

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

November 2, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Members Jon Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternates Richard Shea and John Mayer

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. October 5, 2016
- October 12, 2016

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to approve both sets of minutes as presented.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- 1. 112 State Street
- 2. 53 Green Street
- 3. 13 Salter Street
- 4. 64 Mt. Vernon Street
- 5. 212 Summer Street
- 6. 774 Middle Street, Unit 2
- 7. 517 Middle Street
- 8. 154 Maplewood Avenue
- 9. 16 Court Street
- 10. 178 Fleet Street

Chairman Almeida stated that he would recuse himself from voting on Items #3 and #9.

Mr. Cracknell briefly read the remaining items.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the following petitions: Items #1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, with a stipulation for Item #5, 212 Summer Street.*

Chairman Almeida recused himself for Items #3 and #9, and Vice-Chair Lombardi assumed his voting seat.

Mr. Cracknell addressed Item #3, 13 Salter Street. Ms. Ruedig noted that the garage windows were 8/8 instead of 6/6. After some discussion, it was decided that the already-installed 8/8 windows on the garage would be approved and that other new windows should be 6/6 windows.

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Item #9, 16 Court Street. The Commission discussed whether or not the fence should terminate at the street. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a stipulation that the fence end at a height of 8 inches above the pavement.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Items #3 and #9, with a stipulation noted on Item #9.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **City of Portsmouth, owner**, for property located at **95 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (wharf removal and replacement) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan103 as Lot 29 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida and Vice-Chairman Lombardi resumed their voting seats.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Cracknell explained that City property was exempt from the Zoning Ordinance and that the Director of Public Works Peter Rice would give an overview, along with Facilities Project Manager Dan Hartrey

Mr. Hartrey distributed a handout to the Commission. Mr. Rice gave a brief history of the wharf and structures and said they would be demolished and replaced due to their dilapidated conditions. He noted that any new structures would be addressed after the Master Plan process was completed.

Mr. Wyckoff thanked Mr. Rice for his presentation and said he wanted to use his action as a guideline for the future of the Commission's Demolition Ordinance.

Mr. Rawling noted that the structures were a character-defining complex in the neighborhood and that it was unusual for the Commission to support a demolition with no plans to put anything back. He asked whether more pumping stations would be built. Mr. Rice said they had a separate program for the long-term plan and had purchased the property to change the esthetic of

the pumping station to make it more in keeping with the area. Mr. Rawling asked what preliminary studies were done, and Mr. Rice said they had not done any as yet but would move forward with the Master Plan for the area.

Mr. Mayer asked whether there was a historic structure report planned, and Mr. Rice said there was not. Mr. Mayer said it was an opportunity for the City to provide historical information about the pier and the structures and asked whether there was an alternative to the demolition. Mr. Rice said there was no alternative because the 1950s pier and structures were collapsing, and he felt that the building removal precluded the historic structure report.

Ms. Ruedig said she agreed with Mr. Mayer but thought that, even though the building was a 1950s one, it was part of the history of Portsmouth and important to document. She suggested that engineering drawings and historic photos be documented and, once the new pier was complete, either a new structure or a memorial sign be addressed. Vice-Chair Lombardi and Mr. Shea agreed.

Chairman Almeida said he was sad about the demolition but excited about what could be put in its place. He said he would support removing the pier, especially if the City wanted to retain the right to rebuild it. Mr. Rice said the contract included the replacement of the pier. He said it was an opportunity for public input as to future possibilities more in keeping with the area.

Councilor Pearson said it was important that the age of the structure be front and center so that the public knew that it wasn't really an old structure.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the Commission would be able to look at future plans for what would be constructed, and Mr. Rice said yes.

Mr. Cracknell recommended that the Historic District Commission support the removal and replacement of the pier and associated structures and that the City prepare a historic structure report and also consider whether it would be appropriate to install a historic marker. Ms. Ruedig noted that her comment about the marker was only a possibility in the future, along with reconstruction for future years.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **accept** Mr. Cracknell's recommendation, and Mr. Rawling seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

2. Petition of **Martingale Wharf, LP, owner**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add awnings, add shade sails to deck, add new railings to deck) as per plans on file in the Planning

Department. Said property is shown on Assessor 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architects on behalf of the owner was present to speak to the petition. Mr. McHenry stated that they were not changing the shape of the deck but simply changing the railings and adding awnings and shade sails. He proceeded to review the plans with the Commission.

Mr. Shea stated that the fun design was in keeping with the original design intent of the building and the deck and said he saw no issues with it. Mr. Rawling said the railing design was creative and would be a nice addition to the area.

Vice-Chairman Lombardi asked whether there was space behind the larger awning for people to exit. Mr. McHenry said there was an existing balcony. He discussed the glass art piece and the railing system in more detail.

Councilor Pearson asked whether the sail shades were removable. Mr. McHenry said they were seasonally removable. Chairman Almeida suggested that they be a permanent feature, but Mr. McHenry said it was a maintenance issue.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and 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, and Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff said the project was compatible with innovative technologies and with the design of surrounding properties. He said it was a scaled-back plan from the original one and, since there was no objection from the public, it was a very good project.

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

3. Petition of **Portsmouth Housing Authority, owner**, for property located at **140 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace all windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 161 as Lot 38 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself from the petition, and Vice-Chair Lombardi assumed his voting seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Alyssa Murphy and the Director of the Portsmouth Housing Authority Craig Welch were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Murphy reviewed the petition, noting that the existing windows were deteriorating and that the sliders wouldn't accommodate air conditioners. She also showed a sample of the proposed window and said none of them would have divided lights.

Mr. Mayer said it was a big improvement for the building and that the window design was in keeping with the building. Ms. Ruedig agreed and asked whether the removal sash was operable. Ms. Murphy said it was an awning window with an awning sash, and that residents who chose to have an air conditioner could have the removable sash.

Acting Chair Lombardi asked whether a building-wide air conditioning system had been considered. Mr. Welch replied that the cost wasn't feasible with the capital grant funds. Ms. Murphy added that only a third of the apartments used air conditioning.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the awning and casement windows were out swinging ones and had interior screens, and Ms. Murphy said yes.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting Chairman Lombardi closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Mayer made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Mr. Mayer said the project would maintain the character of the building and promote the welfare of its residents.

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

4. Petition of **Amy K. Gant Revocable Living Trust, Amy K. Gant, trustee and owner, and Katherine C. Cook, applicant**, for property located at **17 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install shed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 36 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida and Vice-Chairman Lombardi resumed their seats.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Katherine Cook stated that she was in the process of buying the property and wanted to build a shed for outside storage. She showed images and drawings of the proposed

shed as well as street views. She said the shed would match the home and have asphalt shingles and clapboard siding. The only window would be a transom one above the door.

Mr. Wyckoff said he hoped the awning window over the door would not interfere with the trim of the gable, as shown on the drawing. He asked whether the doors were tongue-and-groove boards. Ms. Cook said they were. In response to Chairman Almeida's question, she said the shed would be either pine or cedar.

Mr. Rawling suggested that the door casings surround the transom window and continue all the way around, and that the board brace be on the exterior and the cross brace on the interior to fit the site and house better. He said a vertical board door would be more in keeping.

Mr. Shea suggested that the cornerboards and clapboards match the house in size dimension, that the transom window be divided light, that the barn doors have no cross bar but just a simple tongue-and-groove board with maybe a bead on the side. He also recommended cedar instead of pine and roof shingles to match the existing home.

Mr. Mayer said he agreed with Mr. Rawling and Mr. Shea, especially about the bracing on the outside of the door. He suggested strap hinges for hardware.

Chairman Almeida asked if the shed would be on a slab, and Ms. Cook said yes.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Kathleen Boduch of 34 Hunking Street said she was in full support of the project.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) Floor plan #2 (on plans dated stamped 10-27-16) shall be used.*
- 2) Cornerboards and clapboards shall match the existing historic structure in size and dimensions.*
- 3) The transom window shall be TDL and shall be all wood and cased like the door trim and use rear bracing.*
- 4) The barn doors shall be tongue and groove boards with a bead on one side.*
- 5) Cedar siding shall be used and stained on both sides.*
- 6) Roof shakes shall match the existing historic structure.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig stated that the project complemented and enhanced the architectural and historic character of the building and was compatible with the design of surrounding properties.

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

5. Petition of **Sheafe Street Properties, Inc., owner**, for property located at **18 & 20 Sheafe Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace window, remove window, replace door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 46 as Lots 1 & 2 and lies within CD 4, Historic, and downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Anne Whitney on behalf of the owner was present to speak to the petition. She said there was an added window change that necessitated a new elevation plan, which she distributed to the Commissioners. She reviewed the petition and discussed the windows.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether a double hung sash could be used on the casement windows. Ms. Whitney said she didn't know whether they would hold up.

Ms. Whitney said she wanted to remove one of the ten upstairs windows on the rear elevation, expand the air conditioning closure, and replace a glass door. Ms. Ruedig said she was uncomfortable with removing the second-floor window and asked whether the opening in the interior could be walled over instead. Ms. Whitney said she could remove the Andersen window and infill the opening with a panel. Ms. Ruedig said there were other solutions. Mr. Wyckoff agreed, saying that wanting a window removed was no excuse to change the fenestration on the historic Federal building. Ms. Whitney said she could put a blank panel behind it. Mr. Wyckoff said it would be okay as long as the opening was preserved and not patched in. Mr. Shea agreed and recommended that the window be blocked up on the inside, leaving the original wood frame. He asked if the fiberglass door was field painted, and Ms. Whitney said it was.

Mr. Mayer asked about screens. Ms. Whitney said they would be on the inside of the casements.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) The fiberglass door shall be field-painted.*
- 2) A closed shutter look shall be used on the window on the rear elevation and the old window frame and sill shall not be removed.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea said it was a minor change to the property and would maintain the special characteristics of the building and District.

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

6. Petition of **Thirty Three Richmond Real Estate, LLC, owner**, for property located at **33 Richmond Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (demolish small rear addition, construction new addition on same footprint) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 17 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The contractor Brian Murray on behalf of the applicant reviewed the petition, noting that the addition would match the existing structure and be more in keeping with the District.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the current window specifications would be matched, and Mr. Murray said yes. Mr. Mayer asked whether the skylight was necessary. Mr. Murray said the tenant loved it and that it was similar to the window sizes. Mr. Rawling asked how the window sizes compared to the ones on the house. Mr. Murray said he measured the windows from the exterior and that they would match exactly.

In response to Mr. Shea's questions, Mr. Murray said the windows would match existing and would be all wood, that the casing and sill dimensions would match existing, that the cornerboards would be the same dimension as the house, that the clapboards would have the same exposure as the house, and that the rake boards would match the home frieze board.

Mr. Murray said the front windows on the house were 6/6 and that he would match them. Ms. Ruedig said she'd like to see a similar pane size. Chairman Almeida said he thought a 9/6 window would fit perfectly.

Mr. Shea asked about a drip edge, and Mr. Murray said it was white aluminum to match the trim. In response to Vice-Chair Lombardi's question, Mr. Murray said there would be a concrete slab.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and 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 stipulations:*

- 1) The casings and historic sill and profile design and dimensions shall all match the existing historical structure.*
- 2) The proposed Marvin window shall be all wood, 9/6, and SDL to match the historic windows on the existing historical structure.*
- 3) The cornerboards and clapboards shall have the same exposure as the historical structure.*

- 4) *The rake board and frieze board (if necessary) shall match the historical structure.*
- 5) *A white aluminum drip edge shall be used.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff said the project was consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties and a great improvement over the recent sunroom.

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

7. Petition of **Middle Street Townhouse Association, owner, and Brian T. and Melissa J. Maguire, applicants**, for property located at **774 Middle Street, Unit 3**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear dormer, demolish existing deck, construct new deck, install venting and heat pump unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 153 as Lot 9-3 as lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Melissa Maguire reviewed her petition.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the new windows in the dormer would match existing because they appeared much larger in the drawing. Ms. Maguire said they would look the same. Mr. Shea said the egress size may not match the small windows on the house, which would pose a problem with the permit. Ms. Maguire said her builder was aware of it. Chairman Almeida noted that the plan showed different types of windows. Ms. Maguire said she would use the historical casing.

Ms. Maguire stated that the back elevation would have a shed dormer and that the deck would be replaced in the same footprint but lower. Ms. Ruedig asked whether the historic window on the back would be matched, and Ms. Maguire said yes. Ms. Ruedig suggested that it would be more appropriate to stay with the existing windows and stick with the stylistic intention rather than muddle time periods. Mr. Rawling suggested something in between, noting that the original house was probably heavy to match and that the style and appearance of the house could be improved by a smaller scale window. The Commission further discussed the window sizes.

Vice-Chair Lombardi said was uncomfortable because with the dormer because it began at the ridge of the house and extended down to the wall. He suggested stepping it down from the ridge and back from the drip edge. It was further discussed.

Mr. Shea said the Commission needed more dimensions, details and specifications. Chairman Almeida agreed. Dimensions were further discussed.

Mr. Shea suggested that the cornerboards match the existing home and that the fascia, soffits, rake and shadow boards match existing construction. He said the windows would have to meet egress size and suggested that they all be the same size, with no casing. The windows were further discussed.

Mr. Mayer suggested moving the air conditioning unit lower, and Ms. Maguire agreed.

Mr. Shea asked whether the upper gable window would be changed. Ms. Maguire said it would and that it would match the specified dormer windows.

Ms. Ruedig asked about the dimensions of the casings on the front of the house and suggested they be 1"x4" instead of 1"x5".

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) The clapboards and trim shall match the design and material of the historical structure.*
- 2) The dormer shall be set back at least 2' from the roof edge.*
- 3) The cornerboards, fascia, rake, and shadow boards shall match the existing house.*
- 4) The window casing shall be 1" x 4" with a 1 1/2" historic sill.*
- 5) The HVAC unit shall be mounted no higher from the ground than required by code.*
- 6) The gable end window on the north elevation shall match the specific dormer window with a 1/1 window pattern.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig said that the project complemented and enhanced the architectural and historic character of the building and was compatible with the design of surrounding properties.

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

IV. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Unitarian Universalist Church, owner**, for property located at **206 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct 3 story addition) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 34 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

Steve McHenry and Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architecture were present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. Several members of the church building committee were present as well. Mr. McHenry reviewed his plans with the Commission.

Ms. Ruedig said she felt that the addition was subservient to the main building and was set back and differentiated, which highlighted the main building, but she thought it was a very

contemporary addition. She suggested that the new building meet the old building more sensitively. She asked whether a part of the addition could have the illusion of being under the cornice, and she also suggested that the addition speak more to the language of the historic building by having more rhythm patterns and proportions. Mr. McHenry said he agreed that the window patterns could let more light into the building and said the goal was to have a clean connection where the glass met the old building.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether they could retain the shutters on the historic building. Mr. McHenry said he thought they were busy. Mr. Mayer asked whether the addition could have a lower eave line. Mr. McHenry said it would be difficult, structurally and functionally. Mr. Mayer said he felt that the new overpowered the old and that it was important to preserve as much of the original features of the Federal building as possible.

Chairman Almeida asked about the mechanicals. Mr. McHenry said there would likely be four units on top of the new building. Chairman Almeida suggested that the glass elements be refined and said he would like to see the glass meld into the building as a plane.

Mr. Shea said he felt that the addition was overpowering and did not respect the old entrance to the historic property. He said that the building didn't feel residential anymore and that the addition should respect the fact that the house was an old residence. He suggested that the addition be a smaller scale so that it didn't take the focus away from the Federal building and also so it respected the old residential homes around it.

Mr. Wyckoff said he was shocked by the addition, especially the glass, because it had an institutional look and the fenestration was a mess. He also reminded people that the windows on the front were original and would have to be restored and made energy efficient.

Councilor Pearson said was excited about the project, noting that she just got back from Europe, where there were very old buildings with new additions, and she said she didn't think the addition overpowered the Federal building because it was tucked behind.

Mr. Rawling thought there were better ways to add contemporary construction and not interfere with the historic timelines of existing buildings. He suggested that scale, proportion and rhythm cues be taken from the existing building. It was further discussed.

Vice-Chair Lombardi said he felt that the new building was the dominant building from every view except for the straight-on view and that the large expanse of blank wall became a more dominant box on the property. He agreed that it looked like an institutional fenestration making it into a commercial building, whereas the historic building was more residential. He said he also didn't like the addition rising above the cornice of the existing house.

Chairman Almeida said he supported a contemporary structure but cautioned that the details were very detailed and expensive and that the quality had to be high.

Mr. Shea suggested that a contemporary wood structure with a more residential feeling might be more economical. Mr. McHenry said they did a cost analysis and found that wood was more

expensive. He discussed different colors of brick. Ms. Ruedig said the masonry envelope was a little brutal because there was a lot of it, but said the reality of what it would look like with a less modeled image might be better.

Public Comment

Joanna McKnight of Historic New England said she was a neighbor and wasn't troubled by the contemporary addition but believed it should be differential to the existing structure. She said the roofline should be brought down and that the scale of the neighborhood should be respected.

Brian Murphy said he was an architect and trustee of South Church as well as a building committee member. He said the project started as a community feeling responsibility and the focus was to give the building new life and keep it going. He said the Commission's comments would be discussed and a new design would be drawn.

The Commission suggested that another work session would be helpful.

B. 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, 3 to 3 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.

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios on behalf of the applicant was present to speak to the petition and stated that she incorporated the Commission's previous comments. She said there would be a fourth floor as well as more traditional details. She also noted that a large portion of the wood cladding was omitted. She showed a sample of a composite material.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the canopy feature could be lowered, and Ms. Ramsey said yes.

He said the project had come a long way. Mr. Shea said he was happy with the massing but felt that the first floor was squished and was bothered by the heavy cornice. He also suggested more brick or granite material to give more of a 'Portsmouth' feel.

Mr. Rawling said the bracketing on the corner elevation could be lighter and that he wasn't sold on the wood product or the color scheme but felt that the scale and massing were okay. He said the extra height improved the building. He suggested not doing the 2/2 windows but putting something more contemporary instead. Mr. Mayer said the massing felt much better but found the wood and adobe scheme unsettling. He said the band course on the third level would work better between the second and third floors.

Vice-Chair Lombardi asked how deep the colonnade was and what was behind it. Ms. Ramsey said it would be lit, and they further discussed whether it could have a higher interior ceiling height. Vice-Chair Lombardi said the project was important but noted that no one from the

public had commented on it. He hoped that the public would give their input before the building was built rather than afterwards.

Ms. Ruedig said she agreed about the cornice and bracket comments and the material on the first floor. She said the upper part of the building felt light but that there was a heavy pattern on the bottom. She also noted that a different color of brick other than red could be used.

The Commission stated that another work session would be helpful.

C. Work Session requested by **Edward B. Kitfield IV, owner**, for property located at **46 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (build privacy screen, mahogany planters on existing deck, construct middle deck with new door, construct upper deck, install spiral stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 11 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The designer Charles Hoyt and owner Edward Kitfield were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Hoyt reviewed the packet with the Commission.

Mr. Wyckoff said he was taken aback by the formal entryway in such an informal location. He asked whether the stairway could be entered and exited easily, and Mr. Hoyt said yes.

Mr. Shea said he thought the glass panels with square columns on the 2nd-floor deck felt very formal for the back of the house, but the biggest issue was the floating crow's nest on the roof. He asked whether there was a better way to incorporate it. The Commission further discussed it.

Ms. Ruedig suggested a site walk to understand how the back interacted with the neighbors and public views. She agreed that the design was different and felt that the rear should be a simple and austere style.

Chairman Almeida said he appreciated the level of design and attention to detail but felt that the crow's nest was excessively tall and asked whether it could be brought down by a third. It was further discussed. Chairman Almeida suggested a cupola instead of the crow's nest, noting that it could be used year around.

Public Comment

Gerry and Eloise Karabelas of 461 Court Street said they thought it was a high-quality project but were concerned with how it would fit into the nearby Colonial and Georgian architecture. They were also concerned that the imposing crow's nest would overlook their pocket garden.

Vice-Chair Lombardi said he would have trouble supporting the design because it had a lot of complexity, with multi-level decks and ornamental items on a very simple building.

Chairman Almeida asked whether a dormer into the roof had been considered. Mr. Hoyt said that headroom would be an issue but said the deck could come down a bit. Mr. Kitfield said he wanted to make it work and make the neighbors happy.

The Commission stated that another work session would be helpful.

V. ADJOURNMENT

*At 11:20 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote ((7-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on December 7, 2016.