

**MEETING OF
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

November 4, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members John Wyckoff, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi; Alternates Richard Shea and John Mayer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Dan Rawling, City Council Representative Esther Kennedy

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. October 7, 2015
- B. October 14, 2015

*The motion to approve the October 7 and October 14, 2015 minutes as amended **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

Chairman Almeida requested taking up Section V at this point in the meeting.

V. WINDOWS DEMONSTRATION – WINDOW REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Andrew Keeffe from Green Mountain Window went through the history of the company, noting that they focused their designs on the New England look. He described their Milestone Series product line that mimicked the old-fashioned double hung window but had all the modern conveniences. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the exterior was, and Mr. Keeffe said it was prefinished wood. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked about the cost comparison between the true divided light (TDL) window and the Milestone Series and also asked about the energy efficiency of both. Mr. Keeffe replied that the TDL window was more expensive and that both series had the same energy rating, which he further explained. In response to other questions, Mr. Keeffe stated that the jamb liners would also be painted on the exterior if the unit was painted dark, that the life expectancy of the insulated glass was 30 years, and that they had four standard sizes that could be customize and 14 different muntin widths. The rails were also discussed.

Mr. Keeffe then discussed the Classic Series, which he said had the same look but a visible vinyl strap and was less expensive, and he noted that they also made an insert replacement window. They made casements and patio doors and a small window called the Egress Double Hung style

window. Mr. Keeffe showed samples of his windows and gave contact information and a brochure to the Commission.

Mr. Peter Neuffer from LePage Millwork stated that his company made wood windows and sold them through distributors. He noted that his company had done several seacoast projects and was starting to work primarily with mahogany because the life cycle of the window was much longer, albeit more expensive. They offered aluminum clad exteriors and wooden exteriors and different muntin bars. They also did a lead muntin bar, which he showed to the Commission. He noted that a lot of their work was in landmark-designated districts like Manhattan and Beacon Hill, where profiles of muntin bars, sills and casings were important.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Neuffer if his company did leaded muntins in diamond patterns, and Mr. Neuffer replied that they did and explained how. He noted that the jamb liners were painted the same color as the window and had half screens that went where the bottom sash was. He showed the Commission a mahogany window with aluminum clad sashes that looked like wood.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 65 Washington Street (aka 43 Atkinson Street, postponed from October 7, 2015 meeting)

Mr. Cracknell stated that the applicant was seeking approval for a 6-ft wooden fence with a 20-ft section on Atkinson Street. He said the Commission had prior concerns about the historical precedent for the fence and whether the height was warranted. Mr. Cracknell noted that the applicant Mr. Rodney Rowland was not present but said he received a photo from him of a solid fence. Ms. Ruedig asked whether there was information about where the original fence had come from, and Mr. Cracknell said there was not. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked what the fence's height was, and Mr. Cracknell said it was between 4 and 4-1/2 feet and that its purpose was functional. Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that Strawberry Banke had been installing several board fences recently and he asked if there was a better alternative. Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant made their living in preserving history, so he was comfortable taking their word for it. Chairman Almeida noted that the view of the house foundation would be lost and suggested a combination of both designs to leave some openness. He asked whether the applicant was willing to return, and Mr. Cracknell replied that he was.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill a motion to **continue** the Administrative Approval to the November 18, 2015 meeting, and Ms. Ruedig seconded it.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

Mr. Cracknell then read the descriptions for the following three new applications:

2. 195 Hanover Street
3. 11 Pickering Street
4. 401 State Street

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **approve** Administrative Approvals #2, #3, and #4 as presented, and Mr. Shea seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the three applications were all minor ones.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

III. REQUEST FOR RE-HEARING – 18 Manning Street, submitted by Judith Hiller and John Wilkens

Mr. Shea recused himself from the vote.

Mr. Cracknell stated that Ms. Hiller submitted a new list of other projects that she believed had precedent or similar circumstance warranting reconsideration for a full screen. Ms. Ruedig said she felt that the recent package sent to the Commission was the same list of examples as the previous time. Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that he did not believe the Commission made a technical error because they followed their criteria, and he also didn't think any new material or evidence was submitted to support a full screen. He said the locations were discussed in previous public hearings and felt that the Commission had sufficiently explained their reasoning.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **deny** the request. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill reiterated that the Commission had not made any technical errors in their discussion and had had various public hearings during the past year. He said that the examples presented had already been discussed and there was no new evidence.

*The motion to **deny** the rehearing request **passed** by a unanimous (6-0) vote.*

IV. REQUEST FOR ONE YEAR EXTENSION – request of one year extension of the Certificate of Approval for 39 Puddle Lane, granted on November 5, 2014 – submitted by Strawberry Banke, Inc.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the one-year extension, and Ms. Ruedig seconded it.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the extension was something that the Commission usually did, and he saw no reason to hold back the project. Ms. Ruedig stated that the applicant gave their reasoning, which was that the funding did not presently exist, and she felt that it was sufficient.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

V. WINDOWS DEMONSTRATION – WINDOW REPRESENTATIVES

(See page 1).

VI. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)

A. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Joseph J. and Jennifer Almeida, owners**, for property located at **103/105 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (modify front elevation by adding a storefront, with access stairs and landing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 22 and lies within the CD4-L, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **postpone** the application to the November 18, 2015 meeting, and Mr. Lombardi seconded them motion.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Martin F. Kurowski and Cristina Galli, owners**, for property located at **111 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace wood trim with composite material, remove and replace two basement windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 53 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Ms. Cristina Galli was present to speak to the petition. Mr. Cracknell reviewed the application's history and said it was a retroactive approval of a material change from wood to AZEK. Mr. Shea asked whether the AZEK was painted, and Ms. Galli said it was not. Ms. Reagan verified that it wasn't in the front of the house. Ms. Galli stated that she replaced the trim around the windows a few times but they continued to cause leaks inside the house. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked Ms. Galli whether she was amenable to painting the AZEK, but Ms. Galli said she didn't think it needed to be painted and that she didn't want to repaint every two years.

The Commission then addressed Consent Agenda Items #2 and #3.

2. Petition of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (changes in material of a patio enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department.

Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

3. Petition of **233 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **233 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install free standing sign) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 14 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Chairman Almeida asked for a motion for all three petitions.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the three petitions as presented, and Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the petitions would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its character.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

4. Petition of **Cathy G. Barnhorst, owner**, for property located at **24 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace ten windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 24 and lies within the CD-5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owners Ms. Cathy Barnhorst and Mr. Steve Barnhorst were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Barnhorst described the Marvin Integrity double hung windows and said he wanted approval for SDL windows with bars for a 2/2 vertical windows instead of the existing 6/6 ones.

Chairman Almeida said he thought it was appropriate, noting that historic photos of Market Street showed all 2/2 windows. Ms. Ruedig agreed, saying that either would be appropriate for the building because it was old enough for a 6/6 window but also had evidence of a historic 2/2 window. Mr. Barnhorst said he would eliminate the storm windows and put up half screens. Chairman Almeida asked for details on how the new window would sit within the opening and also asked about the moldings. Mr. Barnhorst said he didn't know about the moldings but knew that they had worked within the existing rough openings. Chairman Almeida asked for clarification that the existing details would not be removed and that the window would be trimmed out the same way, and Mr. Barnhorst agreed. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that the original application showed no spacer bar between the muntins, and Mr. Barnhorst stated that they would

put in spacer bars. Mr. Shea asked about the thickness of the new frame going within the old frame. Mr. Barnhorst said he would consider only the sash replacement.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Barnhorst if he wanted more time to review the discussed options, but Mr. Barnhorst said he wanted to proceed with the window approval and would return if there was a better solution. Mr. Cracknell noted that, once the application was approved, Mr. Barnhorst could come back in a week and request the substitution.

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 as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That the window details will match the existing profile and plane of the existing windows.*
- 2) That a spacer bar shall be used as presented.*
- 3) That a half screen shall be used as presented.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant installed the windows 30 years ago, so they had no historical character, but the applicant would continue the special character of the District and complement its architecture. Mr. Wyckoff said the removal of the aluminum storm windows was important as well as painting the exterior trim, so he fully supported the application.

Mr. Lombardi and Mr. Shea stated that they preferred sash replacements and encouraged the applicant to look into it. Ms. Ruedig stated that she approved it, despite the replacement unit possibly not being the best solution, because the windows were enormous, and she said that as much as possible should be done to save the existing trim and expose the glass. She also recommended that the sash window be used if the replacement unit was not successful.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

5. Petition of **Middle Street Baptist Church, owner**, for property located at **640 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, add two patio doors on rear elevation, relocate existing rear door and window system, install replacement window in its place) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 20 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic District.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner and architect Ms. Lisa DeStefano stated that she had done additional research and requested a work session to present her findings.

WORK SESSION

Ms. DeStefano introduced her husband Mr. Richard Cyr and said they would restore the sashes and replace the storms. Mr. Cyr discussed his research, noting that the windows were in good shape and the combination of restoration with the storms was a good solution. He discussed clad versus wood, sash replacements, and so on. Ms. DeStefano reviewed the windows and showed photos, and she discussed which windows would be removed, some of which would be replaced with doors. She noted that the Dutch door would be relocated to its original location and an ell window would be put in its place. There was further discussion between the applicants and the Commission. They then went into the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. DeStefano gave an abridged version of the work session.

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

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That the plans (including the window restoration and wood storm windows) presented on 11-4-15 and date stamped 11-4-15 shall represent the items reflected in this approval.*

Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig stated that it was an excellent example of retaining the integrity of the house and using existing materials to replace areas. She said that any changes to the rear, the additions of the doors, and so on were all in keeping with the style of the house and would preserve its value as well as increase the surrounding neighborhood value. She added that it was a wonderful example of utilizing the Commission's criteria.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

6. Petition **David A. Sinclair and Nicole J. Giusto, owners**, for property located at **765 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing along front and sides of property) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 37 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic District.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Mr. David Sinclair and the builder Mr. Steven Hunt were present to speak to the application. Mr. Sinclair explained to the Commission how the fence would look.

Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Sinclair whether the fence was six feet, but Mr. Sinclair said the total height was eight feet. Vice-Chair Gladhill noted the examples of other fences that Mr. Sinclair submitted but said the big difference was that Mr. Sinclair would cover the front façade of his house, which would be detrimental to the District's esthetics because the most important side of the house would not be seen. He also noted that the house was on a major thoroughfare and felt that a fence that blocked the front façade was not appropriate. Mr. Sinclair passed around a photo showing how much of the house would be seen.

Chairman Almeida said he considered the Lincoln Street side the dominant side, and Mr. Sinclair replied that the fence was on the longer side and that the Lincoln side had the fence's detail. Mr. Shea said that an 8-ft fence seemed high and asked Mr. Sinclair if he could place the fence to the side or set it back so that the front of the home could be seen. Ms. Ruedig said the issue was not so much the visibility of the house but rather a wall along Middle Street. She suggested a total height of six feet with balusters on top to soften the fence. Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Sinclair whether he would consider a 75" tall fence, like the one at 647 Middle Street. Mr. Sinclair agreed and asked whether it should be solid board. Ms. Ruedig suggested a shorter gate. Mr. Sinclair asked whether he could install a board fence on the side yard and cut it into the house. Mr. Shea replied that there was a precedent for side yards to be private on Middle Street and felt that a smaller fence on the front would be appropriate at a maximum of six feet. Mr. Mayer asked what the existing fences on the back of the property were, and Mr. Sinclair said they were 6-ft chain link and stockade fences and would remain.

Chairman Almeida stated that further discussion was needed and encouraged Mr. Sinclair to reconsider aspects of the fence and return for the next meeting.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Ms. Robin McLean stated that she lived in the neighborhood and agreed that an 8-ft fence would be offensive and felt that the front of the house needed to be seen.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **continue** the application to the November 18, 2015 meeting, and Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

7. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Brick Act, LLC, owner**, for property located at **102 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct shed dormer addition, construct one and two story additions at rear of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

WORK SESSION

The architect Ms. Anne Whitney and the owner Ms. Karen Bouffard were present to speak to the application. Ms. Whitney gave additional material to the Commission and discussed the changes, which included wood shingles, a gate, and a bay window that would be five feet instead of four feet. She discussed whether the singles should be done in cedar or asphalt and also reviewed the rake detail, the drip edge, and the windows. She then requested a public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Whitney summarized her petition, saying that the project was an addition to the rear of the existing structure and that it would include a shed dormer on the rear and two one-story additions with shed roofs that would bracket the addition. She also noted items such as clapboards, copper gutters, a gate on Market Street, and metal roofs.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked whether the metal roof was only on the one-story addition, and Ms. Whitney said that the roof on the existing structure would be cedar, but the roofs on the dormer, one-story and two-story additions would be metal. She also said that it would be a neutral dark color. Chairman Almeida asked whether the foundation would be hand-dug, and Ms. Whitney said they would be able to get equipment into a narrow alley. Mr. Lombardi asked whether the one-story addition on State Street would have light coming into it, and Ms. Whitney said it would not because most of it was up against the building.

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

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The proposed improvements shall be as revised (as shown on plans date stamped 11-04-15) and presented at the meeting.*
- 2) The shed roofs and the roof of the two story addition shall be painted metal in a natural, dark bronze color with a matte finish.*
- 3) The rear portion of the historic structure shall have cedar shingles.*
- 4) Half screens shall be used.*

Mr. Mayer seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the addition would preserve the integrity of the District and complement and enhance its historic character. He said it would be in keeping with the cedar shingles on the roof by having a metal roof that looked like copper. It would maintain the special character of the District by complementing the existing structure.

Chairman Almeida said he appreciated that the addition had its own identity and would not overwhelm the historic building.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

8. Petition of **Timothy K. Sheppard, owner**, for property located at **54/58 Ceres Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install two condensing units on shed roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 44 and lies within the CD4, Waterfront Industrial, and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Mr. Tim Sheppard was present to speak to the petition and stated that he would install one unit on the back of the building where it would be less visible, and he noted that he would be able to go through the wall with the wiring.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked if the skinny side of the unit would be seen, and Mr. Sheppard said he hoped it would. Chairman Almeida asked about the supporting frame, and Mr. Sheppard said it would be on the roof and kept away from the building. Ms. Ruedig asked how far up from the edge of the roof it would be, and Mr. Sheppard said it would be behind the main building. Mr. Cracknell asked how many inches it would be back from the corner, and Mr. Sheppard said it would be at least six inches away. Mr. Mayer asked whether a screen would be appropriate, but Mr. Sheppard said a screen would be a hindrance, which Chairman Almeida agreed with.

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

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That the side of the HVAC unit shall be recessed at least 6 inches from the side of the building.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project would preserve the integrity of the District and would not be seen from Ceres Street. It would be compatible with innovative technology.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

9. Petition of **Wright Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **67-77 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc.

changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 18 and lies within the CD5 and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios was present to speak to the petition and stated that she was changing four or five features of the building, which included changing the railing material from wrought iron to powder-coated black metal, the dormer condition of the roof, and adding more details to the copper bay. She discussed, among other things, a window removal, a gutter addition and downspouts, and header details on the windows. She noted that the same conditions applied to the State Street elevation.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked the reason for the change from the wrought iron, and Ms. Ramsey said they had to go to powder coating so that the two metals would not touch. He asked if it was possible to change the other metal, and Ms. Ramsey said it was not. Mr. Mayer asked about the rail balusters, and Ms. Ramsey said the profiles would stay the same and explained why. Mr. Shea asked why Ms. Ramsey would retain the finial detail if she was converting to a simulated material, and Ms. Ramsey said she felt it was important to keep the detail. Chairman Almeida asked Ms. Ramsey to elaborate on the rail system gauge. Ms. Ramsey said it was a heavy gauge steel and welded together.

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, with the following stipulation:*

- 1) *That the proposed railing system shall be a custom, heavy-gauge welded rail system.*

Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the project would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character and that it would complement and enhance surrounding architecture.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

10. Petition of **143 Daniel Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **143 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc. changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 19 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Ms. Carla Goodnight of CJ Architects and Mr. Steve Wilson were present to speak to the application. Ms. Goodnight distributed a supplement regarding the railing and then reviewed her petition. She discussed the addition of the generator location, the relocated mechanical equipment, the copper flashing and drip edge, new windows on the south elevation, revised railings that were changed from open to solid panels, and doors that were not shown before. She described the railing design and also showed a rendering sketch of a design adding a detail that was on the original Army/Navy Building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the plumbing material in Option B. Mr. Wilson replied that Option A was a simple round pipe rail with a square picket, while Option B was the embellished one that utilized the same parts. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the finials were, and Mr. Wilson said they were made out of iron. Mr. Shea asked why the balconies had been changed to an enclosed panel system, and Ms. Goodnight replied that the Commission previously said they preferred a buffer screen for items left out on the porches. She added that it also provided privacy. Ms. Ruedig said she felt that the solid board was more appropriate for the location. She also noted that the generator originally seemed that it was in the middle of an exposed area but there was now a revised brick wall. Ms. Goodnight replied that there was a half wall instead of an open rail to provide additional screening, and there were proposed planter boxes on either side. She added that it would be accessed by a door that was used for all the units.

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

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the additions would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character. By taking an element of the original Army/Navy Building and including it as part of the new additions, it would also assess the historic significance of that building and use it to enhance the architectural and historic character of the new building.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

IX. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 9:40 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on December 2, 2015.