

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**September 13, 2017
reconvened from September 6, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff;
Reagan Ruedig, Martin Ryan and alternate Molly Bolster

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Richard Shea; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Dan
Rawling

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 280 Marcy Street
2. 13 Salter Street

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **approve** both Administrative Approvals, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (5-0).*

Chairman Lombardi read the Requests to Postpone for Work Sessions A, F, and G into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (5-0) to **postpone** the work sessions A, F, and G to a future meeting.*

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

1. Petition of **Michael Barker and Claudette Moretto Barker, owners**, for property located at **5 Hancock Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add second floor to existing garage, construct rear addition to expand existing mudroom and garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 86 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. She reviewed the site plan and said they wanted to extend the garage and the connector.

She briefly reviewed the history of the building. She also proposed to replace the roof in kind and install a new floor system, and she reviewed the windows at length.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether anything could be done about the garage doors, which he thought looked stuffed in. He also said the front window looked like it was floating. Ms. Whitney said the garage originally had two windows but thought she could install two double hungs, which would spread out the elevation. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he would prefer it. Ms. Ruedig said she thought the proportions were being stretched up, which make it look like it was floating, but she pointed out that it was a secondary building and not necessarily historic anymore. She thought the garage was fine, especially raising it and giving it more mass to make it fit better with the house. Mr. Ryan agreed and said he wasn't really bothered by the single window, noting that it probably looked like it was floating because the clapboards weren't rendered. Chairman Lombardi said that lifting the roof above the garage doors helped and said he had no problem with the other work.

George Dodge of 175 State Street asked what the height of the window sill was. Ms. Whitney said it was two feet. Mr. Dodge thought two windows would look strange.

SPEAKING AGAINST THE PETITION

Rich Horowitz of 127 Gates Street said he opposed raising the garage because it would significantly raise its height, and the house would have a more imposing view on the street than it already did, setting a bad precedent for the neighborhood. He also thought the extra space could be used as an in-law apartment and set a precedent.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Ms. Whitney said the addition would not be an in-law apartment because the space was open to the mud room, which would be continuous open space. She said there was no separate entrance and that the height peaks were a little over five feet, which was a minor increase.

Erica Dodge of 175 State Street said she thought that the project would improve the garage.

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 advertised, and Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he agreed that the little bit of extra height improved the building but wished that a project of that size could replace the garage doors. He said the issue of whether the addition was an accessory dwelling was moot because it was legal in New Hampshire. He said the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties would be enhanced, noting that the houses next door were similar in design and that the scale, mass, and width of the two buildings were very similar. He said the exterior design and materials of the home enhanced the

existing structure and that the same materials and same windows would be used, so it was an improvement that he could support.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 5-0.*

III. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

A. Work Session requested by **Barbara Bickford Revocable Trust, Barbara Bickford, trustee and owner**, for property located at **45 Gardner Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure to construct addition to accommodate interior elevator for accessibility between floors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 21 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone to the October 2017 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (5-0) to **postpone** the work session to a future meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **Susan P. MacDougall, owner**, for property located at **39 Pray Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild and enlarge rear addition, add side porch, new shed) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows on front and left side elevations of original structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 38 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

The project architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. She introduced the owner Susan MacDougall. Ms. Whitney told the Commission that she was involved with the small addition 12 years before and that the shed addition existed at that time. She said there were extensive gardens and that she did the posts to please the woman who lived there are the time. She noted that there was another addition off the main house. She proposed to remove all the additions in the back and add a one-story addition. She said the small shed on the right would be kept and rebuilt with a foundation. She pointed out that the driveway was tight and a giant tree needed to be removed for friendlier access from the driveway to the house. She said the raised brick patios would be removed and that the size of the shed would be reduced. Ms. Whitney discussed the elevations, noting that the casements would be replaced with double hung windows, the skylight would be kept, the addition would bump out, and the bay would follow the existing roofline. She said she also wanted to add a bulkhead to the side elevation. She reviewed the windows and porch in detail.

Ms. Ruedig asked what the reason for the paired window was. Ms. Whitney said it was a kitchen window that didn't have a lot of light coming in, but thought she could put in a wider single window. It was further discussed.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he thought the square window above the three windows at the end was awkward and asked whether the middle window could be taller and wider and the side flanking windows could give a similar look. Ms. Whitney suggested a transom. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was more of a traditional design and that he didn't see making the windows more modern because they were small-paned windows and appropriate for the house. It was further discussed.

Ms. Whitney said the house would be repainted white and that she wanted to use black clad windows, both frame and sash. She said the back addition would have white stained shingles. Ms. Ruedig said the windows looked old. Ms. Whitney said they were Brosco windows and that the storm windows hadn't changed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the storm windows could be changed. Ms. MacDougall said she wanted to have 9/6 windows. Ms. Whitney said the all the sills were rotten due to water seepage and that the surround had pieces that could be repaired but the windows had to be removed. Ms. Ruedig asked if the attic window was old, and Ms. Whitney said it was a Brosco window that might have to be changed to a casement due to egress.

In response to further questions from the Commission, Ms. Whitney said the jambs were plastic, that she would use 9/6 Marvin Next-Generation windows that would match the size of the existing windows, and half screens. She said the frame and sash would be black and the trim would be white, the same as on the back windows. She proposed using clad Marvin windows for the front and Marvin's Integrity line for the back windows. She said that the clads would be aluminum with wood interior. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he preferred not to see aluminum.

Mr. Ryan noted that the addition was contemporary on the back of the house and was kind of rambling, and he asked whether what was happening in the interior was the reason to notch in two feet on the back and create the bay. Ms. Whitney agreed, adding that she also had setbacks to deal with. She discussed it further, and Mr. Ryan said it made more sense.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked for details on the shed, and it was further discussed. Ms. Whitney said she was thinking of doing all cedar and that the shingles would match the house. Ms. Bolster asked whether the new shed would have a smaller footprint, and Ms. Whitney said it was about the same but slightly taller. The landscaping was also discussed, and it was suggested that it be redone to be able to get some cars in.

Ms. Ruedig said she thought it would be more appropriate to have the addition be a contemporary one, and not a reproduction, and recommended that it be simple. She said the design and massing were acceptable. Chairman Lombardi said he would like to see wood windows on the house because it was so close to the street. It was further discussed. Ms. Bolster asked whether the wooden windows were as energy efficient as aluminum. Ms. Whitney said they were and might need more maintenance.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked Ms. Whitney to consider other window brands and return with a report, and Ms. Whitney agreed.

Mary Anker of 34 Salter Street noted that the driveway was next to the gardens and asked whether there would definitely be parking in the back. Chairman Lombardi said the parking

issue was a Division of Public Works (DPW) one and that the Commission would bring it up with them. Ms. Anker also asked how far the shed would be moved. Ms. Whitney said she would provide her with more information. Ms. Anker said the shed was part of her back fence and was fine, but she was concerned about next steps. Ms. Whitney further discussed the fence.

Marsha McCormack of 53 Salter Street said she approved the addition but was against using Salter Street as access for construction vehicles and for parking. Mr. Cracknell suggested that Ms. McCormick discuss it with the applicant and consult the DPW.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that she would move forward with a **public hearing** in the near future.*

C. Work Session requested by **Robert J. Fabbricatore Irrevocable Trust of 2012, owner**, for property located at **177 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct small addition on Penhallow Street elevation) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (restore exterior façade, lower entry access on Penhallow Street elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 44 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the August 9, 2017 meeting to the September 13, 2017 meeting.)*

Ms. Bolster recused herself from the petition.

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architects was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. Attorney Jim Nocas said he represented the owner and introduced Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architects, Al Ross of Ross Engineering, and the mason John Wastrom.

Attorney Nocas said they wanted to remove the wall, which ran parallel to Penhallow Street and was set back from the sidewalk a bit. He noted that the wall was built after the 1828 building and an 1880 addition and felt that it was just a wall that closed in an area and wasn't built as part of the structure. He said the wall was a freestanding two-brick structure with bricks that weren't the same quality as the main building. He also pointed out that the foundation had rotted away in places and that there were mortar problems, so it would be difficult to rebuild the wall.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked Mr. Ross what was meant by the term 'the joint continues to move and be a maintenance issue' and whether the wall 'moved'. Mr. Ross said they would have to continually mortar that joint because there was no connection. He noted that there was evidence of cracking or moving on the inside.

Attorney Nocas said the wall was in bad shape and that there was nothing historically significant about it. He said he thought it was originally built to create storage areas. He said it was important to replace it consistent with the criteria and make it more consistent with the environment and the downtown area. Mr. Wastrom discussed the wall in detail and said it didn't

make sense to fix it in place because it was too far gone. He said it was a dangerous situation because if they removed the roof, the wall would become unstable. He said that the foundation would have to be dealt with.

Mr. McHenry said there were other reasons for taking the wall down and moving it to a different location. He said their first pass was to bring a new wall forward to the street and make a useful space behind it, and that the other purpose was to create an accessible access to the retail portion and units. He said using the same massing and openings would not work because the floors didn't line up. Mr. McHenry then showed a model of what the storefront concept would look like, noting that it was traditional with a clear delineation between the entry and the storefront. He said another prior suggestion from the Commission was to use different materials on the exterior, and he reviewed differences in materials and a clapboard look. He said they preferred the first model but wanted the Commission's feedback on whether it was different enough.

Ms. Ruedig said she thought it was a big improvement and that the greater setback was also an improvement. She said making it something different rather than the brick addition was better and fell in line with the surrounding properties. She said it was an appropriate design and agreed that the brick would be more appropriate and relate to the fact that there once was a brick addition. She said she was convinced that the brick wall had to come down because it wasn't very functional. She said she was in favor of the concept in general and that it was much better than the previous design. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed. He said he also liked the brick vs. clapboard option. He noted that there was no visible entry to the storefront and said that he preferred that the entrance be on the sidewalk rather than recessed to make the sidewalk more active. Mr. McHenry said he could do that and that he could also have the door swing in rather than out. It was further discussed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he'd prefer wooden doors.

Chairman Lombardi read some comments that Mr. Rawling provided, which included the fact that Mr. Rawling preferred the brick proposal but felt that the concept was better expressed as a masonry building from the ground up, with the storefront infilled into masonry support. He suggested that elliptical forms could be explored and would provide interest over carpentry, that both proposals seemed to have overly-paneled storefronts, and that he strongly discouraged the paired windows in the storefront glazing.

Mr. Ryan agreed that the wall wouldn't make it and said he would rather compromise and end up with something better for the District, so he supported its removal. He said he had hoped that some of the window that turned the corner on the main house could be saved but noted that a window was being replaced with a door. He said he like either scheme.

Chairman Lombardi said he was alarmed at the condition of the connection of the wall to the building and how poor a structure it was, so he agreed that the wall needed to be taken down and built in a strong way. He said the storefront was a good option. He said he initially liked the brick better than the wood because the wood on the adjacent building was one of those 'Old West' false fronts, but he noted that the proposed wouldn't be a false front. He said he didn't like losing the windows but thought it was appropriate for the design.

Mr. McHenry said they were likely to go with the brick solution and agreed to refine the proportions of the storefront system.

Public Comment

George Dodge of 175 State Street asked about noise coming from the HVAC equipment and where the equipment would be placed. Mr. McHenry said that two feasible locations were one over the garage and one over the larger patio area. Mr. Dodge said he was also concerned about where the garbage would be placed. He said he felt that the owners wanted to take the wall down to get the extra space and that he thought the wall could be saved. He said he didn't want to see the Commission approve the addition only because the existing wall needed to come down. It was further discussed.

Erica Dodge of 175 State Street said she didn't notice any measurements and said the center part was right out to the sidewalk. Mr. McHenry said it would match the brick sidewalk and that the addition would be 16 inches from the corner of the existing building and then another 16 inches where it connected to the building.

Ms. Ruedig said she felt it would be an improvement to the street because, even if the wall was redone and something was attempted to fit into that space, it wasn't a well-used place on the urban street. She said the downtown land was precious, and to have that wasted space where there was one door was not a well-activated space. She noted that windows, storefronts, and more activity improved sidewalk activation and pedestrian experience.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the HVAC systems would be a central unit for the whole building. Mr. McHenry said it would likely be split, with three units on the roofline. It was further discussed. Mr. McHenry said the systems were restricted by code and would probably be placed on the second-floor patio and screened.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether a panelized door front with cast iron decorative posts would be used. Mr. McHenry said he did wood versions that would be painted.

Mr. Dodge asked about the telephone pole. Mr. McHenry said it would be moved.

Ms. Ruedig said she would like to see a very simple storefront to reflect current styling and construction, yet be in line with the simplicity of the original building. The storefront was further discussed. Mr. Ryan asked whether the windows would be operable and was told that they wouldn't. He said a solid glass plane might work.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that they would move forward with a **work session/public hearing** in the near future.*

D. Work Session requested by **Pamela Thacher, owner**, and **Charlie Seefried, applicant**, for property located at **180 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (convert single family home to four dwelling units and the carriage house to one dwelling unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 8 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the August 9, 2017 meeting to the September 13, 2017 meeting.)*

Ms. Bolster resumed her voting seat.

The architect Steve McHenry was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant and introduced Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architects and the applicant Charlie Seefried. He said it was essentially the same package as last time. He said they met on site with Peter Michael, the tax credit representation from the State of New Hampshire, who gave him information about the procedure for restoration. He said he also received information about the building's history and how far they could go with changes on the exterior building. He briefly discussed the roof replacement and said they planned to use the existing footprint to get the details and proportions right for the widow's walk. He said the chimneys and other masonry work would be repaired and repointed as required for restoration quality. He said the windows were a costly issue because they were original windows and that it was important they be restored or replaced in kind. He said the marble surrounds and granite had to be repaired. He discussed the porch and said they planned to repair it and keep it as existing. He said they wanted to have a small deck on the second-floor unit that wouldn't be seen from the street. Mr. McHenry discussed the wooden doors on the carriage house entry and said they would be restored and would have an indoor set of doors as well. He discussed the window schedule in detail.

Ms. Ruedig asked about storms. Mr. McHenry said he preferred that the storms be on the inside. Ms. Ruedig suggested an option of custom-made windows with muntins applied to the exterior. It was further discussed. Chairman Lombardi felt that the big issue was the roof and said he wanted to see it repaired with slate because the building was a focal one. It was further discussed. They also discussed the asphalt roof on the addition.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a commercial venture and that the Commission would insist on quality for the slate and the windows. He said the deck made a big difference on the second-floor unit and was willing to trade that for complete restoration of the building itself, considering that it was on the back of the building.

Mr. Ryan said he didn't feel strongly about supporting the deck in the back and picking out a window to create exterior space. He said the addition was original to the house, so he wasn't crazy about doing surgery in the back. He asked whether the carriage house had a slate roof and was told that it did. It was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said that she thought retaining the existing doors on the carriage house was a great idea.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that they would move forward with a **work session/public hearing** in the near future.*

E. Work Session requested by **Islington Commons, LLC, owner**, for property located at **410-430 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (demolition of misc. additions, construction of new additions, other misc. renovations to existing buildings, for a total of five units) and allow new free standing structures (construct two, four unit townhouses at rear of lots, for a total of eight additional units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 145 as Lots 34, 35, and 36 and lies within the CD 4-L2 and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the June 14, 2017 meeting to the July 12, 2017 meeting*

The architect Rob Harbeson and his associate Sara Howard were present to speak to the petition on behalf of the developer. Mr. Harbeson noted that the project and building massing was discussed previously and that they focused on the back buildings, which had adjustments related to the Commission's comments. He then focused on Buildings 4-10, 4-20, and 4-30 and said the site layout had not changed much. He reviewed the site plan, noting that they added a chimney to reflect the original one and also added some landscape beds.

Mr. Harbeson asked for comments on Building 4-10. Ms. Ruedig asked whether window restoration or replacement would be done. Mr. Harbeson said they would repair where they could or otherwise ask for specific windows to be replaced in kind. He said they were also installing storms. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked where the garage door was a lift-up one. Mr. Harbeson said it was and that it would have the profile as shown. He said all the doors would be lift-up ones but would look like traditional carriage house doors and would be field painted.

Building 4-20 was then discussed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the building had vinyl windows. Mr. Harbeson agreed and said they were considering Marvin aluminum-clad windows. Ms. Ruedig said the addition was more appropriately placed farther back so that it wouldn't be seen as much from Islington Street.

Mr. Harbeson then asked about Building 4-30, noting that the biggest change was adding a thin veneer masonry chimney in the front to replicate the original chimney form and removing the dormer. He said the other change was eliminating the stairs going up to another level on one side of the building. Mr. Ryan noted that the window above the entrance didn't have shutters. Mr. Harbeson acknowledged that it should have shutters and said they would be wood.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said that all three buildings were greatly improved. Chairman Lombardi read Mr. Rawling's submitted comments about the front buildings, summarizing that the improvements and enhancements were progressing nicely.

Mr. Ryan asked about the entrance to the north elevation, noting that the blocks seemed to hover. He asked if there was a stone there. Ms. Howard said the recess existed but had several steps, so

they left the recess and updated the trim to match historically. Mr. Cracknell asked if there was a granite step in front of the foundation, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Harbeson then discussed the west and north elevations. He said the primary entry on the side differentiated the units. He said the cut line showed, but the sidewalk went down around the building and a raised landscaped bed was maintained. He said they had a cut in the retaining wall to go up the stairs to the front porch. On the west elevation, he said the retaining wall and landscaping was a change to help the building feel more settled.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the chimneys were usable. Mr. Harbeson said they would do thin masonry veneer and install any vents they could. Ms. Ruedig said the west elevation dormer windows were too small and the chimney was too big and suggested that the proportions meet in the middle. She suggested giving the dormers some weight and making the windows the same size as the first-floor ones. She commended the north elevation. Chairman Lombardi noted that the north elevation dormer was the same size as the others. Mr. Harbeson said they tried to reflect the Commission's comments by showing changes of depth to reflect modulation.

Mr. Harbeson then discussed the east elevation (in between the two structures) and the south elevation (on the lower level facing the courtyard). Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the east elevation was only visible to the people in the other house and was told that it was. Mr. Harbeson said they were limited as to how much they could modulate the elevations due to building codes. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the south elevation looked more appropriate.

Mr. Harbeson then discussed the front unit, the west elevation between the two units. Ms. Ruedig said the dormer windows still looked too small and the paired windows were not quite right. She suggested making them larger or installing just one window. The rear shed windows were discussed. She suggested shed dormers on the front instead of the gables. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he liked the gables. Mr. Harbeson said they would reconsider the dormers.

Typology was discussed. Mr. Ryan said he liked the idea that Mr. Harbeson found something in town similar and justified it, but thought maybe that particular inspiration wasn't the best, given the dormers. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a true duplex.

Mr. Harbeson discussed the east and south elevations facing the neighboring lot and the back courtyard. Mr. Cracknell asked whether the balconies could project beyond a Juliet balcony. Mr. Harbeson said they could be deeper. Chairman Lombardi said the balconies over the garage bothered him. Ms. Ruedig said the dormers on the building looked a little better. Mr. Harbeson discussed the unit in the far back, the north elevation facing the courtyard. Chairman Lombardi said the entry doors under the projecting bay looked heavy over the doors. Mr. Harbeson said a fair amount of that was seen in New England, but agreed that more breathing room would be a good thing. Mr. Cracknell said the panel might be too wide. Chairman Lombardi said the doors seemed too crowded, and Mr. Harbeson agreed.

Mr. Cracknell asked whether the casement windows could be on the left. Mr. Harbeson said there was a different unit on the left. It was further discussed. Mr. Ryan asked about the small

window in the east elevation. Mr. Harbeson said the window went over a counter and needed to be shorter, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Ryan asked about the projecting trim and suggested having it project all the way around and having it die into the sill. Mr. Harbeson said he could do the same casement size but keep the projected trim band.

Mr. Harbeson discussed the other back building and the north elevation facing the courtyard. He said the building's biggest change was the two bays projected over the first floor. The Commission felt that it read tall, and it was further discussed.

Ms. Ruedig said she didn't know if the typology of the building in the north elevation would work with two garage doors in front because it was a very traditional and grand façade. Mr. Harbeson agreed and said they tried a transom. A shed roof was suggested, and it was discussed. Chairman Lombardi said it felt like too many windows and very busy. Ms. Ruedig suggested that Mr. Harbeson reconsider the whole façade. She said it was difficult to see a lot of historic details thrown in to try to force a context. Mr. Harbeson said they could pull it down and make it subtler or layer on some elements to fill the space and create depth to simplify it.

Mr. Harbeson asked the Commission how they felt about the east and west elevations and whether it was still too tall. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the ridge was the same as the main house, which was tall. Mr. Harbeson said he thought they were trying to force a formal typology on the unit and that perhaps they should step it back. Ms. Ruedig said it was a common duplex except for how the garage doors fit in. Mr. Harbeson said it was too formal.

Chairman Lombardi read Mr. Rawling's forwarded comments as follows:

'I continue to lack endorsement of the site configuration and the massing models represented for the building volumes. The slight offsets are slight improvements but not significant enough to modulate the buildings. The overall appearance of elevations of the new buildings has been refined but the scaling elements meant to read as projections and volumes are so token as to be meaningless elements for breaking up and modulating the building volumes. In all the elevations that involve this technique, P 34 D1 east elevation remains overly broad and non-contextual. Paired windows throughout the project are strongly discouraged and remain unsupported by me'.

Mr. Harbeson also noted that they had met with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and were trying to reflect their comments.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to continue the work session to the October meeting.

F. Work Session requested by **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **163 Deer Street (Lot 4)**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of existing structure (demolish structure) and allow new free standing structure (construct new mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as

Lots 17-2 and 17-3 and lies within CD 5, Historic District, and Downtown Overlay Districts. (This item was postponed at the August 9, 2017 meeting to the September 13, 2017 meeting.)

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to postpone the work session to a future meeting.

G. Work Session requested by **Deer Street Associates, LLC**, for property located at **157, 159, 161 Deer Street (Lot 5)**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of existing structure (demolish structure) and allow new free standing structure (construct new mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lots 17-2 and 17-3 and lies within CD 5, Historic District, and Downtown Overlay Districts. (This item was postponed at the August 9, 2017 meeting to the September 13, 2017 meeting.)

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to postpone the work session to a future meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The Commission briefly discussed the process of getting another alternate to replace John Mayer. Mr. Cracknell said he would email the requirements to the Commission.

At 9:55 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to adjourn the meeting.

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on October 4, 2017.