

**MINUTES  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

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

**6:30 p.m.**

**October 6, 2021**

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

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

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

.....  
Acting Chairman Wyckoff stated that there were three requests for postponements.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** Old Business Work Sessions A, B, and C to the November 3 meeting.*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. September 01, 2021

The minutes were **approved** as presented by unanimous vote, 7-0.

**Note:** Administrative Approval Item 4 was reviewed out of order so that Ms. Ruedig could recuse herself and it could be voted on separately from the other items.

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

1. **564 Middle Street**

The request was to replace storm windows with CASCO Industries windows. It was **stipulated** that the color of the storm shall match the sash.

2. **65 Lafayette Road**

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant asked for three changes: 1) the front entry is different than the approved drawings; 2) the 3-panel garage door will be replaced with a 2-panel door; and 3) a picket fence on the back wasn't on the plan. Mr. Cracknell noted that two entryway options were previously presented to the Commission and they decided on Option 2C but the applicant built Option 2B. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said it was a classic appropriate look.

### 3. 33 Hunking Street

The request was for a front Peter Happny railing for the stairs. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said it was a fine handrail.

### 4. 160 Court Street

Ms. Ruedig recused herself. The request was to change the previously-approved block wall design for a new one because the applicant couldn't source it for the needed timeline, so he wanted to substitute the lower wall stone for the top one. Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked if it would be in the pattern shown in the photo. Mr. Cracknell said he assumed it would be. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said she liked that design better than the previously-approved one.

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

### 5. 500 Market Street

The request was to place more steel supports under the decks. Ms. Ruedig said it would be an improvement.

### 6. 1 Harbour Place

The request was for telecommunications antennas. The Commission said they liked them.

### 7. 40 Howard Street

The applicant Kenneth Sullivan was present. He said his project was previously approved for wood pediments and modified basement windows but needed to be re-approved because it had been a while. He said the water table board needed to be raised three inches, and a bullseye glass was placed on the transom over the front door. Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked how old the existing glass was, and Mr. Sullivan said it was from 1985. Mr. Sullivan said he also had renderings for a few wrought-iron railings for the front of the house.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff said he had a problem with allowing the mud board to be increased in size to the point that it wasn't similar to a board that might be on a Colonial. City Council Representative Trace said she had seen photos showing the mud boards of other larger and more formal homes in the area and thought the same size of mud board would be inappropriate on the applicant's home. The water table and foundation were further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said the formality of the applicant's house had increased by the changes and looked very different. Mr. Ryan suggested a chamfer starting from the first clapboard and coming out at 45 degrees, or lead flashing.

It was **stipulated** that the mud board shall be replaced in kind with the same height and with scribing and lead flashing shall be used to get to the face of the veneer wall.

*Mr. Ryan moved to **approve** Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7, with stipulations for Items 1 and 7. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Adams voting against the motion.*

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

1. Petition of **64 Vaughan Mall, LLC, owner**, for property located at **64 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow modifications to a previously approved plan (add rooftop atrium and masonry changes to the brick wall and front wall of the structure) 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**

The applicant Steve Wilson was present and reviewed the petition. He noted that he would not discuss outdoor spaces until a future meeting because a user of the building wanted to use the building for commercial use and wasn't fond of the recessed balconies. Mr. Wilson said he wanted to apply a trapezoid to the flat roof of the building and also wanted to have a full brick the masonry veneer instead of a thin one. He discussed the bowed wall on the old building.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff said it was more of a work session and that there wasn't much left to approve, so he suggested continuing the petition to the November meeting. He asked Mr. Wilson if any walls would be completely torn down. Mr. Wilson said one part had to be broken down to be replaced by a new wall but that it wouldn't be noticeable from the outside. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said that iron support plates on the outside of the building would have to be part of the November package. Some of the commissioners said they would go see the mockup. Mr. Brown said he was still confused about the recesses on the front. Mr. Ryan asked if there would be a cavity wall when the brick was put on, and Mr. Wilson said there wouldn't be.

There was no public comment.

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

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the petition to the November 3 meeting, seconded by Mr. Ryan. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

2. Petition of **Jeffrey L. & Dolores P. Ives, owners**, for property located at **44 Gardner Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a 1-story mudroom with new landing and steps) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 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. She said the project was postponed for a year and it was decided to add an addition on the driveway side that would

provide a bath and mudroom space and better access to the kitchen. She reviewed the window changes and said the wood rail system would be the same.

Ms. Ruedig asked why Window B had to be an awning and not a double hung. Ms. Whitney said it matched another window that was previously approved but that it could be a double hung. Ms. Ruedig said both windows should be double hungs, and it was further discussed. Ms. Whitney suggested said she would discuss the window with the owner. Acting-Chair Wyckoff asked if there was any molding between the soffit and the frieze board on the hip roof. Ms. Whitney said it was just a corner board with a gutter. Acting-Chair Wyckoff suggested stipulating that there be a K-style gutter surrounding the whole thing with a downspout at the corner. Mr. Ryan said the new addition didn't reference anything to the porch, like the skirting under the steps and so on. Ms. Whitney said she could do lattice instead of a board and stipulate that it match.

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, with the following stipulations:*

- 1. Both windows should either use a simulated middle rail or, it is preferred they be double hung windows.*
- 2. Matching lattice shall be used under the porch instead of a board.*
- 3. There shall be K-style gutters and downspouts.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

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

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

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

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Architect Jeremiah Johnson was present on behalf of the applicant, along with the applicant Mark McNabb. Mr. Johnson reviewed the petition and said they were proposing a deck to extend

the existing deck use and to add a new public access deck, along with two custom-designed murals and screening. He showed realistic views from the decks as well as eye-level renderings, noting that the changes to the deck would be much less perceivable than shown on the plan. He said there was an alternate option was a squared-off version of the deck but that the applicant preferred the main option with the curved deck.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked what the total square footage of the new combined deck was and if the options were the same square footage. Mr. Johnson said some square footage was gained and lost here and there. It was further discussed. Acting-Chair Wyckoff asked if the project had been before the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Johnson said they didn't need variances because it was a zero lot line downtown. He noted that the DES approval had started, however. Ms. Ruedig asked what the reduction in the public space from the 2015 approved plan was compared to what was proposed now. Mr. Johnson said the footprint of the rounded deck stayed the same but got narrower and longer, so the square footage was the same but the proportions changed. City Council Representative Trace asked if the deck would be seasonal or year-round use. Mr. Johnson said it would be seasonal. Mr. McNabb agreed with further comment.

Mr. Ryan said he had supported the project from the beginning and thought it was an excellent approach. He noted that one of the public criticisms was the balance between what was deemed public area and the restaurant area, and that someone had said that if there could be a larger public space by a bit of a percentage, it would go a long way. He said the squared-off version wasn't as visually appealing as the curved version, and he thought the whaling sculptures would tend to mislead the city's history by presenting something that was inaccurate. Ms. Ruedig agreed, noting that whaling was a strong identification for several seacoast towns that had real whaling histories, and some tourists or new residents might misunderstand the whaling motif. As a historian, she said she felt strongly that it should be tweaked.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering said she still had reservations about the mass and asked if changes could be made to the public deck/waiting area design so that the public deck got more of the front seat. She said that way people could come in and move along the railing and get a nice view while they were waiting for a table. Mr. McNabb said it was all public land from the State of New Hampshire that had a rigorous process for the division between the public's good and the size of the deck, and that he wasn't aware of any private owner in the harbor who had given an easement to the public. He said the public dock fit about 20 people and that he didn't want it any bigger than that. He also noted that it was an easement in perpetuity.

Ms. Ruedig said she had trouble understanding what Option B would look like because it didn't have the number of renderings that Option A had. Mr. McNabb said Option B had the same railing design for the curve and that he could bring back more details. Mr. Brown said his biggest concern was the ratio. He said the long narrow building would have a deck that would project more than any other building deck, and Option B would bring more proportion to balance out the deck size to the size of the building. Mr. Ryan said the curve looked like three different decks and was more appealing and more visually interesting, and the cable rail reflected the nautical theme and was more elegant looking. Mr. Adams said he preferred Option B, and City Council Representative Trace agreed, as did Ms. Bouffard.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff opened the public hearing.

### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION**

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough Street said the applicant didn't keep the previous agreement made with the City and usurped the deck for their profit. She said it got approved based on the public using the 20'x26' part of the deck, which didn't happen because they had to buy food and drink, so the proposal to double the deck was a slap in the face because the applicant didn't follow through with the original proposal. She said there would be noise, drinking, and so and asked that the deck be the original size that was proposed in 2015.

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

Bill Downey of 67 Bow Street phoned in and said he liked the public access and thought the deck was one of the best in Portsmouth, but he was concerned with the neighbors to the north and whether the deck would abut their property because the noise could be impactful depending on the occasion. He said Mr. McNabb always did an outstanding job with the property.

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

Acting Vice-Chair Doering noted that between the two plans, Mr. Johnson had talked about where things move when the curve was straightened and that some of the curved space moved over to the waiting area of the restaurant. Mr. Johnson said the percentage of change in square footage was in the single digits and thought the square footage might even be slightly reduced.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented using Alternate Option B (squared-off front of the deck) and with the removal of the artwork. The applicant shall return for Administrative Approval with a revised artwork plan (to consider shipbuilding versus whaling). Mr. Ryan seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the project would conserve and enhance surrounding property values, especially with the squared-off and more traditional footprint that would have compatibility of design with surrounding properties.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff noted that shipbuilding could be an inspiration for the artwork because it had been done in Portsmouth for over 300 years.

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

4. Petition of **Kenneth Charles Sullivan Revocable trust of 2021, Kenneth Charles Sullivan, owner**, for property located at **40 Howard Street**, wherein, permission is requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (replacement windows as previously approved) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 61 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant Kenneth Sullivan was present and said he wanted to replace 19 windows in his house with Green Mountain windows. He said his existing windows were rotting and that the new windows would be custom made. He reviewed the windows in detail.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked if the sash exterior was painted black. Mr. Sullivan said all the exteriors would be black, including those on the addition. Mr. Brown asked when the house was built and whether the 9/6 and 6/6 windows were original. Mr. Sullivan said the house was built in either 1780 or 1815 but that he wasn't sure if the windows were original. Mr. Adams said the window sills on the front and driveway side were the 3" variety, but the specs for the new windows showed a 1-3/4" sill. He asked if the front windows would be changed and some of the ones on the driveway side. Mr. Sullivan said the Commission previously requested that they look different intentionally because the addition was new. He said the new windows had a historical sill. Acting-Chair Wyckoff asked if the casings would be replaced, and Mr. Sullivan agreed. Ms. Ruedig said it was clear that the sill was made up of two pieces cobbled together; she was fine with the Green Mountain windows, but it meant that some of it would have to be reworked to make it fit. The Commission suggested doing a replacement in kind. Mr. Ryan suggested stipulating that the applicant return for approval for the 3" exterior sills.

## **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, with the following stipulation:*

- 1. That the applicant shall do the 3"± sill.*

*Mr. Adams seconded.*

Mr. Adams said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and conserve and enhance the special characters of surrounding neighborhoods.

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

5. (Work Session/Public Hearing) requested by **Danny Parker, LLC, owner**, for property located at **266 Middle Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the removal and replacement of the rear egress stairs and deck and renovations to an existing structure (replace siding and windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 136 as Lot 9 and lies within the Mixed Research Office (MRO) and Historic Districts.

**Note:** there was no work session.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mark Gianniny and Steve McHenry of McHenry Architects were present on behalf of the applicant, along with the owner John Bosen. Mr. Gianniny reviewed the petition. He said the stairs and old deck were no longer required, and he described the new deck, siding and windows.

Ms. Ruedig asked if the applicant looked at the historic photos at the Athenaeum. Mr. Gianniny agreed and said they showed a 2/2 window on the second floor and mostly 1/1 windows on the first floor. Ms. Ruedig said there were more photos of the building and was concerned that a cottage style like a 6/1 or 4/1 wasn't in line with the house's age. In response to Mr. Adams' questions, Mr. Gianniny said every window in the house had to be replaced, which was around 20-25 windows, and that new sashes would be placed into the existing frame. Mr. Adams said he was at the house and saw that all the exterior woodwork was covered with white aluminum. He said it was an eclectic Colonial Revival house and the casings on the windows had large bands on them, so he wouldn't know about any woodwork being there. It was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig asked if the applicant investigated what was underneath the siding for the trim or clapboards. Mr. Bosen said they removed some of the clapboards in the back and that they weren't in great shape. Ms. Ruedig said the applicant should replace whatever was there, and Mr. Bosen said he would try to restore the building the best that he could.

Mr. Ryan asked why the applicant wanted to install vinyl windows if he was going to restore the clapboards. Mr. Bosen said it was a big dollar item. He said there was existing vinyl and the new windows would look and function better. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said the Hardie siding was too wide, and Ms. Ruedig said the wood siding might be able to be preserved. City Council Representative Trace said she had a problem with vinyl windows on such a historic house. Mr. Cracknell suggested that the applicant remove the vinyl to see what was underneath and that he return at the November meeting to discuss a substitute window.

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**

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for only the removal of the rear deck and staircase and the addition of the new egress porch and stair on the rear. City Council Representative Trace seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the project would conserve and enhancement surrounding property values and relate to the historic and architectural value of the existing structure. She noted that the materials were composite, but it was the back of the house.

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

6. (*Work Session/Public Hearing*) 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.

## **WORK SESSION**

Mark Gianniny and Steve McHenry of McHenry Architects were present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Gianniny reviewed the changes made since their previous work session. He said the applicant chose Option B that the Commission preferred. He said the front façade was broken up into three areas; two entrances were pushed back eighteen inches; the window sills were brought up 18 inches; and the Juliet balconies on the Bridge Street side were removed and replaced by a pair of double hung windows, but the two balconies on the front were kept. He discussed the penthouse and materials and gave samples to the Commission.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering said she liked the choice of brick better because it had a smoother finish and was less rustic, but she wasn't sure about the precast lighting. She asked what the reasoning was for the Boral color and the siding vs. the vertical on the penthouse. Mr. Gianniny said it was to differentiate the two and take the same material but go vertical. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said she didn't like the look on Maplewood Avenue on the corner where the surrounding for the mechanicals was made lighter because it was so different from the body of the building and stood out. She suggested that Mr. Gianniny look at that building and others in town to see how they actually looked vs. how they looked on paper.

Mr. Adams said the continuation of the side wall over the windows using the parapet as a railing seemed to be used as a blind for the penthouse, and he thought there should be some sort of obvious termination to the window before that area of the extended parapet. He asked if there was room to put a panel in the solid parapet in the front so that it mimicked the size of the window in a darker material to give it a 3D quality. Mr. McHenry showed the Commission masonry material samples and it was further discussed.

Mr. Ryan said the windows with no trim around them looked like they were disproportionate and needed to be taller, and he still had a problem with the tall windows in the brick portion near the front entrance. He said the building was very plain and needed canopy treatment. He suggested curving the cornice and the brick section. City Council Representative Trace said the severity was obviously intentional but thought the problem could be that the penthouse was a different color, and she suggested that it be the same color as the rest of the building. She said the penthouse shouldn't be so cluttered and that its white color didn't relate to anything.

Ms. Ruedig said the massing would work well with the building next door but the windows in the bays were stripped down, and a bit of detailing here and there would draw the eye away from the severe simple façade. She appreciated that all the mechanicals were placed in the back corner. Acting Vice-Chair Doering said the Commission told the applicant from the beginning that they wanted the building to be simple because it was small, but that she had also talked about the quality of materials and about finding something that would make the building special,

like spectacular cornices or a fantastic entryway. She said there was no ‘wow’ factor that went from a simple elegant building to a simple interesting building.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff said he didn’t like scuppers and that most buildings had internal drainage. Mr. Gianniny said it was just for emergency use. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said the room with mechanicals on the first floor should be a bike storage room, seeing that there was no parking. He said his biggest problem with the outside of the building was that there was 75,000 square feet of gray and dark next to it and that the Commission had approved it because there were too many brick buildings in town. He said the huge 4-1/2 story gray building next to the applicant’s proposed gray building made no sense to him, and he also didn’t like that the applicant chose gray bricks for the center bay. He said he couldn’t support the building in that color, especially with it being next to a giant building of the same color.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jeremiah Johnson of 4 Fairview Avenue said he was in favor of the project because he thought the applicant did a great job of breaking up the building into smaller masses. He said the site was challenging and the corner building was awkward because it wrapped around the side of the applicant’s building. He said he liked the residential entry tucked in around the corner because it afforded some privacy. As for the bike storage room, he said the project got a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for less parking and that there was a plan to address pedestrian ride sharing because he expected that the building residents wouldn’t have cars. He said it was a design challenge and hoped the Commission approved the project at the next meeting.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff closed the work session.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the work session/public hearing to the November 3 meeting, seconded by Acting Vice-Chair Doering. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

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

**A. 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.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the work session to the November 3 meeting.*

**B. 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.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the work session to the November 3 meeting.*

C. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE-** Work Session requested by **Port Harbor Land, LLC, owner**, for property located at **2 Russell Street and 0 Deer Street (2 lots)**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new freestanding structure (3-5-story mixed-use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 124 as Lot 12, Map 118 as Lot 28, and Map 125 as Lot 21 and lie within the Character District 5 (CD5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the work session to the November 3 meeting.*

At this point, City Council Representative Trace left the meeting.

## V. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **Steve & Cathy Ann Henson, owners**, for property located at **0 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new single family dwelling as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 141 as Lot 3 and lies within the General Resident A (GRA) and Historic Districts.

Architect Michael Keane was present on behalf of the owner. He said the proposed home would be a two-story building with an attached garage, with the lower elevation fronting on Prospect Street and the upper fronting on Maplewood Avenue. He noted that all the neighborhood properties also took up 80-90 percent of the frontage in mass and were close to the street. He said the windows would be Andersen 2/1, the siding would be asphalt shingles, the porches would have metal roofs, and any exposed foundation would have a brick veneer.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering asked why Mr. Keane felt that the proposed building responded to the style of architecture common to Prospect Street. Mr. Keane said there were more Colonial buildings on Prospect Street and that the applicant did similar massing but did not choose to do a period style. In response to further questions, Mr. Keane said the lot was larger than most of the lots in the area, so they would end up with a larger-than-typical building using the same ratio. Ms. Ruedig said there wasn't a lot about the design that she could get behind because the proposed house was large and looked more like a stock house in a subdivision. She said most of the neighbors had no garages, and she thought sticking a 3-bay garage to the house was totally out of context. She said the houses in the neighborhood were close together and the applicant's plan didn't show the house close to Prospect Street at all. She suggested that the applicant consider putting two houses or a duplex on the lot to match the neighborhood's density, rhythm, and context, noting that the proposed house was totally incongruous with the neighborhood. She also suggested that the applicant look at the designs of the surrounding homes and bring the proposed house into that context. It was further discussed.

Mr. Ryan said he agreed with a lot of the statements and thought the proposed house looked foreign for the neighborhood, like a big house trying to be a couple of houses. He said something was needed to make one of the massings primary and some of the additions secondary so that the house looked like it grew over time. He agreed that the architecture should relate more to the surrounding context. Ms. Bouffard said it was a lovely house but just didn't look like it belonged on that lot in that very historic neighborhood. Mr. Adams said he didn't see any property value in building something that didn't look like it was part of the dense neighborhood. He said most of the houses didn't have parking programs in their houses or clusters of gable roofs. Mr. Brown said the neighborhood was eclectic, with a brick school and so on, but the house seemed like it belonged in the suburbs and didn't draw in any consistency on any side of it.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff said he was in total agreement with the board. He said the applicant could have the 3-car garage if he could build it to look like a carriage house and out of the way a bit more, like on North School Street. He agreed that the house was more suburban and didn't fit into the neighborhood context. The garage's location was further discussed.

There was no public comment.

Acting Vice-Chair Doering referred to Mr. Ryan's previous comment about having a main house and then a smaller subsidiary structure that would mimic the idea of buildings that were added on afterwards, like ells. She said the applicant would then get the lot coverage and house size while still fitting into the fabric of the neighborhood. She asked that Mr. Keane better identify at the next meeting where the proposed house sat on the lot and what he planned to do with the trees between the site and the school. Mr. Keane then showed the Commission a new design that was similar to a Greek Revival. Ms. Ruedig said hiding the garage doors that way would be more successful. Mr. Adams said the design worked well. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said the applicant would have some approvals if he continued working on that particular design.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the work session to the November 3 meeting, seconded by Mr. Ryan. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary