

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**April 12, 2017
reconvened from April 5, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice Chairman Jon Wyckoff; Members Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Richard Shea, John Mayer; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternate Martin Ryan, Molly Bolster

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

Chairman Lombardi read into the record the names and addresses of the three petitions that were postponed to the May meeting.

*Vice-Chairman Wyckoff made a motion to **postpone** the three petitions to the May meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

Chairman Lombardi also noted that the Committee had just received an Administrative Approval request for 28 Dennett Street and said it would be addressed after the public hearings.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

8. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Islington Street Homeowners Association, owner, and E.J. Cheney, applicant**, for property located at **239 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install steps, railings, planters, landscaping) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan138 as Lot 45 and lies within the CD 4-L2 and Historic Districts.

Work Session

The designer Brandon Holben was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced the applicant E. J. Cheney. Mr. Holben said the building was a residential one with six units. He reviewed the packet and summarized the changes that included a new access and balcony for each unit and improvements to the façade. He showed photos of the existing building as well as historic photos. He reviewed the proposed design, materials, and site plan.

Mr. Shea asked whether the color for the new stairs was the same black as the one proposed for the wall, and Mr. Holben agreed. Ms. Bolster asked whether the deck and the stairs were the same color. Mr. Holben said the wood screen wall and the upper deck would be natural wood.

In response to Vice-Chairman Wyckoff's questions, Mr. Holben said that the wall between the units would be capped with composite material, that the polycarbonate was frosted, and that the current framing would be simplified. Vice-Chairman Wyckoff asked how Mr. Holben came up with the frosted color when there was currently no light color on it at all, and he asked whether it should be bronze. Mr. Holben said they would do bronze.

Mr. Shea said that he thought it was a good concept because everyone would have little yards and the units would look more like condominiums. He said the light going through was probably good for the polycarbonate material and noted that black tones seemed unnatural for Portsmouth.

Ms. Bolster asked what the material was between the window glass, and Mr. Holben said it was the existing metal.

Mr. Rawling noted that the original site plan had trees along the street edge, but the revised site plan did not. He said the trees were a strong component of the urban aesthetic that enhanced the units and the streetscape and thought it was important to clarify it. Ms. Ruedig asked what the improvements were for Islington Street at that particular spot, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling noted that the planting buffer didn't appear in the revised plans, and it was further discussed, as well as the three large trees. Mr. Rawling suggested a better species of tree.

Mr. Ryan said he had reservations about the polycarbonate because he was worried that it would come off as a back-lit sign. The details were discussed. Ms. Ruedig requested that the Commission receive a sample of it before final approval, as well as samples of the colors.

Mr. Shea asked for more detail on the screen wall, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Mayer mentioned that the original steps were obscured by the planters. Mr. Holben said the planters could be pulled in.

Ms. Bolster asked whether the roof would be replaced. Mr. Holben said they would replace it with a metal one but would not add any vents. Vice-Chairman Wyckoff asked what the metal roofing was, and Mr. Holben said it was coated. Vice-Chairman Wyckoff said he thought the standing seam looked better, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Shea asked whether the polycarbonate panels were flat, and Mr. Holben said they were.

Mr. Rawling stated that the street-edge tree planting should be a condition of approval, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Ryan asked what the handrail material was. Mr. Holben said it was a steel tube.

There was no public comment.

Chairman Lombardi closed the work session and went into the public hearing.

Public Hearing

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Holben re-introduced himself and the applicant Mr. Cheney. He reviewed the packet and the recommended changes from the work session.

Mr. Shea asked about the composite decking detail for the top of the walls. Mr. Holben said they would create something that would weather better than natural wood and would match the decking material.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) Seven shade trees shall be included in the location as shown on the original plan (Sheet A2) and any modifications shall require an administrative approval.*
- 2) A fabral standing seam metal roof over the canopies shall be used.*
- 3) A mock-up of polycarbonate panels and details shall be submitted for administrative approval.*
- 4) A 1" x 6" cladding of natural wood (Douglas Fir) shall be used on the wooden screen walls.*
- 5) The vertical face and cap shall be a composite material.*

Mr. Rawlings seconded the motion.

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff said the project was an improvement to a modern building and solved a number of code-compliant issues. He said that installing individual stairs for each unit would transfer a little respect and make the building a bit friendlier.

Mr. Rawling said he supported the individual stoops and thought they would make the streetscape friendlier and more active. He said he also supported re-establishing the street edge with the trees and creating more of an aesthetic.

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

9. Petition of **Jamer Realty, Inc., owner**, and **Julian Armstrong, applicant**, for property located at **178 Fleet Street, Unit 4**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace glass block windows with clear glass and wood treatment, add artwork to east elevation, add second story glass conservatory at rear of building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 2-4 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The designer Brandon Holben was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the owner and applicant, Julian Armstrong. Mr. Armstrong was also present. Mr. Armstrong stated that he wanted to replace the existing Coat of Arms restaurant with a new restaurant/bar.

Mr. Holben reviewed the petition, noting that the proposed alterations would create a more attractive appearance. He said they wanted to replace windows and the entry door, install a piece of street art, and install a glass conservatory. He reviewed the packet.

Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Holben where the glass block was being removed. Mr. Holben said it was over the entry door, noting that it would become a square storefront. Ms. Ruedig asked whether the panel and wood would cover existing, and Mr. Holben agreed. Ms. Ruedig said that the curved glass block and entrance were very much of its time and that she wouldn't want to see it removed because she felt it would be nice if it were re-exposed in the future. She said the storefront window above would be an improvement of the interior and exterior space, and she said she was willing to give up the curved glass block if the rest of it was contained. She asked what the brick would be painted with. Mr. Holben said it would exterior masonry primer block filler. Ms. Ruedig said she was concerned about the product's durability and whether it could be removed. Mr. Holben said the concrete block was already painted and would be coated and the new brick would be done properly. Ms. Ruedig asked that whatever was done be reversible.

Mr. Rawling said he was in general support but asked for a stipulation stating that the new external lighting would be wired from within the building and would have no exposed conduit on the exterior surface. Mr. Holben agreed.

City Council Representative Pearson advised that the street art be sealed properly and offered her services at Art-Speak.

Mr. Shea asked whether the new aluminum frames would be coated. Mr. Holben said they would be factory-coated black and that the other wooden frames would be painted to match. Mr. Shea said he was concerned about painting the brick because it would cover up the history of the building, but he said he was in general support of the project.

Mr. Mayer asked for the other Commissioners how they felt about the addition of the conservatory. Vice-Chairman Wyckoff said he thought it was a good idea for the back of the building and that it would be a plus because of the building's utilitarian nature. Ms. Ruedig said she thought it was a great thing because it would add variation to the roofline and skyline. Mr. Ryan said it would be a much-improved space and would add activity above the roofline.

Mr. Ryan said it seemed that the glass block would be replaced with lesser materials. He asked whether the second entrance, which looked like a dark hole, would be addressed. Mr. Holben said it went into another property. Mr. Ryan said he wouldn't cover up the brick because of its richness and history, but thought the project was an improvement.

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff asked what the rationale was for covering up the glass blocks. Mr. Armstrong said the glass brought back an era that the direction of the new restaurant wasn't going in. He said he also wanted to get the exposure from the street to see the inside activity. It was further discussed. Vice-Chairman Wyckoff asked whether there were any broken glass blocks. Mr. Holben said that a few were cracked.

Mr. Ryan said he thought the glass block was an art deco material of the 1930s rather than the 1980s, and it was discussed. He suggested backlighting it.

Chairman Lombardi said he was hesitant to paint brick but had no problem painting a block. He said he was concerned about covering the glass block because it was a unique feature of the building. He said the glass atrium was an asset and contributed something a bit different to the roof other than mechanicals.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said that the side of the building with the rabbit art piece was already painted and could be worked with, but thought that the front natural brick was nice. He said that the mahogany bar was built by his family and hoped it would stay.

Esther Kennedy of 41 Pickering Avenue said she agreed with Mr. Ryan and Chairman Lombardi's comments. She encouraged the owner not to paint the brick, and to let the glass remain. She said she had a hard time with the rabbit art piece, especially in the District.

Ms. Ruedig said she had no problem with the painting because painting a historic building was a historic treatment, and she felt that anything that would give an extra layer of protection was a plus. She recommended that it not be a permanent paint that wouldn't allow the brick to breathe. She wanted to know what product would be used and suggested an administrative approval. Mr. Armstrong said he thought the brick was nice and said he would just keep the brick.

Mr. Rawling noted that the glass block was covered up and said the idea was to have some spacing, with the light coming through. He asked whether the rabbit was part of the restaurant logo. Mr. Armstrong said it was a jackalope and represented the spirit of the restaurant. City Council Representative said public art was supposed to elicit a reaction and was public purview.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) All new external lighting shall be connected internally with no external conduit.
- 2) The brick face shall not be painted.
- 3) The glass blocks shall be preserved in place for potential future exposure.

City Council Representative Pearson seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig said she thought the project was an upgrade to a building that was funky and had an interesting industrial history to it. She said the project used innovative technology, and she appreciated that much of the glass block would be covered over and retained. She said the glass conservatory was compatible with the semi-industrial building in a commercial and formerly industrial area.

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff said he thought it was important that a charred wood cladding be over the curved glass block and strongly accented. He said he didn't want to see the glass blocks torn out, but was otherwise supportive of the project if the front wasn't painted.

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

The Commission then addressed the administrative approval petition mentioned at the beginning of the meeting.

28 Dennett Street Petition for Administrative Approval

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant requested that two existing basement windows be replaced with one vinyl-clad window. Ms. Ruedig asked whether the window could be a 3-light or SDL window. Mr. Cracknell agreed, saying that the applicant could return if it didn't work.

Mr. Shea said the basement sash should be recessed in and thought the new window could be recessed 4-5" from the base of the foundation, with a sill. Vice-Chairman Wyckoff said the new window was inappropriate and suggested that the applicant either build a wooden frame with a wooden sill and make it look like a 3-light or just buy the correct window. He said he could not support the petition. Mr. Rawling agreed with him and said the window should resemble the existing one.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulations:

1. The proposed basement window design shall not be used.
2. The basement windows shall be three light SDL with an exterior grill to resemble the appearance of the existing windows.
3. The basement windows shall be recessed 4-5 inches from the face of the masonry wall to resemble the appearance of the existing windows.

4. *A composite or vinyl window may be used.*
5. *For compliance purposes, an image or representation of the revised basement window shall be presented to the Planning Department prior to installation.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

V. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

B. Work Session requested by **Unitarian Universalist Church, owner**, for property located at **206 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct 3 story addition) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations) as per plans on file with the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 34 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone review of the application to the May 2017 meeting.)*

*Vice-Chairman Wyckoff made a motion to **postpone** the petition to the May meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

C. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use, 3 to 3 ½ story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone review of the application to the March 2017 meeting.)*

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios was present on behalf of the applicant. She summarized the site walk that took place before the meeting. She reviewed the colors that the Commissioners preferred and their comments about the wood siding material. She said she would bring renderings of the buildings showing close-ups and three color schemes for the next work session.

Ms. Bolster asked what color was on the original drawing. Ms. Ramsey said it was walnut, and the colors were further discussed. Vice-Chairman Wyckoff asked whether the bays could be mahogany. Ms. Ramsey said she didn't want to backpedal and pointed out that the material would look new for a long time and came with a great warranty.

Mr. Mayer noted that some variation could be seen in the surface, and he felt it wasn't substantial enough. It was further discussed. Ms. Ramsey said she felt that the material was competent and had been used on homes in York, Maine quite a bit.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the 51 Islington Street project's renderings did not match the colors of the building and said it could be misleading. Ms. Ramsey said that a close-up would give a better representation. Mr. Cracknell said that the sample chips should be matched and that the Commission and the public had the right to see the whole building. It was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling said he went by the York building regularly and thought it was a poor, irreversible color choice. He also felt that the flat-box detail with the windows set in wasn't great. He said that flat box bays could be worked in as a contemporary detail, but felt that more elaborate detail and texture relief were needed. It was further discussed.

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff said he would support the window trim but wasn't sold on the mitered corners. He thought there was a very wide range of choice for colors. He said he was pleased with the trim details and the smaller brackets.

Chairman Lombardi told Ms. Ramsey that she did a disservice to herself at the site walk by showing a model that had flawed corners and pieces that were weathered. Ms. Ramsey said they had not weathered but had been sitting in a site environment. Chairman Lombardi said they had they had deteriorated nevertheless, which made him skeptical.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the staining product was raw and stained in place. Ms. Ramsey said they applied three coats and a ceiling coat before the installation. Vice-Chairman Wyckoff noted that mahogany would last a lot longer and that natural products would get them past all the color choices. Mr. Ryan said he thought the material should look modern and clean and suggested that Ms. Ramsey note that the product was a natural one, with fibers and resins. He said he supported the material but wouldn't weigh in on the color. He said he liked the material for the base and thought the project would have one of the better streetscapes in the City.

Mr. Shea said the massing was good and that he understood the color selection. He discussed the windows, bays and corner boards and asked for more details and shadow lines. Mr. Rawling suggested a 3/4" dowel on the corner to cover the joints and add some interest. He also suggested that something other than the glass railings for the 2nd-floor balconies be used.

Ms. Bolster noted that the windows were standing proud but that the drawings didn't reflect it, and it was further discussed. She asked where the breaks were between the units. Ms. Ramsey said there wasn't a natural break at every bay. She said there were 21 units in the building and 4-5 retail spaces, and that everything was flat except for one townhouse.

Chairman Lombardi asked how many doorways there were. Ms. Ramsey said there were 12 entryways. Mr. Shea asked whether there was a band in the brick areas or whether the bricks stepped up. Ms. Ramsey said they stepped up. She showed how far the bricks went before changing to a different material.

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff asked whether the cornice above the third floor was different from the front of the building, and it was further discussed. He asked whether the penthouse was brick. Ms. Ramsey said it was, up to a point, and said she would bring a roof plan next time.

Mr. Shea asked whether the PVC material was only on small areas of the penthouse, and Ms. Ramsey agreed. He suggested making the cornice important when changing materials from brick to the PVC, which would make the massing feel smaller, and it was further discussed. Mr. Shea asked whether the top piece was a circular. Ms. Ramsey agreed, noting that it was windows all around.

Mr. Rawling emphasized that the brackets needed more detail.

Public Comment

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said he appreciated the mass but wasn't crazy about the balconies. He liked the upper railings but didn't think the garage door should stand out. He noted that darker colors would expand more than lighter ones and said he preferred mahogany.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

Ms. Bolster asked whether there were other ideas besides the glass for the second-floor balconies. Ms. Ramsey said she considered metal but liked the glass because it was different. She said frosted glass would have shadow interest. It was further discussed.

Chairman Lombardi concluded that the Commission felt some concern about the materials and the balconies, and that the details on the bay and brackets needed work. Mr. Rawling suggested a heavier top rail and perhaps a frosted panel beneath it, and it was briefly discussed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) that the applicant would continue the work session at the May meeting.*

D. Work Session requested by **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **163 Deer Street (Lot 4)**, wherein permission is requested to ~~allow~~ demolition of existing structure (demolish structure) and allow new free standing structure (construct new mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lots 17-2 and 17-3 and lies within CD 5, Historic District, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

*Vice-Chairman Wyckoff made a motion to **postpone** the petition to the May meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

E. Work Session requested by **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **157, 159, 161 Deer Street (Lot 5)**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of existing structure (demolish structure) and allow new free standing structure (construct new mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lots 17-2 and 17-3 and lies within CD 5, Historic District, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

*Vice-Chairman Wyckoff made a motion to **postpone** the petition to the May meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

F. Work Session requested by **299 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **299 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use building to include a hotel and associated parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 10 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Carla Goodknight of CJ Architects and Jeff Johnston of Cathartes Private Investments on behalf of the applicant were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Goodknight reviewed the changes and images of the building in context. She also reviewed the site plan, the landscape development, and the walking trail.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the parking would be screened. Mr. Johnston said the rain garden would screen it. Chairman Lombardi said the crossing in front of the garage looked very visible. Mr. Mayer suggested a rendering of the passage with features showing on the landscape to get a sense of scale.

Mr. Rawling said he still saw a very flat building and felt that it needed skyline elements. He said the corner could get bumped up more. He also suggested that the condensers be considered. Relating to the general fenestration of the building, he said he liked the wood elements and the base materials but felt that the metal panels seemed like a graphite rendering. He said they were important elements that needed softness and texturing to humanize the contemporary design.

Ms. Bolster asked whether there was a photo of what the building would look like. She said the drawing showed a sandy texture to the material. Mr. Johnston said he would bring one at the next work session.

Mr. Shea said he liked where the brick ended because it helped break up the mass but thought it still looked like a big box and didn't do anything in Portsmouth. He said that more detail and different window proportions would make it blend better. He said he didn't mind the modern materials but thought the building should have more detail and shadow line. He said the front entrance was nothing special and that the corner felt more like the entrance. He noted that two brick columns over the garage stopped in mid-air and felt heavy, and he suggested that the garage opening be built upon more. He also suggested that some brick be used on the bottom of the metal building.

Mr. Martin said it was rectilinear and suggested that something break up the strong x-y axis. He said the only relief was the parking garage. Ms. Goodknight said that seeing the building in 3-dimension would make a big difference.

Mr. Mayer suggested more of an edge between the main floor to the upper floors to make a change in depth.

Chairman Lombardi said he agreed that the building was rectilinear and that it needed relief somewhere. He said it could be the main entrance to the hotel and felt that the corner looked more like the main entrance. He agreed with Mr. Rawling that the whole back of the building could be seen from Market Street and that it looked very flat. He said the roofscape could use

some work and questioned where the generator would go. He said the utilities had to be considered because they would have a significant impact on the property. Mr. Johnston said they would be clustered behind the pocket area. Chairman Lombardi asked whether the venting would go through the roof, and Mr. Johnston agreed and said it would be detailed.

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff said the flat roof had no way of hiding interesting details and said it might be worth considering a structure on the roof that could contain mechanicals. City Councilor Pearson said she thought the proud corner worked beautifully.

Public Comment

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said he thought the metallic material would be reflective. He suggested introducing brick on the face of the building to blend in with the corner more, and he hoped the park itself would be prioritized.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) that the applicant would continue the work session at the May meeting.*

G. Work Session requested by **Worth Development Condominium Association, owner,** and the **Friendly Toast, applicant,** for property located at **113 Congress Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (replace storefront windows with retractable windows with screens) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6-104 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The applicant P. J. Morales was present to speak to the petition. He said that the current windows would be replaced with retractable window and that there would be no exterior difference except for the trim around the window. He said the frame would be mahogany and the glass would be like the current glass. He said the screen would be mounted on the top frame so that it didn't stick out on the street.

Mr. Shea asked whether the operable windows would go up inside the building on a track, and Mr. Morales agreed, saying they would curl up and then slightly back, like two panels. He said that one huge set would replace all three existing windows. Mr. Shea asked about the roll-up screen. Mr. Morales said it would be on the interior of the frame and recessed a bit. He said he would do a drawing or take a picture to show where it would be mounted on the building.

Mr. Rawling said it appeared that people sitting at the bar would face a 12" strip of wood. Mr. Morales disagreed, saying that they had the option to increase the pane size so that the split wouldn't be in the center. It was further discussed.

Ms. Bolster asked whether the new window would have just two panels. Mr. Morales said it would be four feet of window and that the glass would be comparable to existing. Mr. Mayer said he struggled with the window scale affecting the aesthetics of the storefront and was fearful of the big piece of glass. Mr. Morales said it was designed to be able to go up and down 10,000 times and could be made to operate many times that amount

Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Morales to bring in better storefront examples and also said the choice of screening was important. She said her main concern was losing the light, open storefront look when the glass was closed. She said the window was a huge horizontal expanse, whereas most of the downtown stores had a more vertical feel. She asked for more examples so that the Commission could see where else it had been installed and decide whether or not the look would be appropriate. Mr. Morales said the window was customized and didn't know if there would be pictures. Ms. Ruedig said it could be photoshopped, or the photos could be drawn on top as a mock-up to give an idea of what it would look like.

Ms. Bolster said the screens could look like a curtain from the outside when the window was open. She asked for a mock-up of what the window would look like open and closed.

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff said he was troubled by the whole proposal. He said he didn't like the horizontal aspect and couldn't think of any other storefront in town that had it. He asked for a more complete and professional application from Mr. Morales that would show exactly what would be done with the storefront and how it would look next to the surrounding storefronts.

Mr. Shea asked whether the canopy would be changed. Mr. Morales said it would not. He said that after the bricks were removed, the screen would be mounted within the frame under the bricks, on the outside of the glass.

Mr. Rawling said the horizontal window was more contemporary and fit the building. Mr. Mayer asked whether the band could be made smaller by using three window units instead of one. Mr. Morales said it was the minimum they could do for the framing but thought he could add more vertical lines.

There was no public comment.

Chairman Lombardi said the Commission needed more details and graphics.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) that the applicant would continue the work session at the May meeting.*

H. Work Session requested by **Bluestone Properties of Rye, LLC, owner**, for property located at **135 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct glass addition on rear of building) and to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovation of exterior façade) as per plans on file in the

Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 5 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Andrew Sitford and Cindy Schartman of Andrew Sitford Architects and owner Mike Labrie and contractor Ben Auger were also present.

Mr. Sitford reviewed the petition, noting that there two faces, and said they wanted to bring back the front façade to its original glory. He discussed the façade's evolution. He said the back was also unique, which they wanted to highlight and add space to.

Ms. Schartman reviewed the stages of the building's evolution and their restoration plan. She said they wanted to recreate the bay windows and needed the Commission's suggestions for product selection. She said they would return the street-level façade to its original pattern of recessions, including floor-to-ceiling glass work. They would also return the original spacing of the third-floor windows and wanted to recourse the entire façade and return detail to the band molding. Mr. Sitford said the first floor would be a restaurant, the second floor would be for events, and the third floor would have offices. The existing gym would be made into a function room.

Ms. Ruedig discussed the tax credit benefits for restoration.

Mr. Sitford said they wanted to highlight the stained-glass windows on the back and open them up to the gym. Ms. Ruedig said it was a great idea in concept to bring out more space and open it up, but she had trouble seeing how the outside design would fit in with the historic building. She said she saw the glass addition as sharp, angular, and busy. Mr. Sitford said it was intentionally different because they didn't want to mock the historic feature.

Vice-Chairman Wyckoff agreed that it was a positive addition to the back but overly busy with the glass system and would look better simplified. He said he had no problem with the glass on the back and a modern addition.

Mr. Rawling said he was supportive of the project and felt that the tower was a relief element that gave some character to that side of the Vaughan Mall lot. He said he was concerned that once the windows went inside the structure, they would be part or the interior and the Commission would have no purview over them. He said they were significant windows and suggested that a preservation easement might be possible.

Mr. Mayer said he thought the window framing was so busy that it obscured the windows. Mr. Sitford said he would look at some fenestration models and bring in some 3-dimensional models at the next work session.

Ms. Bolster said she loved the project and appreciated the effort to honor the windows and make it a space so that people could see them, but wasn't sure that the glass really enhanced the way the windows looked outside. She further discussed it.

Mr. Ryan said he would like to see the glass on the roof look more transparent, but thought it was great. Mr. Mayer asked whether the glass would heat up the temperature in the building, and it was further discussed.

Chairman Lombardi said he thought it was a great project but agreed that the glass addition should feel lighter. He said he didn't want the tower to rise above the top of the original building. Mr. Sitford said it wouldn't.

Mr. Sitford said he would bring versions of the fenestration for the next work session. Mr. Rawling said he liked the way the fenestration was a bit different on the tower.

Public comment

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said that the back of the building unique and that he appreciated the fact that it would be seen.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) that the applicant would continue the work session at a future meeting.*

VI. ADJOURNMENT

*At 11.15 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on June 7, 2017.