

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**May 12, 2010
reconvened from May 5, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena Maltese; Alternate George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Anthony Coviello; Alternate Joseph Almeida

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Petition of **ED PAC, LLC, owner**, for property located at **152 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove, replace, reconfigure windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 37 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Dave Paolini and Mr. E.J. Cheney, owners of the property were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Paolini stated that they would like to reconfigure the windows on one side of the building and replace them with vinyl clad windows with simulated divided lights and exterior muttons.

Chairman Dika informed the public that a work session was held on this project and so the Commission was somewhat familiar with the reconfiguration of the windows.

Ms. Kozak asked if the new windows had the option of a spacer bar. Mr. Paolini replied yes and was amendable to that addition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was a trim piece that would snap in and rest on the existing window sill. He pointed out that the window sills had a slant to them. Mr. Paolini said that he could find out if the windows had that option but that he was amendable to that change as well.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicants. 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

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) That a trim piece is added to the bottom of the new windows to abut the existing window sills.
- 2) That the windows have spacer bars.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the proposal was entirely appropriate for the building.

Chairman Dika added that she was glad they were working on the building.

Ms. Kozak said that the new configuration was an improvement.

The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulations passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote:

- 1) That a trim piece is added to the bottom of the new windows to abut the existing window sills.
- 2) That the windows have spacer bars.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

7. Petition of **Joseph J. and Jennifer Almeida, owners**, for property located at **33 Blossom Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing exterior stairs) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new exterior stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Joe Almeida, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that he had additional material to give to the Commission.

Mr. Almeida said the page 1 of the plans showed the existing brick steps which spill down onto Blossom Street. He pointed out that they have to walk into the street to get into the house. They also do not have a landing at the top of the steps. He explained that he submitted a couple examples of existing steps on area homes that he would like to duplicate for his house.

Ms. Kozak asked if the new steps would be the same footprint as the old steps. Mr. Almeida replied no and explained that the current steps cross the property line. He said that the new steps would be completely on his property.

Ms. Kozak asked if the steps would be painted. Mr. Almeida said that the tread would be oiled mahogany and the rest would be painted.

Chairman asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. 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

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

Ms. Maltese stated that the homeowner has demonstrated that this was not a new reality to the historic district. She felt it was in keeping with the historic district.

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 (6-0) vote.

8. Petition of **Blue Star Properties, LLC, owner, and 233 Vaughan Street, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **233 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use, multi-story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 14 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. (*Work Session/Public Hearing*)

WORK SESSION

- Ms. Carla Goodknight and Mr. Stephen Silver of C.J. Architects were present to speak to the application. Ms. Goodknight stated that they would like to review materials prior to moving into the public hearing.
- Ms. Goodknight showed a glass sample of the curtain wall system and passed around a photo of a building on Newbury Street in Boston where the same curtain wall system was being utilized. She also passed out a color photo of the roof top railing system that they were proposing.
- Page 20 showed the proposed light fixtures and the proposed roofing materials. She showed a sample of the roofing material.
- Ms. Goodknight also showed a sample of the metal siding material which was a Centura product and a brick mock up panel. She pointed out that they would also be using granite banding and would be varying the grout for each material. She brought samples of the grout samples. She also showed a sample of the masonry block being proposed as well.

- Ms. Kozak asked Ms. Goodknight why that particular brick was chosen. Ms. Goodknight said that it had a higher level of flash than other bricks and it was her intention to make a distinction with the brick. She explained that these were the same bricks that were manufactured for Port Walk but they had a little more texture with a monochromatic grout to give it a different feel. She added that it was smooth faced. Chairman Dika asked Ms. Kozak if she had an objection to the brick choice. Ms. Kozak replied no, not for this building since it had some contemporary features along with some historic features. She felt it was a good blend between old and new. It was not something she would want to see on Bow Street or the State Street row houses.
- Ms. Kozak asked what the material would be for the soffit. Ms. Goodknight said that they were doing a wrapped metal cap material with custom brackets in Azek. Ms. Kozak asked about gutters. Ms. Goodknight said there would be a gutter on the tower.
- Mr. Melchior asked how the metal siding would be installed. Mr. Silver explained that it would be interlocked. Mr. Melchior asked if the gaskets would be visible. Ms. Goodknight replied no.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked about the light fixtures. Ms. Goodknight stated that they were a Hubberton Forge fixture that was metal and glass. She said that the glass was muted.
- Ms. Kozak asked if the balconies on the Green Street side were cantilevered. Ms. Goodknight replied yes. She added that the slab was a concrete deck and would have the same railing system as what was on the roof.
- Ms. Maltese commented that there was still a very clear rear to the building. She wondered if there were any options for dressing it up a bit. Ms. Goodknight said that there was a brick recessed door with light fixtures on both sides of it. She explained that she did not want to give the entrance too much importance since it was an emergency egress.
- Ms. Maltese stated that it was a very visible and public side of the building. Ms. Goodknight showed the landscaping that was proposed. Ms. Maltese said that when you look at the building square on, you can only see the door.
- Vice Chairman Katz commented that they should not go too far in making the building something that it is not. He felt the lighting gave it importance and he had no problem with it.
- Ms. Maltese stated that there was nothing to guarantee that the landscaping will be there. She said she needs to evaluate whether the building can sit there on its own. She thought it felt like a back side of a building and was concerned that it faced downtown.
- Ms. Goodknight said that in addition to the landscaping, they have carried the light fixtures across this area as well as introduced brick detail at the top of the openings. She said that they also installed vertical banding and there were also balconies on this elevation. Ms. Goodknight said that there was a lot of mirroring going on.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked how far the door was recessed. Ms. Goodknight thought it was about four inches.
- Mr. Melchior agreed with Ms. Maltese. He did not know what the solution was but it was not the Commission's place to find a solution. Ms. Goodknight said that she did not share that opinion of the back of the building and she reiterated all of the details again.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that there was a new building in the downtown area that has been much heralded in its construction and he did not think the front of that building was as successful as the back of this building that the Commission was complaining about.

He added that there were a lot of elements in it and he felt the efforts with the lighting were successful and the architect had done a successful job.

- Ms. Goodknight went through the rest of the packet with the Commission.
- Ms. Kozak asked if the canopy was cantilevered. Ms. Goodknight said that they were using a C shaped channel assembly that was wrapped. Ms. Kozak asked if brackets or cables would be visible. Ms. Goodknight replied no.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to move to a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz. The motion passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Goodknight reviewed the renderings with the Commission and explained that she inserted the proposed building into the existing landscape.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. 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 Ms. Maltese. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that the Commission has worked with the applicant for quite a period of time and had great interaction. In his mind, he felt she has resolved a number of problems to his satisfaction. He felt it was a successful design and was appropriate to the site. He added that he would support the application.

Ms. Maltese said that she agreed with Vice Chairman Katz about the work put into this building. She reminded the Commission that she stated in the first work session her fear of the back of the building. She pointed out that she has seen some wonderful renderings of the building this evening but the one rendering she did not see was the specific angle she was worried about. She thought maybe that rendering might prove her fears true that it was just a big, long flat side to a building. It was a side that faced the center of the City and she urged the other Commissioners to require the applicant to work a bit more on this so that they do not have a building facing the wrong direction in the City. She added that the work has been magnificent but she did not think it was there yet.

Chairman Dika stated that she understood Ms. Maltese's concerns because she has the same concerns; however, the Commission has spent many hours on this and the applicant has made some attempt to mitigate the situation. She did not think it was as successful as she had hoped but many other things are successful so she said she would support the motion.

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 vote of 5-1 with Ms. Maltese voting in opposition.

9. Petition of **Jon Schroeder, owner**, for property located at **324 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (new siding, windows, skylights, doors, and garage door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 1 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Chris Wright and Mr. Bill Eiseman, representing the applicant, were present to speak to the application. Mr. Wright stated that a work session was held last month and the applicant has incorporated the suggestions from that work session. He pointed out that they are now proposing clapboard instead of shakes. They felt it was in keeping with the houses in the neighborhood. He also said that they have incorporated the crown detail, a build out on the rake and have centered the sign on the building.

Chairman Dika asked if they decided to not go with a pitched roof. Mr. Wright said it was not allowed by the ordinance.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be lighting for the sign. Mr. Wright said that they have not discussed lighting. Vice Chairman Katz asked if they were planning to have lighting. Mr. Wright replied no.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. George Dempsey of 42 Dennett Street was present to speak to the application. He stated that he and another person met with Mr. Schroeder prior to the work session. Mr. Dempsey said that he also represented another person who could not be at that meeting. He wanted the Commission to know that the neighbors did reach out.

Mr. Dempsey wanted to know if there was any exterior lighting to go on the building as it was not indicated on the plans. Chairman Dika said that no lighting was shown on the plan. Mr. Dempsey asked if this was the drawing of record. Chairman Dika replied yes.

Mr. Dempsey commented that it was a pleasant change to go from the shingles to the clapboard. He pointed out that three elevations were shown but there was no rear elevation shown. Ms. Maltese pointed out that there were no changes being proposed on the rear elevation. Mr. Dempsey asked if that was okay with the Commission. Ms. Maltese explained that the

Commission could not require someone to change something on their property if they were not proposing any changes.

Mr. Dempsey asked about the painted vertical V-groove with siding. He wondered if it was existing and if not, were they talking about T111. Mr. Wyckoff thought it meant 1"x 6" tongue and groove board.

Mr. Dempsey said that he was also representing an abutter behind the applicant. He said that there was concern about a planter that was on the right side of the building. He wondered if that planter could be removed. Chairman Dika reminded Mr. Dempsey that this was not a work session, they were in public hearing. She said that whatever had been presented was what the Commission would vote on.

Mr. Dempsey also suggested in lieu of the garage doors, going with what was called a paired opening. He said that might eliminate someone trying to back up to the doors. Ms. Maltese told Mr. Dempsey that traffic issues were outside their purview.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that the Commission was willing to listen to Mr. Dempsey's comments but the time for his input would have been at the work session. Chairman Dika pointed out that Mr. Dempsey could talk with the applicant after the hearing about some of his recommendations and if the applicant so chooses to make those changes, the applicant could come back before the Commission and amend his approval.

Mr. Dempsey thought it would be helpful for the public to understand that when there is a work session that everyone gets invited and everyone is invited to speak. He said that was not what he has heard about the Commission's work sessions. Chairman Dika pointed out that the work sessions are advertised and people are allowed to speak.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. Dempsey if he had any challenges to the current design. Mr. Dempsey said that he would prefer to not bring a specific challenge because he would have to take it beyond this Board and he did not want to do that. He said that he would like to see this project succeed and that was why he was bringing up his major concern, which was the doors. He added that he has already spoken to the applicant. He thought there was another way of doing this that would be just as acceptable and just as historic looking.

Chairman Dika asked if there was anyone else 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 Vice Chairman Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that this was a very difficult cement block building with two garage doors that was totally inappropriate to the historic district. He said that the applicant was not allowed

to put a pitched roof or a second story on it so he was attempting to give the building a cottage spin. He felt that this was the best that they could hope for. He thought that the windows and garage doors were appropriate.

Vice Chairman Katz agreed with Mr. Wyckoff and added that this was a very difficult application to make the building even make minimally acceptable and he felt the applicant did a good job.

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 (6-0) vote.

Chairman Dika stated that she wanted the public to know that the Historic District Commission gives individuals the opportunity to speak at work sessions.

10. Petition of **Worth Development Corporation, owner**, for property located at **121 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install two new window openings, replace rear door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Paul McEachern, representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. He stated the proposed changes were to the back of the building. He said that the building was built in 1972-73 when there was no historic district overview. Attorney McEachern explained that in one of the alcoves on the back of the building was a steel door that they would like to replace with a glass door to accommodate a new restaurant. He said that they would also like to add two display windows. He added that this same application was approved two years ago but that the approval has since lapsed. Chairman Dika recalled a work session for the project when it was first approved.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if this was what was approved. Attorney McEachern said at the time they also asked for upper windows as well. Now they are just asking for the lower ones.

Attorney McEachern pointed out that the back of this building may be facing a parking garage in the future.

Chairman asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. 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

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

Ms. Maltese stated that she found this to be an appropriate application for this building and it was also an application that they have seen before.

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 (6-0) vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

C. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood Avenue Trust, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (new trim work, eave banding, storefront, and fenestration). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios was present to speak to the application. She stated that this was her third work session.
- She said that they were working on the inside programming of the building.
- Ms. Ramsey reminded the Commission that the “boutique” look was the rendering that they liked best from the options submitted at the last work session. She said that the investors wanted a more industrial “gritty” look so they were going to lean in that direction.
- On the Maplewood Avenue and Hanover Street side of the building, they were anticipating a restaurant and on the far side of the building, they were anticipating a grocery or market. A bakery and retail space would also be added. She added that they were also hoping to have open vendors’ stalls inside the building.
- Ms. Ramsey showed the Hanover Street rendering of the building. She said that she would need to talk with the health officer about the indoor/outdoor dining concept.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that none of the elevations had a strong symmetry because what was driving the rhythm was that they were working with the current window openings.
- Ms. Ramsey said that the items that have changed since the last meeting were the eave line, the arched detailing was removed, they added French balconies, and eliminated the fabric awnings. They were looking into a more industrial looking awning.
- On the Bridge Street elevation, they were proposing a privacy fence to help hide the mechanicals. Ms. Ramsey pointed to a number of closed shutters detailed on the elevation. She also said that there was the possibility that down the road an addition could be added to the east end of the building.
- Ms. Ramsey said that they were proposing exterior lighting on the shutters on this side of the building. She said that they needed better lighting on this side of the building. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the Commission was comfortable with this type of lighting. Ms. Maltese commented that she has seen it done before and she kind of liked it. She thought it was fun. Mr. Wyckoff said that he would rather see a type of metal closure over the existing openings than bricking them up.
- Ms. Ramsey talked about the possibility of using retaining walls. Mr. Clum said that if the walls are 18 inches or higher, then they are considered a structure.
- The Deer Street elevation will have the closed shutter detailing also. This side would have bike storage.
- Ms. Ramsey pointed out the proposed horizontal banding. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was horizontal banding existing. Ms. Ramsey replied yes but said it was very subtle.
- Ms. Ramsey asked how the Commission felt about the French balconies and the eave lines. Mr. Wyckoff said that there were so many little details and felt Ms. Ramsey did a good job of breaking down the entries. He felt it was more or less whether the

Commission was for the concept or not. He added that he was comfortable with the eaves.

- Vice Chairman Katz stated that this was a very difficult building to view as an entity so he thought they were going to be sampling it in bits and pieces as far as when they experience the building. He thought it was exciting.
- Ms. Kozak commented that the balconies were something new within something old. She thought the smaller balconies on the single windows looked like security bars. She thought if the materials were all in keeping with the same language, it could work.
- Ms. Maltese said that the balcony on Maplewood Avenue really stuck out for her. She felt it should face the Bridge Street side which was more residential instead of facing Port Walk.
- Mr. Melchior commented that the more squat the elevation the more it lends itself to complimentary details.
- Ms. Kozak asked if screened panels would be used for the mall opening entries. Ms. Ramsey said currently no but they would have to check with Ms. McNamara of the Health Department about food service.
- Ms. Ramsey asked the Commission if these plans were going in a direction that they were amendable to. The Commission was in favor of the current proposals.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked which side of the building was considered the prominent location. Ms. Ramsey said she felt it was the Hanover Street and Maplewood Avenue sides. Vice Chairman Katz felt the primary entrance might require more detail.

D. Work Session requested by **Sean Mahoney, owner**, for property located at **27 Austin Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two car garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 28 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Lisa DeStefano and Sarah Morehand of DeStefano Architects were present to speak to the application.
- Ms. DeStefano asked which Commissioners remembered a prior application that came before the Commission in 2001. Vice Chairman Katz was on the Commission at the time.
- Ms. DeStefano explained that the applicant recently purchased some land from an abutter that allows them to do this project. She said that they were proposing a new two car garage. The existing garage would become family space. She also stated that they were proposing to add perimeter fencing as well.
- Ms. DeStefano walked the Commission through the plans. She stated that the new addition completed the entire structure. She explained that all of the detailing would match the existing structure. The cupola would give the new structure some vertical height. She pointed out that the back elevation was very hard to see.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that the addition did seem to finish off of the house. He said that he liked the cupola.
- Vice Chairman Katz stated that he did not think that the design posed any problems. He felt it was done nicely.
- Ms. Kozak thought that the proportions fit what was there. She also said that it would be hard to see where the addition started.
- Ms. DeStefano stated that she was hoping to use the old garage doors. If that was not possible, they would have new ones made to match the existing ones.

- Ms. DeStefano said they would be coming back before the Commission for a public hearing.

D. Work Session requested by **Nicholas Gegas Revocable Trust 2007, Nicholas Gegas, trustee, owner**, for property located at **128 Penhallow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to the front façade). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 21 and lies within Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Larry Dukes, contractor for the project was present to speak to the application. He stated that the architect, Mr. Wayne Rawley could not attend due to a family emergency.
- Mr. Dukes stated that they were looking for some direction to address the front of the building. He said that when they got into the internal demolition, there were a lot of structural issues to address. He explained that they were working with Emanuel Engineering to repair the support issues.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked which of the columns on the new design were the support beams. Mr. Dukes pointed them out on the plans. Detailed discussion ensued on the plans to reinforce the structure.
- Chairman Dika commented that the applicant was taking extraordinary measures to save the building.
- Ms. Maltese stated that she did not have any big issues with the changes to the opening but she was not sure about the long canvas awning that was proposed. She also had concern with the amount of mahogany on the front of the building. Mr. Dukes said with regards to the awning, they were trying to mimic what was in the area and pointed to the Dolphin Striker as an example.
- Ms. Kozak asked how far the awning projected out. Mr. Dukes said it projected out 24" and extended 24'. Mr. Dukes said that the awning would help to hide some of the damage done to the building. Mr. Wyckoff thought the awning was a concern and pointed out that it was not an actual functioning awning.
- Ms. Maltese thought a site walk would be helpful. Mr. Dukes agreed and said that when they come for the site walk, they would see that the wooden section of the building was not original to the structure but added on later. He added that the building has had a lot of changes, especially in the interior.
- Mr. Melchior had additional questions about the steel beams because he thought the drawings were not accurate.
- Ms. Kozak asked if the main entry had two sets of doors. Mr. Dukes said that there would be two sets of doors that would be recessed. He pointed out that the outer doors were sliding doors and the inner doors were swinging doors.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the drawings he has presented were engineered drawings. Mr. Dukes replied no. Mr. Wyckoff said that his big concern was that the measurements have got to work.
- Mr. Melchior asked if there would be insulation behind the paneling façade. Mr. Dukes said yes and explained that the brick on the lower level would be removed as it was not supporting anything.

- Ms. Maltese stated that she had some concern about making the addition look like the original part of the building but she wanted to go and look at the building. She reiterated that a site walk, early on would be helpful. Chairman Dika said that they would schedule one.
- Mr. Dukes asked the Commission if they would feel better about the mahogany if it were painted. Mr. Wyckoff said that he was not sure if the Commission could say anything about whether it was mahogany or not. Painting was up to the applicant.
- Mr. Wyckoff continued to say that he had a problem with trying to veneer the clapboard section of the building. Mr. Dukes said that the clapboard section had been used as a freezer.
- Chairman Dika stated that she was happy that the applicant was attempting to fix up the building.

Prior to adjournment, Chairman Dika stated for the record that a letter was submitted by Ms. Skye Maher and Mr. John Maher stating their support for the 27 Austin Street application.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:40 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 July 7, 2010.