

**RECONVENED MEETING OF  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**March 9, 2016  
reconvened from March 2, 2016**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Joseph Almeida; 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:**

**ALSO PRESENT:** Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....  
**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. February 2, 2016
2. February 17, 2016

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to **approve** both sets of minutes.*

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

- A. 687 Middle Street (*Request to postpone to the April 6, 2016 meeting.*)

*It was moved, seconded and **approved** unanimously (7-0) to **postpone** the request to the April 6, 2016 meeting.*

Mr. Cracknell then read Items B through E and gave brief descriptions. The Commissioners had questions on Petition E, and Mr. Wyckoff asked to pull it so that they could discuss it.

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **remove** Administrative Approval Item E from the group and vote on it separately. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

The Commission discussed Administrative Approval Item E (see below) and rendered their decision. They then voted on Items B through D.

- B. 33 Hunking Street
- C. 1B Jackson Hill Street
- D. 300 New Castle Avenue

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Administrative Approval Items B through D. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

- E. 404 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that two revisions were submitted for the building permit regarding reducing the window size on the side elevation of the barn conversion. Mr. Rawling recused himself and explained the window issues as the project architect.

Mr. Wyckoff asked a question related to the bracket. Mr. Rawling said he assumed that the bracket would be mounted on the side of the relocation of the column. They further discussed the bracket. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether it was a pilaster or a column. Mr. Cracknell referenced the owner's letter indicating that a third column was needed for the deck support, and he concluded that it was a column and not a pilaster. They further discussed whether a bracket could be installed. Mr. Cracknell suggested bifurcating the petition and approving the windows.

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the window changes with the understanding that the plans for the back of the building would be addressed the following month. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.*

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

### **III. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)**

1. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Hayscales Real Estate Trust, Robert Krieger, owner and trustee**, for property locate at **236 Union Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct a new two story, two unit building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 22 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the February 17, 2016 to the March 9, 2016 meeting.)*

### **WORK SESSION**

The architect Richard Lo and the applicant Piper Alice were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Lo stated that a pre-demolition report was put together. He reviewed his document and the history of the property and showed several photos of the property.

Mr. Wyckoff verified that the building was not square. Mr. Lo discussed the footprint, lot coverage and boundaries and said that the house was within the side yard requirements. He discussed the concrete block exposure, the construction, the façade, and the changes to the windows, doors, awnings, cladding and mechanicals. Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Lo to describe the shape of the roof system and its supporting trusses because it wasn't clear on the photo.

Mr. Wyckoff said he was saddened to see a piece of Portsmouth torn down, even though the garage was listed as an intrusion. Ms. Ruedig said that the intrusion listing meant that the building was non-conforming to the rest of the neighborhood in terms of its shape and didn't mean it was a throwaway. She said the building's integrity was much different from the 1970s photo, and little was left of the original fabric.

The façade and proportions were discussed in detail. They reviewed the survey and site plans. Mr. Lo showed his alternative site plan with accompanying drawings.

Mr. Mayer suggested pulling the building back because he had a problem with the façade almost to the setback because the sense of human activity was lost. Mr. Lo replied that several buildings had similar setbacks, and because the building was slab on grade, the ground floor was close to sidewalk level. Mr. Cracknell noted that the project needed variances. He explained the history of the project's feedback and said the change to the setback would burden the applicant. There was further discussion about the façade. Mr. Rawling said it would help to bring the door's proportions to the side entrance style. He also discussed giving the window casings some relief and using a contemporary mulling pattern on the windows. Ms. Ruedig said it was important to be true to the contemporary design. She thought the chosen casement windows and the minimal details were fine. Mr. Lombardi and Mr. Shea agreed.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said he wasn't against contemporary architecture but felt that something based on the old façade would be preferable because it was in the boundary lines of the District.

### **Public Comment**

Kerry Vautrot, Chair of the Portsmouth Advocates and part of the Historical Society, stated that they took the demolition in the District seriously. They researched the history and agreed that the garage had lost its integrity. She asked for a copy of the applicant's documentation so that they could append it to their information for future uses. She also said they thought the new construction exemplified a design ethos that had been missing in the District.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Almeida closed the public speaking session.

Mr. Lo further discussed the comments relating to the window casement outswings in response to Mr. Rawling's questions.

It was decided to go into the Public Hearing.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Chairman Almeida read the petition. Mr. Lo briefly reviewed his petition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether there were adjustments in the record and if there should be stipulations. Chairman Almeida said they would clarify it.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Kerry Vautrot representing the Portsmouth Advocates reiterated what she previously said.

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Ms. Ruedig moved to grant the Certificate of Approval for the application with the following stipulations:

- 1) *That the plans date stamped March 2, 2016 by the Planning Department are the approved plans.*
- 2) *The alternative options shown on pages A-2.1a, A-2.2a, A-2.3a, A-2.4a are the approved elevations.*

*Mr. Lombardi seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig stated that it was a good example of a contemporary representation of a traditional house and felt that Mr. Lo had done an exhausting analysis of the proportions, forms, massing, and materials. She said that the details and materials chosen were of a contemporary style and spoke to the 21<sup>st</sup> century yet were compatible with surrounding properties. The current structure had lost integrity and therefore wouldn't be a complete loss to the history of Portsmouth. She stated that the project related to the value of surrounding structures and was compatible to surrounding properties and also had compatible technology to surrounding properties. She said it would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character.

Mr. Wyckoff said that if anyone had spoken against the garage demolition, he would rethink his support. He said he would support the project because of the forms, the sizing, the spacing and traditional shapes and also because of the overwhelming support of the Commission for contemporary expression. Mr. Rawling said he supported the concept of a contemporary building, and he felt that the building was 95% there, so he would support it. He thought, however, that the window treatment worked against the building due to its flatness.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said the project failed to be consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties and he could not support it.

Mr. Lombardi said he seconded the motion because of Ms. Ruedig's comments and also because he thought it would enhance property values and would be an innovative and complementary structure. Chairman Almeida said it was a wonderful application.

*The motion **passed** by a 6-1 vote, with Vice-Chair Gladhill voting in opposition.*

#### IV. WORK SESSIONS

A. Petition of **City of Portsmouth, owner, and Prescott Park Arts Festival, applicant**, for property located at **0 Marcy Street (Prescott Park)**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing stage, relocate and construct new stage, construct new control booth) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 1 and lies within the Municipal and Historic Districts. *(The applicant has requested to postpone to the April 2016 meeting.)*

#### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved (7-0) to postpone the request to the April 6, 2016 meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **Kimberley A. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, Kimberley A. and James C. Lucy, trustees and James C. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, James C. and Kimberley A. Lucy, trustees**, for property located at **127 & 137 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to existing structures (construct new building at rear of 137 High Street, construct roof deck at rear of 127 High Street, both with associated parking and landscaping) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 20 and 21 and lies within the CD 4, Historic and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the February 17, 2016 meeting to the March 9, 2016 meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida recused himself and Vice-Chair Gladhill assumed his seat.

The owner Jim Lucy and Kevin Roy of Kevin Roy Builders were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Lucy said he had updated renderings and that Mr. Roy would review their attempts to address the Commission's previous concerns. Mr. Roy said that the Commission had been concerned with the building height and had felt that the exterior color should complement the building and the façade should be softened. He noted that a gable barn-style element as a second building was favored. Mr. Roy reviewed how they lowered the roof pitch and made the dormers less expansive. He said the height was two feet lower than the City required, and they changed the color to a complementary one and lowered the exposed brick to bring the building down. He then showed renderings of the Moffatt-Ladd House and courtyard.

Mr. Shea said the massing had improved and the scale had come down quite a bit so that it didn't feel like a 3-story building anymore. He said he liked the elimination of the French doors and felt that tucking the cars under the building was appropriate. Ms. Ruedig said the massing needed to be smaller or at least equal in massing to the historic building because it was too big. Mr. Lombardi said he thought it was still too big and overwhelmed the historic house. He thought that a structure more in keeping with the scale and massing of the original house might need less parking. Mr. Lucy said they researched the challenging parking extensively.

Mr. Mayer agreed that the scale of the new addition overwhelmed the historic quality and that the challenge created was to develop the property to its maximum capacity, thereby creating the parking problem. He asked for a site plan. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the building was separated from the historic structure and was told that it was. He said he did not feel that the massing was inappropriate because it was near large hotels, and he didn't feel it was inappropriately sized. He said the dormers softened the building but it seemed a bit busy.

Mr. Rawling said the package didn't show the break in the dormers, and he felt that the applicant treated the building as a long gable one and put things on it to break it up. He said the enclosed bays on the front seemed heavy and busy and that the elevations had to be considered more carefully. He felt that the building needed a lot of scaling, which was further discussed.

Acting Chair Gladhill mentioned a letter written by a neighbor who complained that the letter had not been read out loud. He said the Commission did not generally read entire letters but emphasized that it was part of the public record. He read some of the letter's highlights, including the fact that the neighbor was upset that not every angle was shown and there was no proof given that the annex was not historic in nature and could not be renovated. Mr. Lucy replied that the structural integrity of the back part bowed in and was not sound, and the proposed changes were due to those limitations and were not easily renovated.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested a site walk to look at the annex and the relationship of the structure to the neighbors, and the Commissioners agreed. They decided on April 13 at 5:30 p.m.

Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Lucy whether he had considered using Federal tax credits. Mr. Lucy said he had, but for now they were listening to neighbor groups and trying to find a balance. Mr. Rawling brought up issues with the ceiling, which they further discussed.

Mr. Lucy asked whether they should wait until after the site walk to create additional views because the renderings were difficult to read. Ms. Ruedig suggested that they resolve the massing and ceiling issues before spending too much time on the renderings.

### **Public Comment**

Kerry Vautrot, Chair of the Portsmouth Advocates, stated that they had met twice with Mr. Lucy and thought there were improvements but felt that the garage level treatment needed refinement. They encouraged the applicant to look into tax credits and the site's archaeological sensitivity.

Barbara Ward of 16 Nixon Park said she worked at the Moffatt-Ladd House and thought the site walk would allow the Commission to see the elevation of the site compared to surrounding ones.

Acting Chair Gladhill asked whether she could allow the Commissioners into the gardens, and Ms. Ward agreed that she would.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Lombardi moved to **continue** the petition to April meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

C. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use, 4 to 5 ½ story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the February 17, 2016 meeting to the March 9, 2016 meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida resumed his seat.

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios on behalf of the applicant was present to speak to the petition. She summarized the project and emphasized that they were proposing a mix of materials and keeping some brick and the forms and protrusions of the bays. She discussed the roofline attributes, the pedestrian experience, and the overall proposed building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked where the garage entrance was. Ms. Ramsey said they had two garage entrances, one on Deer Street and one on Bridge Street. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether they were connected, and Ms. Ramsey said they were not. Mr. Wyckoff said it seemed that the building had gone up a few stories but that the penthouses were removed except for one. Ms. Ramsey said they abandoned the mansard roof and went to a more contemporary one.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said he liked the previous version better. Mr. Wyckoff noted that Ms. Ramsey would need a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and mentioned the green space and public good criteria that she would have to meet.

Mr. Shea brought up the massing, noting that no one wanted another Portwalk. He thought the height could be stepped back and that the corner could be pushed back. He thought brick was a good material but felt that it had to be in the same form and texture that Portsmouth had.

Ms. Ruedig said she thought Ms. Ramsey was going in the right direction but still had concerns about massing. She appreciated that the building stepped down both ways and that it was one big building with a variation of facades because it set it apart from Portwalk. She thought it was more sculptural and that brick was appropriate to tie it to the rest of Downtown. She echoed City Councilor Pearson's remark and recommended that Ms. Ramsey continue to develop the idea of it being a transitional building.

Mr. Rawling said he was glad that it wasn't just a big box and had articulation of the forms. He didn't think they needed a mansard roof representation and felt that doing a full expression of the building was appropriate because the building needed to stand tall. He felt that it had evolved into a flat-roof building, however, and thought it needed variation, and he was concerned with the amount of metal cladding. Ms. Ramsey said she didn't know for sure if it would be metal.

Mr. Lombardi said he was pleased to see that the building looked like one structure but thought there were a lot of doorways. Mr. Mayer said the massing was a big improvement but thought there were a lot of building materials, and he suggested making it more simple and elegant by not using a chaotic clutter of brackets and chimneys.

Vice-Chair Gladhill suggested that they discuss the CUP at the next meeting and ways that the applicant could focus on the public benefit. Mr. Shea said he'd like to see the garage door on the back side of the building. Ms. Ruedig stressed the use of quality and warm materials.

### **Public Comment**

Rick Beckstead of 1395 Islington Street thanked the Commission for emphasizing the CUP. He noted the 45-ft height limit and said it was hard to believe that some Commissioners stressed a higher building. He said the building looked very modern and did not look like one big building. He reminded the Commission that it had to be public opinion and not their design opinion.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the work session to the April meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

D. Petition of **Harbor Hill Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **77 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace composite siding, trim, and panels, re-flash masonry veneer walls, window and door openings) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 29 and lies within the C 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the February 17, 2016 meeting to the March 9, 2016 meeting.)*

The President of the Harbor Hill Condominium Association Arthur Carakatsane and the engineer Tim Little of Noblin and Associates were present to speak to the petition. They discussed the deterioration of the panel and the trim and said they wanted to replace them with PVC material in all the areas, including the first-level street area. They also wanted to repair the brick work and paint the PVC material white but restrict the painting to the first level.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about screw holes. Mr. Little said they would use plugs.

Mr. Carakatsane said the beige fiber cement clapboard siding throughout the project was a major issue and that they wanted to keep a similar color but wanted replacement material. They thought fiber cement didn't have a good track record and wanted to explore metal cladding. Mr. Little showed photos of a Boston project with a wide panel system and further discussed it.

Ms. Ruedig said it was good that the Commission was being shown the material and made aware that materials marked as lasting forever did not do so. She thought it would be okay to go back to a traditional material. They discussed the deterioration, building materials and alternates.



Mr. Wyckoff reminded everyone that the back of the building faced historic properties and felt that the building should be residential in tone. He recommended that the applicant look at other clap sidings rather than switch the design of the building to a metal product. They further discussed the color and the materials. Mr. Little said they could improve on the siding installation and make it work much better, keeping their manufacturer in the process.

Chairman Almeida said the path of least resistance was fixing the current material, and he asked the applicant to present new drawings with the exact material, texture, and colors at the next work session.

Mr. Carakatsane also noted that they wanted to replace the French doors on the upper floors facing north with a different manufacturer, but emphasized that they would look the same. Mr. Cracknell said it could come back as an Administrative Approval because it would be a smaller opening. He said the Azek panels would be included at the next session on April 6.

### **Public Comment**

Rick Beckstead of 1395 Islington Street said that he appreciated the preservation of what a previous HDC board member had put emphasis on. He said he used Azek and found it durable.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the work session to the April meeting.*

E. Work Session requested by **Petra A. Huda and Kimberly A. Schroeder, owners**, for property located at **280 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing shed, construct garage, construct rear addition) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate front door from side of house to front of house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 8 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

The owners Petra Huda and Kimberly Schroeder and Kimberly Schroeder were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Huda said they wanted to move the front door from the side to its original location in the front. They also wanted to put an addition on the back and replace the existing shed/garage with a two-car garage.

Mr. Lombardi asked if they were relocating two doors. Ms. Huda said it was only one door and that they wouldn't relocate it but would simply push it out to the edge and keep it as a back door.

Mr. Lombardi noted that there were no images of the existing garage. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked the applicant to bring color photos of the house and shed/garage to the next meeting.

Mr. Mayer said he was glad the front door was being relocated to its original location. He asked whether the house had vinyl siding and if so, whether it could be matched. Ms. Schroeder said

yes to both questions. Ms. Ruedig asked whether the chosen door was fiberglass. Ms. Schroeder said it was, but that it felt and looked like wood. Ms. Ruedig encouraged a real wood door.

Mr. Shea said he had no problems with the alterations because it was an early 18<sup>th</sup> century house that had been renovated extensively. He thought the garage was a typical kit garage. He suggested a steeper roof pitch because of its prominence. Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that the application indicated vinyl siding and trim. Ms. Huda said they could consider clapboard.

Mr. Rawling said that the drawing (A2.1) showed no roof overhangs on the additions, but he assumed they would be on them. He said it was an unusual arrangement of windows because they were separate ones that looked like they were pushed into one another.

Chairman Almeida suggested a site plan.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether there were porches or steps in the back. Ms. Huda said there was only one step. Mr. Rawling asked whether the new door would be painted. Ms. Schroeder said it would if they didn't get a wooden door. Mr. Wyckoff suggested making the roof overhang detail a separate drawing. He emphasized the need to see dimension and material. Mr. Rawling recommended that they leave the shutters off. Mr. Shea suggested a gutter for the rear elevation.

No one in the public rose to speak.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was decided that the applicants would **continue** to a public hearing in the future.*

F. Work Session requested by **Michael De la Cruz, owner**, for property located at **75 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild historic parapets, add series of flat roofed dormers, add series of roof walkways and decks, add series of windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 5 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The architect Steve McHenry and the project manager Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architects as well as the owner Michael De la Cruz were present to speak to the petition. Mr. McHenry passed out revised plans to the Commissioners. He stated that they were proposing four changes to the exterior of the Franklin Block Building, which included rebuilding the historic pediments, adding a series of flat roof dormers and a series of walkways and decks, and adding a series of four windows on the Fleet Street elevation. Mr. McHenry reviewed his package in detail.

Mr. Shea said it was wonderful that the pediments were going back on the roof, and he asked whether they would do the historic materials. Mr. De la Cruz went through the history of the building in extensive detail.

Ms. Ruedig asked why the parapets were removed. Mr. De la Cruz said they fell down due to structural reasons. Mr. Shea asked what the materials would be. Mr. De la Cruz said they would

be Azek but would look like wood. Mr. Shea asked how they would put another level on the 60-foot building. Mr. McHenry said they would need variances. Mr. De la Cruz said they wanted to use Azek because it had a good track record.

Mr. McHenry said the penthouses would not be seen from the street except from the front of North Church. Mr. Cracknell said the penthouses would be in 3D model format.

Ms. Ruedig said she was concerned that the top railings and decks would be visible. Mr. De la Cruz said the deck railings would line up behind the pediments on the sides. Ms. Ruedig said they would still be visible. She asked whether the applicant had considered sandstone. Mr. De la Cruz said he needed more time to research it. Mr. McHenry said they had discussed other material but wanted to give the Commission their rendering first to show the contrasting and texture. Ms. Ruedig said she'd like to see something to match the texture.

Mr. Mayer asked about the roof plan and whether it was being programmed for new residential. Mr. McHenry said there would be five units in the front so the residents could see the North Church and have sunlight. They further discussed it. Mr. Rawling said he was glad to see the parapets and the rooftop come to life. He thought the new version seemed to be a lighter color than the one in the historic photos. Mr. Lombardi asked about the previously-approved decks. Mr. De la Cruz said they originally wanted to hide the roof decks, and he went into further detail. They also discussed drainage issues.

### **Public Comment**

Rick Beckstead of 1395 Islington Street said that he remembered when the windows were on the Deer Street side and talk of putting the pediments back in place. He said there were 50-ft height restrictions, yet the building was 60 feet. Mr. Cracknell said the applicant would get a variance.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Almeida closed the public comment.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was decided that the applicant would **continue** the work session to a later date after working on the variances.*

G. Work Session requested by **Northern Tier Real Estate Acquisition and Development, LLC, owner**, for property located at **172 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing solarium and entry) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate entry, infill misc. windows, and add fire stair tower) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 1A and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Rob Harbeson and Sarah Hourihane of DeStefano Architects were present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Harbeson discussed the exterior. He said they wanted to remove the sunroom on the front of the building because it crossed City property lines.

Ms. Hourihane showed the context photos, locus and floor plans, and the existing and proposed photos. She said they wanted to remove the solarium and pull the entry inbound, add new windows to existing openings, and add awnings over the windows and the door. She discussed the roof plan, the stair tower, and the extension of the existing gable dormer into the wall. She discussed elevations and said the shingles would match existing. Ms. Hourihane also said that the small shed and the fire escape would be removed from the back elevation.

Mr. Mayer asked how old the building was. Mr. Cracknell said it was built around 1920. Mr. Mayer thought the proposed treatment on the façade made sense and that the single divided-light windows were a nice resolution. Mr. Shea said that he liked it but felt that the entrance seemed back-of-the-door instead of celebrated and suggested that the applicant add more pedestrian experience. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked whether the existing dormer would be extended, and Ms. Hourihane agreed. Mr. Harbeson said they would not repair existing but would use the same material. Mr. Rawling mentioned awnings as a way to make the entrance more welcoming.

#### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was decided to **continue** the work session to a future date.*

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

*It was moved, seconded and approved to **adjourn** the meeting at 11:00 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary

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