

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**June 7, 2017  
to be reconvened on June 14, 2017**

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

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** City Council Representative Nancy Pearson

**ALSO PRESENT:** Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....  
A site walk was held prior to the meeting at 5:45 p.m. at 135 Congress Street.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. April 5, 2017
- B. April 12, 2017
- C. May 3, 2017
- D. May 10, 2017

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to approve the four sets of minutes as presented.*

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

- 1. 138-140 Maplewood Avenue
- 2. 404 Middle Street
- 3. 540 Marcy Street
- 4. 160 Middle Street
- 5. 143 Daniel Street
- 6. 33 Deer Street
- 7. 314 Court Street
- 8. 18 Sheafe Street
- 9. 239 Islington Street

*Vic-Chair Wyckoff made a motion to remove Item 1, 138-140 Maplewood Avenue, for discussion. Mr. Shea seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

Mr. Rawling recused himself from Item #2, 404 Middle Street. The Commission decided to review the remainder of the petitions (including #2) before taking a vote.

Mr. Cracknell reviewed Items #2 through #9. There were no issues.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Petitions #3 through #9, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Petition #2, 404 Middle Street, and Mr. Shea seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Petition #1, 138-140 Maplewood Avenue. He said the applicant installed full screens on the building even though the approval stipulated half-screens. He said the applicant also wanted to remove the previously-approved shutters. Other proposed changes included the wider porch and a different grill pattern.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff stated that the full screens should not be accepted and that the half-screens that were previously required should be installed. He said the rear windows could have half-screens because they were the back-of-the-house, but the sides were very visible.

Ms. Ruedig agreed. She discussed the shutters, noting that the Commission had felt that they were important on the Colonial to reflect its history. She said she could be lenient on the rear elevation but not the front and the sides because they could be seen from Maplewood Avenue.

Mr. Shea noted that the stipulations had helped to alleviate the Colonial from looking like a brand new house and was the reason he had approved the original petition.

The Commission discussed the wider porch briefly.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application with stipulations. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Mr. Rawling said he wasn't sure that the Commission originally approved the back porch because it would have been set back further. He said it was the applicant's blatant disregard of approved drawings.

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

### **Request for a One-Year-Extension for 280 South Street**

Mr. Cracknell said he received an email from the owners of 280 South Street requesting a one-year extension for their garage replacement because the June 13, 2016 Certificate of Approval was going to lapse and their contractor couldn't begin the work until August.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the request for a one-year extension, and Mr. Shea seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

Chairman Lombardi then read the three postponements for the 113 Congress Street, 220 South Street, and 82 Court Street petitions.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote to **postpone** the petitions.*

### **III. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)**

A. 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 **Request To Postpone** 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. *(At the applicant's request, this item was postponed at the May 3, 2017 meeting to the June 7, 2017 meeting. The applicant is asking to postpone to the July 5, 2017 meeting.)*

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to **postpone** the petition to the July meeting.*

### **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)**

1. Petition of **Peter and Joanne Foster, owners**, for property located at **7 Hancock Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace 5 windows on rear of house, remove and replace rear door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 87 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Shea recused himself from the petition.

The applicant Peter Foster was present to speak to the petition. He said the renovations would include replacing five storm aluminum windows with Harvey white wood windows and half-screens to match the rest of the windows on the house. He noted that the porch faced their neighbors' backyards and would not be seen from the street.

In response to questions from Mr. Mayer and Chairman Lombardi, Mr. Foster said there would be no exterior finishes to accommodate the new windows and that there was a slab foundation.

### **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 stipulation:*

- 1) Half screens shall be used for all replacement windows.*

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

2. Petition of **Kristina Logan, owner**, for property located at **220 South Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, remove asbestos siding and replace with cedar shingle siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 1 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote to **postpone** the petition to the July meeting.*

3. Petition of **Martingale, LLC, owner**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing sign, add "bowsprit" sculpture above west entryway, add stained glass artwork windows in archways on west façade, add black granite bases on front façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Shea resumed his voting seat.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the owner. Mr. McHenry reviewed the proposed improvements, which included a bowsprit

sculpture that would replace the current sign, stained glass, and granite bases. He noted that the bowsprit artwork was inspired by the history of the Martingale restaurant, a clipper ship that collided into the building. He further described it.

Mr. McHenry noted a discrepancy in the packet, saying that there would be no internally-lit sign.

He then described the stained glass and the granite bases. He noted a missing dimension for the granite bases and said he could resubmit it.

Mr. Rawling asked about the stained glass infill patterns and whether the bottoms should be heavier. Mr. McHenry said it hadn't been fully detailed but ensured that it wouldn't wobble. Mr. Rawling said it could be an administrative approval.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the gooseneck light fixture would remain and how the bowsprit would be lit. Mr. McHenry said the center light would change and that the final lighting plan had not been discussed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it could be an administrative approval. He said his only caveat was that the lights not shine down on people's faces. Mr. McHenry said they would have very small spotlights illuminating the figurehead only. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was very appropriate for the seaport and suggested that the lighting at both sides of the entryway be considered as well because they were commercial-looking fixtures.

Mr. Mayer referred to a schematic and asked whether the stained glass would protrude four inches from under the archway. Mr. McHenry said that was the plan but that the detail might change. Mr. Mayer said that having it inside might make more sense due to the wind pressure.

Mr. Ryan said he was concerned that if the wood might appear less authentic if it looked too painted. He asked whether natural wood had been considered instead. Mr. McHenry said it could be clear finished but noted that historic figureheads were extensively painted.

### **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 stipulation:*

*1) The final shop drawing for the proposed lighting and stained glass windows shall be reviewed and approved as an administrative approval prior to construction.*

*Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project preserved the integrity of the District and maintained its special character.

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

4. Petition of **299 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner, and Sanel Realty Co., Inc. owner**, for properties located at **Vaughan Street and 299 and 225 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use building to include a hotel, associated parking and community space) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 123 as Lot 15 and Assessor Plan 124 as Lots 10 & 11 and lies within the CD5 and CD4-L1, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

#### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Jeff Johnston, principal of Cathartes, briefly reviewed the petition, noting that it was consistent with the North End Vision Plan and the draft 2025 Master Plan and that almost an acre of land would be deeded to the City for use as a waterfront park.

Carla Goodknight of CJ Architects was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. She showed an external interactive tour of the proposed building. She reviewed the packet in detail and noted several changes that were done in response to the Commission's previous comments, which included extending the bays and overhangs, moving the café to the corner, shielding the cooling tower, and extending and adding canopies.

Mr. Johnston said the project was approved by the Technical Advisory Commission (TAC).

Chairman Lombardi noted that the Commission had three issues at the previous work session: the roofline's lack of variation, the mechanicals and how they interacted, and the siding finish. Ms. Goodknight passed out samples of the siding material. The issues were further discussed.

Mr. Rawling said he had continuously remarked on the cladding of the building. He said the earlier illustrations showed a rendered material that resembled stone, which he felt was an important element that should remain on the building. He noted that the building skylines were flat in that area and that everything from the Maplewood Avenue was a 'massive mesa of monotony', which he didn't see any adjustments to from the project. He said the applicant screened the views of mechanical equipment somewhat but that it still didn't give any relief to the building and the skyline elements. He said that the evenness of the finish was very much to the detriment of the building. Ms. Goodknight said the intent was to have a large variety of changes to the façade's surface while maintaining the integrity of the shape. Mr. Rawling said he appreciated some of the adjustments that were made but felt that the earlier rendering was much more appealing. He said that the metal panels would dominate the building and that he didn't want his name attached to them.

Mr. Shea said the building had not evolved a lot from any of his comments. He felt that it was too flat and lacked any character of Portsmouth's historic district. He said the building had too much metal, the design was monotonous, and there was a lack of details. He said he liked the park for the City. Mr. Goodknight said the intention was to be deliberate and have clean, spare lines. She discussed a traditional design versus a contemporary one and said the building responded to the area it was in. She said the brick anchors recalled portions of Portsmouth.

Ms. Ruedig agreed that the area called for contemporary architecture that was representative of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. She said it was hard to say what downtown Portsmouth's character was because it was subjective. She said the applicant had thoughtfully chosen modern materials and details for a mix of materials and that she appreciated the brick anchor buildings because it brought in Downtown's brick language in a contemporary style. She noted that the applicant added high-quality details to the brand style for the hotel and thought the building would add to Portsmouth's more contemporary 21<sup>st</sup> century design. She said she was disappointed in the storefronts and doors because they seemed too stark and didn't have a lot of character, and she suggested that they be made more interesting.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he agreed with Ms. Ruedig. He noted that the public had shown a lot of enthusiasm for modern buildings at the previous charrettes and were accepting of the fact that the area was a 21<sup>st</sup> century one and would continue to grow. He said the project was tastefully done. He also said he felt the roofline was broken up by the additional projecting of the parapets and the extension of the bay sections to the roof.

Mr. Mayer said the area was suitable for a modern building. Mr. Ryan said he supported the design but had hoped that the monotony would be broken up more. He noted that there was a nicer quality to Sheet 2 than Sheet 1 and that the vertical window along the front corner was more articulated on Sheet 2. Ms. Goodknight said she would omit the image on Sheet 1.

Chairman Lombardi stated that, in the initial packages, there were photos of other AC hotels as well as images of hotels from other areas. He said it bothered him that the applicant's design looked like all those others and felt that the building design was confined by the branding of the architecture for AC hotels and that the building could be anywhere. He said the building had the brand of an AC hotel but didn't have the soul of Portsmouth. He said he still had a problem with the flatness of the roof and felt that the mechanicals would be visible from Woodbury Avenue. He agreed with Mr. Rawling that it was another flat building in a sea of mesas. He also felt that, although the park was a wonderful contribution to the community, the building offered little for the residents. He suggested that the applicant offer more to draw the public in, like a rooftop restaurant overlooking the water, to make the building really special.

Mr. Rawling said the project fell short of design on a significant site and was not ready for design approval. Ms. Goodknight said the modern style came out of the North End Vision Plan. It was further discussed.

Mr. Shea said he felt that the building's architectural style was very flat and not unique to the District. He said one of his issues from the very beginning was the corner element, which he thought should be the primary entrance to the hotel instead of the café entrance. He said it was a historic feature of Portsmouth that buildings were entered on the corner. He also noted that all the entrances were flat instead of recessed, which he felt was another important historic characteristic that could have been added to the building.

## **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said she had attended every charrette for the Northern Tier, where more modern buildings were presented and liked by the majority of the public in attendance. She said she liked the design and felt that the building should be approved.

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

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

- 1) Use 2.4A design for parapet height and screening for roof-mounted mechanical equipment.*
- 2) The image shown on Sheet 2 shall represent the color tones of the building (the image shown on Sheet 1 shall not be used for color tones).*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff stated that the project was consistent with the special and defining character of surrounding properties and that the design was compatible with the surrounding properties. He said the building would shine in its context, that it was well thought out, and that a lot of changes were made. He said it was an appropriate structure in that location.

Ms. Ruedig said the building was appropriate for its location and setting. She said the Commissioners had a lot of good suggestions and that the applicant always had the opportunity to add rooftop space and make improvements. She hoped that the applicant took to heart some of the comments made and would continue to improve the building.

Mr. Rawling said he didn't think that the building would not be a supported or appreciated element of contemporary architecture introduced into the City.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 4-3, with Chairman Lombardi, Mr. Rawling, and Mr. Shea voting against the petition.*

5. Petition of **Robert J. Fabbricatore Irrevocable Trust of 2012, owner**, for property located at **177 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, repairs to chimneys) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 44 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture on behalf of the applicant was present to speak to the petition, with project manager Jeremiah Johnson and builder representative Eric Hall. Mr. Johnson reviewed the packet and said he had samples of the window and the glazing product.

In answer to Mr. Shea's questions, Mr. Johnson said the window unit to the right would be replaced and would match the other windows in uniformity.

Mr. Rawling asked whether there were specifications on the repointing. Mr. Hall said they would match the neighbors exactly. He said the mortar mix would be the same and that the same brick type would be replaced if needed.

Mr. Cracknell said the Commission needed specifications of the matched brick prior to installation to ensure that everyone agreed that it was the right brick. He also said the same would be required of the slate roof. He said it could be done through administrative approval.

Mr. Mayer asked whether any windows could be preserved. Mr. Hall said the windows on the third floor were original but all others had been replaced. He said the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows would be 3/3 and the others would be 6/6. He said there would be storms on the inside and that the screens would be interior only.

Ms. Bolster asked whether the detail above the windows on the second floor and first floor's right-hand side would be repeated. Mr. Hall said it would be repeated in wood. He showed a model of the third-floor window to the Commission.

Mr. Johnson said they wanted to remove the triangular stairway going into the first floor in order to create an entry. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked how old the masonry stairs were and what would happen to the surround around the door with the arched window. Mr. Hall said the 50-year-old stair would be removed and replicated and that the door would be lowered but duplicated.

Mr. Johnson said the door would be lowered to grade and that the top of the door would be halfway to the window. Mr. Rawling suggested that a drawing be submitted. Mr. Johnson said they were just requesting permission to remove the stairs but that there was no design approval yet. Ms. Ruedig said the Commission needed a drawing to approval its removal. The stair and the ramp were further discussed. Mr. Johnson said that changing the location of the door would be less impactful than putting in a ramp, which there wouldn't be room for.

Ms. Ruedig suggested that the Commission allow the brick to be removed but that it be stipulated that the stairway be replaced with granite if the applicant didn't return with a design. Mr. Johnson agreed. Mr. Shea also asked the applicant for some options on lowering the door.

### **SPEAKING FORTHE PETITION**

George Dodge stated that he was the owner of the other part of the building. He said the brick steps were in terrible condition and should be removed and that the roof should be done in slate. He discussed window dimensions and said he was in favor of the project.

Erica Dodge said she was an abutter and suggested that caps would waterproof the chimneys.

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

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission discussed the stipulations in detail.

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

- 1) A brick specification shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to construction.*
- 2) The brick stairs are permitted to be removed pending a detailed drawing of the revised door location plan being submitted to the HDC for approval. Note that the applicant shall install granite steps and landing if the door relocation plan is not approved.*
- 3) The repointing shall be a complete application on the building.*
- 4) A 6/3 window pattern shall be used on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor (attic story).*
- 5) Bishop's caps, similar in appearance to the abutting structure, shall be installed on the chimneys.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project was consistent with the special and defining character of the neighborhood and related to the historic and architectural value of existing structures. He said it was compatible with surrounding properties and innovative technology.

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

6. Petition of the **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 stairs) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new metal stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 3 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

## SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Bill Bartell of CJ Architects on behalf of the applicant was present to speak to the petition. He reviewed the petition and noted that there were some changes, saying that the horizontal guardrail baluster was revised to be vertical and that the metal grate below the stair was moved to the far side to get planter space. He said the stairs that would be replaced were not original and that the finish would be black galvanized for durability.

Mr. Shea said he appreciated that the applicant listened to the Commission's previous comments and that he would support the petition. Mr. Rawling said it was a nice resolution that would be complimentary to the building.

## SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Shea made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Mr. Shea said the project was of a minor nature, replacing a stairway that was falling apart, and that it was a good solution and design.

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

7. Petition of **82 Court Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **82 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovation to an existing structure (remove and replace seven windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 48 and lies within the CD4-L1 and Historic District.

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote to **postpone** the petition to the June 14, 2017 meeting.*

8. (Work Session/Public Hearing) **Petition of 46 Maplewood Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein a Conditional Use Permit and a Certificate of Approval was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct 3 ½ story mixed use 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 CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studies on behalf of the applicant was present to discuss the petition. She reviewed the details on the bay and the glass railing specifications. She discussed the two options for the glass and proposed that the clear frosted glass be used, which she showed a sample of. The Commission discussed the railing material and the bay details.

Mr. Shea said he thought the first pass was fine but liked either one. He said he liked the play of the etching on the glass and also liked the building because it had some character of Portsmouth.

The etching on the glass was further discussed. Mr. Rawling said he liked the etching on the glass with the metal band and preferred the plain bay. He said the brackets felt heavy and suggested an overlay strip in the center of them to lighten them up.

Ms. Ruedig said she preferred the simpler bays but thought the horizontal pieces would work if they were thoughtfully done. She said she was fine with the darker masonry color. Ms. Ramsey said the grout would be monochromatic.

Mr. Mayer said the massing was much better but that he still struggled with the materials. Mr. Ryan said the pattern on the glass worked and suggested that the verticals be carried down. He said the banding gave it a rich texture. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the bays were fine with or without the banding and that he preferred the frosted glass pattern. The metal banding on the glass was further discussed.

Mr. Cracknell discussed the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and said it had been replaced by character-based zoning. He said the project had been around for a while and gone to the Planning Board for design review but that it had to start over. He explained in detail what the process required.

Chairman Lombardi said he didn't care about the horizontal on the bays one way or the other. He suggested that the etching be grounded in some way. There was no public comment.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to close the work session and go into the public hearing.*

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios on behalf of the applicant reviewed the petition. She listed the four criteria needed for the CUP, which included civic space, parking, building materials and scale elements. She reviewed the application in detail.

Ms. Ruedig asked about half screens. Ms. Ramsey said the windows would all have half screens.

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

The Commission voted to refer the Conditional Use Permit application to the Planning Board per RSA 674.21, II and to continue the Certificate of Approval application to the July Historic District Commission meeting.

At this point, Mr. Mayer left the meeting.

## **V. WORK SESSIONS**

A. 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. *(This item was continued at the May 3, 2017 meeting.)*

The architect Andrew Sidford was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. He stated that a new skylight would replicate the original one and that they had modifications of the tower's fenestration. He discussed the non-truncated version.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he preferred the truncated version and asked why the roof didn't follow the truncated design. Mr. Sidford said they it was important to give some accent to that corner. Mr. Rawling said he preferred the non-truncated version because it was a simple, bold form. Mr. Shea said he like the non-truncated version and thought the new version was busy.

Mr. Ryan said that the way the glass roof sloped back made it seem like it was coming in above the arched window, and he suggested a bit more space so as not to squash the arch. It was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said she still struggled with the addition's funky angles and felt that the design was busier and more angular than necessary and didn't see how it worked with the building. It was further discussed.

The window pattern was discussed.

There was no public comment.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*The applicant indicated that he would return for a public hearing.*

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

*At 10:55 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 July 5, 2017.