

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**October 14, 2009
Reconvened from October 7, 2009**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena Maltese; Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts; George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Eric Spear; Alternates Joseph Almeida

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....

Chairman Dika called the reconvened meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced the Commissioners.

Chairman Dika stated that she wanted to clarify a statement she made when discussing the 31 Richards Avenue application at the October 7, 2009 meeting. She said that she stated incorrectly that if any part of a lot falls within the district then the entire lot was in the district. She pointed out Section 10-1001 E. in Article 10 that stated "Where the district line bisects a portion of a structure, the entire structure is deemed to be within the district." She noted that the lot was not. She also explained that the proposed zoning map was recommending that the lot be taken out of the historic district.

Chairman Dika also informed the Commission that the first reading for the proposed zoning ordinance changes was scheduled for November 16. Beginning November 17, any applications coming forward would need to comply with both ordinances. She said that the second reading was scheduled for December 7 with a public hearing. After that, there would be a third reading but she did not have a date for that. It was hoped that by January 1, 2010, the revised zoning ordinance would be adopted.

At this point in the meeting, the Commission reviewed the proposed zoning map and more specifically, the changes proposed to the historic district.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Petition of **John R. Maher, owner, and Skye Maher, applicant**, for property located at **240 Middle Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar hot water system) in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 10 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts. *(This item was postponed at the October 7, 2009 meeting to a work session/public hearing at the November 4, 2009 meeting.)*

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to the November 4, 2009 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

2. Petition of **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **157 Deer Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove brick veneer, replace with vinyl siding and composite trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 17 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the October 7, 2009 meeting to the October 14, 2009 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios, was present to speak to the application. She gave the Commission an additional handout for her presentation. She explained to the Commission that this was a site where the brick siding was failing and considered unsafe. She said that the applicant received permission from the Inspection Department to remove the brick prior to coming to the HDC.

Ms. Ramsey stated that the renovations would take place on the back of the building. She was proposing to replace the brick with a Certainteed board and batten product. It was still a vinyl product but it was a thick product that was more rigid and would hold up well with this type of installation. She added that they were still proposing to use azek trim around all of the openings and eaves.

She explained that the contractor's intentions were to strap the entire block wall, plywood the wall, and then begin the application of the vinyl product. She also said that it would be one full mud board up to the eave line so there would be no seams.

Mr. Wyckoff was curious as to what color they were thinking of using although he stated that he realized they did not have purview over color. Ms. Ramsey said that they were looking to use a taupe or clay color.

Chairman Dika pointed out that currently on the front of the building was a perpendicular product. She wondered what that was. Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was a product called T111.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Dika asked if there was anyone from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Roberts. Chairman Dika asked of discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff felt this was a situation where there has been damage and the cement blocks are exposed. He said that the proposed product fit in with the other properties in the immediate area and he did not feel that the building had any historical value.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

3. Petition of **51 Islington Street, LLC, and Arthur E. and Joan T. Jones, owners**, for property located at **51 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (eliminate townhouse structure, addition of at-grade landscaped parking, minor adjustment to front building footprint, change of various windows to patio doors, addition of two inverted decks with brackets, addition of downspout locations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 33 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts. *(This item was postponed at the October 7, 2009 meeting to a work session/public hearing at the October 14, 2009 meeting.)*

- Ms. Jennifer Ramsey and Mr. Steve Kelm were present to speak to the application. She explained that at last week’s meeting, they proposed a significant change to the scope of the project. She said that the plans submitted showed the Commission what the back of the building would look like. She added that they were proposing a parking lot at grade at the back of the lot with landscaping. She pointed out that the rendering she submitted also showed the Keefe house in the distance to show the relationship between the two structures.
- Chairman Dika asked what the difference in the height of the peak of the roof was of the Keefe House and the proposed building. Ms. Ramsey answered that it was about a 7-10 foot difference. She said that the proposed building was about 56 feet high from grade.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that they have pulled the building back about 75 feet and it was a big improvement to the neighborhood. She said that the proposed building was 23 feet higher than the existing Kline’s building. This proposal was smaller than what was there now and a less intense use of the lot.
- Ms. Ramsey told the Commission that taking away the back building now allowed for 37% of open space. They also have 20% less lot coverage. She pointed out that they have donated portions of the lot to the City for wider sidewalks and possible parallel parking spaces if the City so chooses to do them.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked if the donated portions of the lot were a result of going before the various land use boards. Ms. Ramsey said yes, it was a result of their conversations with the Technical Advisory Committee and the Planning Board. Vice Chairman Katz asked if this process added to their decision to eliminate the residential building. Ms. Ramsey said that the process led them to believe that the best solution was to abandon the building in order to make everything work.
- Mr. Kelm stated that they did not want to eliminate the building but that was where they were. He pointed out that they have cooperated with all of the boards and now they are back before the HDC again. It has been a 22 month process. Vice Chairman Katz also pointed out that these were changes that were beyond the HDC’s purview. Mr. Kelm

gave a detailed account of the process they went through with the boards to arrive at this proposal. He added that they just wanted to move forward.

- Chairman Dika asked how the parking lot would be maintained over time. Ms. Roberts replied that the Planning Board takes that issue very seriously when reviewing an application. One of the issues that they deal with is snow removal.
- Mr. Kelm stated that they are considering taking the snow off of the site or creating a heated area on the lot where the snow can be taken to melt. He added that with it being a condominium association, the lot will be professionally maintained.
- Chairman Dika asked the Commission if any of them felt a second structure should be there or did they feel that this solution was adequate. Vice Chairman Katz stated that they have been presented with an application that has changed because of the realities of dealing with other boards. He said that he was comfortable with the project as it has evolved over the process. He added that he saw it as a win for those living adjacent to the structure. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was satisfied with the proposal.
- Mr. Kelm pointed out that the residents of Tanner Court will be about 105 feet from the proposed building and right now they are about 20 feet away from an existing concrete block wall. There will now be open space for the neighbors to enjoy.

At this point, the work session ended and the meeting moved into the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey explained the additional changes to the building that was part of their application.

Page three showed the locations of the copper gutters and downspouts. It also showed the change in the building footprint which was a result of the TAC and Planning Board approvals. She pointed out that the building had decreased in size by about five feet.

The back elevation was shown on page four and showed changes of dormers to small inverted decks with French doors. A powder coated metal rail would also be a part of the decking system.

Ms. Ramsey pointed out that page five showed a change of two windows to an egress door. Page six showed the replacement of some windows with French doors. Page seven showed all of the new fenestration. It also showed the bracket detail which had been scaled down.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any additional questions from the Commission. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that it was a bit of a shock when this application first came to the Commission. He felt that the work session and the input from Planning Board representative,

Ms. Roberts, was invaluable in helping him come to a realization as to what was happening with the site. He did not see the revision of the application as having a detrimental effect on the neighborhood or the adjacent homeowners, and felt it might be a benefit for them.

Chairman Dika commented that she was apprehensive about the change. She said that she went to the lot today and really looked at what was there and envisioned what was coming. She felt it would be a big improvement in that area.

Ms. Maltese stated that she was comfortable with the project. She said that she knows the neighborhood and they have always spoken up on projects in the past. She noted that no neighborhood members were present this evening to speak against it.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

11. Petition of Benoit R. and Andrea M. St. Jean, owners, for property located at 54 Humphrey's Court, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (remove fence, install new fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property was shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 46 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Ben St. Jean, owner of the property spoke to the application. He stated that he was looking to install a section of fence in his backyard.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the fence pictured in the submitted plans was the one he proposed to install. Mr. St. Jean replied yes and pointed out that it was the same fence that his neighbor had which would be a continuation of the fencing.

Chairman Dika confirmed that the fence would be a stretch of thirty one feet along the back of the property.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Dika asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that the fence did not take away from historic preservation in any way and felt that the integrity was intact.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

12. Petition of Fifty/Fifty Two Market Street Realty, owner, Peter R. Egelston, trustee, and John Merrigan, applicant, for property located at 56 Market Street, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 33 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. John Merrigan, representative for the applicant was present to speak to the application. He stated that they would like to change three windows on the second floor of the building. They would be Marvin windows and the work would be done from the interior. There would be no changes to the exterior of the building. He said they would also like to replace two windows on the back of the building.

Vice Chairman Katz asked if this was a sash replacement rather than a whole unit replacement. Mr. Merrigan replied. Vice Chairman Katz felt that this was the best example of how to replace a window in a historic structure because the intrusion was minimal and the appearance would remain unchanged.

Ms. Roberts asked if the muttons would or would not be removable. Mr. Merrigan said that they would be permanently affixed with simulated divided lights.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any additional questions from the Commission. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF TH COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Roberts. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt the proposed windows would be an exact replica of what was existing and would be compatible with the exterior design and arrangement of the other windows in the buildings. He appreciated that fact that a lot of the backs of the buildings in Portsmouth are being fixed up. In other historical towns only the fronts are fixed up.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

13. Petition of Peter H. Rice and Meghan Milne, owners, for property located at 196 South Street, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear addition, construct new rear addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 67 and lies in General Residence B and Historic A Districts. (Work Session/Public Hearing)

- Mr. Peter Rice, owner of the property and Mr. Jerry Smith, designer of the project were present to speak to the application. Mr. Rice explained that at the previous work session it was expressed that more detail was needed. He said that he tried to provide that information with the submitted revised drawings.
- Mr. Rice explained that the project was driven by a couple of things: the existing shed addition foundation was crumbling, the sills and plates were rotting, and the roof was failing and leaking.
- Mr. Rice said that the Commission expressed concern about how the roof lines would tie together, the frieze board dimensions, and the water board dimensions. He pointed out that competed details were on page A-3 of the submitted plans.
- Chairman Dika asked what had changed with the project since the work session. Mr. Rice said that there was a change of material for the foundation. He said they would match the existing foundation. Also, they would be putting in a cellar door instead of a bulkhead.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that they had done a good job of matching up the eave lines. He added he was pleased with the project.
- Ms. Kozak stated that the project had come a long way and had really come together.
- Mr. Rice pointed out that the only cut sheet he could not get was for the side door. It would be a Simpson nine light panel door, model #7944.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked if the whole house would be clapboard. Mr. Rice said yes and that they may reuse some of the clapboards that are already there.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

At this point, the work session ended and the meeting moved into a public hearing.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Roberts. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the scale and design of the project was appropriate for the neighborhood and for the structure. He felt it was a major improvement.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by Iain and Katherine Moodie, owners, for property located at 14 Mt. Vernon Street, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new single family dwelling). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 26 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

- Mr. Iain Moodie, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that he researched the date of building and found a construction date of 1910. He said it was built by Sherburne B. Donnell but did not know anything about him or the house. He also said he met with the Portsmouth Advocates to show them his proposals and they recommended a particular design. He showed that design to the Commission.
- Ms. Kozak asked how the dimensions compared to what was there now. Mr. Moodie said he reduced the height and made the footprint slightly larger by about 60 square feet.
- Ms. Kozak pointed out that the smaller section of the house was on Mt. Vernon Street. Mr. Moodie said that he wanted to keep the street impact as minimal as possible.
- Ms. Roberts asked about the demolition. Mr. Moodie explained that virtually nothing was salvageable; it was 95% a rebuild. Ms. Maltese informed Ms. Roberts that a site walk was held which included going down into the basement and seeing how the building was currently being held up. Ms. Kozak pointed out that there was a tree that was buckling the foundation.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he thought the house was salvageable. He disagreed with the 95% rebuild figure. Ms. Roberts asked Mr. Moodie who gave him the 95% figure. Mr. Moodie said that he has been in construction for 35 years and that was his assessment. Mr. Melchior stated that everything is salvageable but if the replacement value is more than the value of the house then it was impractical. He also said that at the last work session, he thought the issue of whether the house was salvageable was resolved. He did not want to waste time revisiting it.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked how many other Commissioners shared Mr. Wyckoff's opinion. Ms. Maltese was comfortable with exploring a new structure on the site. Ms. Kozak said it was a close call for her. She could see a replacement in that spot being of the same contributing value to the neighborhood. It was not a monument property; it was a contributing property. She would like to see it fixed up but she could support the replacement. Mr. Melchior said that he stood by his comments from last week. Chairman Dika stated that she did have a concern whether the applicant bought the house with the idea of taking it down but she added that from what she saw, the value of the house was not worthy of the effort to restore it.
- Vice Chairman Katz explained that the house would have to be raised and a new foundation poured. He was not sure that was possible with the close proximity of the other houses in the neighborhood. He asked how important this structure was to the history of Portsmouth.
- Mr. Wyckoff reminded the Commission that most of the neighbors hoped that the house would sit as it was and would like to see a renovation.
- Chairman Dika stated that most of the Commission was in agreement that the applicant could move on with his plans for a new structure.
- Mr. Moodie explained that he would like to use two over one sashes with clapboard siding.

- Mr. Melchior said it was important to see how the structure fits in with the context of the neighborhood.
- Mr. Moodie stated that he was trying to alleviate the problems with the house that caused it to be abused over the years. It has no off street parking which reduces its value significantly. He wanted to create one parking space but he would not be moving the building back on the lot to get it.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if any Commissioners had an objection to the front narrow section of the structure. Ms. Kozak said it is always unsettling for her to see a smaller addition being the street front. She felt this would require another work session. She suggested taking photos of the street to review.
- Mr. Moodie said that the intention was to make it look like an addition that was added to a house set back from the street. Ms. Roberts pointed out that Portsmouth does not have many homes in the historic district that are set back from the street. Ms. Kozak said she would not want to see a secondary lesser addition and the primary house set back from the street. Mr. Moodie explained that he was just trying to find something that would work on a small lot.
- Chairman Dika stated that her concern was its height. Mr. Moodie told her the height would be 23 feet, 6 inches. The current height was 25 feet, 6 inches. Vice Chairman Katz asked what the ceiling heights would be. Mr. Moodie replied about 7 feet.
- Ms. Maltese commented that she would rather see something that represents the language of the architecture that was in the neighborhood currently than falsifying some old historic home that never existed. Mr. Moodie pointed out that the neighborhood was an eclectic mix of designs. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a Cape design set sideways on the lot which could have a smaller addition on the street but would not have a door. He said his biggest problem with the proposed design was the door on the smaller section of the structure. He thought it made more sense to have the door on the side of the structure.
- Chairman Dika commented that it may take longer to work toward an acceptable design.
- Mr. Moodie said that he would come back for another work session and would bring contextual photos with him.

B. Work Session requested by Blue Star Properties, LLC, owner, and Bungalow Development Group, applicant, for property at 233 Vaughan Street, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct multi-story, multi-use building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 14 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Carla Goodknight, architect for the project, and Mr. Andy Livingston, Mr. Ed Cole, and Mr. Dave Lafave were present to speak to the application. She explained that she was proposing demolition and new construction at 233 Vaughan Street. She said this was their third work session on the project.
- The proposed site plan showed that they would be maintaining some parking on Vaughan Street and adding parking underground as well as parking on Green Street.
- Page four illustrated the Green Street elevation. Ms. Goodknight stated they would be able to accomplish the masonry base in granite veneer.

- Mr. Wyckoff asked what changes were made since the last work session. Ms. Goodknight said that they have since completed all of the elevations around the building. Mr. Wyckoff thought it now had a more traditional look.
- Ms. Goodknight explained that the first floor would be commercial, the second and third floors would be offices, and the fourth floor would be residential units with a rooftop deck.
- Ms. Goodknight said that they were still looking to have shop style windows on the first floor and still looking at aluminum wrapped components for the tower. She added that they were looking to create a metal cap system on the top cornice that would probably wrap up and underneath.
- Ms. Kozak felt that the roof design on the tower would be critical. She thought it was the icon on the whole building. She said that she was grappling with the conical shape. Ms. Goodknight felt it would be most visible from the roof deck itself. Ms. Kozak thought it would be seen from Russell Street as well. Chairman Dika asked what the height was. Ms. Goodknight said that the rooftop appurtenances allowed for 10 feet and she thought the conical may go a little higher than that. She was still working on determining the average grade in order to determine the height.
- Ms. Roberts asked why the building was situated right next to the railroad tracks. Ms. Goodknight said the location was driven by the view which looked down to the water. Ms. Robert’s concern was to make sure it was pedestrian friendly.
- Ms. Maltese stated that she liked how the building was situated, however, the staircase on the back of the building really made it look like the back of the building. She said it would be viewed from downtown. She asked for more thought on that elevation. Chairman Dika thought the back elevation looked almost prison like. Vice Chairman Katz suggested looking at ways to give it more importance.
- Mr. Wyckoff wondered where the proposed arch for the proposed Westin Hotel would be located in relation to this building. Ms. Goodknight said she could research that.
- Ms. Roberts explained that it has been suggested and discussed to try to recreate Vaughan Street as it was prior to the urban renewal projects of the 1970’s.
- At this point in the meeting, there was considerable discussion on the vertical and horizontal elements of the building and the materials proposed.
- Mr. Melchior asked where the deliveries would take place. Ms. Goodknight showed Mr. Melchior on the plans where there was potential to put the delivery zone.
- Ms. Roberts asked where HVAC units would be located. Ms. Goodknight said they might be going geo-thermal in which case, everything would be internal.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that the massing and general shape of the building was fine and that the tower was an interesting element.

C. Work Session requested by David J. and Vasilias Tooley, owners, for property located at 166 New Castle Avenue, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new garage and connector to main house). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 24 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

Ms. Kozak recused herself from this last discussion of the evening and left the meeting.

- Ms. Jennifer Ramsey, representing the applicant, was present to speak to the application. She stated that this application came before the Commission in 2004. The applicant wants to replace the one story garage and add a connector to the house. They will need to go before the Board of Adjustment for dimensional requirements. It would add about 77 square feet of footprint. She explained that the garage would be built on the existing garage footprint.
- Ms. Maltese pointed out that on the north elevation, one will see a continual garage. She was concerned with that. Ms. Ramsey said that the garage would grow in height by about 10 feet. Chairman Dika thought it was too much. Mr. Melchior agreed and said that not matching the roof line caused him some heartache. Mr. Wyckoff agreed and said it was almost a commercial look.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked how visible it was from the street. Ms. Maltese said it was quite visible. Ms. Ramsey said it was less visible when you are driving into New Castle. Vice Chairman Katz felt a perspective would be helpful.
- Chairman Dika wondered about another roof design. Ms. Ramsey said that they explored a lot of different roof designs. She felt that the roof design chosen was the one with the least encroachment on the existing structure. Mr. Melchior sketched out an alternative for Ms. Ramsey to consider.
- Vice Chairman Katz stated that he thought the ceiling and door heights could be reduced a bit. Ms. Ramsey agreed but she pointed out that the applicant was quite tall.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that the garage was the problem.
- Ms. Ramsey said that they would like to come back for another work session in November.

D. Work Session requested by David M. Krempels Revocable Trust and Mary Roddy Krempels Revocable Trust, owners, for property located at 111 Gates Street, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition (to be replaced by a screen porch) and allow new construction to an existing structure (to be replaced by a screen porch). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 96 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:30 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on December 2, 2009.