MINUTES
RECONVENED MEETING OF
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m. **April 13, 2016**
reconvened from April 6, 2016

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

A site walk was held prior to the meeting at 5:30 p.m. at 127 & 137 High Street.

Chairman Almeida stated that Work Sessions A, D, and E had requested postponements.

*It was moved, seconded and unanimously passed (7-0) to **postpone** Work Sessions A, D, and E to the May 4, 2016 meeting.*

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. March 2, 2016
2. March 9, 2016

*It was moved, seconded and unanimously passed (7-0) to **approve** both sets of minutes, with minor edits on the March 9 minutes.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

A. 404 Middle Street (Postponed from April 6, 2016 meeting.)

Mr. Cracknell described the petition, stating that the carriage house would be moved three feet instead of two feet in order to get a building permit, certain windows would be relocated to the side, the columns would revert back to the originally-approved ones, and Hardiplank siding would be used. He also noted the 3-foot waiver.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval for the application. Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

B. 29 Vaughan Mall

Mr. Cracknell stated that the petition wasn't ready for administrative approval due to more changes and would be postponed to the May 4 meeting.

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. Petition of **Wright Avenue, LLC, owner,** for property located at **77 State Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (install mechanical vents, relocate gas meters, relocate gate, install transformer) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 18 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the April 6, 2016 meeting to the April 13, 2016 meeting.)*

Mr. Cracknell said he received an email that day with a request for postponement so that the placement of the gas meters could be re-evaluated. He said it was possible that the petition could be approved by an Administrative Approval.

*Mr. Lombardi made a motion to **postpone** the petition to the May 4, 2016 meeting, and Councilor Pearson seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

IV. WORK SESSIONS

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

Request To Postpone

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and unanimously passed (7-0) to **postpone** the petition to the May 4, 2016 meeting.*

B. **Work Session/Public Hearing** requested **Bradley Boisvert and Karen Bannon Boisvert, owners,** for property locate at **124 State Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct dormer, construct rear deck, install skylights, and stairs) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace existing windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 56 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

WORK SESSION

Steve McHenry and Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architecture and the owner Bradley Boisvert were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Johnson said the project was originally approved in April 2014. He reviewed the changes, which consisted of adding a dormer on the Court Street side, add skylights and a walk-out roof deck as well as a second-level deck. They also wanted to replace the windows on State Street and replace the wood lintels with granite. Mr. Johnson said the Portsmouth Advocates had said the house was circa 1815, and he read the description.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the State Street skylight was part of the original plan. Mr. McHenry said that it was, noting that the pitch roof would be invisible from the street. He said he also had a letter of support from the abutter across the street. Mr. Mayer asked whether the skylight on the other side could be made bigger. Mr. Johnson said it had been discussed but they had felt that it was a tall building and the skylight would be difficult to see.

The windows were discussed. Mr. Lombardi asked whether the original sills and lintels were original wood, and Mr. Boisvert said he didn't think so. Mr. Johnson said the other half of the building had granite lintels. Mr. Boisvert said he preferred the granite but would do wood if the Commission requested it. He said the sizing of the windows would not change, nor would the openings be increased. After further discussion, it was decided that the windows in the front would be a wood product (probably Green Mountain) and painted white. Mr. Boisvert said he would not do screens on the State Street side.

Mr. Lombardi asked whether the skylights could be moved from the center of the roof to the back. Chairman Almeida said they had discussed it before and wanted the design to lean toward a traditional clear story. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked Mr. Boisvert whether he would use a true divided light (TDL) window or one with a spacer, and Mr. Boisvert said he would use the TDL.

There was no public comment.

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to go into the public hearing.*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Johnson stated that the packet was as presented and discussed at the work session. He named the three stipulations, as recorded below in the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill verified that they would use TDL windows, and Mr. Johnson said yes.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

1) *The window lintels and sills shall remain wood.*
2) *The windows on State Street shall be solid wood, true divided lights, to match the existing window profile.*
3) *No screens shall be used on the State Street windows.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project would preserve the integrity of the District and conserve property values by staying true to the historic nature of the building and using TDL windows. It would maintain the special character of the District and complement the historic character of the building by the high level of details, like the copper flashing on the skylights.

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

C. Work Session requested by **Kimberley A. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, Kimberley A. and James C. Lucy, trustees and James C. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, James C. and Kimberley A. Lucy, trustees,** for property located at **127 & 137 High Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to existing structures (construct new building at rear of 137 High Street, construct roof deck at rear of 127 High Street, both with associated parking and landscaping) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 20 and 21 and lies within the CD 4, Historic and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the March 9, 2016 meeting to the April 13, 2016 meeting.)*

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

Acting Chair Gladhill stated that the Commission did a site walk of the property prior to the meeting and also saw two abutter properties and the Moffatt-Ladd House.

The owner James Lucy said he hoped to get clear direction for the project and gain approval so that construction could begin. Mr. Rawling said his issues revolved around the massing studies. Mr. Lucy said he felt the issue was the parking constraint and that he wanted to restore and elevate the properties back to their historic context and develop the rear property.

Mr. Shea said he felt that Mr. Lucy had listened to the Commission's massing concerns and cut down the building to make it look like a 2-1/2 story structure, like the surrounding ones. He said he wanted to discuss more window fenestration and wanted to see more interest on the end elevation next to the Moffatt-Ladd garden. Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the window on the gable facing the Moffatt-Ladd House should be more conventional and not three windows mashed together like on the driveway side. He also wanted to see a compromise between the original design, which was flat but had inappropriate French doors, and the current design. He said the projecting bays with the triple windows made the building look heavy and made them seem like

they loomed over the parking spots. They further discussed the windows. Mr. Lucy said he wanted to have a deck or balcony space blended into both revisions.

Ms. Ruedig said she had trouble accepting that the addition was taller than the historic buildings in the front. She felt the addition should be more of a secondary structure. Mr. Lucy said they had already lowered it by two feet and tried to blend it to be seamless from the street. Ms. Ruedig suggested making the addition as diminutive as possible and not have the structure loom over the Moffatt-Ladd garden.

Mr. Rawling talked about having the scale and footprint of the house match the neighboring context and also discussed the issues with the textures and patterns. He agreed that the building seemed heavy and recommended changing the pattern a bit instead of having one long sequence. He drew a sketch showing how the rhythms could be changed. The Committee discussed using individual gables instead of shed dormers. Mr. Mayer suggested that the back side of the property be stepped down to make it less dominant to the Moffatt-Ladd House. Mr. Lucy said the parking was the issue. They discussed bringing the ridge and parking area down, roofline changes, and making the floor heights different to get a staggering effect.

Acting Chair Gladhill said that the demolition of the addition on the historic house structure bothered him and that he would be against it if it was part of the original structure and built at the same time. He agreed that the addition should be subservient to the historic house and suggested a barn or carriage house look.

They further discussed the gambrel and the balconies. Mr. Wyckoff thought the metal balconies would be fine if there were two. He didn't think they amplified the front mass. Acting Chair Gladhill said he didn't like Juliet balconies. Ms. Ruedig suggested simplifying the balconies.

Acting Chair Gladhill asked for opinions on the demolition. Ms. Ruedig said she preferred to see more research about whether the structure was original or from the last few decades. Mr. Wyckoff said the plans could work around the demolition structure.

Mr. Mayer said he'd have a problem with changing the rooftop and putting a deck and preferred that it be more restrained. Mr. Wyckoff said it was an urban site and thought it was appropriate. Mr. Shea suggested raising the addition to a second floor and keeping the chimney extended. Mr. Lombardi said he agreed that the style of the deck on the second house didn't seem to fit and that the garage level was bothersome because it made the house look like it was floating.

Public Comment

Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said that she hoped the project could be approved. She said the addition was like the Blue Mermaid building, which was larger than the original structure, so there was precedence in the area. She suggested keeping the front buildings historic but giving the back a break. She thought a real deck would be nicer than a Juliet balcony.

No one else rose to speak, so Acting Chair Gladhill closed the public comment session.

Mr. Lucy asked for more feedback on the demolition. Acting Chair Gladhill said he was not in favor of the demolition. Mr. Wyckoff agreed and said he preferred that it be renovated. If not, he thought the back ell would have to change. Mr. Rawling suggested preserving as much of the original structure as possible but understood that there were tradeoffs. Ms. Ruedig agreed and suggested that Mr. Lucy do more research on the structure itself to drive the Commission's decision as to what was significant to keep.

Mr. Lucy asked about opinions about a contemporary deck. Acting Chair Gladhill reminded him he was in a very historic area, and Mr. Shea agreed that the deck should reflect the surroundings.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to **continue** the work session to the May meeting.*

D. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner,** for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue,** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use, 4 to 5 ½ story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the March 9, 2016 meeting to the April 13, 2016 meeting.)*

Request To Postpone

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and approved unanimously (7-0) to **postpone** the petition to the May 4, 2016 meeting.*

E. Work Session requested by **Michael De la Cruz, owner,** for property located at **75 Congress Street,** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild historic parapets, add series of flat roofed dormers, add series of roof walkways and decks, add series of windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 5 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the March 9, 2016 meeting to the April 13, 2016 meeting.)*

Request To Postpone

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously (7-0) to **postpone** the petition to the May 4, 2016 meeting.*

F. Work Session requested by **Eric and Johanna Landis, owners,** for property located at **540 Marcy Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing shed) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct

new garage, construct two dormers, add screen/storm system to existing porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 79 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida resumed his seat.

Sarah Hourihane of DeStefano Architects and the owner Eric Landis were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Hourihane said they wanted to add dormers to the third floor, demolish the front porch rail and add a screen storm system to the front porch, and add a garage at the rear of the property to replace the existing shed. She said a gable dormer would be added to the third floor with a new double hung window to match existing, and two half-sash windows would be added next to that window. Another shed dormer would be added on the back side of the property. Existing double hung windows on the back would be replaced with half-sash windows, and a mud room entry would be relocated. They also wanted to add a skylight on the third floor and a fence for the dog run. She noted that the garage would need a variance but would not encroach any further than the existing shed.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said he felt that the third-floor half sash window on the front facade gave the New Englander an ornate appearance, and he noted that the porch doorway on the front façade was normally seen on the back façade. Mr. Lombardi asked whether the screens on the storm system were removable. Ms. Hourihane said the storms would be affixed to fixed panels and could be pulled off, and the screens would be fixed. Mr. Lombardi suggested fabric screens.

Mr. Shea said the gable dormer on the front seemed wide and suggested that it be narrowed in keeping with the New Englander style. He agreed that the two half sash windows didn't look right and suggested a larger window. He asked whether the railing could be kept with the screen porch, and Ms. Hourihane said they wanted to keep it more visual. Chairman Almeida suggested a simple horizontal piece instead of the whole rail system.

Mr. Shea said he had a problem with the sliding glass door, and Ms. Hourihane said it wouldn't stand out with the fixed panels. Mr. Landis said it would probably be a French door. Mr. Mayer said he agreed that the railing would soften the storm system. He asked about the ventilator on the garage, and Mr. Landis said it was an architectural feature to add scale. Mr. Wyckoff said he agreed that the half sash windows on the front didn't look right, and he said he would insist that the railing on the porch be retained. He suggested that a wooden screen system within the porch be built. Mr. Landis said the reason for removing the rail was to maximize the glass for the winter, but he said he could keep the rail. Chairman Almeida said he would leave it up to Mr. Landis to use a full rail or an element to see the screen in multiple pieces.

Mr. Rawling said he supported the comments about the sliding door. Ms. Hourihane asked about eliminating the half sash windows and adding a skylight to the gable in the front of the side dormer. The Commission said they would think about it.

Chairman Almeida said the overall design was appropriate but thought some improvements could be made. He agreed with the issue of the rail height and felt that the two smaller windows should have a cleaner cut. He felt that the wider dormer was appropriate for the design of the

house, and a cupola on the garage would be fine if done properly. He said a weathervane might be too ornate. He asked whether there could be a little more separation from the garage. Vice-Chair Gladhill said the weathervane had a function. Mr. Wyckoff warned the owner about the cupola, noting that it could leak. He suggested that the louvers be deep and not pre-made.

Chairman Almeida said that his comments about the garage did not apply to the side elevation because it was one consistent addition, but on the front, he felt that the garage door entry and the small continuation of the roof could be tweaked. He said there was one little piece of the entry roof that could be expressed better.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to ***continue*** *the work session to the May meeting.*

G. Work Session requested by **Strawbery Banke Museum, owner,** for property located at **14 Hancock Street (Tyco Visitor Center),** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct three season porch, patio, and deck, add one new window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 7 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

Larry Yerdon, CEO of Strawbery Banke, and the architect Tracy Kozak were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Kozak said that the building was built like a barn and still evolving. They wanted to add a 3-season porch on the north side. She noted that there was currently a brick patio that they would mimic the footprint of and said it would be enclosed in the winter and open in the summer. The porch would be over the brick patio and the new brick patio would be on the north side. In front of it, there would be a small wood deck area and access to the rink would be relocated to another part of the campus.

Mr. Yerdon said that the fence would be moved. They further discussed the location. Ms. Kozak said there would be a single gateway that was not shown on the plan. She said they may not keep the bricks on the existing brick patio. She said the design of the shed addition was utilitarian. She discussed the posts and roof system and the removable storm unit. She also said they wanted to add a new window to the original building behind the porch that would be the same size and manufacturer.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the rental building still existed, and Mr. Yerdon said it did not. Mr. Mayer asked whether part of the porch would be kept, and Mr. Yerdon agreed. Mr. Shea asked whether the roof shingle would match existing and was told that it would. He asked about the fascia board materials. Ms. Kozak said the board would be painted wood to match existing and might have a wood gutter. She said the posts and beams would have a frieze trim and painted wood to match the building trim, and the mahogany panels would have a natural finish.

Ms. Ruedig said the massing and placement were fine but felt that the difference between the original packet with the simple posts and the changed packet with the shed roof addition did not seem to go with the barn-like structure. She thought the Brosco panels gave a more residential look and that the look in general seemed more ornate than the simple barn-look building. They further discussed the panels. Chairman Almeida suggested that Ms. Kozak get approval to include the screen in case they decided to use it. He suggested that the gutter be a galvanized product instead of wood.

Mr. Shea asked about a standing seam roof. Ms. Kozak said they could consider it. They discussed using the word 'warehouse' instead of 'barn' to describe the building.

Mr. Rawling said he could accept the structure as being an addition to the simpler structure. Ms. Kozak thought it would help if they experimented with the colors or tones and stain the mahogany dark or paint the mutton bars a dark color so that the posts would stand out more. Chairman Almeida asked whether the little base blocks and edge banding could be eliminated, and Ms. Kozak agreed.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant stated that they would move to a **public hearing** in the near future.*

H. Work Session requested by **St. John's Church, owner,** for property located at **100 & 101 Chapel Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove and rebuild retaining wall and stairs, remove existing shed) and allow exterior renovations (resurface and re-stripe pavement) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 2, 60, 61 & 63 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The architect Tracy Kozak, and congregation members Doug Greene and Jerry Simpkins were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Greene reviewed the history of the project and said they had to repair the retaining walls to make the parking area safer. They wanted to add a sidewalk to abut the gable end of the building for future use as a link between the parish house and the church. They also proposed a ramp to get to the parking area.

Ms. Kozak showed context photos and said the main issues were the retaining walls and the fencing. Mr. Greene showed examples of retaining walls and fences throughout Portsmouth and said his contractor suggested using a blank wall. He was not sure what style of railing they would use. Ms. Kozak showed images of ornate and simple fences. She discussed the locations for the fence and retaining wall and asked for input on the railing style.

Chairman Almeida said he thought the fence should be substantial. Mr. Shea noted that the old fence was a continuous one, and Ms. Kozak said the old fences had iron braces in the back. Mr. Shea suggested doing something related to that design and said he preferred not to see the posts.

Mr. Rawling said he liked the double rail at the top because it gave it more substance and noted that it was aluminum with finials. Mr. Wyckoff said to ditch the finials.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the concrete block would go up against the retaining wall. Ms. Kozak said it would abut at the corner. Mr. Lombardi asked about the materials, and Mr. Greene said it was a block of grayish tone with a texture akin to Stone 'K'. Chairman Almeida asked whether they would consider a stone cap at the top, and Mr. Greene agreed. Mr. Rawling said he preferred the scale of Stone 'I' versus Stone 'K'. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he liked the variation of Stone 'J'. Mr. Lombardi liked Stone 'J', as did Mr. Shea.

Mr. Wyckoff said the dilapidated shed was demolition by neglect. He thought the structure was circa 1870 and not 1950. Mr. Greene said they wanted to remove the shed because they didn't need one that big. They instead wanted to allow vehicular access for wheelchair-bound people. Mr. Wyckoff said he felt that the Commission should look at the shed. Ms. Kozak said there was no foundation to it. Mr. Rawling said he was amazed it survived and thought it was a relic of another era. Chairman Almeida agreed that it needed to be looked at. Mr. Shea said he liked the shed's mass and scale and suggested that, if it were removed, the Commission would have to look at the design of the new structure first to ensure that it was more appropriate.

Mr. Mayer said he liked the exposure and texture of the concrete stairs on the Chapel Street side and asked whether the applicant would consider a concrete wall with a brick veneer. Mr. Greene said he would consider it. Mr. Wyckoff said he preferred the split-face look of the stone rather than the block form.

Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Greene if he had talked to the Warner House personnel, and Mr. Greene said they were in full agreement.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to continue the application to the May 2016 meeting.

I. Work Session requested by **355 Pleasant Street, LLC, owner,** for property located at **355 Pleasant Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct a two unit dwelling) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 64 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Mr. Shea recused himself from the petition.

The owner Kathy Williams Kane and the architect Richard Shea were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Williams Kane said she wanted to build a Greek Revival on the empty lot next to her home. She said she researched the old deeds and the lot line adjustments, and the general

history. She showed photos of surrounding homes, noting that there used to be a house in the empty lot. She also showed examples of Greek Revival homes in the country.

Mr. Shea stated that the front foundation would be treated with a brick veneer over the concrete, and the front windows were oversized casement windows. He described the flush siding on the front, the clapboard sides, the window casings, and lintel headers on the first-floor windows. Chairman Almeida said it was a major change to the street and asked about scale.

Ms. Ruedig suggested sticking with the overall impression first. She said she thought it was beautiful but looked very southern, and she wasn't sure it fit into the south end. She said some aspects could be tweaked to make it more compatible with New England styles. She thought the massing looked great. Mr. Lombardi said the scale and massing were the right size and that he liked the Greek Revival, even though it was very different from its surroundings. Mr. Wyckoff said the southern feeling might be from the 1st-floor windows with the metal railing and suggested double hung windows with big window sills. Chairman Almeida said it was a beautiful building but found it difficult imagining it at that location. He agreed that some tweaking could work, like high-quality windows for the front façade. He thought the louver location seemed too low from the gable and felt that there was a need for a side entry door. He said the doors on Pleasant Street were very celebratory and felt that the house lacked that.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said he liked the overall design but also thought it looked like a southern plantation. He felt that the wide front façade made the building look larger, and he wondered whether the design would fit in with the fabric of Portsmouth. Mr. Mayer said the project had a nice quality design but felt that a few of the elements, like the louver and the metal railing treatment, would not be in a New England building. He suggested a wooden rail.

Chairman Almeida asked whether steps down to the Pleasant Street side had been considered, and they discussed it. Vice-Chair Gladhill agreed that a centralized door on the front façade might help the structure blend in more with the neighborhood. Chairman Almeida suggested wider, more formal steps. Mr. Shea said a firewall was necessary in the middle of the floor plan that required the window to be split. Mr. Rawling said the front elevation was a problem for him because it was big and didn't really blend in with the other homes, with its uneven rhythms and bays. Ms. Williams Kane asked whether it was the exposure of the basement and suggested that big plants going up to the balconies might help. Mr. Rawling said that the more it was shortened, the wider it would look.

Mr. Shea told the Commission that the house would have expensive condominium units and that he didn't want the owners to share entries. He said the challenge was to make the elevation work. They discussed a design element applied to the side and pilasters. Chairman Almeida suggested that a rendering of side images instead of just the front would help. Mr. Shea said they would present construction documents and could also do a physical model.
They discussed using 6/6 double hung windows and eliminating the four large windows on the front and removing the railings. Chairman Almeida said to go for the casings, and Mr. Lombardi said the tall windows on the first floor were fantastic. Mr. Rawling suggested making the windows on the ground floor wider.

Mr. Shea asked about applying a crown going up the rakes. They discussed using operable shutters. Mr. Lombardi said the basement window wells seemed strange, and Mr. Wyckoff said that the basement windows were amplified because of the way they were drawn. He also felt that the railings took away from the typical New England Greek Revival look. Mr. Shea said the porch roofs would be higher than shown on the plan.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to continue the application to the May 2016 meeting.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Vote to adopt the Design Guidelines for the Historic District Commission

Mr. Cracknell said the document was in a different format than the previous one given to the Commission. He noted that the Historic Overlay District was in the Zoning Ordinance and he had inserted a reference to the Design Guidelines as well as the previous draft of the proposed revisions to the exemptions. He said there would be two votes, one to adopt the Design Guidelines and one to approve the draft zoning amendments.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **adopt** the Design Guidelines, and Mr. Lombardi seconded. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

Mr. Cracknell asked the Commission to consider the draft zoning amendment with all the exemption revisions inserted into it. He said he referenced the Design Guidelines into the guiding principles for the Historic District language and also inserted it into the review criteria. He noted that he referenced the Design Guidelines in Criteria #3 and read it.

Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that it wasn't on the agenda so no one from the public was present to comment, and he said he wanted to give the public a chance to review it and comment.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **postpone** approval of the draft zoning amendments to the May 4, 2016 meeting so that the public could comment on it. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary
These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on May 4, 2016.