

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

September 04, 2019

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Martin Ryan

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. August 04, 2019
2. August 11, 2019

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **approve** both sets of minutes as presented.*

Chairman Lombardi noted the petitions that were requested to be postponed.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **postpone** the petitions, and Mr. Rawling seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

Note: It was decided to address Items 7 and 8 separately after reviewing the other items.

1. 673 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant submitted dimensional drawings with details of the rear addition, as previously stipulated by the Commission.

2. 150 Congress Street

Mr. Cracknell said the owner of the Goat restaurant wanted to replace the fixed glass windows on the main façade with accordion-style windows. Mr. Rawling remarked that the whole downtown area would soon have vertical casement windows instead of glass picture windows on storefronts, which he felt gave a different characteristic to the historic district downtown core. He asked where the Commission would draw the line. Ms. Ruedig agreed that it was becoming more

common and thought a fixed picture glass window would be more appropriate on a historic window, but she didn't have a serious problem with it. She noted that the building wasn't as old as the others, although it still had consistent contextual storefronts. Ms. Doering said it wasn't in keeping with the rest of the building context. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the building was completely renovated ten years before and used to be a bowling alley in the late 1950s. Chairman Lombardi said the windows would be questionable if it were a different building.

3. 117 Bow Street, Suite 5A

The request was to relocate a vent location that would not be seen from the street.

4. 40 Mt. Vernon Street

Ms. Ruedig recused herself. Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to replace the decking with an Azek material. He said the deck was pressure treated and was not visible from the street.

*Mr. Rawling moved to **approve** the item as presented, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

5. 170 Mechanic Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to shift a window to the left of the two paired windows because it was a bedroom. Ms. Doering said some symmetry would be lost. Mr. Rawling said it was a minor change and that it would be difficult to view the symmetry anyway.

6. 410-430 Islington Street

The request was to install a 6-ft cedar fence around the perimeter. The applicant's representative Sarah Howard was present. In response to Vice-Chair Wyckoff's comment that a board above the windows was different from the original, she said it had not been installed yet

*The Commission **stipulated** that within eight feet of the front property line (Islington Street) the fence shall not exceed five feet in height.*

7. 105 Chapel Street

The request was to replace the shingles on the church with a different shingle. Barry Heckler was present on behalf of the applicant and said he represented the grant fund committee for St. John's church. He said the most important part of the renovation was replacing the roof. He explained why it would be costly to replace the natural slate, which was the reason they were requesting imitation slate. He showed a sample of a Boral slate.

In response to the Commission's questions, Mr. Heckler said the product's lifespan was 50 years. Mr. Rawling asked if the product was randomly mixed. Mr. Cracknell said it was one natural slate that had a clean look. Mr. Beer said it looked like real slate. Mr. Rawling commended the

applicant for doing a more authentic-looking slate product. He said he didn't want to set a precedent for it in town but would support it because it was an upgrade.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** Item 7, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

8. 169 Lafayette Road

The request was to address the barrel-roof section of the previously-approved porch roof. The applicant Stephen McCarthy of 169 Lafayette Road and president of the condominium association reviewed the house's history and showed examples of similar barrel-roofed homes. He said the barrel-shaped roof was previously approved in 1997 and 2006 and that the proposed product was a 50-year architectural shingle.

Mr. Rawling said many of the roofs with asphalt shingles in the District were done before the Commission existed, and some of the examples Mr. McCarthy showed were contemporary buildings with historical styles. He said the Commission had suggested a rubber roof because it simulated metal and was more affordable, and he thought it was unusual to put asphalt shingles on a barrel roof. Ms. Ruedig said the metal roof wasn't the original roofing and was worthy of saving if possible, but she had no problem approving asphalt as long as it was consistent and not detrimental to the house or district.

Mr. McCarthy discussed the new windows. Mr. Rawling said the Commission previously had no issues with the windows except for the illegible drawings. Ms. Ruedig asked if the windows would be a complete sash replacement, and Mr. McCarthy agreed. He said the restoration expert he consulted said the original windows couldn't be restored.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **approve** the item, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

9. 31 Dennett Street

The request was to install windows on the rear and right facades to match the others.

10. 33 Holmes Court

Mr. Cracknell said the property had three different styles of fence and that the applicant wanted to replace 24 feet of a 34-ft fence and place a 5-1/2-ft fence along the side of the garage to replace the 4-ft picket fence.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **approve** Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10 with their respective stipulations. Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

It was requested to address Item 2 separately, so the motion was **amended** to the following:

Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10. Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **approve** Item 2, and Mr. Beer seconded.

Mr. Rawling said it was becoming prevalent for applicants to install accordion-style windows on historic downtown building storefronts. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the modern building was recently remodeled and was a commercial structure, and the windows were acceptable and in other parts of town. He said the Commission received no complaints about the windows, so he would support approval.

The motion **failed** by a vote of 4-3, with Mr. Rawling, Ms. Doering, and Chairman Lombardi voting in opposition.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Gregory J. & Amanda B. Morneault, owners**, for property located at **137 Northwest Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (demolition of existing side porch to be replaced with deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 122 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 07, 2019 meeting to the September, 2019 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to postpone the petition to a future meeting.

B. Petition of **Drew & Brittany Schulthess, owner**, for property located at **15 Mt. Vernon Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (extend roofline of the existing house over the attached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 111 as Lot 33 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 07, 2019 meeting to the September, 2019 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to postpone the petition to a future meeting.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. *(Work Session/Public Hearing)* requested by **Dagny Taggart, LLC, owner**, and **Mark A. McNabb, applicant**, for property located at **3 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations and new construction to an existing structure (3-story, 2000 ± s.f. addition to the rear and modify the roof of the building with office space) structure as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 287 as Lot 1 and

lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 07, 2019 meeting to the September, 2019 meeting.)*

The applicant said they did not need the work session and would enter the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant's representative architect Tracy Kozak was present and introduced the owner Dagny Taggart, the developer Mark McNabb, and the landscape architect Robbie Woodburn. She reviewed the petition, noting that it was no longer a stand-alone project but part of a larger development that consisted of three parcels. She reviewed the other changes, which included:

- Replacing the entire back addition with a new addition;
- Replacing the mechanical equipment on the roof with an oval-shaped office space;
- Removing awnings and re-doing the main door with an arched opening; and
- Flanking the four upper windows with wood siding and changing it to a copper panel to match the other copper.

Ms. Kozak said the new addition would bring the elevator and stairwell up to code. She emphasized that all the copper would patina naturally and that they could do either a mill finish or pre-patina green. She said other changes were that the wood veneer composite panels were horizontal and a staggered pattern instead of vertical and the new windows on the addition were copper clad wood, with top-floor windows aluminum clad. She showed the Commission samples of the proposed brick and the wood veneer. She reviewed the banding and other details.

Mr. Rawling said it was a handsome addition that fit in with the existing building and would enhance the surrounding properties downtown. Ms. Ruedig agreed and thought the addition was well designed and would improve and preserve the building. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was glad the applicant didn't go back to the Colonial Revival 1919 look and instead brought the building into the 21st Century. Ms. Doering asked the applicant to document and photograph whatever historic interior pieces they could to submit to the Athenaeum.

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 petition as presented, and Mr. Rawling seconded.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a first-class restoration and addition on the back that would preserve the integrity of the District; conserve and enhance surrounding property values; maintain the District's special character; be consistent with the specific and defining characteristics of surrounding properties; have compatibility of design with surrounding properties; and have a relationship to the historic and architectural value of the existing structure.

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

2. Petition of **206 Court Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **206 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (construct an addition to an existing structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 34 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD 4-L1) and Historic Districts.

The Commission asked for a brief work session.

Architect Jeremiah Johnson was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced Mary Brake of McHenry Architecture and the applicant Todd Adelman. Mr. Johnson noted that the project was considerably reduced in intensity. He reviewed the petition, noting that the major changes were that the design went from 1,000 square feet to 450 square feet, the building had two units instead of three, and the west wall had one window instead of five.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that the process of blocking the other four windows had already begun. Mr. Johnson said the reconfigured window locations were all the same sizes, with an additional awning on the rear but no sliding door. He said the rear façade of the existing building was more exposed, so there were more windows on it. He said the building had less intensive design and mass, and that the design made the addition more subservient to the existing building. Mr. Adelman said the Fire Department advised them to brick up the side windows in case the abutting building was extended. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he had a problem with the blocked-in windows because they were historic, and it was further discussed. Mr. Johnson said the building's usage was changed, so they had to meet code. Mr. Cracknell said that blocking the windows may not be the only solution and suggested that the applicant speak to the Building Inspector. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he appreciated the reduction in size and mass but that the right elevation was a game changer for him. Chairman Lombardi said it was very visible. Mr. Adelman said the Baker Building's sign would block the view, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Beer said the reduction of the addition improved the look of the building. He said the bricked-in windows didn't bother him because they weren't symmetrical or pleasing windows before and a brick wall was a common sight downtown. Ms. Ruedig asked if the applicant would consider keeping the two windows that were close to the front façade, noting that it was a more visible corner. She said she liked the new design better but hated to lose original windows. Mr. Adelman said there was an old blocked-in fireplace so the windows would be useless on the interior. Mr. Rawling said he had trouble with the window over the door on the front elevation, the lack of overhangs on the proposed addition, and the closed-in windows. He suggested keeping the front windows and doing a recessed panel on the back windows, and he was opposed to trying to replace all traces of that window and doing a flat façade. He said the windows on the back elevation related to nothing in the building and he found the whole elevation atrocious, noting that overhangs were very important. Chairman Lombardi said the massing improved dramatically but agreed with Mr. Rawling about the appearance of the rear of the building and didn't understand why the little windows were necessary. He said he wasn't a fan of paired windows in the District and agreed that the roofline on the addition needed something.

Mr. Adelman said the rear elevation hadn't changed from the time the Commission did their site walk. Ms. Ruedig said the contemporary addition wasn't really visible, so she was comfortable with it and didn't feel that it detracted from the building's façade. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed, but said he still didn't like the bricked-in windows and also wasn't 100 percent convinced about the front design. He noted that the awning window over the door was wider than the door itself and seemed awkward. Ms. Doering said she didn't favor bricking in the windows and thought the front elevation was stark but thought the back massing was much better. The design was further discussed. Mr. Rawling suggested a round window over the side entrance on the front elevation. Mr. Sauk-Schubert explained why he found the addition's front elevation awkward and agreed that a round window might help. Mr. Rawling suggested how to do a better projection with the roof canopy over the side entrance.

There was no public comment.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggesting postponing the public hearing because he didn't think the Commission had enough to vote on due to some big issues. The Commission further discussed the design and decided that the applicant could enter into the public hearing but that several stipulations would be necessary.

Chairman Lombardi closed the work session and opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Johnson said he echoed all the comments and suggestions from the work session. He reviewed the petition and addressed all the stipulations.

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 and updated project, with the following stipulations:*

1. All five (5) windows on the southwest side of the building shall remain as previously approved.
2. A revised detail of the proposed 2-story side entrance along Court Street shall be submitted for Administrative Approval. Included in the modifications, a round window is preferred above the second floor over the proposed new entrance on Court Street and alternative designs shall be submitted for the front door, canopy, and roof-line details.
3. A revised detail shall be submitted for Administrative Approval that provides details for roof-line, gutters, and down spouts, and all mechanical penetrations for both the historic structure and the proposed addition.

Ms. Ruedig seconded.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character; was consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties; related to the historic and architectural value of the structure; and was compatible with innovative technologies. He noted that it was important that the front façade and the right-hand side were being restored for the overall approval of the project.

Ms. Ruedig said she supported the new design and thought it had improved in massing, setbacks, and refinement. Mr. Rawling said he did not support the approach to the project but would support the modifications and stipulations because it was a previously-approved design.

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

3. Petition of **Hart House Condominium Association, owner, and Russell Serbagi, applicant**, for property located at **306 Marcy Street, Unit 3**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install A/C condenser) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 102 as Lot 75-3 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Russell Serbagi was present and said his unit was one of three in the building. He said he wanted to install a mini split condenser and locate it where the other mechanicals were on the side of the building, which was a narrow space and a natural fit for the condenser.

In response to the Commission's questions, Mr. Serbagi said the unit would stand on the ground and the conduits were painted in the clapboard's color. He explained the layout for the three conduits and said it was the best way to locate the condenser. He said screening the mechanical area would draw more attention to it and shut it down because it had a narrow access,

Mr. Rawling said he was concerned about all the mechanicals running over the building's exterior but thought it could be mitigated by screening at the ground level, like clumping bamboo or ornamental grasses, to clean up and soften the area. Mr. Serbagi said there was no grass or dirt in which to plant anything. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested hanging the condenser system from angled brackets. He said planting material in front of the mechanicals wouldn't work because the fan would blow heat out and also make it difficult to do maintenance. He suggested a small fence instead. Ms. Ruedig said it was fine as it was because the corner had enough clutter that a condenser wouldn't make a difference, but she encouraged the applicant to consider fencing or screening in the future. City Council Representative Roberts suggested putting a fence along the sidewalk instead of up against the utilities. Chairman Lombardi said the mess of mechanicals was all the building owners' problem, not just the applicant's, and he didn't want to stipulate that the applicant had to do all that work for his condenser.

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 Approval for the application as presented, and Ms. Doering seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the project would conserve surrounding property values, be compatible with innovative technology, and preserve the integrity of the District because it was consistent with what other people had done. She also asked that the applicant consider screening in the future.

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

4. Petition of **Katie C. & Jason R. Jenkins, owners**, for property located at **35 Mark Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (raise existing garage roof and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 50 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD 4-L1) and Historic Districts.

Ms. Ruedig recused herself from the petition.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Jason Jenkins was present and reviewed the petition, noting that they wanted to make the top of the garage functional by lifting up the roof. He said they would replace the windows with wooden clad ones to match the house. He also wanted to add a mini split condenser in the back, which he noted wasn't on the application.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a great idea of conserving as much of the structure as possible but noted that the double windows didn't seem to be lifted up with the rest of the roof. The applicant said he would lower the windows. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the structure looked better, and Mr. Rawling agreed. Mr. Beer said the proportions looked better on the gable end. Chairman Lombardi said he agreed with all the comments and thought it was a worthy project.

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 as presented, and City Council Representative Roberts seconded.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project would preserve the integrity of the District, conserve and enhance property values, be consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties, and have compatibility of design with surrounding properties.

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

V. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **202 Court Street Property Group, LLC, owner**, for property located at **202 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (new dormer addition to the north elevation) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace: siding, roofing, windows and doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 35 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 07, 2019 meeting to the September, 2019 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to postpone the petition to a future meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by Joe Caldarola, **owner**, for property located at **55 Lafayette Road**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new freestanding structure (home with attached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 151 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from August 07, 2019 meeting to the September, 2019 meeting.)*

(Note: the applicant wasn't present at the time, so the Commission heard Work Session C and then returned to this petition).

The applicant Joe Caldarola reviewed his petition and showed photos of nearby homes that inspired his design. He said he tried to de-emphasize the garage by putting a shed roof on it. He discussed the front porch, the window symmetry and window prairie grills, the back dormer, and the ledge and foundation.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested that the side with no windows have at least a window in the garage. Mr. Cracknell suggested putting one in the study. It was further discussed. The floor plan was reviewed. Mr. Rawling said he could see the building fitting into the neighborhood and thought the design had more creativity than the previous version. He suggested establishing a water table on the front and wrapping it around the house to break down the scale and mass. He suggested a half-hip roof on the garage elevation to get rid of the awkwardness of the shed. He said he was troubled the most by the approach to the house, where the front door seemed to be recessed behind the towering element, and it was discussed.

Ms. Ruedig said she wasn't comfortable with the size of the house on the small lot that was raised up on ledge, and she thought it would tower over everything else behind it. She said the house would seem incongruous to its surroundings. She said that particular form and type of house was appropriate for the District, but not in that particular location. She appreciated that the

garage was set back, but questioned the use of prairie windows in the District, and she wasn't comfortable with all the composite. Mr. Caldarola said he would do wood siding.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was pleased with the massing, size, and height as well as reducing the garage by cutting it back. He said Mr. Rawling's suggestion of removing the shed and making it into a half hip made sense. He said he had seen prairie windows in Portsmouth and didn't think they were inappropriate. City Council Representative Roberts said there might be prairie windows on Miller Avenue but that it wasn't common or prominent. He said they stuck out and suggested that the applicant consider alternatives. Ms. Doering said she had the same massing concerns as Ms. Ruedig and would recommend a contemporary house in the District because of the many examples of contemporary ranch houses right next to that location and how small the Gothic house to the right was. She said she liked the design better than before and had no issue with the bumpout on the right side because it was very shallow. She agreed with the hip roof suggestion. She said she'd like the style of the house if it were anywhere else but had a problem with its size in that neighborhood and context. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said it was like looking at a Hollywood stage set where only the front of the structure is seen. He said the rest of the house had nothing to do with the Colonial style. Mr. Rawling noted that the street was characterized by large-scale houses, and the infill houses were mostly small scale that seemed to be out of character with the street, so he was more accepting of the applicant's design. It was further discussed. Chairman Lombardi said he liked the design but wanted to look at the site.

Public Comment

Tim Malinowski of 91 Lafayette Road said he lived to the right of the property and that the real issue was having something that naturally fit the lot. He noted that when he did renovations to his home, he had to pull out the existing windows due to three inches of discrepancy. He said the Commission held him to a level of scrutiny that he wanted them to hold the applicant to.

DECISION

*The applicant indicated that he would **continue** the work session at a future meeting and possibly do a work session/public hearing.*

C. Work Session requested by **Dagny Taggart, LLC, owner**, and **Mark A. McNabb, applicant** for property located at **Daniel Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new free-standing (3-story, 50,000 ± s.f.) commercial structure as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown in Assessor Map 107 as Lot 27 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD-4) Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the August 14, 2019 meeting to the September, 2019 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to postpone the petition to a future meeting.*

D. Work Session requested by **Michele P. Cronin, owner**, for property located at **14 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the partial demolition of an existing

Request to Postpone

structure (removal of additions and 1 chimney), new construction to an existing structure (relocating house to new foundation and adding a 1-story addition), and exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, windows, and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed from the August 14, 2019 meeting to the September, 2019 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to postpone the petition to a future meeting.

VI. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

Ms. Ruedig resumed her voting seat and Mr. Beer recused himself from the petition.

1. *Work Session* requested by **Drew & Brittany Schulthess, owners**, for property located at **15 Mt. Vernon Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (extend roofline of the existing house over the attached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 111 as Lot 33 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

Project architect Carla Goodnight was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced the project team and the owner Drew Schulthess. Mr. Schulthess explained that he needed the extra room for his growing family. Ms. Goodnight reviewed the petition and showed examples of nearby similar houses. She said they wanted to use shakes as a material on the addition, add a door to the back left side, install two dormers in the front, retain the skylight over the stairs, add space for an additional bedroom, and redo the detail on the garage.

Ms. Ruedig noted that Ms. Goodnight had said she would continue the gable over the garage. Ms. Goodnight said it didn't provide enough space. She said the new solution would provide more volume to make the space more usable. Ms. Ruedig said she felt like there was a bunch of height and mass added to the original that made the structure seem too suburban for her. She recommended bumping out a whole shed dormer to get the extra space and thought that extending the roofline all the way across would be more contextual and conducive to continuing the line of the house. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the structure was a half-Cape now and asked whether the front door would be in the middle of the Cape structure if the existing roof was continued over the garage. He said that barn doors were very popular interior-wise, but was afraid that the interior barn door was just covering up the garage door. He asked why the horizontal division was still there and why the two shingles were retained if the design was to make the structure look like a Cape with a dormer on it. It was further discussed.

Ms. Ruedig said if the garage was a carriage house before, the openings and barn doors would have been on the gable end. She said a big sliding carriage door on the end of the short wall looked strange and would normally go on the side. She said it was a bit too much. Mr. Rawling said the forms could be simplified. He suggested getting rid of the horizontal across the front of the house and at the right-hand side, putting trim on the windows, and carrying the form through on the rear. He said it would be better if the windows were separated.

Ms. Doering said it was a mistake to try and make a garage look like a carriage house and having fake sliding doors that were supposed to be real doors. She said it seemed contrived and didn't add to the house in any way. She agreed with Mr. Ruedig about how the mass would look to someone coming down the street and said she wasn't a big fan of how the two structures came together. City Council Representative Roberts said he agreed with the door comments and the horizontal lines on the addition and thought the windows could be separated a bit. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said if the horizontal line on the roof extension on the right side was removed, the clapboards on the first floor would have to be sacrificed. He said there was no natural division between the claps and the shingles and suggested removing the clapboards. Chairman Lombardi agreed about breaking up the wall and separating the windows and said the fake barn doors weren't necessary.

Public Comment

Eric Spear of 49 Mt. Vernon Street said he had lived there many years and had seen a number of homes expanded to accommodate growing families. He said the project was a continuation of the same accommodation and growth that the other houses in the neighborhood had seen.

Ms. Ruedig said she might consider continuing the roof line and propping up some shed dormers, even though the Commission had issues with shed dormers. She had no problem with the massing. Mr. Rawling noted that the historic photos showed the front of the building as a 3-bay definition, with the garage on the side. He said future plans could consider the 3-bay definition on the front of the house, with an arch, and still carry on the former life of a carriage house converted to a building. Chairman Lombardi said the Commission needed to see the structure in context with the neighborhood instead of seeing it by itself in a prairie setting.

DECISION

*The applicant said they would **continue** the work session to the October meeting and perhaps do a work session/public hearing.*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 10:55 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary