Auger said it was a small trench drain that went back toward the building.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the 15-1/2" boxes were illuminated and if the columns were illuminated from the inside. Mr. Auger agreed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it went against the Commission's guidelines. Attorney Phoenix stated that the City regulated the brightness of the sign and that the brightness was adjustable. He said they received a variance to have the sign internally illuminated because it wasn't possible to have it externally illuminated.

Chairman Lombardi verified that the lettering on the marquee was LED, that it would be a black background with white lettering, and that nothing would move.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street noted that the illumination issue would have to go before the City Council. He said he was concerned that the blade wasn't in keeping with the simple brick surroundings and would draw too much attention.

Patricia Bagley of 213 Pleasant Street said she was astounded by the signage, especially the way the blade divided the front middle window, and felt it wasn't authentic to the historic Music Hall.

Esther Kennedy of 41 Pickering Avenue said the Music Hall was built in 1887, the same year as Edison discovered the lightbulb, and that there wasn't a lot of neon and bright lights then. She recommended that the Commission think about how much lighting was too much and whether it would look good in the District. She also asked how late the marquee would be lit.

Michael Labrie said he owned the 141 Congress Street building and thought the sign was very appropriate. He noted that the theater had an illuminated marquee when it was the Civic Theater. He reminded the Commission that the abutters fully supported it and said he supported it as well.

Attorney Phoenix stated that the Ordinance required that lights be off by 11:00 p.m., or one hour after a late show. He said the sign's brightness was governed by the Ordinance and that it could not exceed a certain level. As for the history of neon lights, he noted that times had evolved. He pointed out that a huge blade stuck up above the roof at one point and that the Civic Theater marquee was lighted. He referenced the letters of support from the neighbors, abutters, and the State and Portsmouth Historical Societies. He said the total signage square footage was vetted by the Board of Adjustment.

Rick Becksted said the Commission's vote would determine what was historically appropriate and suggested that they first see a demo of the colors to make sure they were right.

Mr. Auger noted that there would be bollards in the street to prevent large vehicles from backing into the Music Hall.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Councilor Pearson seconded.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff stated that the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources said the project met the Secretary of Interior Standards, and he read an excerpt from the document. He said that neon lights happened much earlier than everyone assumed, around 1900. He said the project had met the standards of professional historic sign and marquee builders and historic societies, so it met his standards.

Councilor Pearson said the marquee would be bright but noted that it was a dark area of town and would draw people in as well as make it a gathering space and make people feel safer. She said it was something to get used to and something the City could be proud of.

Ms. Ruedig said she thought it was a historically-appropriate design and size. She pointed out that 19th-century theaters eventually became movie theaters and got big neon banner marquees. She noted that historians had signed off on the design. She said her only concern was the color, but as long as it wasn't bright green and yellow, she was fine with it.

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

4. Petition of **Worth Development Condominium Association, owner, and The Friendly Toast, applicant**, for property located at **113 Congress Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (replace storefront windows with retractable windows with screens) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6-104 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use, 3 to 3 ½ story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studies was present on behalf of the applicant. She presented three color options of rust, Cape Cod blue, and green to the Commission and asked their opinions.

Councilor Pearson, Mr. Rawling, Mr. Mayer, and Ms. Bolster said they preferred the blue. Vice-Chair Wyckoff, Mr. Martin and Mr. Shea preferred the rust. Ms. Ruedig said she preferred anything but the green. Chairman Lombardi preferred the green. Various reasons were given.

Ms. Ruedig said she was concerned that the brick color would be realistically monotone beige and wanted to see what the rust and blue would look like against it. Ms. Ramsey said the brick tone would depend on the chosen color.

Ms. Ramsey gave the results of the public poll she had done about color choices, stating that 61% preferred the blue, 21% preferred the green, and only 18% preferred the rust.

Ms. Ramsey said she made the brackets smaller and would use the same casing around the bay windows, in the same color.

The frosted glazing in the glass balconies was discussed. Chairman Lombardi and Ms. Ruedig thought it was distracting and competed with the top railing. Ms. Ramsey said they could stay with a solid, opaque panel. Chairman Lombardi asked whether different shades of frosted glass could be used. Ms. Ramsey said there was an etching glass that had a violet hue but that the most typical was frosted gray. She offered to bring samples to the next work session.

The bright stainless railing was discussed. Mr. Mayer said it was jarring. It was further discussed. Mr. Mayer asked whether the second-floor balcony design could mimic the top floor balcony's design, and it was further discussed, as well as the screening material.

Mr. Rawling discussed establishing consistency with motifs. He said the motif on the top-floor railings could be applied to the etched glass railings, except reversed. It was further discussed. He said that repeating the framing pattern or rhythms would also help. Councilor Pearson asked whether the railing came in a different metal finish. Ms. Ramsey said it did but that they preferred a little sparkle for a change. She said it also tied into the glass awning below. Councilor Pearson said it worked well with the blue scheme. Mr. Martin said he agreed with Mr. Rawling about not using the pattern above. He asked whether the railing could be pulled in slightly, and it was further discussed.

Ms. Ruedig said she felt that the frosted panel should be simple and flat because they worked hard to make the building simple and elegant. She said there were a lot of balconies and that it might look too busy if the pattern was brought down. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed and said he would like to see simpler, translucent panels that weren't bright white.

The garage door material was discussed. Ms. Ramsey said it was frosted glazing with the shiny metal. Chairman Lombardi said he felt it emphasized the door and made it look like a primary feature of the building. Ms. Ruedig said it wasn't attractive as a street presence. Mr. Martin and Vice-Chair Wyckoff said they liked the garage door's material.

Ms. Ramsey discussed the metal sloped roof with the finial on top of the apartments. Ms. Ruedig said she thought the spike was unnecessary and felt that it should be simple and elegant. Mr. Shea agreed. Mr. Rawling said he thought it was a nice relief from the flatness.

Chairman Lombardi asked about the appurtenance. Ms. Ramsey said it would be lit from the inside.

Chairman Lombardi said he felt that the corner entrance wasn't quite up to the rest of the building and seemed mundane. It was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling commented on some overall issues and refinements. Related to the vertical aspects, he said that all the different parts of the building seemed to have different characteristics that were then put together. He suggested some design motifs or elements that could be shifted back and forth. He said one of the most successful parts was the top-floor railings and the surrounding framing that broke it up from being just a panel support. He suggested bringing some of it down to the second-floor railings. He noted the lightness in the line work that could be brought down to the brackets. Mr. Rawling then discussed the horizontal lines. He said the brick work and masonry had nice, simple shadow lines, but the flatness of the bays could use some relief. He discussed in detail the emphasis of the horizontal lines and bringing them across to create some shadow lines. He recommended moving the motifs around instead of each building having its own motif.

Chairman Lombardi asked whether the same material could be used on the bays, but with a different color on the horizontal without creating a shadow line, and Mr. Rawling discussed it in detail.

Mr. Martin asked if the curve above the entrance would be the same as the bay. Ms. Ramsey said it would. He asked whether the windows would be curved, and Ms. Ramsey said they could be. It was further discussed.

Mr. Shea asked what the reason was for the long, narrow space in one bay and how deep it was. Ms. Ramsey said it was a notch for the Fire Department to use for connections and that it went back two feet. Mr. Shea asked to see a detail of it at the next work session.

Chairman Lombardi asked the Commission for a consensus. It was noted that half the Commission wanted more simplification. Ms. Ramsey said she could return with two options.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether Ms. Ramsey would bring in a different colored cap. Ms. Ramsey said the cap represented the gray tone and would be in a neutral color.

Ms. Ramsey said the finial would be removed and the roof pitch could go down. She said she would review the lighting at the next work session.

Public Comment

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said he thought the building's mass was in keeping. He thought the balconies would be a concern in the winter and said the garage door would be more in keeping with the first floor. He said he liked the etched glass, but in a different tint. He asked whether the pedestrian way was on one side only, and Ms. Ramsey said it wasn't.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to continue the work session to a work session/public hearing at the June 7, 2017 meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **Bluestone Properties of Rye, LLC, owner**, for property located at **135 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct glass addition on rear of building) and to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovation of exterior façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 5 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The architect Andrew Sidford was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. He introduced other members of his team, including the owner Michael Labrie and the contractor Ben Auger. Mr. Sidford said they would focus on the materials and back fenestration.

Mr. Auger showed a 1910 print of the building to the Commission. He said the existing brick would be restored and that they were working on trim details and door and window fenestration. He said they were considering painted wood windows and copper roofs. He showed a sample of the window pattern, noting that it would be close to the existing pattern and scale. He said the brick would be matched.

Mr. Martin asked whether the building was a wood frame one. Mr. Anders said it was a combination of steel and wood.

Ms. Ruedig asked about the frieze board. Mr. Labrie said he thought it was carved wood under the plywood and that it would be kept if possible. Mr. Sidford said that Vermont marble was used for some of the keystones and that they would use it again.

Mr. Sidford showed computer images of the proposed glass addition. He said six bays were turned into five, horizontal elements in the tower were adjusted, and the awning windows were wider. He said they were considering two colors, copper with a warm gray or black trim, and two schemes of windows, one with two spacing and one with three.

Ms. Bolster asked what the square footage of the space was. Mr. Sidford said it varied between 16-19 feet to 22 feet. He noted that there were two levels, the lower level that was the extension of the restaurant and the second level that picked up the level of the gymnasium floor.

Mr. Shea asked whether the elevation was also an entrance to the building. Mr. Sidford said there was an entrance on Congress Street and that the tower was also a public entrance.

Ms. Ruedig said she thought the design change in the glass box concept wasn't enough and that it was still too busy. She said that breaking up the grillwork in the windows was also too busy as well as distracting. She suggested that the addition be simpler and elegant. Mr. Sidford said the owner requested key operable windows that looked heavier. He said if the wall became too transparent, it wouldn't hold the space enough, but said they could consider making it look more transparent and pull the structure out of the interior wall, which would make the glass look more delicately framed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the divided vertical pieces were confusing and could be simplified. It was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling said that the flat, plain surfaces of all the backs of the other buildings were deadly to the area and that the texture created by the applicant's divisions and forms gave some relief. He said he thought the addition would read much lighter than seen in the elevations, and if the applicant did a flat, smooth glass box, they would repeat more of the flat surfaces of the masonry walls around it. Mr. Rawling said the glazing options were fine and thought the most recent one presented with the differentiation of floors was more refined. He said something with that much glass had to have texture to keep it interesting and that it couldn't be all about the windows behind it. He said he liked the way the roof angle broke the surface and created interest. He said the refinements were going in the right direction. It was further discussed.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Sidford whether he considered a layered grill for the frame pattern. It was further discussed.

Chairman Lombardi said the glass seemed tinted in the images but assumed that the details behind the glass would be seen more clearly in person. Mr. Sidford agreed.

Mr. Mayer asked about thermal loading and heat gain. Mr. Sidford said the heat might be pulled to the top but that it wasn't too much of a concern since the building faced north.

Mr. Shea asked the applicant to review the tower and all the angles. Mr. Sidford said it was a sculptural element to set up an entry sequence as well as a visual marker for the building in the back that broke up the long wall. Mr. Shea asked how snow and ice would be handled. Mr. Sidford said they would probably have a snow guard.

Chairman Lombardi asked whether the bricked-up west side windows would be opened up. Mr. Sidford said they were trying to do so. Chairman Lombardi noted that the historic inside windows would be out of the Commission's purview and asked Mr. Sidford if he would consider placing covenants on them on the deed. It was further discussed.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked how wide the second-floor panel covering up the frame was and how the awning windows would work. Mr. Sidford said he had no answer for the panel and that the awning windows didn't open more than 4 inches.

Ms. Ruedig said she was still trying to accept the structure as a completely different addition with no reference to the historic building. She said she was also struggling with the spiked roof and that the skylight seemed a bit dated and too pointy.

Public Comment

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said he had a hard time with the back because there was nothing like it in Portsmouth. He also said he hated to lose the inside windows. Mr. Sidford said the historic windows would still be seen through the glass.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to continue the work session to a future meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **Swirly Girl II, LLC, owner**, for property located at **244 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear addition, construct new chimney) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, doors, siding and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 3 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

Anne Whitney on behalf of the applicant was present to speak to the application. The applicant Ms. Laurie Kennedy was also present.

Ms. Whitney stated that the existing building was currently a 3-family apartment building that they wanted to convert to a single family. She said they also wanted to build a two-story addition in the back to use as an apartment, as well as a garage and a back entrance.

Ms. Whitney reviewed the history of the house, noting that most of the original windows were replaced and that the two original chimneys were removed. She said they wanted to reinstate the left chimney and replace the windows with 9/6 and 6/6 ones. She discussed the elevations, doors, and dormers. She noted that there would be no parking space for the apartment residents.

Ms. Ruedig said it looked like the size of the house would be doubled and that the addition seemed to be much larger than appropriate. Ms. Whitney said the Board of Adjustment approved it and that it wasn't really visible from any roadway. She said the garage looked like it was no higher than a 2-story building from the street.

Ms. Bolster asked how the garage would be accessed, and Ms. Whitney explained it. Mr. Shea asked whether there was a right-of-way over a driveway. Mr. Whitney said there were maximums but no minimums for residential driveways. She noted that the Board of Adjustment said the applicant didn't need a right-of-way because the driveway had been shared for a while.

Mr. Rawling said the addition was totally out of character with the existing house, and that the only way he thought the addition would work was to do it as a separate piece. He noted that every elevation was contrary to the existing house. He further discussed it. Mr. Shea agreed and

said that more of the original house would be preserved if the addition could be separate and then connected. He said the connector could be smaller between the two forms.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the window pattern on the addition could be less symmetrical, and Ms. Whitney said it could.

Chairman Lombardi said the massing issue had to be resolved before getting into the details.

Ms. Bolster asked what the square footage of the existing house and the addition was. Ms. Whitney said the house square footage was 1700 square feet and the addition was a bit less.

Mr. Martin said it was a very large mass and thought two houses side by side might work.

Mr. Cracknell asked about the two sheds, and it was further discussed

Mr. Shea asked how deep the addition was. Ms. Whitney said it was 22 feet. He suggested making it 24 feet and making the roof pitch steeper to match the original house.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether someone could park in the wetlands buffer. Ms. Whitney said they could but couldn't turn around. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it seemed that the parking garage was driving the massing, besides the fact that the addition was too large and inappropriate.

Ms. Whitney said she would work on massing and simplify the fenestration. She said the massing would affect the elevations, so she would have to rework the apartment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to continue the work session to the June 7, 2017 meeting.*

D. Work Session requested by **Unitarian Universalist Church, owner**, for property located at **206 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct 3 story addition) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations) as per plans on file with the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 34 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone review of the application to the June 2017 meeting.)*

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

IV. ADJOURNMENT

*At 11.15 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

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