

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**January 7, 2015
to be reconvened on January 14, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Members John Wyckoff, George Melchior; Dan Rawling; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; and Alternate Vincent Lombardi

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Alternate Reagan Ruedig, Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

ALSO PRESENT: Jessa Berna, Associate Planner

.....
Chairman Almeida brought the meeting to order.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **postpone** the Harborcorp Work Session H to the January 28, 2015 meeting. Mr. Lombardi seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

A. Chairman

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to re-elect Chairman Almeida as Chairman. Mr. Melchior seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

B. Vice Chairman

Councilor Kennedy made a motion to nominate Mr. Melchior for Vice Chairman. Mr. Melchior indicated that he would not be applying for reappointment in June so did not think a short term would be advantageous. Councilor Kennedy then nominated Mr. Gladhill for Vice-Chairman. Mr. Lombardi seconded. The motion passed unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. December 3, 2014

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **approve** the December 4, 2014 minutes. Mr. Rawling seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

III. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace roof, windows, siding and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the December meeting).*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Doug Bates, President of the Nobles Island Condominium Association, was present to speak to the petition. He showed various slides and pointed out that the big doors would be replaced by windows, the conference door would have a slight transom of AZEK and would return to a standard opening, the lower windows on the left side of the building would mirror the upper ones, and a skylight on one side of the building over the front door would be removed. The front side of the building would be wood and the three sides would be cedar impressions. Two skylights would remain, and the roof would be gray slate.

Mr. Rawling asked whether the replacement windows would be Andersen 400 Series, and Mr. Bates agreed, saying the white frames would match the trim. Mr. Rawling said the vinyl clad window would be an unprecedented standard for the Commission to approve in the District. Mr. Bates replied that none of those windows were in the front. Councilor Kennedy asked about the sheen on the plastic shakes and was told they had no sheen and looked real. Mr. Lombardi thought they were overly regular and looked plastic. Councilor Kennedy asked what the windows being replaced were made of. Mr. Bates said they were glass that had been assembled on site. Councilor Kennedy asked whether people would notice a difference if cedar and plastic shakes were together. Chairman Almeida said they would when the shakes were on the same plane but not if they were the same size and color. Mr. Rawling agreed that cedar shakes weren't perfectly formed and the character of the building was due to the wood shingles.

Vice-Chair Gladhill felt that if the building were historical, it should be all wood, but it was a 1980s building, and when people drove up, they would see the traditional wood on the front and not the plastic shingles on the sides. Mr. Lombardi stated that cedar shakes had lasted near the water for many years and the material was durable. Mr. Rawling said the shingles were the original ones that had lasted 35 years, which was significant. Vinyl would look ragged after 35 years, so he felt they were not extending the life of the site material. Mr. Bates stated that the original shingles were terrible and the new shingles would be straight-line. Most of the building had been replaced over the years, and no one would look at the sides or the back. Councilor Kennedy thought plastic shingles would look strange and asked if the front shingles would be natural. Mr. Bates said they would be painted shingles like they currently were.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

There was further discussion, and Councilor Kennedy asked if a motion could be made to only accept parts of the project and said she could make a motion to accept everything but the fake shingles because she preferred seeing wood shakes on the entire building. Mr. Rawling agreed. Councilor Kennedy felt that real shakes would preserve the integrity of the District and would promote the education and welfare for residents and tourists. A traditional look was the selling point for Portsmouth. She wanted to show a historical presence.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that, as far as preserving the integrity of the District, the Commission had the 'back of the building' rule, and the back and sides of the building were 100 feet from the highway and as far from the Historic District as any building in Portsmouth could be. The building was 30 years old and wasn't really historically significant. Conserving property values and maintaining the character of the District didn't come into play. He said the difference between historic cedar shingles was that the cedar that was used nowadays had a much shorter life than the historic cedar because it deteriorated quicker.

Chairman Almeida read the section in the Ordinance about partial approval and stipulations and concluded that if the Commission did grant a partial approve that evening, the applicant couldn't start work because the application would still be open. He suggested that it might be cleaner if the Commission just voted against the fake shingles.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:*

- 1. That the siding shingles for the entire building shall be cedar.*

*Mr. Rawling seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

Chairman Almeida requested that Consent Agenda Item 4 be separated from the other three items because he had to recuse himself from it. He then read the first three items into the record, asking if there was a need to remove any item for discussion.

Mr. Lombardi noted that in Petition #1, the sign's lighting pointed upward, and he asked whether moving the lights to the top of the band would improve the dark sky compliance. Mr. Wyckoff thought that signs with LED lights pointed downward were blinding. Mr. Melchior said that, from an architectural standpoint, lights should not point downward.

Chairman Almeida read Consent Agenda Items #1, #2 and #3 into the record.

1. Petition of **Peter H. Jarvis and Sons, LLC and Simeon P. Jarvis Revocable Trust 1999, owners**, for property located at **1 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate and replace signage lighting) as per

plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 14 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

2. Petition of **Eric G. Gustafson Revocable Trust, owner**, for property located at **145-147 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install outside condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 3 and lies within the CD4-L and Historic Districts.

3. Petition of **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, of property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to amend previous approval (lighting manufacturer, awning dimensions, vent and rail designs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD4 and the Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida asked if any members of the public wished to speak to the petition, but no one rose to speak, so he closed the public hearing. He then asked for a motion.

*Mr. Lombardi made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Consent Agenda Items #1, #2, and #3 as presented. Mr. Melchior seconded.*

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

4. Petition of **10 State Street, LLC**, owner of property located at **10 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to amend previous approval (add windows inadvertently removed at a previous work session) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 4 and lies within the CD4 and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself and Vice-Chair Gladhill took his place. Vice-Chair Gladhill read the petition in the record and asked for a motion.

*Mr. Rawling made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Consent Agenda Item #4 as presented. Mr. Melchior seconded.*

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0*

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Timothy J. Andrews and Sarah Ann Raboin**, owners, for property located at **647 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add window, restore windows, replace decking, add shutters) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 31 and lies within the GRA and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Mr. Timothy Andrews was present to speak to the petition and showed various views and exhibits of his project. He mentioned that he had added a new window.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what the existing siding material was. Mr. Andrews said it was asbestos. Mr. Wyckoff noted that the asbestos siding had been placed over the window casings and went over the casings and up against the storm windows, and he asked if the intent was to install the window with the casing so that it would be covered up. Mr. Andrews said he would take off all the asbestos siding when he had the money to do so. Mr. Wyckoff asked if he would put a storm window. Mr. Andrews said he wouldn't because it was a new insulated window. He said he would replace all the current storm windows, which were mostly aluminum except for one.

Mr. Lombardi asked if the storm windows overlapped the window frame, and Mr. Andrews discussed two ways to install the product. Mr. Lombardi noted that some windows fit within the frame of the window in the recess in the wooden frame but were more expensive. Mr. Rawling thought the size of the window frames on the storms was very heavy and would stand out from the house. Mr. Wyckoff said the problem was that there was no cross-section of the window. Chairman Almeida said a specification would help. Mr. Wyckoff noted that the Larson Bronze Series triple-track double hung windows were in one space, and the other space showed a double-track window, so he felt that screening would have to be placed in the double-track. Mr. Andrews said he would switch from the triple-track to the double-track due to the lower profile.

Chairman Almeida said it looked like there was a restoration of all the current window sashes. It was a prominent house in an important area, and the storm windows had had the sashes preserved for over 50 years. Mr. Wyckoff agreed but said the specs were for the triple-track windows and Mr. Andrews wanted the double-track. Mr. Andrews said he preferred the double-track but could do the triple-track. In terms of efficiency and based on his research, an original window properly restored could be as efficient as a replacement window, but without the storm he wouldn't get the efficiency, so he would replace the storms and then do the replacement windows from behind. Mr. Rawling thought it was a suitable substitution. Councilor Kennedy said she would support the storm windows with the stipulation that the inner windows be restored to period. Mr. Lombardi was concerned that storms would not be appropriate when the siding was done. Mr. Andrews said the storms were secured to the original window and the new ones would be secured in the same location. Mr. Lombardi suggested ones that fit within the frame of the window. Mr. Wyckoff said Mr. Andrews had aluminum triple-track storms and was replacing them in kind, so there shouldn't be a problem.

Mr. Andrews then discussed the three decks and said he would replace them with composite. Mr. Wyckoff thought composite was inappropriate for a historic building and was concerned about the fasteners. Mr. Rawling said the Commission preferred a painted or weathered finish and not something that looked new. Mr. Andrews said it would be seaside gray. Chairman Almeida thought mahogany would work better and preferred not to see composite decking put down randomly, feeling it should be done right the first time. The Commission only approved composite decking on a new building, never on a historic home. Councilor Kennedy agreed that mahogany would be more durable. Mr. Melchior stated that composite was one of the worst products and preferred hardwood or mahogany because it was more durable.

Mr. Andrews spoke about the roof and said the previous owner replaced 2/3 of it, so he wanted to replace the rest with a product that matched.

Mr. Andrews asked if he could remove the shutters from the application because he wanted to do wood shutters, but there were 40 windows, and he felt that his proposed product was inappropriate. He also offered to remove the decking from the application, saying his main goal was to get the windows approved. Councilor Kennedy asked him if he would consider a wood product for the decking, and Mr. Andrews agreed, so she thought they could make it a stipulation. Chairman Almeida said it would have to be done identical, in wood with the same design, but that it should probably be improved. Mr. Andrews said he was willing to do mahogany. Mr. Rawling stated that he preferred Option #1 for the new window but suggested that it be modified from 6/6 to 3/3 because it didn't relate proportionally and would match the other window. Chairman Almeida noted that it could be another stipulation.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That all the decking shall be mahogany;*
- 2) That the existing storm windows shall be replaced with triple track, double hung storm windows;*
- 3) That the new window proposed on the rear façade shall have a 3/3 grid pattern;*
- 4) That the proposed shutters shall be removed from the application.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy stated that the application met the historical character of the District.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

2. Petition of **Robert and Charlotte Holster**, owners, for property located at **46 Livermore Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (new exterior stairs, condenser, change roofing material, change window & door manufacturer, add generator) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 21 and lies within the GRB and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture, his associate Ms. Sarah Howard, and the owner Mr. Robert Holster were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry stated that they would describe five modifications to the approved plan: 1) changing the configuration of the exterior stair, 2) adding a condenser unit and pad, 3) changing the roofing material of the carriage house, 4) changing the window and door manufacturer, and 5), adding a generator on the site. He stated that the generator wouldn't be visible to the public, and that the biggest change was the curved stairway. He felt that the new configuration was more appropriate and efficient. All roofing materials would be the same, and the metal roof on the porch would go away due to long-term maintenance and durability issues. The windows and doors were originally Marvin, but due to the all-wood request rather than clad material, the owner Mr. Holster agreed to change them. They found that Lepage windows were a better choice because they were solid mahogany. The sash and frame dimensions were larger and the window was a higher-quality window. Mr. McHenry also discussed the condenser and the generator systems and said they would be away from the house and out of view.

Councilor Kennedy asked what the original roof on the carriage house was. Mr. McHenry said it was asphalt shingle. She asked Mr. McHenry if he had considered condenser units that could be placed inside the house, and Mr. McHenry explained why it would work with the system in place. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked if tests had been done on the generator for the Ordinance noise requirement. Mr. McHenry replied that the decibels were not specified and there was a limit from a certain distance to the property line. They could only specify the most quiet and efficient system available. Chairman Almeida noted that the specifications stated the generator was the quietest one that General Electric made. He asked whether Mr. McHenry intended to put the drip edge in copper, and Mr. McHenry agreed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That the drip edge at the roofline shall be copper.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy said she believed that the changes would preserve the integrity of the District, enhance the property, and maintain the special character of the District.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

3. Petition of **John Breneman**, owner of property located at **11 Market Street, #3**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to existing structure (add dormer, deck to 3rd floor addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 13-3 and lies within the CD5 and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Mr. John Breneman and the designer Ms. Michelle Shields were present to speak to the petition. Chairman Almeida asked about the doors and windows. Mr. Breneman stated that the double hung window was fine as it was but thought they could do a simulated double hung that would open and perhaps would improve safety considerations. Mr. Rawling asked the trim color for the paired windows at the top of the building. Mr. Breneman said they were green and said they would match existing. Mr. Rawling said that the mulling strip was sometimes done the same color as the window's trim rather than the color of the sash. Ms. Shields said they were two distinct units with exterior trim. Councilor Kennedy what the windows currently were. Ms. Shields said they were double hung with wood on the inside and clad exterior, and that they weren't egress windows but were safer and had better ventilation. .

Vice-Chair Gladhill mentioned a proposal the Commission had seen in which the deck went beyond the roofline. Mr. Breneman said they could change it. Mr. Wyckoff said it wasn't a concern for him because it would only be seen sideways. Mr. Breneman said the addition was only visible from some isolated locations. Councilor Kennedy asked if there was anything on the front of the building or on the roof that would be changed, and Mr. Breneman stated that there wasn't. Chairman Almeida thought it would be well hidden.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was historically-significant building and that the integrity of the District would be preserved.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

4. Petition of **Edward Benway**, owner of property located at **303 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (dormers, side roofs, balconies, 2nd floor addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 11 and lies within the GRC and the Historic Districts.

Mr. Brandon Holben and Mr. Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architecture were present to speak to the petition. They requested a Work Session before the Public Hearing, which was allowed.

WORK SESSION

Mr. Holben discussed the deck rail, the rear deck addition, the dormers, and the setbacks. He showed context views and images of the dormers and decorative baluster treatments, Oriel bay windows, streetscapes and elevations. He said a massing studies series had been done as well as an Islington Street dormer study. He pointed out that they went from two balustrades over the entry to one decorative balustrade, and they wanted to utilize one bracket instead of two. Mr. Holben also discussed the double hung windows, which were the standard size window for the building. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the height of the balustrade over the main entry was, and Mr. Holben said it was 3 feet. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the setback and lot line, and Mr. Holben said they had received a variance. Mr. Holben then discussed the projection of the parapet and railings. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether it would drain internally, and Mr. Holben said it would. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the scuppers. Mr. Holben said they were copper and would only be used in emergencies. Mr. Holben discussed the front and side elevations, and the dormers. Councilor Kennedy said that she couldn't approve the project due to all the dormers, so the dormers were further discussed, as well as other aspects of the project. Chairman Almeida asked if the width of the clapboards on the addition could be doubled. Mr. Holben said it would depend on the fluctuation of the existing siding.

Councilor Kennedy asked what they were taking away. Mr. Holben said the new windows on the addition's rear elevation and the gable and the brackets. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked about the ornament on the dormer and was told that one of the removed brackets would go on the dormer. Mr. Wyckoff thought the ell surrounded what was visible. There was more discussion of dormers and whether they belonged on the building or not. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he preferred all synthetic slate instead of a combination of synthetic slate and artificial shingles. Chairman Almeida said there was no other slate on Islington Street. Mr. Rawling said he was okay with what was proposed except for the dormers and the oversized porch roof.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the portico had a flat roof, and Mr. Holben said it was a sloping one. Mr. Wyckoff said they created the 36" tall safety rail and did not change a window opening, so someone could open the window and walk out on the roof. He suggested that they just call it a decorative trim and not a balcony rail. He also suggested an interior guard. He thought it was a good design and appropriate for the building style.

Chairman Almeida asked if they wanted to go into the public hearing. Mr. Holben thought they might need stipulations about the Islington Street side and the dormers. Chairman Almeida felt that there was a lot on Islington Street that wasn't right. Mr. Wyckoff didn't think they had to be rigid about Islington Street because they had to allow some leeway and the additions were not game-changers. He thought people wouldn't make the effort to do renovations because they would be paranoid. The Commission wanted to see the buildings improved as well as possible and had to compromise. Mr. Lombardi thought Islington Street was a mish-mash but was important, but he didn't see a precedent for a front dormer on the house and preferred that the façade look like it did originally. Mr. Melchior stated that there was no precedent on Islington

Street and that the entire street had been changed. It used to have trees, lawns, gates, and so on, but the street was allowed to be let go, and he questioned why they were arguing about a dormer.

There was no public comment, so Chairman Almeida moved the work session into a public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Holben made his formal presentation, saying that dormers were proposed on Rockingham Street on the rear of the building, with a rear addition. The Islington Street façade would be left as it was, but with no dormer or railing as shown in the package.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said he was glad to hear that the dormer would be removed. He reminded the Commission that they were getting ready for the final revisions on 275 Islington Street, and he thought it would help the Board for a project of that magnitude to see the building with what was about to be approved. It would be taken into view and context and would set a precedent.

With no one else rising, Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That the Islington Street façade shall remain as is.*

Mr. Melchior seconded.

Mr. Wyckoff said it was a quality addition that preserved the integrity of the District and lifted up the area. The conservation enhancement of property values would be helped. To say it would be consistent with the special and defining characters of surrounding properties was a bit difficult due to the new development at the Port City Traders, but because the applicant had maintained all the Italianate details and was using them on the dormers, it kept it in relationship to historical and architectural values. The addition on the back was true to its age, and he felt that its location on the third floor made sense.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

5. Petition of **Katie and Jason Jenkins**, owners of property located at **35 Mark Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (dormers on Mark

St elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 50 and lies within the CD4-L and the Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself and Vice-Chair Gladhill to his place.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios representing the owners was present to speak to the petition. She stated that two dormers were added to the attached garage structure. Mark Street was residential and made up of rebuilt homes or remodeled duplexes. The purpose for the dormers was to improve the living space above the garage, and the double dormer would allow for a slight rebuild of the interior stair and also allow headroom. The siding would match the claps, and the roofing would also match. A proposed window would be different, an Eagle clad window with simulated divided light, and would match the master plan for the main house.

Councilor Kennedy noted that the window were currently wood and would go to clad. Ms. Ramsey said they were wood windows with a white storm sash and would be the only windows facing the main street. Councilor Kennedy asked how the current windows on the house looked. Ms. Ramsey said they were a mish-mash and would be replaced. Councilor Kennedy said she had a hard time with clad windows when all the windows were currently wooden.

Mr. Rawling thought the garage was a predominant element as someone entered the streetscape and felt that it was too heavy for the garage. He didn't think the dormers were proportional and that they overwhelmed the streetscape. Ms. Ramsey said they were matching a window pattern on the side of the garage and also wanted to make the space functional, and there was also the headroom issue. Mr. Lombardi thought it looked heavy, due to the dormer that went up to the ridge of the roof, and preferred to see it more in proportion to the garage because it was on a prominent structure. Ms. Ramsey said if they lessened the pitch so it didn't reach the ridge, it would look flat and less appropriate. Mr. Wyckoff thought if they dropped the ridge of the dormers down a foot, the windows would be a bit smaller and would not match the side windows. Mr. Rawling said matching everything didn't necessarily mean a good design.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Mr. Melchior seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was a nice design and that the dormers were appropriately sized. The second floor would be used, so it dictated the size of the dormers. The design didn't take away from the little building. It would preserve the integrity of the District, enhance property values, and maintain the special character of the District.

Councilor Kennedy stated that she could not support it due to the windows. She agreed that the dormers were heavy and overpowered the barn. She thought the building was still considered a barn. Mr. Wyckoff argued that the windows were 2002 Brosco ones and had an energy panel held in place by clips. He felt that on a 2002 garage, replacing the windows would be the best thing. Councilor Kennedy said she would have preferred to have the work session on the barn and house combined, so she was concerned that it could set a precedent for the house.

*The motion to grant the Certificate of Approval **failed to pass** by a vote of 4-2, with Mr. Rawling, Councilor Kennedy, Mr. Lombardi, and Vice-Chair Gladhill against the approval, and Mr. Melchior and Mr. Wyckoff for the approval. The motion failed for the following reasons:*

- 1) Given that the garage was considered a prominent element of the streetscape, the Commission felt that the dormers were too large and too heavy for the structure and as a result, overwhelmed the garage and the streetscape.*
- 2) The Commission also felt that approval of this application would have implications for other proposals on the site currently being considered under a work session by HDC.*

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Katie and Jason Jenkins** owners, property located at **35 Mark Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (to remove porch, roofing, increase ridge, construct new 1 story addition, replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 50 and lies within CD4-L and Historic Districts.

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios and the owner Mr. Jason Jenkins were present to speak to the petition.

Councilor Kennedy asked how many windows would be added. Ms. Ramsey said they would add two windows, and the others would be replaced with more efficient ones. Mr. Wyckoff thought the windows on the front of the original house were historic 6/6 windows and that they should not be changed. He was also concerned about the front elevation. He discussed how it was a mistake when the addition on the left-hand side of the front was built in the same line as the original and felt that Ms. Ramsey shouldn't work off of it. He asked if the roof could be lowered to make it subordinate to the original house, and he also felt that building an addition on a Colonial home that continued the ridge out was acceptable. Ms. Ramsey said they could make it work if $\frac{3}{4}$ " of a ridge change was acceptable. Mr. Rawling agreed with Mr. Wyckoff.

Mr. Rawling asked about the front door and how old it was. Ms. Ramsey said it was wood plank but didn't know its age. Councilor Kennedy asked how old the addition was. Ms. Ramsey didn't know but said the one-story piece added on could have been a shed-like structure because the addition on the main house pitched away from it. Councilor Kennedy said she'd like to know the history because it would help her make some decisions. She agreed with Mr. Wyckoff and Mr. Rawling that the Colonial needed to be preserved. She also questioned the 6/6 windows on the front of the house. Mr. Wyckoff hoped Ms. Ramsey could come up with other ideas for the

roofline. Ms. Ramsey mentioned the sketch that Mr. Rawling had done and asked if the Commissioners agreed with it. They seemed to like it. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked that original windows be preserved and also discussed Lepage windows.

Condensers and their location were discussed. Ms. Ramsey thought a stairway could be omitted and the space used for the condenser. Ms. Berna said she would check with the Building Inspection Department. Mr. Wyckoff asked about an egress window. Ms. Ramsey said the new windows were egress ones.

Ms. Ramsey stated that she'd like a public hearing in February and would combine the two applications as one.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to have a **work session/public hearing** in February.*

B. Work Session requested by **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market Street**, wherein permission requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar panels) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor's Plan as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business A and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the December meeting).*

This item was postponed to the February 2015 meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*At 10:20 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on February 4, 2015.