

ACTION SHEET

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1 JUNKINS AVENUE
City Council Chambers**

7:00 p.m.

February 4, 2004

PLEASE NOTE: Due to the length of the Agenda, Old Business, Public Hearings and Work Sessions A through C will be heard at the February 4, 2004 meeting; however, Work Sessions D through G will be heard on the following Wednesday, February 11, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

January 31, 2004 – 9:30 a.m. - Site Walk – 133 Islington Street

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman John Rice, Vice-Chairman David Adams, Members Rick Becksted, Ellen Fineberg, City Council Representative Joanne Grasso; Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts; Alternates, Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

MEMBERS EXCUSED: John Golomb and Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

ALSO PRESENT: David M. Holden, Planning Director

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS

A) Work Session/Public Hearing of petition for Antonios Tzortzakis, owner, and Robert Cannon, applicant, for property located at 413-415 Islington Street wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (a one-story 165 s.f. addition being 11' x 15' in size and windows to match existing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 33 and lies within the Mixed Residential Business and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the reconvened meeting of January 14, 2004 to the February 4, 2004 meeting .

Voted to **approve** as presented with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....

B) Work Session/Public Hearing of petition for Brina Lampert, owner, for property located at 202 Islington Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (approval for installation front door as well as side door on building that have been installed and that the issue of the installed internally illuminated sign be removed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as lot 021 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. Since there was no one present to speak to the application, the Commission tabled the petition at the reconvened meeting of January 14, 2004 to the February 4, 2004 meeting.

Voted to **approve** as presented with the **stipulation** that there be no electrical connection/feeds to the sign with a 7 – 0 vote.



C) An Amendment to an application that was previously approved on November 5, 2003 for property owned by Ocean National Bank requested by JSA Architects, Inc. to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add two new windows on second floor that will match existing windows on Fleet Street façade and revise glass type (glazing to have spandrel glass) on State Street vestibule) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 1, 6 and 7 lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

Voted to **approve** as presented with the **stipulation** that the door be placed on the building as presented on Plan A2.01 submitted at the meeting with a 6 – 1 vote with Vice-Chairman Adams voting in the negative.



II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1) Petition for Joan Sanborn, owner, for property located at 191 South Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (seeking approval for a squirrel proof chimney cap that was installed in March of 2002) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 039 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

Voted to **approve** as presented with a 7 – 0 vote.



2) Petition for Worth Development Corporation, owner, for property located at 147-151 Congress Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (seeking approval for an acrylic canvas awning being 16' wide with a 4' drop and a 5' projection that was erected in December 2003 on the Maplewood Avenue façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 004 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

Voted to **approve** as presented with a 7 – 0 vote. The Commission advised the applicant to contact the Inspection Department to determine if Historic District Commission approval was required before making any exterior changes.



3) Petition for Olde Port Development, owner, and Stephen Kelm applicant, for property located at 126 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow renovations and addition to an existing structure and to allow new construction of approximately 25' x 20' 3-story addition attached to an existing structure at rear of building for conversion into residential and commercial uses (as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 057 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

Voted to approve as presented with a 7 – 0 vote and that the Building Permit reflect 4 residential and 1 commercial use. Please note that this has been reflected.



4) Work Session/Public Hearing for the petition for Tom and Kim Hitchcock, owners, and Roe G Cole, III, applicant, for property located at 50 South School Street #5 wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add one additional Velux, Model #308 30-5/8" wide x 55" long skylight to front left façade of building that will match the skylights approved at the August 6, 2003 meeting) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 060-5 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

Voted to **table the application to the reconvened meeting on February 11, 2004** to discuss solar tubing be used rather than skylights since it would less obtrusive to the area.

.....

III. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by DeStefano Architects for property owned by Parade Mall and located at 195 Hanover Street (corner of High Street and Hanover Street). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 001 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. (Construct a 116,000 s.f. mixed use building for hotel, residential and retail uses.)

- Ms. DeStefano presented three different renderings of the project for the Commission members to review for property located at 195 Hanover Street;
- Ms. DeStefano presented photographs of the area looking up Hanover Street from partway up the street from Market Street that shows the relationship of the parking garage across the street;
- The height and size of the building is relative to other engineered elevations of other hotels in the area;
- The materials used will be metal, brick, slate and composition bays;
- The scale is being broken down on the walls by introducing a pattern in the brick as well as patterns within the glass in differentiating some of bays.
- The top is being pulled out flush to the face of the main building or the red brick building, but we are trying to keep a lighter cap at the top and introduce a flat roof and brackets that would still be the hotel rooms at the top;
- A corner piece is on the angle that is on the corner of Hanover and High streets which she feels is a good way to gain attention without having a hard edge on the corner;
- Rendering #2 – Ms. DeStefano stated that they played more with the rhythm and size to Bow Street as well as Market Street (across from 100 Market Street).
- Different size bays were used to break down the scale as well as produce much more color;
- Different window patterns, sizes, pieces stepping back differently along the street scape that we feel will create an interesting walkway as work is being done up and down Hanover Street;
- Have a unique entry form;
- There will be a break between the residential wing and the main hotel building to allow a separation between the different uses of the building.
- Mr. Young addressed the proposed materials to be used and brick is the most common material; however, there are no fixed ideas being proposed as of yet; metal

- painted brick in color, or slate or a composition of new material that is like wood similar to what is on the Porter Street townhouses;
- The third rendering is a development of the previous rendering. The building is five stories and has a heavy base as well as awnings to allow for protection for pedestrians when walking on Hanover Street and for future activity;
 - The building is proposed to cascade more down to The Hill;
 - The materials on this rendering are proposed to be brick and copper and pre-cast, but that is still being developed;
 - Ms. Fineberg asked that the residential part of the project be discussed further;
 - Ms. DeStefano stated that in the third rendering, a completely different look was being looked into – such as in the Boston Back Bay with a raised stoop. The separation of the two uses start with the glass store front, the heavy brick building that would turn the corner as well as retail space;
 - Ms. DeStefano requested that the Commission members discuss the rendering that would be most desirable for the location or a combination of certain renderings;
 - Ms. Roberts asked about the corner entryway at Hanover and High Streets on rendering #1;
 - Ms. DeStefano replied it will be curved on one side with the doorway notched into it at a 45 degree angle and will also create an outdoor gathering space;
 - Ms. Grasso stated that she could not choose which rendering she preferred, but she could eliminate #3 because it is the least appealing;
 - Mr. Katz stated he felt #1 was the least appealing because of the upper story cap and feels it is too similar but not as extreme as 100 Market Street; however, he feels the safest rendering is #2 – would like to see a model on it. He is intrigued by rendering #3 simply because it could be similar to an old mill building; but can understand why people would be a little bit weary of this rendering;
 - Vice-Chairman Adams stated he feels rendering #3 is honest, has a rhythm to it, has a roof; however, there is a problem with a single massive building on a sloping site where storefronts either get smaller or larger. On 100 Market Street, it did both.
 - Rendering #1 has masonry with windows and being broken up into pieces, it allow the storefront to walk down the slope so that it will have a more pedestrian friendly feel to it.
 - Concerned about rendering #2 in that some of the modules are narrower than typical store fronts or the downtown jumbled buildings;
 - Vice-Chairman Adams is concerned about rendering #1 because of the capped roof (thing on the roof) because it looks like it gets larger as it goes up and would rather see more roof;
 - Rendering #3 has solid building integrity and is valuable;
 - Ms. Dika likes rendering #1 since it is more graceful than the other two renderings and because the cap ties it together in good rhythm. The #1 rendering – she likes the subtlety of the brick working against the brick rather than the more reddish brick tone.
 - Mr. Becksted stated he liked #2 rendering, but there was something that just did not settle right with him – like the width element of some of the elements and should have other options;
 - Ms. Fineberg stated she liked rendering #1 the best because the rhythm is right; however, she doesn't like the residential component or maybe it is the glass on the bottom. She likes that the facades are broken up and not all the same. The roof needs some work. #3 rendering remind her of Lincoln Center in New York to the

- sense of the shape and rhythm of it reminding her of a very large and institutional high school. #2 rendering has too many things going on;
- Ms. Roberts stated she agreed with what fellow Commissioner members have stated; however, she found rendering #2 to be visually fragmented because there were too many different pieces, but she did like the articulation of the residential piece on rendering #3. Rendering #1 does have good potential.
 - Ms. Grasso stated she liked part of rendering #2 especially the façade on the street because the design makes it less massive; liked the appearance on the bottom and the way the building gives a little more pedestrian feel and will encourage people to walk down High Street which would be a good thing;
 - Chairman Rice stated he liked rendering #2 the most because it has larger and smaller units and picks up that this is the way the neighborhood is. There is rhythm so this building breaks up a little bit in this regard. Rendering #3 is monolithic and liked the residential component. Liked the interesting entryways for rendering #2 and added, he did not like the balconies. Rendering #1 he did not like the penthouse and is a reflection of 100 Market Street and is repeating a form that does not need to be repeated. This rendering looks rather institutional and gives you no direction at all.
 - Chairman Rice stated that based on Commission members remarks, rendering #3 has been eliminated.
 - An abutter at 62 Deer Street asked if anyone had thought of using a different material on the residential units than what is on the Hotel to give it the building a different feel. He also suggested that possibly pitched roofs be added to the building to mimic buildings in the surrounding neighborhood.
 - An abutter, who owns two properties on The Hill asked if a rendering could be drawn up to show how the Hotel would look from The Hill. Ms. DeStefano stated that these views would likely be unveiled at the next work session. The abutter was concerned with the brick color that was discussed. Ms. DeStefano stated a brick selection has not yet been made at this time since it is too early in the project.
 - Chairman Rice stated he did not have a great desire to have a different material on the residential area vs. the Hotel.
 - Ms. Fineberg would like to have a more traditional storefront on the first floor to look different than the floor above and is basically the reason she does not like rendering #2;
 - Mr. Katz feels that to make the residential entity subtly differentiated may not be a bad thing, but if it is made into a separate entity, the differences in scale and mass would make it look very awkward, and could possibly look like an afterthought.
 - DeStefano Architects implied they would be back for another work session next month.

.....

B) Work Session requested by Mary and Erik Maurer, owners, for property located at 65 Rogers Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 115 as Lot 002 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts. (Change house from a duplex to a single family; demolish a neglected barn and replace with a barn on same footprint; attach barn to house and move southerly 4' away from property line); add a half story walk-up; raise existing roof to 5'6" to accommodate for headroom; and renovate existing three-season porch.)

- Frank Hyer, the architect for the project, stated that since the last work session, we have scaled the project down for the dormers and presented plans to reflect the changes;

- The windows have been changed to bring the fenestration in line with a 1880 New England style dormer;
- The windows in the kitchen will be removed on the inside to allow for counter space; however, there will be windows on the outside to keep the house in symmetry;
- Chairman Rice thanked the applicant for making the changes to his application that the Commission members suggested at the last work session;
- Vice-Chairman Adams is very comfortable with all the changes and design of the addition as well;
- Mr. Hyer stated that he would be back for a Public Hearing at the next meeting in March 2004.

.....

C) Work Session requested by Anne Whitney, Architect for property owned by Kathleen Beauchamp located at 21 Blossom Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 003 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. (Remove existing one-story garage and replace with a one-1/2 story garage; build a one-story addition between existing residence and new garage that will include an entry porch.)

- Anne Whitney, the architect for the project, stated they had made changes since the last work session. They had lowered the height of the garage; reduce window fenestration to a single window;
- The addition is definitely smaller ;
- The front door can still be seen;
- Presented a view of the corner as you drive by and the tree that was an issue last meeting can still be seen;
- When driving by the structure, the proposed changes will not be seen;
- Ms. Whitney presented a photograph.
- Ms. Fineberg stated she was happy that the scale of the addition will be scaled down;
- Ms. Roberts stated she agreed that the scale is a big improvement.
- Mr. Becksted stated he also agreed and was happy the tree was still on the property;
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated he feels the addition is just too much and too large for this small cape.
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated if the handicap issue was not there, then we would not have an issue; however, the interior of the structure is painfully small and cannot imagine who could live in this house and added it looks like the suburbs;
- Ms. Whitney stated her client has lived there for 13 years and that the assumption made by Vice-Chairman Rice should not be made;
- The majority of the neighborhood is very supportive of this project;
- Mr. Zabarsky, a direct abutter stated that zoning requires 25' setback from the property line and the Board of Adjustment granted a 4-1/2' setback from his property line. This is blocking air and light to his property and is very unhappy that his concerns were not addressed by this Board
- Ms. Whitney replied that she has discussed this project with Mr. Zabarsky on many occasions and has done as much as she could; he is not happy with anything that is being proposed or anything that I say;
- The owners have been given permits to expand this house and there job is to complete the project;

- Chairman Rice stated that just because the Board of Adjustment has indicated they can expand, does not mean we have to approve it. There are other considerations for people to make to make to use their property successfully;
- Ms. Whitney stated that under the Scope of Review of the Ordinance, one of the major objectives is to preserve the integrity of the district;
- Ms. Whitney stated that they would be back in March for a public hearing;
- Chairman Rice stated at that time the Commission will vote on whether the design is appropriate for the neighborhood and the vote could be either yeah or nay. Our vote is very sensitive.

.....

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:45 p.m., the Commission voted to adjourn the meeting and meet at the reconvened meeting on February 11, 2004 to complete the Agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Long
Secretary

/jml