

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

February 6, 2019
To be reconvened on
February 13, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; City Council Representative Doug Roberts; Reagan Ruedig, Martin Ryan, Dan Rawling; Cyrus Beer; Alternates Heinz Sauk-Schubert and Margot Doering

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....

Chairman Lombardi introduced the two new commissioners, Heinz Sauk-Schubert and Margot Doering, and congratulated Cyrus Beer for being appointed to a full commissioner.

As Chairman Lombardi read the Conflict of Interest statement, Peter Harris of 46 Manning Street approached the podium and said he had a conflict of interest with the 11 Meeting House Hill Road petition. He stated that the applicant Nicholas Cracknell was a City employee who was on the Planning Board and a representative for the HDC, and that it didn't seem fair to him as an abutter that Mr. Cracknell should represent himself as the applicant and seek approval from the neighbors for his project. He said that Mr. Cracknell should appoint a proxy.

Chairman Lombardi stated that Mr. Cracknell acted as a private citizen for his petition and that he was not a commissioner or a voting member but was simply a representative of the City staff. He said the commissioners were all independent and had their own voice and that the Commission as a whole was perhaps more scrupulous in judging a petition when someone like Mr. Cracknell came before them. He said the Commission had nothing to do with the Planning Board, and that there was no conflict of interest. City Council Representative Roberts said it was a perception issue that Mr. Cracknell would seem to have undue influence with the Commission, but that he had the same rights as anyone to appear before the Commission and did not receive preferential treatment.

Chairman Lombardi noted that Ms. Doering would be voting as alternate that evening. He stated that two petitions had requests to postpone, 325 Marcy Street and 62 Daniels Street.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote to **postpone** the two petitions to the March 6, 2019 meeting.*

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 2, 2019

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote to **approve** the January 2, 2019 minutes with minor amendments.*

2. January 9, 2019

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote to **approve** the January 9, 2019 minutes as presented.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

Mr. Cracknell requested that the 76 Congress Street petition be discussed separately.

A. 177 State Street

Mr. Cracknell reviewed 12 minor changes. There were no comments.

B. 129 Market Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant originally requested a door without grills, but the door was delivered with grills, so all the doors had grills and matched. There were no comments.

C. 76 Congress Street

This request was removed for separate discussion. (See page 3).

D. 40 Bridge Street

Mr. Cracknell reviewed minor changes. There were no comments.

E. 490 Marcy Street

Mr. Cracknell said the petition was approved in July 2018 but that the rear dormer was erroneously shown in the drawings as lower than the ridge. Ms. Ruedig said it was fine if it was just a mistake in the drawing and if the existing dormer was already at the ridge and both dormers matched.

F. 14 Market Square

Mr. Cracknell said the restaurant was requesting approval of their roll-up awning and new signs. He said that signs would also be applied to several of the windows. He noted that the applicant would return with more changes at the March meeting. There were no comments.

*Mr. Rawling moved to **approve** Items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. City Council Representative Roberts seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote.*

The Commission then addressed **Item 3, 76 Congress St.**

Mr. Cracknell stated that the storefront would be preserved except for moving the recessed door toward the street. He said the applicant submitted a cover letter and was present to address some of the design changes that happened in the field.

Doug Green of Port City Design was present on behalf of the applicant. He summarized that the design had been a moving target in evolving and that the team completed the storefront feature with the new glass and entryway. He said the sign board was originally going to be refashioned to look like the entablature next door, but the owner wanted the storefront to represent the logo, so it became a branding and signage issue. He said they were considering putting a vertical tongue-and-groove wood around the base that was similar to the façade above and leaving it a natural tone to set it off from the building and enliven the storefront.

Mr. Rawling said the applicant was given a great deal of concessions in removing the previous storefront and that the Commission cooperated with him in updating the building to make it more usable to its current needs, insisting that the entablature and columns remained intact. He said he found the pediment and storefront alterations incompatible. Mr. Ruedig agreed, noting that the aim of the Commission's final approval process was to preserve the 1940s storefront. She said the new sign had a heavy impact on the historic storefront and that she could not accept it as being compatible with the storefront or the streetscape itself. Mr. Beer said it was a key part of the building's architecture and that it violated what was previously approved. City Council Representative Roberts said the original approval hinged on the glass feature and maintaining the elevated display, and that there was no indication that the aluminum siding should be kept. He said the existing entablature was already different from what was originally built in the 1940s.

Chairman Lombardi said the Commission had discussed the entryway and its depth but had not discussed any change above it because the original drawings had not presented it as such. Mr. Cracknell confirmed that the Commission had approved the whole storefront, including what was above the windows, but not the way the applicant did it. He said that everything below the sign band was consistent with the original approval. Mr. Ryan noted that the knee wall below the glazing wasn't in the original presentation. The Commission concluded that the presented design was not what was originally approved and that the applicant would have to return.

The applicant left without indicating when they would return.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. (Work Session/Public Hearing) requested by **Margot L. Thompson, owner**, for property located at **57 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction and exterior renovations to an existing structure on the property (the replacement of windows and doors, the addition of a new dormer to match the existing dormer and relocation of exterior

stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 102 as Lot 32 and lies within the Waterfront Business (WB) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

The project designer Jennifer Ramsey was present on behalf of the owners and introduced Margot and Ned Thompson. Ms. Ramsey reviewed the changes by elevations, which included moving a stairway, replacing two doors with a single door, adding a few dormers, omitting gable louvers, installing a metal stairway and a French door, replacing two small windows with a picture window, and removing a skylight. Also reviewed were a retractable awning system, new cover entries over the doors, removal of a masonry stack, and a cable rail system.

The first and second floor plans were discussed. Ms. Ruedig asked if the interior stairway would be removed. Ms. Ramsey said they would replace it with an elevator. The proposed windows, doors, brackets, and divided lights were discussed. Mr. Rawling said the window jambs should match the window color. He said he still did not support the addition of the shed dormer because it changed the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Ryan said he was comfortable with the design. Mr. Beer asked whether the surround system was solid mahogany. Mr. Thompson said it was 4"x4" mahogany posts with a cap. Mr. Beer recommended that the house would look better if the brackets were more detailed, and he gave Mr. Thompson a printout of bracket examples. Ms. Ramsey noted that the steel stairway was for safety reasons for ice and snow issues.

There was no public comment.

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

Chairman Lombardi read the petition into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Jennifer Ramsey briefly reviewed the package and highlighted the items discussed during the work session.

Chairman Lombardi said he partially agreed with Mr. Rawling regarding the dormers but that he also liked that the building was being repurposed. Mr. Rawling said he would not support the application due to the addition of the dormers. He said the form of the building was historically significant and was already dressed up beyond what it was. He pointed out that the property was perhaps the most popular postcard view of Portsmouth and that the characteristics of that view were clustered gabled roofs. He also noted that several shed dormers were added to buildings in the area and that he thought it was wrong to let it continue because it changed the character of the neighborhood and the view as well as the nature of the historic buildings.

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 moved to **grant** the Certificate of Acceptance for the application as presented, with the following stipulation:*

1. A spacer bar shall be used in the SDL (Simulated Divided Lite) windows and doors.

City Council Representative Roberts seconded.

Ms. Ruedig said she agreed that it was a great example of re-use of a small building and was better than seeing it half-used and dilapidated. She was the design was consistent with the special and defining character of surrounding properties and that the project would conserve and enhance surrounding property values.

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

2. Petition of **Portsmouth Strategic Partners, LLC, owner**, for property located at **124 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations and construction to an existing structure (partial removal of existing roof for walk out dormer expansion, new skylights and rear multi-level deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 56 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4, Character District 4-L1 (CD 4-L1) and Historic Districts.

Chairman Lombardi read the petition into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Juli MacDonald of DeStefano Architects was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. She explained that the applicant closed on the property in December 2018 and that they thought the dormer approval and permit application were still active but then realized that all 2016 approvals had lapsed, so they had to re-submit their 2016 documents. She distributed copies of the April 2016 Certificate of Approval with stipulations and existing condition photos that were not included in the packet that were part of the original submittal.

Ms. MacDonald reviewed the recently-approved documents and the changes, which included the addition of a dormer and a deck at the upper level, a new steel deck at the second-floor level, window replacements, and the addition of skylights. She said the skylights would not be seen from State Street. She noted that the Commission had requested that the wood headers and lintels remain wood instead of granite and that the windows and doors also remain wood. She said they wanted to use Green Mountain windows and doors. She noted that the project was presently under construction and that some windows and skylights were already installed. She discussed sliders and a French door for the Court Street elevation. She said the construction was on hold because they didn't have an active permit.

Mr. Beer asked if there was anything in the plan that had not been approved by the HDC. Ms. MacDonald said the only item was replacing one door with a window. Mr. Beer said he saw no reason to change the original decision if everything else had been approved. Ms. Ruedig said she still thought the petition was appropriate and was happy to re-approve the approved plans.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR, AGAINST THE PETITION

Linda McLear said she was an abutter and was pleased with the project but urged the applicant to finish the construction so that she didn't have to look at dumpsters and trucks anymore.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to re-approve the project and **grant** the Certificate of Approval, with the following **stipulations**:*

1. Window replacement for a door on second floor is accessible as presented.
2. The Green Mountain window is acceptable provided the windows are consistent with stipulation #2 from the Approval granted on April 13, 2016.
3. All other stipulations from the April 13, 2016 approval shall remain.

Ms. Doering seconded.

Ms. Ruedig said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and was consistent with the special and defining character of surrounding properties.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote.*

IV. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **The Estate of Bernard A. & Elsie Hollings, owners**, and **Nicholas Cracknell & Lisa Koppelman, applicants**, for property located **11 Meeting House Hill Road**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a 2 ½-story addition to existing garage and a one-story connector to existing home) and to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 59 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item continued from the January 2, 2019 meeting.)*

WORK SESSION

Peter Stith assumed Mr. Cracknell's seat as Planning Department Representative. Chairman Lombardi read the petition into the record.

The applicant Nicholas Cracknell was present to speak to the petition. He said he was a resident of Amesbury, MA and an employee of the Portsmouth Planning Department. He clarified that he was not a Planning Board member and did not represent the Planning Board at the HDC meetings, was not a voting member, and did not make recommendations beyond the administrative approvals. He stated that he and his wife Lisa were representing themselves as a matter of transparency and intended to live in one of the two units if the project was approved. He said the Legal Notice was in error and would be corrected, pointing out that they were not trying to add to the garage but rather replace it with a barn-style structure.

Mr. Cracknell introduced his wife Lisa and one of the owners Carol Hollings, and he noted that the project architect Richard Shea was on vacation. He said they wanted to replace the two-story garage with a larger structure that would have the same depth but an increased height of 5-1/2 feet. He said they would restore the exterior of the Drisco House by removing the siding, restoring the windows, adding wood shutters, and restoring the door surround and front entryway. He said they also wanted to preserve the three off-street parking spaces.

He reviewed the project goals. He showed a historic lithograph of the Drisco House and an old photo of the Peirce-Tuckerman house that used to be next to the Drisco House, proving that it was much larger than the Drisco House. He discussed the property's history, noting that the lots were merged after the Peirce-Tuckerman house was dismantled and removed from the property. He showed context images of houses in the neighborhood to illustrate that there was a lot of variety in building styles from one street to the next. He discussed how compact the South End was and how it was designed for walkability. He said the average lot size was 3,000 square feet and that the average house was 24 feet high and 2-1/2 stories and had a pitched roof, wood frame, simple form, center entrance, and shallow to non-existing setbacks. He showed a diagram of the contributing structures in the South End, noting that the existing garage was the outlier because it was constructed in 1981.

Mr. Cracknell reviewed the changes he made to his original design, saying that he made it simpler because people felt that there was too much detail to the barn and that it looked too busy for a large secondary building. He reviewed character images of other barns in Newburyport, MA and in the South End. He said the design scale was appropriate, given the precedent of the historic structure, and that the barn design was also appropriate. He discussed how some commissioners felt that three garage doors were strong and different and how some were concerned with the massing of the dormer. He said the public felt that the scale of the barn was inappropriate, the massing was too big and would affect views, that the barn would be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood, that the dormer window on Manning Street created privacy concerns, that the building design should be simplified, and that landscaping should be added on the corner of Manning Street. As a response, he said he removed the shed dormer on Manning Street and replaced it with two skylights, and that he upgraded the roof material to red cedar and changed the siding shingles to clapboards. He said he would prefer a small, single doghouse or shed dormer to be added over a second-floor window instead of the skylights. He said he simplified the roof, reduced the window sizes, removed some windows and lighting, added a brick walkway on the side entryway, and added a fence and plantings. He showed a representation of what the barn would look like and said the floor-to-ceiling heights met the building code.

Mr. Cracknell compared his structure to the average building height of the neighborhood homes, as well as the gross floor area and lot size, and said they were consistent. He said he was still willing to decrease the width of the front elevation, reduce the awning length on the side door, and reduce the garage doors from three to two but it seemed that the HDC was not supportive of that design. He showed slides of several barns, garage structures, and dormers in the South End, noting that there were lots of different types of dormers. He showed photos of several large structures in the South End as well as typical house styles. He also briefly reviewed the design guidelines and explained how this project as revised met them.

The Commission discussed the changes. City Council Representative Roberts said he liked almost all of the changes except for the remaining shed dormer. He said the design was greatly improved by being simpler and thought the three garage door would work better with the simple design. Ms. Doering said she was concerned about the three garage doors because if the structure had been an actual barn converted to a garage, it would probably not have had three doors. She said it read as a very big house with three bays for garage doors, and she asked whether Mr.

Cracknell considered a large, more barn-like door that could be centered. Mr. Cracknell said he thought the building was actually quite small in footprint and too small to have a center door and park more than one car inside. He said he didn't think one would see a historic barn used as a residence with only a single center single door and little to no parking. Ms. Ruedig said she saw the building as a contemporary one of 2019. She said it was a barn-style building that wasn't trying to replicate the Peirce house but was a new structure using a lot of traditional barn language. She said some details needed to be refined but that she was comfortable with the barn proposal and hoped they could get a well-designed new building that still fed from the surrounding character and style.

Mr. Ryan said the photo of the original house confirmed that it was a big structure for the neighborhood. He said the massing was correct, given what was there previously. He said the project would accomplish taking a car off the weak corner and turning it into what it should be, a structure that supported the corner. He said the density was right and felt that the three doors were appropriate, given that the floor plates were only so high up. He recommended a dormer or a cupola instead of the skylights. He said he liked the direction the project was going in.

Mr. Rawling pointed out that there was a variety of structure sizes in the neighborhood and that the contemporary structure added to some of the interest and character. He noted that the structure was pushed back and some of the setbacks were softened, and he liked that some green space was added. He said the approach to a barn-like structure was more appropriate than trying to do a complete house-type structure that could start to introduce reproduction ideas. He said the barn offered a straightforward detailing and contemporary form that fit with the neighborhood and some of the historical context of past barns that used to be there. He said he also supported the three garage doors. Mr. Beer said he preferred the new design. In response to issues raised by Mr. Beer, Mr. Cracknell said the second-floor window could be a French in-swing casement or double-hung, with shutters that could close, and that a single doghouse or shed dormer would likely look better than the skylights.

Chairman Lombardi said Mr. Cracknell had addressed his previous concerns that the original design of the garage was too small and that the barn had the right massing but should be simpler. He said the three doors looked fine and agreed that it was a 2019 building that could reference historic elements. He said he was comfortable with the new design. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he had concerns about the awning roofs, center door, entry door, and shed dormers because they seemed too robust. He thought the front elevation seemed to compete with the entry to the Drisco House. Mr. Cracknell said he wasn't opposed to making changes to the awnings if it strengthened the building. Mr. Ryan asked if the Drisco House would have wood roofing like the new structure. Mr. Cracknell said the new structure shouldn't emulate the Drisco House but felt that the wood roof would be a unifying element between the two structures. Mr. Ryan said that having a wood roof on both structures was a good idea but thought there should be a little differentiation between the two buildings. Mr. Rawling said the center window was improved but thought the center double hung window needed to be a different texture pattern.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ken Sullivan, of 40 Howard Lane said he was an abutter. He said he met with Elaine Boucas of 12 Meeting House Hill Road and had a letter from her because she couldn't be present at the meeting due to illness. He read some of her letter, in which Ms. Boucas stated that she was in favor of the project as revised. She wrote that she had lived more than 30 years next to a 2-1/2 story 19th-Century barn and felt that the proposed structure was far more in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood than the existing building. Mr. Sullivan said he lived around the corner, and he distributed a packet to the Commission and noted that the barn that faced the Meeting House was a difference of only 60 square feet in size than Mr. Cracknell's barn. He said the project was in character with the neighborhood and that he was in full support. He also noted that Mr. Cracknell had done a tremendous job in trying to satisfy people's concerns.

Donald Coleman of 122 Mechanic Street referenced a book called Historic Portsmouth that showed the different buildings in the South End as well as historic barns that were replaced by other structures. He said the existing garage was inappropriate and that Mr. Cracknell's plan had a similar mass to other buildings. He said he was in support of the amended plan because of the structure's placement and because it complimented the Drisco House and the neighborhood.

Peter Whalen of 100 Gates Street said he had a letter that a direct abutter Sandra Gosser had written, stating that the proposed structure mass and the 30-ft connector annex between the structures to access a joint parking facility were inconsistent with the neighborhood's character. Mr. Whalen said he felt that the Drisco House should be discussed more because it was more of a focal point. He said the existing garage was built as a compromise so that it wouldn't detract from the neighborhood. He said the proposed structure was too big for that corner and suggested that the applicant stay in the footprint and renovate the existing garage.

Edith Kean of 32 Manning Street said she had just bought her house and wouldn't be able to see the water if the proposed structure was built. She asked what would happen to the snow pileup.

Kristen Peterson of 51 Islington Street said she was interested in historic preservation and thought the property was within the existing mass, scale, and volume of the neighborhood.

Esther Kennedy of 41 Pickering Avenue said the dormers were inappropriate on the front of the house; thought there should only be two garage doors, said the revised plan still looked massive for the corner, and said the skylights belonged on the back of the house. She also suggested that the Drisco House be looked at in greater detail and be considered more in the work sessions.

Chris Brodeur of 51 Manning Street said that a building that size on that lot would have a negative impact on his property's value. He said he supported using the existing structure and not filling the whole lot. He urged the Commission to consider the negative impact to the neighbors.

Larry Yerdon of 372 Court Street said the building should be a modern one and not a reproduction. He said it had a refreshing appearance that took the neighborhood into consideration and noted that there wasn't a real rhythm of house sizes on that street. He said the structure would be a great addition and that he supported it.

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street noted that the existing building was approved in the 1980s, with mass and scale factored in, and that it was respectful to the neighborhood then. He said the mass and sale should remain the same.

Wendy Sullivan of 40 Howard Street said the neighborhood belonged to everyone – residents, walkers, and visitors – and thought the landowner should have the opportunity for the highest and best use of his property. She said she was in support of the project.

Peter Harris of 46 Manning Street said the external appearance of the structure had improved but that the garage entry was still not representative of the neighborhood. He thought the awnings didn't match others in the area. He said he didn't understand the mass comparisons because building of that size was no longer placed on a lot that size.

John Guido of 35 Howard Street said he appreciated the design because of the parking, which was a big issue in the area, and found the project pleasing to the appearance of the neighborhood.

Paige Trace of 27 Hancock Street said the deed was recorded in 1960 as a parcel of land without a house. She cited the restrictions placed on the garage in 1981 by the BOA and noted that the garage and the land had not changed and that the existing structure was proportioned to its lot. She urged the Commission to pay attention to the details and restrictions.

Kathy Williams Kane of 337 Pleasant Street said her backyard was behind the project's abutters. She said the proposed structure was beautiful and would add to the diversity of structures in the neighborhood. She said she didn't know why the property, given its current dimensions, shouldn't be allowed the same setbacks as all the other properties. She said the three garage doors had a better symmetry and that she'd love to see that building right behind her house.

Mary Beth Herbert of 112 Gates Street said she liked the simpler design but still thought the project was a little large for what should be there. She asked that the Commission consider the input of the direct abutters more.

Peter Harris of 46 Manning Street said that the lot was not a separate lot but was part of the Drisco House.

Romar Parozza (name indecipherable) of 11 Howard Street said he spent a lot of time in the area and thought the proposal was an improvement of the existing structure. He urged the Commission to think about the City's future instead of just retaining the heritage of the past.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Cracknell asked the Commission's opinion about window options, awnings, and a gable doghouse instead of two skylights, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Cracknell indicated that he would like to have a work session/public hearing at the March 6 meeting.

B. Work Session requested by **Henderson Living Trust, Norman and Eliz Henderson Trustees, owners**, for property located at **325 Marcy Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (the replacement of twenty one existing windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 102 as Lot 12 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item postponed at the January 2, 2019 meeting.)*

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to **postpone** the meeting to the March 6, 2019 meeting.*

V. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Work Session requested by **56 Middle Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **56 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (the removal of a 1 story rear addition and the construction of a 1 ½ story addition on the north elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 19 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD 4-L1), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

The architect John Tuttle of T/W Designs was present on behalf of the owner. He said they wanted to remove a 1940s single-story addition and replace it with a slightly larger one that would house a two-car garage and a master suite. He said the back dormer wouldn't be that visible from the street and discussed where the garage doors would be placed. He said the blue spruce would remain and that the parking lot pavement would be replaced with cobblestone and grass, leaving two parking spaces.

Mr. Cracknell recommended that the grass area be expanded closer to the tree and that Durham pavers be installed. Mr. Rawling said the fence was too high. Ms. Ruedig said an open picket fence would be more welcoming. Mr. Rawling said the shed dormers on the garage were oversized. He said the Pella window had a detracting feature because it added a lot of frame, giving it a heavy appearance. Ms. Ruedig agreed that the garage dormers were oversized and recommended bringing them back a bit. She suggested bringing a side dormer in to make it a true dormer and save the profile of the window. She said the Palladian window on the garage was oversized and suggested simplifying it. Ms. Doering questioned the shed dormer addition to a Tudor-style house. The dormers and windows were further discussed.

Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he thought the main house and the garage ridge made an awkward intersection and would cause flashing problems. Mr. Ryan suggested pulling the massing off three feet to have a thinner connection to make it easier to retain the dormer. Mr. Beer said the project was a big improvement but felt that the corner was awkward and that the dormers were too big. He said the Palladian window bothered him because its weight didn't seem to carry the

timber frame of the Tudor. Mr. Rawling noted that the Gothic dormer worked and suggested working it into the garage dormers to add a little more interest and break down the scale.

There was no public comment.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote that the applicant **continue** the work session to the March 6, 2019 meeting.*

2. Work Session requested by **Porter Street Townhouse Association, owner**, and **Ellen Bullard, applicant**, for property located at **12-32 Porter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (the removal of 6 faux chimneys) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 117 as Lots 46 & 48-57 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

The construction manager Sandy Dewing was present on behalf of the applicant and said they wanted to remove the chimneys because they were failing.

There was no public comment.

*The applicant indicated that he would **return** for an administrative approval at a future meeting.*

3. Work Session requested by **Salvation Army, owner**, and **James McSharry, applicant**, for property located at **15 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (10 new attic dormers; 5 on the north and 5 on the south elevations and new shed dormer on the east elevation) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (new door and balustrade system) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 12 and lies within the Civic, Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

The project designer Brendan McNamara was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated that they wanted to turn the church into an inn or small hotel, with a restaurant. He discussed why the ten dormers were necessary and explained why they wanted to add a shed dormer on the brick side of the building. Mr. Rawling said he could support the dormers but recommended that they be refined because they looked heavy. It was further discussed. Mr. Beer said the pediments looked too big. Ms. Ruedig asked for more background material. Mr. McNamara said an elevator would go under the large chimney, and he proposed a faux chimney.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote to continue the work session to the May meeting.*

4. Work Session requested by **Stephen G. Bucklin, owner**, for property located at **322 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (new foundation for existing carriage house and construction of 1 story addition to existing main house) and exterior renovations (new trim and siding on the east and north elevations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 145 as Lot 3 and lies within the Character District 4-L2 (CD 4-L2) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

The project designer Brendan McNamara was present on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the petition, noting that the house was divided into two units. He said they wanted to preserve the carriage house and would pour the new foundation by lifting the carriage house and then moving it back. Mr. Rawling said the carriage house proposal looked good but noted that the BOA would request that the building be moved five feet off the property line.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote to **continue** the work session to the March 6, 2019 meeting.*

VI. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to **adjourn** the meeting at 11:28 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary