

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**October 18, 2017
reconvened from October 4, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Members Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Richard Shea, Martin Ryan; Alternate Molly Bolster

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
A site walk was held prior to the meeting at 5:45 p.m. at 151 Lafayette Road, Unit 2.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. August 28, 2017

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (6-0) to approve the August 28, 2017 minutes as amended.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

Mr. Cracknell stated that Item 7 would be continued to the November 2017 meeting. He then addressed each item separately.

1. 34 Ceres Street (postponed from October 4, 2017)

Mr. Cracknell stated that the item was an enforcement application, and he read the description. It was further discussed, and Mr. Shea suggested a few stipulations.

*Mr. Shea moved to **approve** the Administrative Approval item, with two stipulations:*

- 1) The finish trim around the windows and sliding door shall be the same dimension as around the existing windows and shall be painted to match the dark blue color.*
- 2) The casing and sash of the 3 new windows shall be painted dark blue to match the existing windows.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

2. 403 Deer Street (postponed from October 4, 2017)

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to work on the building's surround, do repairs in kind, and replicate where they could. Mr. Rawling suggested that the column base project out instead of recede and that the square piece be smaller. Ms. Ruedig recommended that there be historic photos for reference.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the Administrative Approval item, with one stipulation:*

1) The base block on the column shall be decreased in dimension and the plinth enlarged and beveled to extend past the base block.

*Mr. Shea seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

3. 501 Islington Street

Mr. Cracknell said it was a new project that needed a minor alteration to the roof. He noted that the project engineer Doug Green was present to speak to it.

Doug Green stated what the dimensions of the deck were and said there would be two stair penthouses for egress. Mr. Rawling recommended that the penthouses be painted a lighter color. Mr. Green said the penthouses would match the body of the main building and would be a light tan. Mr. Rawling said he thought it would be better separated. Mr. Shea agreed.

*Mr. Shea moved to **approve** the Administrative Approval item, with one stipulation:*

1) A lighter color than the main body of the building shall be painted on the penthouse.

*Mr. Ryan seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

4. 38 Chapel Street

Mr. Cracknell said the Commission approved the project in May, but the applicant wanted to field paint the window sill and casing blue to match the house. He said the Commission had told him that it should be white.

The applicant Ryan Patrick was present to speak to the application. He said the window cases were currently dark blue and that he mocked up a trim and the 5" Azek around it. He said it matched the windows of the house next door. He said the sashes and jambs were white.

Mr. Rawling said the previous stipulation was that the jambs and trim match. Mr. Patrick said he was willing to do white. He asked whether he could do a 1"x5" casing instead of the 1"x4" one. Mr. Rawling said it should stay the 1"x4" one.

The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to deny the Administrative Approval request for 38 Chapel Street.

5. 536 Marcy Street

Mr. Cracknell said the field change was previously approved and implemented, but the applicant adjusted the top window so that it was shifted about eight inches from the approved plan. He said the window couldn't be seen from the front of the house and that the applicant requested that the project be approved as modified in the field.

*Mr. Shea moved to approve the Administrative Approval item as submitted, and Ms. Reagan seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

6. 10 Humphrey's Court

Mr. Cracknell stated that dormer on the garage wouldn't be built. He said the revised modifications were that the French doors would slide to the left with a roof canopy above them, the four windows on the back would be realigned to new locations, and the stair deck would be brought to existing grade.

Ms. Ruedig said the new windows at the rear seemed squat and asked whether they could be a single piece to make them look taller. The project designer Bud Angst was present and said that it was the master bath window and could be switched to an awning. Ms. Ruedig asked that he look at the single awning window that was previously approved and that he copy the size.

Mr. Rawling asked whether the new windows would have casings and whether the canopy over the French door would be wider by 6" on each side. Mr. Angst agreed to both. Mr. Rawling said the divided lights on the French doors had an unusual configuration. Mr. Angst said he was willing to do a non-custom door. Mr. Cracknell asked whether the Commission was opposed to a 15-light standard French door, and no one was.

Ms. Ruedig moved to approve the application with five stipulations:

- 1) Change the "C" window to a 6 pane awning window shown as "A" on the previous approval.*
- 2) The new windows shall have a casing to match the existing windows.*
- 3) The canopy over the French doors shall be widened by 12 inches.*
- 4) The stairs and handrails shall be wood.*
- 5) A 15-light French door shall be used.*

Mr. Shea seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

7. 55 Market Street (continued to November meeting)

8. 1 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell said the mechanical equipment was located at 150 Congress Street but was serviced by a gas meter at 1 Middle Street, and the applicant needed to run a conduit to it. He encouraged a stipulation that the conduit casing be painted to match what was behind it.

*Mr. Shea moved to **approve** the Administrative Approval item, with one stipulation:*

1) *The conduit shall be located behind the stucco flange and be painted to match the CMU block wall.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

9. 17 Hunking Street

Mr. Cracknell said the set of French doors was rotting due to water issues, so the applicant wanted to install an Andersen sliding door and use Fibrex material. He said it would be field painted and was in the back of the house.

Ms. Ruedig moved to approve the Administrative Approval item with one stipulation:

1) *The sliding French door shall be field painted to match the house.*

*Mr. Shea seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Walkers Place Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **151 Lafayette Road, Unit 2**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add egress window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 151 as Lot 21 and lies within the GRA and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the October 4, 2017 meeting to the October 18, 2017 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Steve Entenmann of EJS Construction was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He passed out new drawings to the Commission. He reviewed the petition, noting that he took the Commission's previous comments into consideration, including adding trim on the sides of the two casements to restore the look of the old porch, adding mullions and double hung windows, incorporated the look of the old columns, aligned some windows with the double hung ones, and added a window on the bedroom side to make it more symmetrical. He noted that the building was a hodgepodge of various window sizes.

Mr. Shea said the window proportions were much better and recommended a stipulation that the trim and the window sill sizing match that of the original windows on the house. He asked Mr. Entenmann what he was using for a window. Mr. Entenmann said it was the Andersen 400 Series and that he would look into SDLs. Mr. Shea said that the Commission previously referred the diagonals on the awnings, but if that couldn't be done, he suggested the 6-light on the awning and 6/1 on the double hung and the SDLs. It was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling said he agreed with Mr. Shea that the window submittal should have diagonal lights. He noted that contemporary designs didn't resemble historic ones, and he said the design had improved considerably. He said it retained the porch look and would be enhanced by the

heavier sills. He said the 4-light as shown on the plan seemed proportionally awkward. Mr. Entenmann said they would be 6-lights at the very least.

Chairman Lombardi suggested that Mr. Entenmann determine what specific windows he would use and submit them as an administrative approval. Mr. Cracknell suggested a stipulation that the proposed windows with the diamond pattern match the existing diamond pattern on the building. Ms. Ruedig suggested matching the diamond patterns on the first floor. She also recommended matching the trim and the sill. Mr. Shea noted that the diamond panes were painted the color of the house and recommended that they be a material like Fibrex that could be field painted and match the rest of the diamond panes.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the new drawings, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The proposed awning windows shall be a diamond pattern to match the existing rear diamond pattern of, if unavailable, a 6/1 SDL window may be used.*
- 2) The proposed window (D-4) shall have a diamond 6/1 mullion pattern.*
- 3) The trim and window sill shall match the existing windows.*
- 4) A diamond or 6/1 mullion shall be painted to match the existing windows.*

Ms. Ruedig said it was a creative solution to fix the modification from a porch to a bedroom. She said it took from the current language of the windows, would preserve the language of the Historic District, and would complement the character and architectural designs of the other homes in the neighborhood.

*Mr. Shea seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (6-0).*

IV. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Islington Commons, LLC, owner**, for property located at **410-430 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (demolition of misc. additions, construction of new additions, other misc. renovations to existing buildings, for a total of five units) and allow new free standing structures (construct two, four unit townhouses at rear of lots, for a total of eight additional units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 145 as Lots 34, 35, and 36 and lies within the CD 4-L2 and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the October 4, 2017 meeting to the October 18, 2017 meeting.)*

The project architect Rob Harbeson was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He introduced his associate Sara Howard and John McMaster, property representative.

Mr. Harbeson stated that the Commission previously gave him several comments on the elevation details, which he responded to, and he asked whether they had further comments on the three front buildings.

Mr. Shea said he liked the overall concept. Mr. Rawling said he still wasn't comfortable with the site plan or the way the buildings were laid out. He said he had previously discussed breaking up the articulation and that it was so small dimensionally as to be meaningless. He said the project was going in the wrong direction. It was further discussed.

Mr. Harbeson asked for comments on Building D1. Chairman Lombardi said he heard that the Fire Department was concerned about their ability to go through the back area. He asked whether the Commission should know where the Fire Department stood before they spent a lot of time on design. Mr. Harbeson said they still had to go through the site review and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and would receive technical comments. He said he submitted the site plan at the last TAC session and it had not changed the arrangement much, except for a few technical issues like parking, turning radiuses, conduit sizes, and so on. He said they would use pavers instead of pavement. He said Building D1 would soften the curb and address turning concerns, so the project was modified a bit and it affected massing. He said the main adjustment in Building D1 was on the west elevation, where they reduced the footprint and pulled the landscaping and pavement closer to the building. He said the box bay would have only windows and no door. He said the gable and bay were moved to the left side on the north elevation and reduced the footprint. He said the south and east elevations had not changed much.

Mr. Shea said he liked the overall massing of Building D1 and thought it was a plus not to have the door on the bump-out on the west elevation. He said he was happy with the majority of things. He asked why the fake chimney couldn't be centered on the front gable. Mr. Harbeson said it could. Mr. Shea said the north elevation looked like a house that belonged and liked that the fact that it was a duplex was masked from the front. He said the south elevation was good.

Mr. Ruedig asked where the door would go. Mr. Harbeson said it was previously going to be a door for a patio, which they didn't have room for, so there would not be two entries on the front. Ms. Ruedig agreed that the massing was nice and seemed a bit smaller and more appropriate.

Mr. Shea said the ridges didn't look right on the north elevation and suggested that the ridgeline be brought down. Mr. Ryan asked whether the box projection was floating and if the foundation stepped out. Mr. Harbeson said the foundation would bump out as well. Mr. Ryan said he didn't like it floating, and Chairman Lombardi agreed.

Mr. Harbeson addressed Building D2, noting that it had not changed significantly. He said the dormers were adjusted, along with minor adjustments to alignments and window sizes.

Mr. Shea said the north elevation was successful and thought the shed dormer was better than the gable dormers. He recommended different front doors. He said the west elevation was intriguing and thought it could be more modern instead of recreating historic buildings, but he said it didn't bother him if things weren't quite symmetrical on the west elevation. He said the scale felt okay. Ms. Ruedig agreed, saying that the building was simple and appropriate.

Mr. Harbeson then presented Building D3. He said they had discussed using the two-story Colonial as a template but that it didn't work out, so they did something more in keeping with the other structures by bringing the eave lines down and other massing elements to break up the scale and pull down the height. He said the south elevation had more two-story deck space and a porch to break up the scale, and the gable form was transferred from the front to the back. He said a bay was added to the west elevation.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the two ridges on the north elevation met at the same height. Mr. Harbeson said they adjusted the right-hand side down to make it feel secondary.

Mr. Shea said he liked the porch on the south elevation but would have liked to see more of that on the backs of the other houses so that people could use it. He said it broke up the three stories nicely. He asked why the garages were placed on the right on the north elevation. Mr. Harbeson said it was part of how one entered the site. He said that side had the side entry and the chimney and bay element, and someone coming down the driveway would face that end of the building. Mr. Shea said the box window looked like it was in the garage. Mr. Harbeson said it was and that they wanted to draw attention to the walkway and dress up the elevation. Mr. Shea said he would find it a bit awkward knowing that there was a garage door a few feet away and then the bump-out. He suggested simplifying it by putting a double hung window there.

Chairman Lombardi asked whether the chimney was functional. Mr. Harbeson said it wasn't but that it could be on the second floor. Mr. Shea pointed out a few windows to the top of the fascia on the east elevation. Mr. Harbeson said he would look at it and said they were floating a bit. Mr. Rawling said he thought the building looked pretty good. He said he thought the hips on the north elevation cluttered the lines up and suggested that it would be better to have shed roofs. It was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said she thought it was a more successful design.

Mr. Harbeson stated that Building D4 had previous comments about the dormers and the metal on the gables carrying across and that they still had to address the front entry doors being squashed by the bay above them.

Mr. Shea said the keys above the doors on the north elevation felt too heavy and that the columns were too short. He asked whether there was any foundation left in the south elevation because the first floor looked too short. He suggested adding something above the French door. He asked the reason for the windows being placed on the side on the east elevation so that it was not all wood panels. He said the porch felt a bit short over the French door and suggested pushing the ceiling height a bit. He said that otherwise, he liked the overall mass.

Chairman Lombardi said the columns on the north elevation looked like two sticks. Ms. Ruedig said she was glad the building was tucked into the corner the furthest because she still felt that it was a large mass and that it had a lot going on in the front façade.

Ms. Bolster said the garage doors on the north elevation looked busy and asked how they opened. Mr. Harbeson said they went up and in but were designed to look like a panelized

carriage house door and that there were transoms above them. Chairman Lombardi said the façade had a lot of doors, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling noted that Marvin Ultimate Clad windows were specified and that the Commission had discussed installing them on historic houses. Mr. Shea asked whether the casing and band molding were applied, and Mr. Harbeson agreed. Mr. Shea said he had no problem putting the clad in the new structures.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant indicated they would return for a work session/public hearing at the November 2017 meeting.

B. Work Session requested by **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **163 Deer Street (Lot 4)**, wherein permission was 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. *(This item was postponed at the October 4, 2017 meeting to the October 18, 2017 meeting.)*

The project architects Tracy Kozak and Mark Moeller of JSA Architects were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Kozak stated that they made some changes and added new details, and she reviewed the packet. Chairman Lombardi asked whether the wall on the back of the building jutting out into the driving path was intentional. Ms. Kozak said those bump-outs would be structural columns and allow for two travel lanes. Mr. Moeller said they would be well outside of the travel lanes and that the wall would also give them a framework for the dumpster enclosures.

Ms. Kozak showed 3D images of the project. She said the primary changes on that façade were that the top windows had transom windows above them to make them taller, and the double brick arches were stretched to touch the bottom of the frieze band on the top of the building. She said the stair tower was required by code for fire access. She noted the brick aluminum clad window and zinc panel. She showed the view from Deer Street between Buildings 4 and 5 and said they stretched the top windows and added the metal detail around the top. She showed perspective views around the back and discussed materials. Chairman Lombardi asked whether there were doors. Ms. Kozak said there was just a service door for the kitchen.

Ms. Kozak then showed 2D elevations, noting that they added more depth at the cornice at the transition to the metal buildings and also added depth to the lower precast band. She said the sidewalk cafes were a good way to engage the pedestrian sidewalk experience. She discussed the east and west facades and said there were recesses on the second and third floors for future art. She discussed the alcove and the balconies. She said the materials were pretty much the same on all the elevations. She noted that the north elevation near the railroad had three levels on the back and four on the front. She discussed the drive-through, with the decorative metal grills, precast

base, frieze band, vaulted brick arches, wood-look ceiling, and ATM machine. She said they brought a sample of a wooden Pella aluminum-clad window to show the Commission and that they might return with a second option. She said they had precast sills that projected from the face of the brick and the arches above.

Mr. Rawling noted that they would use a double hung window with a transom above, so the top piece had a projecting style but was quite different from what Ms. Kozak was discussing. Mr. Moeller said the windows may not project as far, but that was the intent. Mr. Rawling said he thought it was a plus, and it was discussed further. Mr. Shea said he liked everything but the window because it was too historical. He said he liked the contemporary windows that were industrial and read more as a modern building. Mr. Ryan agreed, saying that even a steel window would go a long way. Chairman Lombardi said it should be kept industrial looking.

The Commission discussed the canopy. Mr. Moeller said they would end up with a slight gradation. Chairman Lombardi said it would be nice to have a little shade if it looked out to the southwest. Ms. Kozak said the windows and the masonry were set back eight inches to get more shading. She said they were also looking at way to expose most of the brick on the underside of the header. The bottom floor of the building and the cornices were discussed.

Ms. Kozak discussed materials. She showed a sample of the metal mesh for the balcony railings and a sample of the brick to the Commission.

The Commissioners gave their opinions of the building. Ms. Ruedig said she was impressed by the building and thought it was very successful. She said it was a great example of melding a historic building and an industrial one. She said it was contemporary but contextual and a great example of a building for downtown Portsmouth. She said the language was consistent throughout the building. She noted that the windows on the second floor above the arch on the east elevation seemed too busy and that the vertical windows were kind of smashed together.

Mr. Shea said he had liked the building for a long time and that it felt like an industrial building that had been modernized. He suggested that the wooden double hung windows be looked at again. He liked the verticality of the building, the relationship of the height to the windows and the vertical lines in the brick from the second floor to the fourth floor. He said the way it was recessed helped break up the façade. He suggested that the band between the first and second floors could be a bit taller because they felt slender to him.

Mr. Rawling said there were many improvements and refinements. He said the ground floor was successful and that he liked the windows and cornice treatments. He said he had trouble with the top floor because it felt too harsh and stark, and he liked a textured feeling to the top. He suggested that it be set back more. He referenced the Portwalk development and said the hotel entrance was a technique to break up the buildings. He suggested that the entrance be emphasized more yet still remain a shadowy recess. He said he was comfortable with the metal but felt that it could be treated differently and suggested a projecting lintel. He summarized that something more was needed on the top floor in that area.

Mr. Ryan said he agreed with all the comments except for the consistency of language. He said the grills in the back looked too polished and recommended something more industrial that matched the language of the windows, something bolder and more artistic, and more custom looking. He said the cables in front were slender and could be bolder. He said he liked the arch space but wasn't crazy about the painted wood grain on the panel because it wasn't authentic.

Ms. Bolster said it was a very interesting, simple building, and she appreciated the art gesture. Chairman Lombardi said he thought the building was great and that the Commission's comments and suggestions were good.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant indicated they would return for another work session at the November 2017 meeting.

C. Work Session requested by **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **157, 159, 161 Deer Street (Lot 5)**, wherein permission was 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. *(This item was postponed at the October 4, 2017 meeting to the October 18, 2017 meeting.)*

The project architects Tracy Kozak and Mark Moeller of JSA Architects were present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. Ms. Kozak said they made more revisions to Building 5 than Building 4, based on feedback from the Commission.

She reviewed the changes, which included adding more canopies along the pedestrian way, changing the fenestration, materials and massing on Deer Street, and creating a recessed entryway under a corner. She referred to the view coming into town from the traffic circle on Maplewood Avenue, noting that the top floor was different because they got rid of the zinc and added projecting dormers on the top and more of a projected bay. She said they added some materials on the back and wrapped the brick into the courtyard and also bumped them out about 18 inches. She said they got rid of the transformers, which left only the railroad switch box.

Ms. Kozak discussed the changes at the corner of Deer Street and Maplewood Avenue, saying that they pulled in the bump-outs to create more of a nested massing, changed the proportions by bringing the top down, added metal screening panels at the top, added a canopy and a mini-projecting bay, added a recessed entryway under the corner canopy, and added recessed windows. She said the southwest corner of the building transitioned to all stone and that the window spacing was changed. She said the bump-out at the corner was changed to make it look wider and broader. She said the building massing eroded and stepped down. She handed out a drawing of an optional tower element to the Commission, which she said was the big brother to the corner at the railroad and was only four stories tall.

Ms. Kozak discussed the Deer Street elevation. She said it was mostly apartments and that they changed the coursing to make it subtler than the zinc. She discussed the west side facing Building 4, the service entrance, underground parking, and trash services. She said there would be a hedgerow with a metal fence along the entire way up to the balcony bump-out at the north side facing the railroad. She discussed the courtyard elevations that had cast stone masonry. Mr. Moeller said they had projecting rails based on the railroad ties. He discussed an artistic iron work. He said the tower went beyond what was permitted by zoning, but the intent was to get some hierarchy to that corner and anchor it. Ms. Kozak discussed the canopies, the entry alcove, the ceiling treatment, and the materials. Mr. Moeller said there would be a graphic on the steel span at the main entrance that would serve as an introduction to the building. The cornice details, box dormers, window bays, vertical rails, balconies, and window details were presented.

The Commission gave their views on the changed building. Mr. Rawling said the Deer Street elevation looked good and was pleased to see the dormer bays added at the top floor. He said he struggled with moving around to the Maplewood Avenue side and the section along the railroad tracks, and also with the second-floor and third-floor projecting bays. He said he couldn't relate to the fenestration patterns because they were unfriendly and seemed detached from the other building. He suggested more of a cornice projection over the added bays and a shadow pattern. He said he preferred the first tower that was presented.

Ms. Ruedig said she wasn't as impressed with the building as she was with Building 4 and that the building failed all the reasons that she said Building 4 was successful. She said the building was still very large. She appreciated that the architect was trying to break up the massing but thought the design was having an identity crisis because there was so much going on. She said the cast stone was flat at places, and some of the cornice capping was simple and some of it was bigger with steel lintels. She noted the shiny and projecting bays. She said it wasn't a cohesive building and had too many cornices, details, and different brick designs jutting in and out. She said the building would be very visual at a major intersection that was becoming a new center of town. She said the tower reminded her of a hospital building.

Mr. Shea said the building wasn't as successful as Building 4 and that he still struggled with its height. He said five floors were too much for the corner and that he'd like to see the fifth floor set back on the Deer Street side. He said the building was too busy and suggested removing some details and simplifying it a bit by taking some language from Building 4. He said the building also reminded him of a hospital. He said the cornice was weak on the third floor on the Maplewood Avenue side and suggested that it be more continuous and simplified. He said he didn't like the stone on the fifth floor because it felt too heavy. He said he liked the bays on the Deer Street side. He said he preferred the second handout for the corner but would like to see it stop at the fourth floor. He suggested bringing in some language from Deer Street onto Maplewood Avenue to simplify it and cut back on the fifth floor.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the entrance at the corner of Maplewood Avenue and the railroad tracks could be activated. Ms. Kozak said it was designed as retail and there was just one tenant on that whole floor. She said it wasn't a good spot for a major entrance.

Mr. Ryan said he thought the project was successful in a lot of ways. He agreed that it could be simplified at the top, which might make the first tower more successful. He said he liked the tower and thought it was important to support the main intersection, but suggested that it be simplified. He said the new rendering was improved. He said he thought the industrial elements worked well. He said the project was on the right track.

Ms. Bolster said she felt overwhelmed because there was so much going on compared to Building 4, and she said she struggled with that contrast as well as the complexity of Building 5. She said the building was almost competing with itself.

Chairman Lombardi said his first impression of the building was also that it was a hospital. He said he thought at the outset that the building should be four stories and not five, and he still felt that way. He said the street level was good and liked the activity and the continuation of the efforts of Building 4 as far as the shops and entrances. He said the very large bays, especially on Maplewood Avenue, were too flat, and the big picture windows made it look like a hospital. He said he was bothered by the roofline being so high with the five floors and that it was basically a single plan. He said the roof was very flat, even though it went in and out, and had no interest. He said all the changes and details jutting in and out were very complex and that the building wasn't coherent like Building 4 was.

Ms. Kozak said they added more details because the Commission previously said the building was too stark. Ms. Ruedig said the language of the details needed to be more consistent. She noted that each corner or floor had its own configuration and that it didn't read consistently as a design due to all the layers and so on. She recommended that the building be brought somewhere in the middle to make it consistent.

Mr. Rawling said the Commission tried to convince applicants to incorporate HVAC screening into the building. He thought that was successful on Deer Street. He said Maplewood Avenue was the starkest side.

Ms. Kozak said they would focus on the interplay and agreed that there was different language between the simple Maplewood Avenue bump-outs and the more heavily articulated Deer Street side. She said they could try to bring those two designs together so that they were less different. Mr. Moeller said they could try to use restraint at the street scale, like the canopies and the articulation, and try to simplify some of it as they got away from the human interaction.

Mr. Rawling said the stone at the top floor was a little unusual because normally it was a base versus a cap, and he suggested switching them. He said he appreciated the texture and pattern but got lost at the second and third floors of the Maplewood Avenue elevation. He said it was so utilitarian that it perhaps suggested the hospital look. Ms. Bolster said there was too much busyness as opposed to too much detail. Ms. Ruedig agreed, noting that it wasn't so much the detail as it was the details that were just piled on.

Mr. Shea noted that one side had three stories and one side had four stories, which he thought made it feel busy. He said he liked the bays and suggested putting the bays on the other side, too. He suggested making the top floor lighter and more invisible because it had a high presence on

the corner. Mr. Rawling noted that part of the building rose up to the adjacent buildings, which were very large, and making the building undersized made the others more monumental. Mr. Shea said it could also make everything look like a canyon.

Ms. Kozak said she didn't think knocking a whole story off would hold up well as an entrance. She said they were doing the upper floor as workforce housing and that it was the only downtown project doing so. Workforce housing was further discussed.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant indicated they would return for another work session at the November 2017 meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

*At 10:30 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (6-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on Nov. 8, 2017.