

**MEETING OF
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

6:30 p.m.

**March 2, 2016
to be reconvened on March 9, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members Jon Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternates Richard Shea and John Mayer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chairman Joseph Almeida

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
Chairman Almeida was absent, and Vice-Chair Gladhill assumed his seat.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

A. 687 Middle Street (*Request to postpone to the March 9, 2016 meeting.*)

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **postpone** the petition to the March 9, 2016 meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

B. 275 Islington Street

Mr. Shea recused himself from the petition.

The architect Wendy Welton on behalf of the applicant stated that they made several changes to the petition and reviewed them.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Ms. Welton if she was specifying a 16"x20" green awning window. Ms. Welton agreed and said it would match the other window. She said the other changes to the exterior trim were minor, and she discussed alignment problems in more detail.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the tabulature issues didn't address the Commission's previous comments. Ms. Welton said the tabulature above the columns didn't come out far enough, so they were padding it out to bring it in alignment with the column shaft.

Mr. Rawling noted that the building's rear elevations on the new layout had discrepancies from what was previously requested by the Commission. Ms. Welton said that the model didn't

actually reflect that particular section. Mr. Rawling said the Commission would not approve anything above the requested elevation.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the window and rooflines on the rear elevation weren't even close and also thought that every floor was different. Ms. Welton stated that the 3D model they were using was sensitive but said she would review them.

Mr. Cracknell said the Commission could remove the requested elevations from consideration and do only the items on the front page. They would need a condition on the approval that the revised drawings would get submitted with the correct elevations.

Mr. Rawling referred to the approved front elevation, saying it had an unusual relationship with the tabulature and columns for the right side entrance. The pediment had no projections and needed an overhang on it. He also noted that the return on the elevation on the side street had shown a canopy over that projection, but there was nothing in the as-built conditions.

Mr. Wyckoff further discussed the rear elevation, noting that the columns were out further than the supporting deck and that the decking would have to be padded out.

Mr. Cracknell suggested that two stipulations be included in the motion, which he described.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Administrative Approval with the following stipulations:*

- 1) that the proposed elevations as submitted were not representative of the changes requested;*
- 2) that the plan shall not be provided to the site contractor in order to avoid someone coming back to the Commission with more changes, as presented.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the changes were minor differences between the approved and the as-built and still preserved the integrity of the District and maintained its special character.

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

C. 7-9-15 Pickering Avenue

Mr. Shea resumed his seat.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the commercial property was in the Waterfront Business District and that the applicant wanted to replace the trim boards on some of the windows with Azek material.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the Azek would be painted once installed. Mr. Cracknell said that it would not but that he could recommend that it be field-painted. Ms. Ruedig asked that it be a stipulation. Mr. Rawling said contemporary material would be suitable for the new building.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Administrative Approval with the following stipulation:
1) That the new Azek shall be field painted.*

*Mr. Shea seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Walter W. and Patricia B. Bardenwerper, owners**, for property located at **69 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing with gates) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 40 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Walter Bardenwerper stated that he had a unique property that was abutted by the Wentworth Gardner and the Tobias Lear museums and he wanted to install a fence due to safety reasons because there was no visibility of oncoming cars. He said he chose a fence that was identical to a neighbor's fence. He gave the Commission a letter of support from the President of the Tobias Lear and Wentworth Gardner houses and also said the owners of Geno's Restaurant were in support. He said he was willing to replace the stockade fence between his property and the Tobias Lear property. He also said he would go before the Board of Adjustment to get a variance for the corner with the rounded edge.

Mr. Rawling suggested that the applicant have a slightly distinctive fence instead of a replica of a manufactured fence so that he could match the unique character of the other fences in the neighborhood. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a beaded edge on the top. Ms. Ruedig said she was okay with either adding a beading or keeping it simple because it would be a huge improvement to the house, and she felt that a consistent language of fences in the neighborhood was good.

Mr. Cracknell said that a 48" fence seemed tall for the neighborhood and suggested a 42" fence. Ms. Ruedig said she didn't know if stepping the fence down in the corner would help.

Mr. Shea asked whether the grade level was to the top of the wall. Mr. Bardenwerper said the wall was 14-16" from the pavement but that he could make it shorter. Mr. Mayer asked the applicant whether he would consider a solid fence, and Mr. Bardenwerper said there were three different fences surrounding the Wentworth Gardner property already.

Acting Chair Gladhill said he was concerned with the fence going up close to the corner because people walked in that neighborhood. He wanted to ensure that there were good sight lines for drivers to see the walkers. Mr. Bardenwerper said the Board of Adjustment would address it.

Mr. Lombardi said that the fence would be high if it sat above the stone wall and could be distracting to a person viewing a historic property, so he felt that a lower fence would be preferable. Mr. Bardenwerper said he would do a 42" fence.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That approval is given subject to receiving Board of Adjustment approval.*
- 2) The 3 ½" fascia board shall have a beaded edge as discussed.*
- 3) The front fence shall be reduced to 42" along the public way.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that 42 inches was a height required on condominiums for handrails, decks, etc., so it was not an unusual height. He said the fence would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character and the historical significance of the building. He noted that it had raised no red flags with the historic mansions next to it.

Acting Chair Gladhill verified that he received a letter from the Marconis, who said they wanted to ensure that the fence followed the stone wall.

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

2. Petition of **Tanner Bridge Development, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge 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 Plan126 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architects on behalf of the applicant stated that there were minor changes to the petition and introduced his staff member Jeremiah Johnson.

Mr. Johnson went through his presentation and summarized what was approved in June 2015 and what the changes were. The changes included the following:

- remove the center skylights;
- drop the entry down;
- clad the elevator shaft overrun in the same slate material and trim;
- add ventilation stacks;
- replace the Marvin Integrity window;
- replace the granite veneer on the rear and side elevations with stucco;
- install additional louvers;
- extend a wall due to the larger elevator shaft; and

- add a downspout and a gutter to mitigate rain from the rooftops.

Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Johnson why the skylights would be removed. Mr. Johnson said it was the builder's decision. Ms. Ruedig said the skylights were an important part of the design that gave a more contemporary feel to the building. She also noted a lot of other differences between the approved and proposed drawings, like differences in sizes of transom windows and deck and stair rail materials. Mr. Johnson attributed the differences to the drawing software.

Mr. Lombardi said the design of the square windows on the second floor seemed changed and that the window near the wall extension seemed crowded and not centered. Mr. Johnson emphasized that everything would match the approved drawings.

Mr. Wyckoff said it looked like all the windows in the proposed plan looked wider than the approved ones, but agreed that it could be a drawing software problem.

Mr. Cracknell recommended that the Commission consider a statement that the proposed elevations would not reflect reality and anything other than the noted changes and that, prior to a building permit issue, a revised set of drawings be submitted.

Mr. Shea said he agreed with Ms. Ruedig about the removed skylights. He asked about the ventilation stacks, and Mr. Johnson described them and said they would be painted to match. In answer to further questions from Mr. Shea, Mr. Johnson said the right-hand element on the building would be granite veneer steps with a recessed wood storefront and the column would be wrapped in granite. He said the reason for going from one material to another was because it was a utility alley with minimal public view.

Mr. Rawling said he was not in support of the granite change to stucco because of durability issues. He was also concerned about the storefronts. Mr. Johnson said the storefront design was not changed but the grade was slightly lower. Mr. Rawling said it was a significant change in the building design because of the way the building interacted with the streetfront, and that the only access to the building was through the glass doors and the corner. He said it was contrary to what was previously presented to the Commission and that the storefront feature was the only strength in a weak building. Mr. Johnson said the change was the lowering of the entry of the glass door front by a small amount.

Mr. Wyckoff said if the sidewalk wasn't graded properly and the building had to be changed because of it, he wouldn't be in support. He was also concerned that the drawings were the problem and that the Commission was not approving the drawings as presented. He said the store front was a problem and that he wished to remove the front facade from approval consideration and have the applicant return for a work session. He felt that the building would have two storefronts with a middle entry.

Ms. Ruedig asked what the window changes were. Mr. Johnson said Pella could match the detail of the approved Marvin window. Mr. Shea said it would make all the storefronts go up further and show more foundation. Mr. Johnson said the applicant had never indicated that there would be stairs that could be walked up, and he pointed out that there were no railings or clearance for

doors to open. Mr. Rawling said the Commission was presented with café tables and umbrellas, and Mr. Lombardi recalled discussing multiple openings and separate retail entrances.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how far back the storefront system was from the sidewalk. Mr. Johnson said it was about a foot and that there was no way to enter into the storefronts. Mr. Wyckoff said it would be two feet due to the 6” rises. He asked whether it was a storefront or not, and thought that the mini steps were deceiving and not what the Commission wanted.

The Commission decided to pull out that part of the application from consideration (Page 3, Item #2) and to continue with the rest of the building.

Mr. Lombardi addressed the stacks that stood out on top of the building and said he thought the rooftop utilities were supposed to be masked. Mr. Johnson said the stacks were more sizable than they intended. Mr. Wyckoff said they wouldn't be visible from the street.

Acting Chair Gladhill said that stucco would be fine on the back of the building but felt that granite veneer would be more appropriate for the two sides of the building. Mr. Mayer said he would have a problem approving the change to stucco on the back of the building because the stucco would not preserve the integrity of the building consistently.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Ed Carrier of 7 Islington Street said he was concerned about the vent that went up the side that adjoined the Buckminster House because it seemed to be in the vicinity of the decks of the residents. He was concerned about odors and asked whether the vents at the top could be moved away from the Buckminster House. He asked whether any sound or hum could come out of it. He said the building looked wider and closer to the Buckminster House. He asked for assurance that there would be no problems with blasting and drilling during the garage excavation.

Mr. Johnson said the excavation issues would be addressed and that the building width had not changed. He said they couldn't fit the vent shaft in the middle of the building and that it was just for the garage and would run only, if ever, when the carbon monoxide alarms went off.

Mr. Wyckoff noted discrepancies in the ventilation indications, and Mr. Johnson said all the stacks were grouped together.

No one else rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval with the exception of the front elevation and changes to the doors at the front of the building, and with the following stipulations:*

- 1) This approval is exclusively limited to item numbers: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 as noted on Sheet 1 dated March 2, 2016. The other items (1, 2 & 4) have been removed from this approval.*

- 2) *The proposed elevations do not represent the requested changes and are not approved as shown. Only the noted changes listed in 1) are approved and new elevations shall be submitted prior to issuance of the building permit in order to clearly reflect the approved items on the previously approved elevations.*

Ms. Ruedig asked that the skylights be removed from consideration.

Mr. Rawling asked how the Commission could clarify what got connected to the vents. Acting Chair Gladhill said it was out of the Commission's jurisdiction.

Mr. Wyckoff said he would amend his motion to include removing Items 1, 2 and 4 and approving Items 3 and 5 through 9.

Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the ventilation units in the center of the building were 18 inches higher than the roof and not offensive. He said that the rest of the changes were minor and maintained the character of the District. They were consistent with the special and defining characteristics of the property and of compatible design with surrounding properties.

Mr. Shea suggested that when the applicant returned, Item #2 for the lower center entry alignment could tie in to the front elevations below and could become fenestration instead of doors because of the grade.

The motion passed, with a vote of 6-1 with Mr. Lombardi voting in opposition.

3. Petition of **Julian Frey and Ana Barndollar, owners**, for property located at **59 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove chimney) and allow exterior changes to an existing structure (remove one window, replace with siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 48 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Julian Frey and the contractor Pat Driscoll were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Frey stated that he wanted to remove the chimney and box window because the chimney encroached on the functional living space and was structurally deficient. He said the fireplace was not a working one and that the box window was not consistent with the style of the home.

Mr. Shea said removing the window was a good thing, but he hated to see a chimney removed. Mr. Rawling agreed, noting that removing the chimney would change the character of the house. Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the chimney could be removed below the roof and asked whether Mr. Frey had considered it. Mr. Frey said he did, but preferred to remove it and perhaps install a faux chimney. Mr. Rawling said the Commission discouraged faux chimneys. Acting Chair Gladhill agreed that the chimney was an important architectural feature.

Mr. Driscoll said they considered keeping the stonework but were concerned about supporting it properly. From a safety standpoint, they felt that a veneer system would be better.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Harold Whitehouse of 58 Humphreys Court said his rear property abutted the applicant's rear property. He was pleased that the Commission was against removing the chimney because he felt that the chimney determined the age of the house and it bothered him to have it removed. He asked the Commission to ensure that the chimney stayed unless it was a safety hazard.

No one else rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for removing the window only, with the following stipulation:*

- 1) The removal of the greenhouse window is approved but the removal of the chimney is not approved.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the suggestion to build up the chimney from the roof did not remove options for the owner because the owner could either rebuild the chimney on top or install a fake chimney. Mr. Wyckoff said that removing the window was encouraging and would maintain the character of the District by not having a vinyl box bay window.

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

4. Petition of **Darryl E. Mojdehi, owner**, for property located at **137 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 55 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The contractor Adam Jackson on behalf of the applicant said they wanted to replace all the windows and change them from a 6/6 grill pattern to a 4/1 one, with a black color change.

Ms. Ruedig said the house was a prominent, historic one, and the Commission had reservations about replacing historic windows. She said she drove by the house and noted that the windows seemed to be in very good condition, and she felt they should be restored if they were old. She said she could not support changing the style of the windows because the windows were integral to the character and history of the house, and the proposed window style did not match the character, style and age of the house. She suggested a site visit.

Mr. Jackson stated that the windows were most likely installed in the 1980s and were leaking. He said there were many different grill patterns in the south end and no model for consistency. Ms. Ruedig said a dark color was acceptable but thought it would be difficult to locate a 4/1 window in the south end. She again suggested a site walk to confirm that the windows were true 1980s Brosco windows. Mr. Shea asked whether the windows were paned and had insulated glass and were replacement windows. Mr. Jackson agreed. Mr. Shea said he thought it would be okay to replace them but that the style of the home required 6/6 windows.

Mr. Rawling said he supported the window comments but had an issue with the replacement windows because of the contrasting trim and sash. He said black windows would have black trim around the glazing and the rest would not match the siding color. Mr. Jackson said he would keep the trim color similar to the house color. The Commission further discussed it. Mr. Jackson said the proposed windows were new construction and said they would also replace the exterior trim and install new casings to match existing. They further discussed the Andersen A Series and replicating the double hung look, the casements, the storm windows, and half screens.

Mr. Cracknell suggested a stipulation to encourage the Building Department to not require egress windows on the front and two sides, and they further discussed it.

Mr. Lombardi asked why the applicant wanted all Azek trim. They further discussed it and decided that Azek would be okay as long as it was painted. Mr. Rawling asked that casements go on the inside area over the porch.

Acting Chair Gladhill suggested a stipulation that someone from the Commission or the Planning Department go to the house and verify that the windows were not historic, in which case the motion would carry. Mr. Wyckoff said he would do it.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Cracknell read the stipulations, all of which were carried into the motion except for the sixth one, which addressed the sash being dark to match the siding.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The HDC has a strong preference to not include the casement egress windows in the approval given the impact to the historical integrity of this structure; therefore, use of any casement windows shall require administrative approval from the HDC.*
- 2) All window trim shall be wood and the use of Azek is not approved.*
- 3) A half screen shall be used.*
- 4) A 6/6 grill pattern shall be used.*
- 5) The Commission shall visit the site to confirm that the existing windows are replacement windows prior to the issuance of a building permit.*

City Council Representative Pearson seconded the motion.

*Mr. Rawling made a motion to **amend** the motion to include that the sash be dark to match the jamb. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

There was further discussion. Mr. Wyckoff said he had never seen separate framework around the sashes being a different color to match the trim and asked what would happen if someone wanted to paint the house. He said he wasn't sure that windows even came that way. Ms. Ruedig said she would support the amendment because it was a good way to replicate how historic windows would have to be painted, and if it didn't work, it wouldn't be a problem to get administrative approval to do something else. Mr. Lombardi said the amendment seemed complex and wasn't sure that he could support it.

*The amendment **failed to pass** by a vote of 3-4.*

Mr. Wyckoff said if the windows were truly modern replacement ones and were replaced, then the storm windows would be removed. It would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character by not having triple-track storms. It would also be consistent with the special and defining character of surrounding properties to use 6/6 windows and would be compatible in design with surrounding properties.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1 with Mr. Rawling voting in opposition.*

5. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **121/123 State Street Condominium Association, owner, and Mark and Marie Bodi, applicants**, for property located at **121 State Street, #2**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new, larger deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 48-2 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Sarah Hourihane of DeStefano Architects and the owner Mark Bodi were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Hourihane said they wanted to extend the existing deck and remove the portion going up to the stairs. She said they also wanted to make the deck thicker.

Mr. Shea asked whether the changes would affect the abutters. Ms. Hourihane said they would not. He asked whether the thickening would affect the arch opening of the brick and was told that it would not. Mr. Rawling said the addition might enhance the streetscape more by eliminating some of the view of the cars below it. City Council Representative Pearson said the change made it less of a giant white stairway and more to scale.

Acting Chair Gladhill noted that the Commission received a letter from the abutters Barbara Noyes and James Keane, who were present.

Mr. Mayer asked about materials, and Ms. Hourihane said they would match the existing wood.

Acting Chair Gladhill opened up the public session.

Jim Keane of 123 State Street stated that he and his wife were direct abutters. He said their deck was the other half and that there was a common area stairway terminating at their door. He said they discussed doing a deck extension on both sides with the applicant so that they could have a common area stairway going up the landing and splitting to the left and right, which would allow a privacy screen. He said the Bodis did not like the design and withdrew the application. He said he and his wife thought there was a better solution than having two disjointed decks.

Acting Chair Gladhill asked why the previous plan had not gone through. Mr. Bodi said there was a history dating back a decade and explained how he and Mr. Keane and Ms. Noyes couldn't agree about realigning the stairs. He said the alternative would be to not relocate the stairs and that Mr. Keane and Ms. Noyes could compensate him for the loss of property and parking. He said the conditions were in place when Mr. Keane and Ms. Noyes bought their unit and that the other neighbors would very supportive of his plan.

Mr. Wyckoff said he wasn't comfortable with the abutter's situation and thought the stairs were dangerous. Mr. Cracknell recommended that the applicant consider other design ideas.

Mr. Shea said he looked at it from a design viewpoint and thought it was appropriate. He felt that the Commission should not be judging the history or the dispute. They further discussed it.

Frank Heitker of 37 Sheafe Street stated that it didn't make sense to move the stairs and lose the parking. He said he had no problem with expanding the deck.

Mr. Bodi said he had told his abutters that he planned to extend the deck and had even offered to re-shield the surface, but they had not approached him with an alternative design. He named other abutters who were in favor of his project.

It was moved, seconded and approved to go into the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Sarah Hourihane of DeStefano Architects representing the applicant stated that they were requesting a 3-ft extension of the deck and that the details would match existing. She said they would maintain the special character of Sheafe Street by introducing dimension to the elevation and differentiating between the two separate residents.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Jim Keane and Barbara Noyes of 121 State Street stated that they were condominium association members and direct abutters and wanted to bring their comments from the work session forward and also have the letter they forwarded to the Commission included for consideration.

Frank Heitker of 37 Sheafe Street stated that the application should be approved, noting that it was only a change of three feet.

No one else rose to speak, and Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Mr. Rawling stated that all the Commission could do was approve what was before them or make suggestions. He said he found nothing that he could reasonably vote against and felt that the changes contributed to the character of the neighborhood and seemed to enhance it by extending more cover over the parking areas. He said it reduced the visual impact of the parking on the street. Mr. Wyckoff said he would support it, noting that the asymmetrical design had more character to it than just the straight front. He noted that there were abutters in agreement.

Ms. Ruedig said she would support it because of all the previous reasons stated, but she acknowledged that there were issues with abutters. She said that hopefully the simple change would not prevent any sort of future design that might come up, and she encouraged the abutters to go before the Commission even before the plan was implemented.

Acting Chair Gladhill said he would support the application and thought that adding three feet to a deck would not be detrimental to the District. He said the symmetry would look better.

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

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Review of Design Guidelines

This item was postponed to the March 9, 2016 meeting.

B. Discussion of 2016 Work Plan

Mr. Cracknell said he was still working on edits in the Design Guidelines and hoped to have it ready by the following week.

He discussed the list of exemption, noting that they were updated three years before and had gone from 12 to 23, which reduced the Commission's workload significantly. He suggested that the Commission set up performance standards so that they could discuss them.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the Character-Based Zoning was drafted and considered for the west end, and there were adjustments for the downtown and the north end to be done. He also said

that the GSA was initiating the procurement process for the McIntyre property to support a facility downtown.

He said the 3D model was updated for the downtown area and discussed the details.

Mr. Cracknell also discussed the potential of demolition review and said he had been asked to review the former Historic District B. He said the Commission needed to determine if the Ordinance assessed what was proposed for the site. Mr. Shea asked whether the HDC would have input into the design of the pump station. Mr. Cracknell said the history was to bring City projects to the HDC for review out of courtesy.

They further discussed the McIntyre Building and the fact that people wanted the US Postal Service to stay in the downtown area.

Mr. Mayer suggested initiating a schedule of existing windows for future applications to make it simpler, and Mr. Cracknell agreed.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on April 13, 2016.