

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**March 06, 2019  
To be reconvened on  
March 13, 2019**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** N/A

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

.....  
Mr. Cracknell was recused, and Peter Stith assumed his seat as Planner.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Vice-Chair Wyckoff and City Council Representative Roberts recused themselves from the vote.

**A. February 06, 2019**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **approve** the February 6, 2019 minutes as amended.*

**B. February 13, 2019**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **approve** the February 13, 2019 minutes as presented.*

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

**1. 77 Daniel Street**

Mr. Stith said the applicant requested continuing the item to the April meeting because several field changes were made to the building design.

**2. 6 Dearborn Street**

Mr. Stith said the request was to demolish the existing dilapidated fence. He said the City Staff stated that the fence's removal should be approved unless the Commission felt that it was an enhancement to the abutting structures. There were no comments.

### 3. 442-444 Middle Street

Mr. Stith said the applicant wanted to replace the front door and also replace the wood steps for granite ones. He said the other items would be addressed at a work session. Ms. Ruedig suggested that both doors be wood. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said that more details were required for the door's overhang. The applicant Mike Schwartz approached the podium and said the overhang would be discussed at the work session. Ms. Ruedig said the right-side wood door was appropriate and suggested that the other door match it. It was further discussed.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to pull the request for a separate vote.*

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the change to the granite steps as presented, with the following stipulations:*

1. The Administrative Approval is for the front steps and front doors only.
2. The applicant shall match the Left door to the existing right door in style and material.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote.*

### 4. 355 Pleasant Street

Mr. Stith said the petition was originally approved in August 2016 and that site work had begun. He said the applicant wanted to modify the rear first-floor windows to match the second-floor ones. The applicant Katherine Kane was present and explained that she wanted to go from larger square windows to narrower ones that would match the ones above it.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** Administrative Approval Items 2 and 4. Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote.*

## III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. (*Work Session/Public Hearing*) requested by **Katherine Balliet & Carol 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 and replacement of the existing 2 story garage and 1 story connector to existing home), demolition of existing detached garden shed, 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.

## WORK SESSION

The applicant Nick Cracknell of Amesbury, Ma was present to speak to the petition, as were the owners Katherine Balliet and Carol Hollings. He noted that he received approval from the Board of Adjustment (BOA) for two dimensional variances. He gave a brief history of the property and discussed the neighborhood context and the property's existing conditions. He noted that several design changes were made in response to the neighborhood's and public's concerns. He reviewed the awnings, windows, and skylights.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that he wasn't present at the previous work session. He said he had a problem with the massing and felt that the barn structure was overpowering to the Drisco House. He said he wasn't convinced with Mr. Cracknell's argument about the size of the structure and thought the same argument could be used for a shed. He said he was uncomfortable with the shed-type awning roofs and all the added details to the building. He noted that the Commission had objected to a similar proposal for three garage doors on a Strawberry Banke structure because it was too suburban looking, and the applicant had compromised by having two sliding doors.

Mr. Ryan said the Commission had an understanding at the previous work session about the mass and language of the building, had established a position, and were ready to look at its development. He said he had no problem with the mass, the awnings, or the three doors and was ready to move forward with the details and materials. Ms. Doering said the three doors were not in the barn style and that she continued to have a problem with the size of the structure. Mr. Rawling said he agreed with Mr. Ryan that the Commission had discussed a lot of issues and had looked at alternatives, like two garage doors instead of three, but felt that two doors would make the structure look more like a garage than a barn and less attractive. He said Mr. Cracknell's changes improved the structure but thought the center window over the garage door would look better if it were wider. Ms. Ruedig suggested a single shed dormer instead of skylights.

The three-car garage, the center window, and the awnings were further discussed. Mr. Cracknell said he would drop six inches off the awning's projection so that it would only be two feet. The Commission discussed the dormer versus the skylights, and more were in favor of the skylights. Mr. Cracknell showed two samples for a roof material, and the Commission favored the lighter shade. Mr. Cracknell said the double hung windows on the Drisco House would either be restored or have a Green Mountain sash replacement/ He said clapboards would be used for siding and that the doors would be replaced in kind. He discussed the windows for the new structure and showed a sample of the LePage aluminum clad sash with mahogany frame. He also showed a sample of the oversized center window. The Commission said the windows were fine and preferred the cedar trim. Mr. Cracknell said the storm doors and shutters would be custom wood and that the overhead garage doors would be wood, with sizes that would match the elevations. Ms. Ruedig asked that the garage doors have just one transom, and Mr. Cracknell agreed. The foundation was briefly discussed.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Peter Whalen of 100 Gates Street said the massing of the new structure was too big for the location, towered over the Drisco House, and was not in character with the historic neighborhood. He said the neighborhood felt that Mr. Cracknell should stay within the footprint.

Virna Brooks of 27 Gardner Street noted that 40 people in the neighborhood were opposed to the project and concerned that its approval would set a precedent.

Peter Brooks of 27 Gardner Street said he believed that the data presented to the Commission relating to the footprint was selective and not representative of the south end.

Ken Sullivan of 40 Howard Street said Mr. Cracknell made a great compromise as a result of listening to the neighborhood's feedback. He said the property had stagnated on the market because of its poor condition. He noted that the footprints of the four abutters' properties were larger, so the proposed massing would not be out of character.

Peter Harris of 46 Manning Street showed a presentation that included photos of barn and garage structures in the neighborhood that didn't exceed the footprint. He said the proposed new structure would take up a lot of space and create blind spots.

Dennett Page of 25 Hunking Street said he opposed the proposal because the barn's mass and size would stick out like a sore thumb and dwarf the Drisco House. He said the existing garage was meant to be a garage and not a dwelling, and he felt that a precedent could be set.

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said he was concerned that the missing design for the fourth side would change the character of the Drisco House. He said the Commission should be addressing the entire project and the details. He said the 3-car garage wouldn't be tall enough to park modern vehicles in. He suggested that the two existing buildings be looked at as a whole.

Sandra Gosser of 260 Marcy Street said the new structure's mass in relation to the lot size was far different from other houses in the area because the other houses sat on larger lots. She noted that very little was heard about what would happen to the Drisco House.

Katherine Kane of 337 Pleasant Street said she was in favor of the modifications and the three garage doors, and that nothing historical was being changed because the Drisco House would be preserved and new construction would be placed on a lot that used to have a historic house.

Paige Trace of 27 Hancock Street said she endorsed Vice-Chair Wyckoff's comments. She said the barn structure's three doors reminded her of a fire station, there were too many components that didn't fit the neighborhood, and that more attention should be given to the Drisco House.

Hermann Engelbach of 305 Marcy Street said the scale and mass of the barn structure was too much for the neighborhood and overshadowed the Drisco House. He said it did not have a welcoming front entrance and that what would be seen would be the three garage doors.

Chris Brodeur of 51 Manning Street said he was not in favor of the project because the building was too large and too tall for the lot size and the mass was too great.

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

*It was moved and seconded to move into the public hearing.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said Mr. Becksted brought up a good point about there being no details for the partial right side elevation of the new structure. Mr. Cracknell said the connector was shown in the material specification submission and that only two windows were considered for that elevation, which was the reason why it wasn't drawn out.

*The motion to go into the public hearing **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairman Lombardi read the petition into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Cracknell summarized his previous presentation. He said the project goals included restoring the Drisco House, which was a small percentage of the change to the buildings, and that the exterior would be restored in kind. He said the garage structure was too small for the proposed use and could not be re-used due to its poor condition. He said he wanted to retain the off-street parking and keep the three doors. He reviewed the historic land use pattern, pointing out that the Drisco House was subordinate to the Peirce Tuckerman dwelling for 150 years, which used to be three times the size of the existing garage, and that his proposed barn structure was twice the size. He noted that the land was partitioned and that his proposal was proportional to the volume that was there for 200 years. He reviewed the neighborhood context. He reviewed the changes, noting that the barn structure was simplified by removing and reducing windows. He said he preferred to have two windows on the east elevation to match the west side. He discussed the dormer and said a two-foot projection could be stipulated. He said the proposal met the Design Guidelines for small-scale new construction.

Mr. Cracknell reviewed the material specifications. He said they would restore in kind any siding that had to be removed under the aluminum siding and would re-use whatever siding they could on all four sides to preserve the Drisco House. He said the double hung windows would be restored or replaced and that the chimney would be repaired. He said the new construction would include the yellow cedar for the roof shingle; two skylights instead of the dormer; aluminum clad windows instead of Green Mountain; LePage inswing mahogany French casement window for the middle window; Boral material for the trim; red cedar siding; storm doors, custom wood shutters; and fiberglass gutters. He said any exposed foundation would be parged. He noted that the proposal was completely different from the 1981 proposal in design, style, and use. He said there would be no precedent on a 3-car garage because each petition was decided on a case-by-case basis. He said the connector could be stipulated to be approved as shown in the design specifications and if not, he could return. In response to some comments by the public, Mr. Cracknell said new construction was under the Commission's jurisdiction. He emphasized that the Drisco House had never towered over anything. He said his architectural team didn't design a garage but designed a barn with parking on the ground floor, which was common in the area. He noted that the front entrance was on Manning Street.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether there was an existing window on the Drisco House where the connector would go. Mr. Cracknell said there was an opening that would be a door. He said his architect wasn't concerned that the connector's roof would interfere with any second-floor window. Ms. Ruedig said she preferred that there be no connector. It was further discussed. Mr. Rawling suggested bumping up the center window over the doors to the next width.

Chairman Lombardi opened the public hearing.

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

Katherine Kane of 337 Pleasant Street read a letter from the project architect Rick Shea, who noted that he was also an abutter on 19 Howard Street and was in support of the project. Mr. Shea wrote that he had restored several historic structures and that he helped design the barn structure. He briefly reviewed the history of the Drisco House and the Peirce Tuckerman House and explained what the project would accomplish.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he had never seen or heard the designer of a project give his opinion on his own project to the Commission, and he thought it was inappropriate. Mr. Ryan pointed out that Mr. Shea was also an abutter.

Mary Beth Herbert of 112 Gates Street said the new structure was too big and there was no hardship to make a barn for a living space. She read a letter from Jane Nelson of 135 Gates Street stating that the District's character would be affected by the mass and the suburban design.

Ken Sullivan of 40 Howard Street said he supported the project, noting that if someone built a cottage instead of the barn structure, it would be too small and out of context.

Paige Trace of 27 Hancock Street said Mr. Shea was still on the Commission when the project was filed and agreed that it was inappropriate for him to give his opinion of his own work.

Sandra Gosser of 260 Marcy Street said the Commission was entrusted to ensure the preservation of the neighborhood's historic character. She said a connector to the Drisco House would make it look like a subordinate structure and thought the garage replacement should be a residential use.

Ken Sullivan said that rebuilding on the garage site as it was didn't make sense because it was tiny and no one would want to live in it. He read a brief petition and submitted it to the Commission, noting that it met all the Commission's findings of fact and criteria. He said it was signed by 61 residents, 45 of whom lived in the south end.

Attorney Duncan Maccallum of 536 State Street said he represented 16 abutters and other neighbors and asked to see the petition. Chairman Lombardi refused, pointing out that it would be part of the public record.

Mara Wisling (name indecipherable) of 33 Hunking Street said the proposed barn overpowered the Drisco House and that it was a hypothesis as to what might have been in the location, but the lot had changed over time.

Peter Harris questioned that there were 45 people in favor of the petition. He read a letter from an abutter at 11 Meeting House Hill Road who was opposed to the mass and design.

Ken Sullivan clarified that the signatures were those of south end residents and not of direct abutters.

Peter Whalen suggested another work session. He noted that the packet showed a lot line of 3,400 square feet but the tax card recorded it as 3,000 square feet, which he thought was a big discrepancy and would affect the mass.

Peter Harris said he welcomed the applicant to do something smaller and work with the neighbors. He said the neighborhood relied on the HDC to protect them.

Edie Kane said she was a direct abutter and opposed to the project. She read a letter from Sarah Garnett, who was an indirect abutter and opposed to the project's mass and size.

Judy Hiller of 18 Manning Street said she was not in favor because she would lose her view. She read a letter in opposition from Patricia Bagley of 213 Pleasant Street.

Paige Trace read a letter from Kristin Goodwillie of South Street, who said she was not in support and felt that the new structure would be an eyesore because it was too massive.

Chris Brodeur said the project would ruin the neighborhood.

Rick Becksted reiterated that the application was incomplete because it only showed three sides. He asked that the details be finished and the application be reheard.

Omar Peraza of 11 Howard Street said the Commission wasn't there for people's motives and issues but for historic preservation. He said history evolved, and the Commission's purpose was to preserve the nature of the neighborhood. He noted that Mr. Cracknell had been receptive to many comments and did not deserve to be so unjustly treated.

Carol Hollings said she was the co-owner of the Drisco House and had lived there when the Pierce-Tuckerman house existed, which she noted was massive and overpowered the Drisco House. She said the proposed barn structure was not as big and that it would fit into the neighborhood. She also said the focal point on the Hill was the Meeting House.

Nicholas Cracknell apologized for not reading the architect Mr. Shea's letter himself into the record and for not having made clear where the lot size number came from. He said the lot area was as indicated on the application and based on a review of the deed and registry plans, and that it wasn't unusual for the tax map not to be precise. He said he was not asking for special privilege and that it was standard operating procedure for the Commission to stipulate particular items that were incomplete as part of a larger project. He said he and his team were willing to meet with the neighborhood to explore alternatives. He reminded the Commission that his team offered in January to reduce the garage to two cars and that it was rejected.

Peter Whalen emphasized that the lot line numbers were different by 400-500 square feet and urged the Commission to table their decision until it was resolved.

Mr. Cracknell said the lines would be where they were, and if they changed, he would go before the BOA again. He reminded the Commission that the lot lines had no bearing on their review.

Peter Stith said a survey was not required for BOA applications and that it was typical to have a site plan that would include an as-built survey. He noted that people sometimes had to come back to get further relief if the coverage resulted in a different number and said it was not in the Commission's purview to worry about the lot size.

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

### **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Ms. Ruedig said she wasn't at the first meeting but was conflicted about whether she was looking at a barn or a garage. She said she would like to see a barn style garage with one large door that would allow two cars. She suggested continuing the petition because she felt that more details were needed, noting that the Commission usually asked for details regarding trim work, window sills, and so on, especially for new construction.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the application, and Mr. Beer seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the square footage didn't really matter to her and that she wasn't considering the economics but was trying to be objective and look at the space, context and character of the neighborhood. She said she had no problem with the massing because the building was in a very dense neighborhood, with big buildings built right up against one another. She pointed out that if there were a more form-based zoning code in the area, the project would be more appropriate regarding zoning and code, but she felt that what was proposed was more appropriate than the current two-car garage attached to the small Drisco House. She noted that there was a demolition permit for the garage, which she was happy to grant. She said she was surprised that the garage was approved by the HDC many years before but pointed out that it was a different commission at a very different time. She realized that there were lots of different opinions and said she appreciated the massive amount of neighborhood participation. She said she hoped that Mr. Cracknell could reach an understanding with the neighbors because she couldn't imagine him moving into a neighborhood filled with such angry neighbors.

Mr. Rawling said it was straightforward construction and wasn't sure what distinguishing detail was missing but that the Commission could request that detail if it were missing. He said the window details and dimensions were presented and the missing elevation was straightforward, and that he didn't know what would be resolved by another meeting. Mr. Ryan agreed and said it came down to whether the Commissioners liked the project or not. He said he couldn't see another three hours of back-and-forth and who had more signatures, and that he would vote against the continuation. He said any missing elements could be handled by stipulations. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed that the Commission should simply vote, with appropriate stipulations.



City Council Representative Roberts acknowledged that the neighborhood turnout was impressive and that he received a lot of letters. He said he read the arguments and that most of them centered on the design being too massive and would ruin the neighborhood. He said he didn't agree and thought the structure was a reasonable size for that corner and bigger than the Drisco House, which was one of the smaller houses in the neighborhood. He noted that the amount of building did not go down because it was at the top of a hill. He said the applicant moderated the design so that it was not a 'look-at-me' building. He recommended that the Commission go forward with the vote. Mr. Rawling concurred, noting that it was an infill site and the context of the neighborhood had to be determined, which involved setbacks and building volumes. He said the proposed structure reflected the typical character of the neighborhood and eased the setback more than other adjacent structures. He also noted that the current garage did not reflect the neighborhood's context and was more like a 'missing tooth'. Mr. Beer pointed out that the width of the casing and sills was still missing. He said that stipulations for the Drisco House would be fine, but that the 1"x2" casing around the window should be specified.

*The motion to continue the petition to a future meeting was **denied** by a vote of 5-2, with Ms. Reagan and Mr. Beer voting in favor of the continuation and the rest in opposition.*

*Mr. Ryan moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulations:*

1. A full elevation of the right side of the structure shall be shown and submitted for Administrative Approval.
2. The applicant shall provide additional details of the window casings and trim on all elevations.
3. The center in-swing casement window on the front elevation shall be one size larger than proposed.
4. The applicant shall provide a more detailed plan of the connector building and show the impact on the Captain Drisco House. The final connector design shall be submitted for Administrative Approval.
5. The applicant shall provide elevations of the Drisco house confirming which architectural features will be removed, replaced, or altered.
6. Elevations shall be updated to show the approved materials as presented.

*Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.*

Chairman Lombardi said he was convinced that the massing was appropriate for the site and that Mr. Cracknell had worked hard to accommodate a lot of the issues that were brought forward. He said the Commission had not provided any special consideration for Mr. Cracknell being a member of the City Staff and that he was offended by such an accusation. He emphasized that Mr. Cracknell's team put together a very good project that was compatible and would be seen as fitting once it was built. He noted that history was not stagnant anywhere and that it was very consistent to have additions and new buildings in historic areas.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he would not support the application because he felt that the building was too massive to be the secondary structure on that lot. He said he wasn't convinced by some

of the details, like the awning over the doors, and that he did not believe that the project would preserve the integrity of the District, especially with the three garage doors.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Vice-Chair Wyckoff voting in opposition.*

2. (Work Session/Public Hearing) 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.

Mr. Cracknell resumed his seat as Principal Planner representative, and Mr. Stith left the meeting.

## **WORK SESSION**

John Tuttle of T/W Designs representing the applicant was present. He said the Commission's prior comments about the dormers were listened to, and he explained what was done to make the dormers more compatible, including incorporating a doghouse dormer into the front of a shed dormer. He said the new windows would be Marvin Next-Generation and that the remaining windows would be renovated. He reviewed all the changes.

Mr. Rawling said the design was moving in the right direction but noted that the rectangular pattern change from the diamond one didn't seem to go with the house. He said the view from South and State Streets showed the windows in the stairwell to have a smaller grid pattern and suggested using that as inspiration for more compatibility with the new windows and the addition. He said there was too much glass in the garage doors and that the northside dormer projected out too much and was dominant. He said the picket fence could be a more compatible design but thought its awkward location and configuration would be a problem when dealing with snow. Ms. Ruedig suggested pulling the fence back a bit because the sidewalk plow would destroy it. She recommended 6/1 windows and said she had no problem with the dormers.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was pleased with the basic concept but agreed that the window could use more detail, especially more small panes if the top sash was done. He found the garage doors appropriate and thought the fence would be appropriate if it was custom cut and more pointed or having a steeper angle. Chairman Lombardi suggested separating the windows on the northside dormer. Ms. Doering suggested a fancier fence than a picket one. She said that pairing the Gothic element to the front side and putting the doghouse in the shed dormer were elegant solutions, and she suggested further changes for the dormers. City Council Representative Roberts said he preferred a 42-inch fence. Ms. Ruedig asked that it be stipulated that the fiberglass garage doors be field painted to match the garage.

There was no public comment. Chairman Lombardi closed the work session. The Commissioners agreed that there were too many design changes to move into a public hearing.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to **continue** the work session to the March 13, 2019 meeting.*

3. (Work Session/Public Hearing) requested by **Michael B. Myers & Stephanie G. Taylor, owners**, for property located at **700 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (the replacement of 3 existing windows, the addition of 9 new windows and 1 new door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 148 as Lot 29 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and Historic Districts.

Chairman Lombardi recused himself from the petition, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff assumed his seat as Acting Chair.

## **WORK SESSION**

The applicant Mike Myers was present and said the structure would be used as a barn. He reviewed the changes, noting that the façade would not be changed except for the windows. He discussed which windows would stay and which would be replaced, and he noted that some original windows would be replaced.

Mr. Rawling said that all the additional windows, especially on Middle Street, made the barn look more like a schoolhouse and that all the new products made the structure look new rather than an old barn. Mr. Myers said the barn was set back from the road, which would make it difficult to see what the products were made of. Mr. Rawling said the insert windows had lots of extra layers of frame that would affect the appearance because they were very modern. He also pointed out that the trim wasn't suitable. Mr. Myers showed the Commission a drawing that resolved some of the window problems. Ms. Ruedig suggested removing every other window from the Middle Street façade to make the windows wider spaced, with less glass space per wall. The windows were further discussed.

There was no public comment. Acting-Chair Wyckoff closed the work session and went to the public hearing.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Myers summarized the work session.

Mr. Ryan asked whether Mr. Myers would agree to have three windows as an option. Mr. Myers said it would depend on what the rest of the Commission preferred. Some Commissioners preferred three windows, while others preferred five.

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

No one rose to speak. Acting-Chair Wyckoff closed the public hearing.

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulation:*

1. Only three windows shall be installed on the second floor, east elevation.

*Ms. Doering seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the carriage barn was wonderful and thought the applicant did a great job of repurposing and preserving it. She said it would preserve the integrity of the District and also complement and enhance the architectural history and character and have compatibility of design with surrounding properties.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-0, with Mr. Rawling abstaining because he felt that the petition should not have gone into the public hearing.*

4. *(Work Session/Public Hearing)* requested by **Fifty-Fifty Two Market Street Realty, owner, and Peter Egleston, applicant**, for property located at **48 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (the replacement of 4 existing windows and the addition of a gutter system on the rear elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 117 as Lot 32 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

Chairman Lombardi resumed his seat and Acting-Chair Wyckoff resumed his seat as Vice-Chair.

## WORK SESSION

The applicant Peter Egleston and the contractor John McCormack were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Egleston said he wasn't adding a gutter as stated on the application but was repairing an existing gutter. He said the building sustained a lot of water damage and that he wanted to replace the windows with the Marvin Integrity 2/2 windows. Mr. McCormack discussed the gutter and said they would re-use it if possible. He explained how the masonry openings would be done.

Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he was surprised that the contractor considered replacing the windows when there was a lot more work to be done due to the condition of the lintel and masonry. Mr. McCormack said they received an emergency approval to repair the masonry. Ms. Doering asked if three were plans for the windows below. Mr. Egleston said they would also be replaced. He said the original quote was for four windows but that they added two windows. Chairman Lombardi recommended stipulating six windows.

There was no public comment. Chairman Lombardi closed the work session and went into the public hearing.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Egleston summarized the work session, noting that they would replace six windows and repair the gutter.

## **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 moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulations:*

1. The applicant shall use 5/8" mullions on the windows.
2. 6 windows shall be replaced with the Marvin Integrity fiberglass windows as presented.

*Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

5. (Work Session/Public Hearing) requested by **29-41 Congress Street, LLC, owner, and Eric Frizzell, applicant**, for property located at **29-41 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replacement of existing brownstone headers, sills and coins, the replacement of 13 existing windows, in-kind maintenance or replacement of existing bricks and maintenance to wood trim on the roofline) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 117 as Lots 10 & 11 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

## **WORK SESSION**

The owner Keith Frizzell was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant Eric Frizzell. He noted that he was before the Commission a year before and had discussed replacing the brownstone with similar material, but because it was difficult to obtain, he now proposed using colored precast concrete instead. He said they also wanted to do maintenance on the brick work and repair the roofline with a wood product. He said they would also like to do the windows. He had several samples of the concrete and brick.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the picture windows would be replaced. Mr. Frizzel said they would not, and neither would the transom windows with stained glass. He showed a photo of a Boston brownstone with black windows and precast concrete in a brownstone color, and he also showed several samples to the Commission. He said he would rework all the brownstone areas. Ms. Ruedig said she hoped the entire building didn't have to be refaced, noting that the patches and different colors and pieces were all part of the building's character but recommended finding just the places that needed patching. She asked about the material at the top of the building. Mr. Frizzel said there was a wood treatment above the decorative work that was rotting, so the whole wood section above the bricks would be addressed. He said they would try to duplicate what was

there but preferred to use a material with more longevity, like Boral or Azek, and that no one would be able to tell the difference, especially if it were painted black.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the color scheme would change the building but thought it was a nice look and appropriate for the building, but that the problem with a black window was that the jamb liners were light and the window manufacturer Andersen didn't offer jamb liners to match, so he suggested that Mr. Frizzel consider other brands. The windows were further discussed.

Mr. Frizzel said the brick and brownstone were his primary goals. He said the existing windows were fine as they were but that he preferred to replace them at the same time as the rest of the project. Chairman Lombardi recommended matching the mortar as well as the brick. Mr. Frizzel said his mason would ensure that the mortar's color was appropriate for the brick. Ms. Doering asked what Mr. Frizzel would do with the color of the steel headers. He said he intended to paint it the same color as the brownstone. The windows were discussed. Ms. Ruedig asked what would be done to the picture windows if the rest of the windows were black, noting that they seemed to have cladding over the trim. Mr. Frizzel said they could be metal but that the intent was to make everything one color. Ms. Ruedig said the Commission should see the color of the cast concrete, and it was further discussed.

There was no public comment. Chairman Lombardi closed the work session and entered the public hearing.

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

Mr. Frizzel summarized what was discussed during the work session.

#### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Compliance, with the following stipulations:*

1. The applicant shall use the color: MGAB3 of the presented pre-cast concrete options to repair the existing brownstone quoins.
2. The applicant shall submit the final window selection for Administrative Approval that would meet the Historic District guidelines:
  - a. 2/2 & 1/1 (smaller window)
  - b. Jamb liner matches window

*Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

#### **IV. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)**

1. Work Session requested by **Potter-Schwartz Family Revocable Trust, Michael Schwartz and Sharyn Potter Trustees, owner**, for property located at **442-444 Middle Street**,

wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace all existing windows, siding, both chimneys and rear porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 135 as Lot 44 and lies within the Mixed Research Office (MRO) and Historic Districts.

The applicant cancelled the work session.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 12:18 P.M.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary