

**MINUTES of
THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

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

6:30 p.m.

July 07, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Acting Chairman Jon Wyckoff; Acting Vice-Chair Margot Doering; City Council Representative Paige Trace; Members Martin Ryan, David Adams, and Dan Brown, Alternates Karen Bouffard and Heinz Sauk-Schubert

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Reagan Ruedig

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
Alternate Sauk-Schubert took a voting seat for all petitions except where otherwise noted.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. June 02, 2021

The June 2 minutes were **approved** as presented by unanimous vote.

2. June 09, 2021

The June 9 minutes were **approved** as amended by unanimous vote.

Acting Chair Wyckoff stated that Petition 3 for 12 South Street and Administrative Approval Item 1 for 14 Mechanic Street were postponed.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

Note: the items were not reviewed in sequence.

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to pull out Administrative Approval Items 2, 7, 11, and 13 for separate review.

1. 14 Mechanic Street

The item was postponed.

2. 32 Pickering Street

Mr. Brown recused himself from the petition.

The request was to change the lighting to a lantern style.

*Mr. Adams moved to **approve** the request, and Acting Vice-Chair Doering seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

3. 165 Court Street

The request was to change the previously-approved awning design to make the aluminum frame wider and to project the awning farther.

4. 15 Middle Street

The request was to change the façade windows to make them fire-rated glass. Mr. Cracknell noted that the dormer was also a bit lower on the roof than shown on the drawing.

5. 306 South Street

The request was to add a 42-inch New England white picket fence in the backyard.

6. 166 New Castle Avenue

The request was to extend the existing fence and place it on top of the stone wall. Mr. Cracknell said the applicant would request an amendment from the City Council.

It was **stipulated** that the City's right-of-way would be amended by the City Council.

7. 241 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell said the brownstone building was in disrepair and wasn't sure if what the applicant proposed was appropriate for the multitude of repair strategies and replacements. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said there was a lack of understanding of the materials and how well the recommended type of repair material would work with the existing brownstone. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said Ms. Ruedig was concerned about how the material would be applied and wanted to ensure that the person doing it was knowledgeable of the technique. It was further discussed. Mr. Adams said he would be more comfortable if the contractor came before the Commission with photographs and specific locations for where the work would be done and also thought there should be a site walk.

Mr. Cracknell said the contractor could do a mockup of his first repair so that the Commission could inspect it. Mr. Adams suggested an onsite seminar on the product as well.

*Mr. Adams moved to **approve** the request with the following **stipulations**:*

- *The contractor shall do a mockup of the first repair, and allow the Commission to conduct a site walk for review.*

- *The contractor shall clarify how the brownstone shall be restored.*

*City Council Representative Trace seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

8. 125 Bow Street

The request was to replace the mechanical equipment on the rear patio. Mr. Cracknell said it wasn't a replacement in kind but an amendment to a previously-approved project and that it was smaller and wouldn't be seen from anywhere but the abutting property.

9. 60 Penhallow Street

Mr. Cracknell said the request was approval for the artwork presentation. Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked what purview the Commission had regarding the style of art. It was further discussed. Mr. Ryan said the applied material would have a lot of impact on the building's façade and asked whether the Legal Department or City Manager had been consulted. He said he wasn't comfortable with the Commission suddenly making a decision on public art. Mr. Cracknell said the art was a particular kind of screen and the code was very clear that it required HDC approval. City Council Representative Trace said she didn't feel comfortable passing judgment on art on behalf of the City residents. Acting-Chair Wyckoff suggested pulling the item out for separate discussion and vote.

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to review the item separately from the others.

The applicant's representative architect Tracy Kozak was present and said the art and sculpture were exempt from the Commission's purview other than the two pieces that screened the mechanical equipment. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said it came down to the reflective wall and the bronze wall that covered up the transformers. Mr. Cracknell said the request was before the Commission because the art pieces were elements associated with the building that needed to be approved. Mr. Ryan said it was an important issue and that some of the art pieces were iconic and others would become some of the building's fabric.

*Mr. Adams moved to have the request return before the Commission as a public hearing, and City Council Representative Trace seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

10. 60 Penhallow Street

The request was for mechanical equipment changes on the roof and minor changes on the copper. The applicant's representative architect Tracy Kozak was present and said they wanted to add a few more mechanical units and also change some sections of the upper roof to a membrane the same color as the copper. She said they wanted to change the copper shingles on the frieze-bands from factory pre-patina ones to field painted ones instead. She showed samples of the patina to the Commission, noting that the smaller sample was brighter and would be toned down to match. She said mockups would be done before construction so that the Commission could see them. She said they wanted to use zinc for the band of gray metal

on top of the shingle pads instead of fake zinc. Acting-Chair Doering said approval of the product would be dependent on seeing the product. Ms. Kozak said she would update the Commission as to when it would be on site.

It was **stipulated** that the applicant shall submit a mockup of the copper finish to the Historic District Commission for review.

11. 553 Islington Street

Mr. Cracknell said the contractor reduced the five façade windows by 20 percent in the openings, which gave the building a very different look. He said the contractor was notified that he should appear before the Commission first but installed the windows anyway. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said the framing contractor stated that the existing windows had no header over them, so they had to shrink the windows in order to place the header in the opening. He said the windows were close to the floor, which necessitated safety glass, so inappropriate windows were bought. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said the replacement windows completely changed the defining characteristics of the house and were unacceptable, and several Commissioners agreed. City Council Representative Trace said it was disturbing that the City asked the contractor to stop the project but the windows were put in anyway. Mr. Adams said the Commission worked hard to accommodate the plans of the architect and applicant by doing a thorough review and placing a level of trust in the contractor. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said the exterior casings that the contractor said would be restored and copied on the other windows were also wiped out.

*Acting Vice-Chair Doering moved to **deny** the request, and City Council Representative Trace seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

12. 49 Hunking Street

The request was to install four footpath lights.

13. 124 State Street

The applicant Laura Ludes was present and said she wanted to remove the pergola off the 3rd floor balcony, construct a sidewall for the roof deck, and fill two front basement windows with granite. She said the fire code required a minimum 30” height on the wing wall as well as a 42” tall handrail in the front. In response to Mr. Ryan’s question, the applicant said the wall would be capped with bluestone.

*Mr. Ryan moved to **approve** the request, and Acting Vice-Chair Doering seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

14. 290 Pleasant Street, Unit #6

The request was to install a condenser on the back of the building. It was **stipulated** that the conduit on the outside would be field painted to match the brick.

15. 6 Rock Street, Unit #4

Mr. Cracknell said the Inspection Department authorized the owner to do an emergency repair on the deck, so the owner removed the deck and was reframing it and proposed to use pressure-treated wood for the framing, a composite for the kickboard, and mahogany for the treads and decking. Mr. Adams asked about the posts, rails, and balusters. The applicant Kate Coyle was present and said they would replicate what was there before by making them all pressure-treated wood and staining them to match the house.

It was **stipulated** that the decking and stair tread shall be mahogany.

*Mr. Adams moved to **approve** Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 15 with their respective stipulations, and Acting Vice-Chair Doering seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **KWA, LLC, owner**, for property located at **165 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new signage and a mural on the southwest wall of the existing structure as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 27 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant's representative architect Jeremiah Johnson was present. He reviewed the proposed mural and said it was an artist's rendering of Ruth Blay and would be painted on a thin vinyl material. The designer Terence Parker was also present and said the design was based on a book called The Hanging of Ruth Blay and would promote her story.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked how long the adhesive vinyl would be on the side of the building and if there were concerns about effects of rain, moisture, and so on. Mr. Parker said the mural's life expectancy was 7-10 years. Mr. Ryan said it was an icon and asked if it was meant to be there in perpetuity, noting that there was an adjoining property and someone might want to build up against it in the future. Mr. Johnson said someone could build to their zero lot line and hide the mural, but he didn't expect it to happen in the near future and there physically wouldn't be an issue because the mural was a temporary material.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one was present to speak, and Acting-Chair Wyckoff closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*City Council Representative Trace moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, and Mr. Brown seconded.*

Ms. Trace said it was an acceptable design to the neighborhood because it would be on a building that wasn't a historic one and would speak to a current issue. She said it was an expression of a group of people, it was a non-profit project, and it was something appropriate for that particular building.

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

2. Petition of **Martingale, LLC, owner**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (expand existing deck and dock structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the Downtown Overlay, Character District 5 (CD5) and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Architect Jeremiah Johnson was present on behalf of the applicant, along with project designer Terence Parker and Attorney Sherilyn Burnett Young. Mr. Johnson reviewed the petition and said two separate decks were proposed: the west end deck expansion would be a public wharf deck and the east end deck expansion would expand the outside dining and also include a floating dock. He noted that there would be no increase in occupancy.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked who was in charge of how much the decks could go over the water. Mr. Johnson said it was the State. In response to further questions, Mr. Johnson said the right section of the left deck expansion would be an extension of the drink rail and a hostess stand, and the other side would be a public 504-sf deck and another slightly larger deck. He said there would be appropriate signage and the decking material would be similar to the existing decking, with a new rail design. Mr. Adams asked for more explanation on why both additions to the current deck were curved toward the waterfront. Mr. Johnson said it was a nice way to soften the sharp corners. It was further discussed. Mr. Brown asked what the deck's current capacity was changed to. Mr. Johnson said it was currently 100 and would increase to just under 200, making the total restaurant capacity 333. City Council Representative Trace noted that there were multiple points of egress into the restaurant and onto the deck and asked how it was known that the ebb and flow would work properly and that there would be only 200 people at most on the deck. Mr. Johnson said it was a seasonal operation and that people would be counted at the door. He said people could only access the deck by coming down the stairs from the interior or from the tiny pinch point at the far end of the dock.

Mr. Parker spoke to the proposed murals, noting that they were based on a book written by the University of New Hampshire professor Jeff Bolster about the history of Afro-American sailors. He said the murals would be bronze sculptures and would be located near the 32 linear feet of seating on the public dock. He noted that the murals were scaled back from 27 feet to 17 feet and from 16 feet to about seven feet at the request of Harpoon Willy's so that they wouldn't obscure their views. He said the east mural would have planter boxes and a green wall on the back side.

City Council Representative Trace noted that the public had not seen the handouts given out to the Commission. Mr. Johnson suggested pulling the murals out of the petition and resubmitting them at a later date. It was agreed to remove the murals component from the petition.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING AGAINST THE PETITION

John Sherman of 111 Bow Street said he owned Unit 2. He said he submitted some materials to the Commission about how the border in the 20-ft side buffer between his building and the applicant's was being used for trash storage and that the trash would increase because the restaurant size would double. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said trash wasn't in the Commission's purview. Mr. Sherman said the Commission previously approved a much different plan. He said the applicant went before the Conservation Commission in 2012 and had said they would not extend the docking structure any further into the water. He said the Conservation Commission did not approve the project and neither did the Department of Environmental Services (DES). Acting-Chair Wyckoff said the applicant would have to go before the Conservation Commission again, but that the HDC was a design review board. Mr. Sherman said the proposed project was massive for the waterfront.

John Hare of 113 Bow Street said he was strongly opposed to the proposed expansion due to concerns about noise and light and also added congestion to Bow Street from more delivery and trash removal trucks.

David Sands of 113 Bow Street said the project was killing the historic character of the building and the area.

Katy Sherman of 111 Bow Street, Unit 2, said when the existing wharf was approved, the owner said he wouldn't ask for anything more. She said the garbage was being pushed against her building already and would be doubled with the expansion. She said the dock was within her 20-ft buffer, and she was concerned about how the tugboats would navigate around the expanded wharf. She said the project was a huge impact to the shoreland and wetlands and should have a site review. Mr. Cracknell said the project would be reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee and a site plan would get approved, which would capture all the issues of waste disposal and zoning buffer compliance. He said the ecological impacts on marine life were a Conservation Commission issue, and lighting, noise and traffic impacts were not the HDC's purview. He offered to meet with her and her husband to further discuss the issues.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Attorney Sherilyn Young said the building was redeveloped in 2012 but now had greater flexibility. She said the structures on the waterside were consistent with other waterfront commercial structures in the area. She said the applicant received the approval of the condominium association at 109 and 111 Bow Street to consent to the 0-ft setback and would also go before the DES but wouldn't have to go before the Army Corps of Engineers. She said two of the Commission's review purposes were to strengthen the local economy and to promote

the use for education, pleasure, and welfare of the community. She said the project would offer the public a unique view of the waterfront.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Adams moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, for purposes of discussion. Mr. Ryan seconded.*

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams said he had a problem with the deck's optics because it looked like a pleasure dock instead of a historic working one and he was uncomfortable with having it be the signature of the City. He said he was also bothered by the curved nature of the decks. He said the applicant was throwing a bone by making a portion of the dock public. He said he was in support of much of the project conceptually except for the actual design of it. Mr. Ryan said the waterfront wouldn't ever be a working dock again and that the existing dock was already a pleasure dock. He said concerns about noise, trash, odors, and so on were not the Commission's purview. He said he saw nothing more than an expansion of what was already there and thought it was a good expansion and a lot was done to provide artwork. He said it was where the public got access to the waterfront, and he said it was also his way of experiencing the waterfront by going there and having a drink because he didn't have access to any waterfront from his home. He said he would support the project and looked forward to it. He noted that it would bring in more tourism and might be more intense but it was just the nature of what currently existed on the waterfront.

City Council Representative Trace said the massing was huge and said she felt she was looking at something in Monte Carlo. She said she couldn't get behind the project because it was just too large. Acting Vice-Chair Doering agreed. She said she appreciated that the applicant was trying to give the public some access but thought that access was relatively small compared to the mass requested for the restaurant's use. Mr. Brown agreed and said a smaller and tucked-in deck in the first half would fit in better. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he agreed that the public access portion was a bone the developers were throwing to the public and thought it should be enlarged. He said he didn't know of any other decks that were segmented like that. He said he saw it as a pure commercial enterprise that didn't really give back to Portsmouth. Ms. Bouffard agreed that the massing was too much and thought the public offering wasn't large enough to make a difference.

DECISION

*The motion **failed** by a vote of 5-2, with Acting Vice-Chair Doering, Mr. Adams, Mr. Brown, Mr. Sauk-Schubert, and City Council Representative Trace voting in opposition.*

3. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** - Petition of **William T. & Susan Manfull, owners**, for property located at **12 South Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a 1-story addition at the rear of the structure) as per plans on

file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 102 as Lot 42 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

The petition was postponed.

4. Petition of **Warner House Association, owner**, for property located at **150 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow the construction of a new freestanding structure (2-story carriage house) and the installation of mechanical equipment (A/C condenser) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 58 and lies within the Downtown Overlay, Civic and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the applicant and reviewed the few changes from the previous work session, including that the building would be pulled a foot away from Bow Street due to the retaining wall, the front door would be a faux door with a granite sill; and a heat pump would be on the back and fenced in. She noted that the left-side foundation would run higher so a fieldstone veneer would be done and the gap would be bridged with a stone wall. She discussed the new doors and windows and said an electric meter might be placed in the rear elevation. She said the roof would be yellow cedar and that she might try to find an older salvaged arrowhead hinge instead of the proposed wrought-iron one.

In response to Mr. Adams' questions, Ms. Whitney said the roof would be coursed 5-6 inches. She said there might be other vents in the back enclosed area and was considering the electric service because of the existing tree. She said there would be a built-in with a door and an electric panel and a meter inside the building, and the foundations' veneer would have natural stone.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Robert Barth of Lee, NH said he was associated with the Warner House as a former Chair and that the proposed carriage house would allow hands-on activities for visiting groups. He said the carriage house's ground-floor handicapped bathroom would allow wheelchairs and walkers to access the first floor of the Warner House as well. He said the project would allow exhibition space, a meeting room for educational programs, and a staging area for garden functions. He noted that support for the project was evidenced by pledges of \$50,000 by six board members.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one else was present to speak, and Acting-Chair Wyckoff closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Adams moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, with the following **stipulation**:*

- *There shall be a storm door included with the right-side tongue-and-groove door.*

City Council Representative Trace seconded.

Mr. Adams said the building was an asset to the community and filled a blank of missing utility space to the historic house would be in keeping with the architecture of the museum's materials and easy to support. Ms. Trace said the project was a breath of fresh air for Portsmouth and thanked everyone on the Warner House Board for having the vision to do it appropriately.

*The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

5. Petition of **John Durkin, owner**, for property located at **564 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (replace (3) existing windows and create new side and rear windows and doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 147 as Lot 11 and lies within the Mixed Research Office (MRO) and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant John Durkin was present and said two rooms would be swapped in use because he wanted to make the kitchen more welcoming to the backyard. He noted that the large double hung window would be a French door, the single door would become a window, and the casement window would become a window of the same size and dimension as the east corner windows. He said the bay windows on the rear would be replaced by Harvey Majesty windows.

Mr. Adams asked if the casings on the door and two window replacements would be changed to make them uniform on the building. The applicant said the casing on the new door would be similar to the casing on the old door, and also for the windows, and everything would have the same type of materials and dimensions. Mr. Adams noted that the casement window along the driveway wasn't trimmed out and looked new, and the triple unit casement window encroached to the neighborhood over the entryway to the apartment. He asked if something would be done to the new window location, and the applicant explained how it would be done.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one was present to speak, and Acting-Chair Wyckoff closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Adams moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, and City Council Representative Trace seconded.*

Mr. Adams said it was a compatible description of fenestration of the house that was there now and compatible with the house's materials and design. He said the project would move the house to a more concise exterior than it currently had.

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

6. Petition of **Susan Alex Living Trust, Susan Alex Trustee, owner**, for property located at **50 Mt. Vernon Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add dormers to existing garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 111 as Lot 29 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Designer/builder Matt Beebe was present on behalf of the applicant and noted that the project received approval from the Board of Adjustment. He said the applicant wanted to convert a portion of the first story and all of the second story into an ADU for her son. He said the two-dormer design was necessary for the expansion and that the dormers would be set back from the gable ends. He said the wall-mounted condenser at the back would be hidden by screening.

There were no questions. Acting-Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Kathleen Beauchamp of 21 Blossom Street said she was in favor of the project because using space to make another living space for a family member was the kind of thing people wanted to see more of in Portsmouth. She said the design would be compatible with the neighborhood.

SPEAKING TO, FOR OR AGAINST THE COMMISSION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Ryan moved to grant the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, and Mr. Brown seconded.

Mr. Ryan said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and would be compatible with the design of surrounding properties.

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

7. Petition of **Neal Pleasant Street Properties, LLC**, owner, for property located at **420 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (remove existing rear entryway, replace existing south east addition with added rooftop deck, construct 3-story stair enclosure, and construct new rear entry porch) as per plans on file in

the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 102 as Lot 56 and lies within the General Residence and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Architect Jeremiah Johnson was present on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the petition, noting that the five-unit apartment building would be converted to three units. He same some differences from his previous presentation included a change in the back porch windows' layout and rhythm and more railing details. He said the existing details and materials on the building would be matched, and an iron railing would be used on the roof deck and rear stairs. He said the granite stairs would be re-used. He discussed the three roof options.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked what the blank panel in the middle of the back porch was. Mr. Johnson said there was a wall inside the porch and they decided to have a replicated panel because it would look better than having siding on that side. The panel was further discussed and it was decided that it should return as an administrative approval.

Mr. Ryan said he liked Option A for the roof. Mr. Adams said he preferred Option B because it resolved the window location better, and other Commissioners agreed, so it was decided to use Option B for the roof. Mr. Johnson noted that Option B was also the applicant's preference.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Richard Nylander said he was a neighbor and thought Option B was the best option because the bumpout wouldn't be seen from the ground level and it was a good solution for the problems at the back of the house.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one else was present, and Acting-Chair Wyckoff closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Adams moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, with the following **stipulations**:*

- *The applicant shall use Option B for the roof; and*
- *The rear porch level shall be changed to include more clapboard than panels and shall return as an administrative approval.*

City Council Representative Trace seconded.

Mr. Adams said Option B would be more in keeping with the materials and design of the original structure. He said the materials and design were compatible with the house as well as designs of surrounding homes in the neighborhood.

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

8. Petition of **LAXMI Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **33 Gardner Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (replace removed chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 16 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

Mr. Adams recused himself from the petition, and Alternate Bouffard assumed a voting seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant Rita Patel was present. Mr. Cracknell spoke for her and said the left chimney was removed by mistake by the contractor and a vent was still present on the back side of the roof. He said the applicant wanted to remedy the defect and replace the chimney in kind with a restoration brick and appropriate mortar. He said the applicant would put the chimney back in kind with the same profile and dimensions as the chimney on the other side.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Ryan moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, and Acting Vice-Chair Doering seconded.*

Mr. Ryan said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and would be compatible with the special defining surrounding properties.

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary