

**MINUTES of the  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

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

**6:30 p.m.**

**July 14, 2021**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Acting Chairman Jon Wyckoff; Acting Vice-Chair Margot Doering; City Council Representative Paige Trace; Members Reagan Ruedig, Martin Ryan, David Adams, and Dan Brown; Alternate Karen Bouffard.

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Alternate Heinz Sauk-Schubert

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

.....  
Acting Chairman Wyckoff read the postponements into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to **postpone** Work Sessions for 137 Northwest Street, One Raynes Avenue, 279 Marcy Street, and 449 Court Street to the August 4k 2021 meeting.*

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

Mr. Adams recused himself from the following item and Ms. Bouffard took a voting seat.

**1. 21 Humphrey's Court**

Mr. Cracknell said the request was to remove and replace two decks and stairways (decking, framing, kickboard, treads, and handrail systems). He said the applicant decided to use a mahogany rail and an Epay wood deck, with the rest of the items pressure treated.

**2. 1 Harbour Place**

Mr. Cracknell recommended that the item be continued to the August 4 meeting because the applicant wasn't present and needed to be.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** Item 1 and **continue** Item 2, and City Council Representative Trace seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

**II. CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL - EXTENSION REQUESTs**

**1. Petition of Mill Gate Condominium Association, owner, and Lassen Family Revocable Trust, Charles L. and Susan E. Trustees, applicants, for property located at 19**

**South Street, Unit 1**, wherein permission was requested to allow a 1-year extension of the Certificate of Approval originally granted on August 05, 2020 for exterior renovations to an existing structure (on the rear elevation remove one window and one door and add two new windows and new patio door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 102 as lot 53-1 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the one-year extension request, and Mr. Ryan seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

### **III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)**

1. Petition of **Stone Creek Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **53 Green Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow the demolition of the existing structure and the new construction of a 3-5 story mixed-use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 119 as Lot 2 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5) and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

#### **Work Session**

Jeff Johnston of Cathartes was present on behalf of the applicant and requested a work session before the public hearing. Project team Rob Simmons and architect Carla Goodnight were also present. Ms. Goodnight reviewed the petition, noting that the Green Street elevation was shifted over four feet and increased four feet, but the architecture and building remained largely unchanged. She said the biggest change was the new elevation, where the corner balconies were filled in, commercial spaces were increased, and there were glazed corners along the path. She said the transformer was moved to a less prominent location near the garage door opening.

Mr. Adams said it was an improvement and helped make the Green Street piece speak more for itself. He said he was pleased with what the 4-ft shift accomplished. Ms. Ruedig said the streetscape was also improved because the addition of commercial space or pedestrian level activity by adding entrances and glass on the side helped that portion of the building. City Council Representative Trace remarked that just shifting one particular end of the building over made it much more interesting on that side.

Acting Chairman Wyckoff closed the work session and entered into the public hearing.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

Ms. Goodnight reviewed the site and landscape plans, architecture, and details. She noted that the public art piece would be coordinated with 3S Artspace. Acting Chair Wyckoff asked what material came down the Green Street sidewalk, and Ms. Goodnight said it was cast stone. He recommended that it be sealed every year to prevent what was happening to Portwalk Place, and

Ms. Goodnight agreed. She reviewed the updated landscape plan. Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked what kind of screening surrounded the transformer. Ms. Goodnight said plantings screened it because it was a small area and that it would be screened by the garage on the Market Street Side. In response to other questions, Ms. Goodnight said the transformer was 8'x8' and 5 feet tall and would be painted the color of the building. Mr. Cracknell suggested painting the bollards black instead of bright yellow, and it was further discussed. City Council Representative Trace said the applicant did a great job of listening to the Commission's suggestions and said it was a project that she was proud to get behind.

Acting Chairman Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

Mr. Ryan said it was a wonderful addition to the north end and a terrific piece of modern architecture and that, although the applicant took some of the more interesting details out of it and made it safer, it was a successful project. He said it would preserve the integrity of the District and was consistent with the special and defining character of surrounding properties.

Ms. Ruedig said she would not support the project. She said there were a lot of successful components, like the Green Street elevation and the way the applicant worked with the bizarre shape of the lot to make the building fit well, and she felt that the applicant incorporated a lot of the Commission's comments, but she thought the north side of the building wasn't a strong enough design for that most visible elevation and could be more interesting. She said overall it wasn't a terrible project but could have a more successful design on the back, and she didn't care for the big curved portions of the building. She said she didn't think it appropriately fit the north end. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said her initial reaction to the building was that it was always too large for that particular location right on Mill Pond and she had always been concerned about the view of it from Mill Pond. She said she couldn't support the project.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 5-2, with Ms. Ruedig and Acting Vice-Chair Doering voting in opposition.*

2. Petition of **Ten State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **10 State Street, Unit D**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (create new State Street entrance with vestibule within the existing entrance footprint) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 105 as Lot 4-4 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Josh Butkus was present on behalf of the applicant and reviewed the petition. He said they wanted to alter the entry to the unit to provide more safety and character and were proposing a simple vestibule with a glass entry door. He said the materials to wrap the interior would match the other materials on the building.

Mr. Adams asked if the brick was a veneer on the exterior of a wood frame. The applicant agreed and explained how the brick veneer went up the building. He said the edges would be filled in to look like the other finished edges on the building, and the brick would not be cut on the corners. Mr. Adams asked if a separate casing board would be applied to span midpoint on that end of the brick to cover the edging and framing materials. Mr. Butkus said it would be flat stock casing and would match the wall thickness and wrap the interior of the case opening. In response to further questions, he said the existing granite sill would be incorporated into a granite paver instead of tiles, and a wood lining would come up the sides only on a portion of the interior because the lintel didn't go all the way back through the wall. City Council Representative Trace said the building originally had the appearance of a warehouse and asked if the lintel was just a scabbed-on piece of granite. Mr. Butkus said it wasn't a full triple-wide granite lintel but more of a decorative piece that carried underneath and was stained mahogany. Ms. Ruedig said it was a vast improvement to the elevation.

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 Acting-Chair Doering seconded.*

Mr. Adams said the improvement changed the building slightly and would help preserve the integrity of the District and would be similar to other properties in the neighborhood.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

#### **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)**

A. Petition of **64 Vaughan Mall, LLC, owner**, for property located at **64 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add a 3-story addition and create new entry points to the Worth Lot) and additional site improvements as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 1 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

#### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Architect Mark Mueller was present on behalf of the applicant, and the applicant Steve Wilson was also present. Mr. Mueller reviewed the petition and said there was a minor adjustment in the

mansard portion of the Hanover Street façade. He said the group of three windows was widened about two feet, so the outer edges of the shed dormer got one foot closer to the corner on either side; and the arced opening to the right of it opened to a covered deck. He noted that the original drawing showed the arced cover with its front façade all the way out, but he said it was pushed back and the cheek walls on each side of it were removed. He said other adjustments included that the corner had two returns and was set in, and there was a deck on both sides and the decks were enclosed. He said the owner preferred a granite material but they intended to build a full-scale mockup of the granite façade and the painted siding.

City Council Representative Trace said the mansard roof on the corner of the fourth floor had an opening for that particular deck unlike the other corner facing the parking lot, and she was concerned that the opening with the rounded roof was just open. Ms. Ruedig said that whole corner was weird and didn't see the feasibility of it, and that it seemed like the resident would want to take away the windows so that the deck was open or else enclose the other side to make it more usable space. She said it looked like there were missing windows in that spot or that it was under construction. Mr. Adams asked about the openings on the brick façade. Ms. Ruedig said she expressed her discomfort for the recessed balcony on the historic side but thought it made sense on this elevation but that it depended on the deck. She said it made a difference if one could see that there was an actual wall behind there. She asked how deep they were and if there would really be a visible wall. Mr. Mueller said there would be a series of the same type of passage doors, at least from the window sill up, and it would have a simulated divided light look and read similar to the windows. He said the insides of the decks would be clad in brick like the exterior and the ceiling would be treated similar to 25 Maplewood Avenue, which was a tongue-and-groove wood ceiling surface. He said they would be completely finished and would not be left to the tenant to treat the wall whatever was he or she wanted to.

Mr. Cracknell said he thought the Commission didn't want to have the blank wall but instead wanted the storefront extended on the Worth Lot. He asked if it would be the extended storefront or artwork. Mr. Mueller said they considered both options and chose to leave it as a placeholder for potential public art. Mr. Wilson repeated a few of the Commission's previous comments about art and said most of the Commission preferred the art space instead of a storefront.

Mr. Cracknell asked the applicant if they wanted approval that night for the original Margeson building, with the balconies and art space, or if they wanted approval for the new addition on the back. Mr. Wilson said they wanted approval for both, and it was further discussed. He said the only changes were the depth of the eyebrow and one foot on each side of the dormer to make the windows appear to fit better. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said the old section of the building was previously approved except for the two balconies on the Vaughan Mall side, which would return for an administrative approval item. Ms. Bouffard said it looked odd with the windows on one side and the openings on the other, and she had concerns about the use going forward. She said the occupant could put anything in there that could be detrimental to the whole flavor of that Margeson side. Mr. Mueller explained that the floor of the deck wasn't where the opening started and they had created a visual shield at the floor level, so even if someone put a bike on the deck it wouldn't be seen because there was solid material for the lower few feet and higher on the brick side of the building. Ms. Bouffard asked about drainage, and Mr. Mueller said there were internal drains under the decking. Mr. Ryan said he didn't mind the vertical openings but was

concerned about the corner where the cheek walls had to be put back to have a relationship with the window and the open balcony. He said there was no dialog between them, but the cheek walls might make them more cohesive. City Council Representative Trace asked how much control the applicant would have in cold weather by closing that one opening on the balcony. Mr. Mueller said the condo documents would restrict what the tenant could do.

Acting Chair Wyckoff asked what could be done about the fourth floor. Mr. Mueller said the proposed material palette was in the package and they would build a full-size mockup with actual granite. He said the bevel siding would be Boral, which would hold paint longer. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said she didn't care for the wire mesh material choice for the rails on the parking lot side. Ms. Ruedig asked if a thin veneer would be applied to the corbeling detail on the top of the brick building. Mr. Mueller said he preferred an authentic corbeling of the brick. Acting Chair Wyckoff said the windows appeared to project out and were different than the side windows. Mr. Mueller said it was a rendering anomaly and that it was a traditional 5/4 stock window surround. He said all the middle windows were larger than the side windows.

Mr. Mueller discussed the garage door and said there was a gap between the extension of the new addition and the restaurant, so they would provide a 20-ft wide easement that also provided a driveway. He said the façade on the right was the far end of that recess to the building. Mr. Ryan said the residential door and the Conair widows didn't look right, and it was further discussed. Acting Chair Wyckoff said he was comfortable with taking away the garage door but thought the fourth-floor balcony needed to come back to the Commission.

Mr. Adams suggested confidence-building views into the balcony spaces and a better view of the cheek walls of the dormer or how they would work out. He said the panels of the doors and windows over the garage door were inappropriate, even though that elevation was thought of as the back side of the house, because people on the Hanover Street side would see it as part of their public view. He said it needed to be more cohesive and that he was struggling with the details. Acting Chair Wyckoff said the fenestration was changed to match the inside, and he suggested having the same triple Andersen double hung windows that were on the second and third floors because it would look better. City Council Representative Trace asked if a certain window by the door was going to be a row of windows. Mr. Wilson said they were covered openings with an open walkway and were not climate controlled. He said it was a ramp that made the transition from Hanover Street. Ms. Trace said she saw a door that looked like someone had to go down 6-7 steps to get to it. Mr. Wilson said it was a security gate that wasn't illustrated well. Acting Chair Wyckoff said the Commission needed details on the gate.

Mr. Wilson asked how the Commission felt about the windows over the garage door matching certain windows better. Mr. Adams asked what the fabric of the balconies would be. Mr. Mueller said it would be a sheet of copper with a zinc finish that would look like a lead-coated copper and have a horizontal reveal breaking up the vertical panel into three components.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering said there were two options on moving forward: having a laundry list of administrative approval items to cover later or asking for a new presentation. She said she was struggling with all the issues coming up and all the questions about things that couldn't be seen. Mr. Wilson said he would return with another garage door option, window changes, and so on.

Mr. Cracknell read the five issues for further consideration:

- 1) Alternatives for the garage door;
- 2) Better details and cross-sections for the tower balconies on Hanover Street;
- 3) More detail on the Vaughan Street balconies;
- 4) Alternative options for the commercial windows over the garage door, dimensionally and stylistically; and
- 5) The arcade having a lot more detail on what's happening with the gate, the openings, the last window, and how the precast will be worked into each of those openings.

City Council Representative suggested having an internal drainage system for snow conditions.

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 **continue** the application to the August 4 meeting, and Mr. Ryan seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

B. Petition of **William T. & Susan Manfull, owners**, for property located at **12 South Street**, wherein permission was 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.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the applicant and said the request was for a simple addition at the rear of the property that also ran along Marcy Street. She reviewed the windows, doors, and foundation. She said a fireplace with a true chimney would be installed and the existing fencing would have an additional piece of the same style.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked about window casings. Mr. Whitney said the sills would match and their depth would be applied with a 5-quarter and 2" sill. She said the flat stock corner boards would match the house and the roofline would be simple. In response to further questions, she said the top of the new chimney would match the style of the existing one. She said there would probably be exterior lighting on the yard side of the addition and two lights on either side of the French door, which she would return for administrative approval for.

Acting Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

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

No one was present to speak, and he closed the public hearing.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

Ms. Ruedig said it was an appropriate addition to the house because it was very simple and the design was seamless and appropriate. She said the addition would complement and enhance the architectural and historic character, would be compatible with surrounding properties, and have a relation to the historic and architectural value of the existing structure.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

## **V. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)**

A. Work Session requested by **238 Deer Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **238 Deer Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the demolition of the existing structure and the construction of a new 3-4 story mixed-use building as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 3 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

Architect Jeremiah Johnson was present on behalf of the applicant, along with architect Richard Desjardins. Mr. Johnson reviewed the petition and said the ground floor would have retail space and the upper floors would have residential micro units. He said there were some options for massing, and Option 1 was to divide the building in thirds across the front façade on Deer Street. He said he was inspired with the relationship to the railroad and a lot of the materials and buildings that had a rusticated metal industrial feel. He showed samples of metal and zinc panels. He said the building's challenge was that it felt like a corner lot because it was up against a newly-renovated parking lot. He said breaking the building up into thirds in the front made it look like a smaller module and played off the nearby building, the Deer Street/Maplewood Avenue intersection, and the views from the Foundry Garage and Bridge Street. He said it had a strong cornice line broken by the center line and the penthouse was recessed back.

He said Option 2 had a more receded mass instead of a protruding center, with a bit of a canopy over the storefront. He said they were considering an opaque guard rail at the top and different materials, with wood on top and a metal panel to the side, and stone veneer in the middle. He said the first floor would all be the same material instead of broken up into three masses like Option 1. He said the building would step down from the Deer Street/Maplewood Avenue corner, which was a prominent one, and would reflect that the next lot over was vacant and the building wasn't too many properties away from being in a residential neighborhood.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering said Option 2's roof looked like a fence. Mr. Johnson said it was a guardrail. Acting-Chair Wyckoff asked if the storefront on Option 2 was at the area where the projected middle bay was on Option 1. Mr. Johnson agreed and said they were both up against the sidewalk like the steps were. Mr. Adams said he was sold on the stark international style, the projecting balcony, the approach to the street, and breaking the three units into separate pieces.

Ms. Ruedig said she hoped the playful elements of the building calmed down a bit and that she didn't see much of a difference in the massing. She said the simplicity and bringing the building into a more coherent style would make it a much more successful building. Mr. Ryan said it wasn't a really big building and thought the applicant was trying to do too much with it, with multiple cornices and windows. Mr. Johnson said they didn't have a lot of room to play with the mass and that the busy-ness resulted from trying to make one part different from another. Mr. Ryan said it was just too busy and to keep it one nice beautiful object.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering agreed with some of the comments and said 'simple' went a long way. She said the applicant could find an element or material that could become the focal point, like a line of brick, or a stripe of a motif. Acting Chair Wyckoff agreed. Mr. Brown said the building fit in nicely and was massed well but suggested that the applicant not overdo it. Ms. Ruedig said the doors looked like one entrance in the floor plans but she hoped multiple doors were put across the front. Mr. Johnson agreed. He said the property stepped in on the Bridge Street side and that they were considering changing the material there to a higher-end one on the three divided sections. Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked to see a perspective from Bridge Street at the next meeting.

There was no public comment.

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

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the work session to the August 4 2021, meeting, and Mr. Ryan seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

**B. REQUEST TO POSTPONE-** Work Session requested by **Gregory J. Morneault and Amanda B. Morneault, owners**, for property located at **137 Northwest Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new structure (single family home) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 122 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and Historic Districts.

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

*It was moved, seconded, and passed to **postpone** the petition to the August 4, 2021 meeting.*

**C.** Work Session requested by **Dagny Taggart, LLC, owner**, for property located at **93 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (renovations of existing building) and new construction to an existing structure (construct 3-story addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 74 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and Historic Districts.

Architect Tracy Kozak was present on behalf of the applicant. She said she wanted to separate the application into two projects and that the renovation of the existing building would happen first. Acting Chair Wyckoff said it would have to be a separate hearing. Ms. Kozak said they would replace the roof shingles and windows on the existing building and use synthetic slate. The windows were discussed and Ms. Kozak said she would bring a sample window in.

Ms. Kozak said the addition was made smaller and shorter and pushed back from the street about six feet, resulting in a loss of eight units. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said it appeared that the addition wasn't stepped back further, and she asked if the wall still had to come down and be rebuilt. Ms. Kozak said they weren't touching the rest of the wall on Court Street. She discussed the old foundation and said they cleaned it up a bit but that it still obscured the bottom three feet of the stone wall, so they wanted to lower the top of that corner so that drivers could see oncoming pedestrians. She said the building was made to look like a unified one that had been there a while and was broken up into smaller masses lower than the Treadwell House, with smaller dormers on top. Ms. Ruedig said the massing was much better and made more sense. She said it was a historically sensitive and important area, and making it match was important. She said she was confident that the details would make it read as though it were new. Ms. Kozak said they could take the addition in different directions depending on how different or old the Commission wanted it to look and could make the differentiation at the breaks where the setback portions were. Mr. Ryan said the addition indicated that it was just as good as the old building but wouldn't shy away from presenting itself to the street. He said the massing was excellent. He asked how the wall on the flat part of the back would be handled, and he said he didn't have a problem with the 16-ft width. Mr. Brown said the addition fit in a lot better and didn't overwhelm the Treadwell House or the addition to the temple. Ms. Bouffard said she had a problem with the connection because it didn't look right. She said she didn't care for glass and thought the addition's design was much more appealing but very different than the connector. City Council Representative Trace said she saw it as a repeat of the porch off the side of the front and thought it looked like an homage to the front. The materials were discussed.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering said the project was heading in the right direction. Acting Chair Wyckoff said he was confident the applicant would come back with the proper details for the connector. He said he liked the massing and the fact that the center building was only two stories with dormers, making it look like an old commercial building that had been there a while. He suggested putting shutters on the hip roof of the Federal building, which he thought would make a big difference in separating the two buildings. Mr. Adams said the sticking point was what it would look like from the sidewalk across the street. Ms. Kozak said she would return with proper elevations and more detailed views. Mr. Brown asked what was happening on the back with the flat roof, and Ms. Kozak said the mechanical equipment would be hidden as much as possible. Ms. Ruedig said she hoped that much of the original material in the interior would be saved. Ms. Kozak agreed and said the trim around the windows would be restored.

There was no public comment.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the work session to the August 4, 2021 meeting, and City Council Representative Trace seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

**D. REQUEST TO POSTPONE-** Work Session requested by **One Raynes Ave, LLC, 31 Raynes LLC, and 203 Maplewood Avenue, LLC, owners**, for properties located at **1 Raynes Avenue, 31 Raynes Avenue, and 203 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a 4-5 story mixed-use building and a 5 story hotel) as per plans on file

in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 123 Lot 14, Map 123 Lot 13, and Map 123 Lot 12 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and Historic Districts.

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

*It was moved, seconded, and passed to **postpone** the petition to the August 4, 2021 meeting.*

E. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**- Work Session requested by **Ross D. Ellenhorn and Rebecca J. Wolfe, owners**, for property located at **279 Marcy Street, Unit #3**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct recessed deck on 3<sup>rd</sup> floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 45-3 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

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

*It was moved, seconded, and passed to **postpone** the petition to the August 4, 2021 meeting.*

F. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**- Work Session requested by **Mary H. and Ronald R. Pressman, owners**, for property located at **449 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (add 4<sup>th</sup> floor addition and roof deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 105 as Lot 6 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) and Historic Districts.

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

*It was moved, seconded, and passed to **postpone** the petition to the August 4, 2021 meeting.*

#### **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary