

**MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

February 7, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman John Rice, Vice-Chairman David Adams, Richard Katz, John Golumb, Ellen Fineberg; Planning Board Representative Jerry Hetjmanek; and Alternates Sandra Dika and John Wyckoff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Councilor Representative Ned Reynolds

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A) Approval of minutes, January 3, 2007

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.

B) Petition of **414 State Street Condominium Association, owner, and Timothy S. Wheelock, applicant**, for property located at **414 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (repoint chimneys, install stainless steel chimney caps, apply chimney saver water protection to both chimneys) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 13-2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was tabled at the January 10, 2007 meeting.)*

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to remove the petition from the tabled status. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dika. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Timothy Wheelock, president of the condominium association spoke to the petition. He stated that he was before the Commission in November of 2006. He explained that 414 State Street was a five unit condominium complex in a historic building. They are currently experiencing water entering the building around the chimneys. The right side chimney is the one that is most deteriorated. He stated that they thought the water was coming through the slate roof so they had the roof repaired but that did not solve the problem. He said that the water was coming in from the chimney, freezing and thawing, and then seeping into an upper condo unit.

In an earlier meeting with the Historic District Commission, he was asked if it was possible to substitute stone chimney caps for the proposed stainless steel caps. Mr. Wheelock stated that it would be possible to substitute them and he submitted an estimate of \$1,500.00 a piece. He added that the stainless steel caps were priced at \$600.00 a piece. He said that the condominium association had two concerns – one was financial as it would increase the cost of the project substantially and secondly, they had a concern about putting a mason on the roof and damaging the slate. It was the condominium association's preference to proceed with the original proposal. He said that if that was rejected, they were prepared to proceed with the stone caps.

Chairman Rice asked if the Commission had any questions.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the cost of the original estimate. Mr. Clum stated that the original application stated that the cost was \$2,200.00 for the entire job.

Ms. Fineberg said that the difference between the two estimates was \$640.00. Vice Chairman Adams pointed out that there were other repairs involved in the original application. He said that the difference was actually \$1,640.00.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application as originally submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hetjmanek. Chairman Rice asked if there was discussion.

Mr. Katz stated that there are ideal situations and there are workable situations. He said that there are stainless steel chimney caps all over the City and in the Historic District. He added that they probably did not get approval for them. He added that the caps will remain until someone makes them take them down. He felt that with this application they should consider the risk of harm to the roof. He said that he would support the application.

Vice Chairman Adams stated that he would not support the application. He felt that Mr. Katz's concern for the slate roof was undo cause for alarm. He added that the HDC could send a message with this application concerning the use of stainless steel chimney caps in the Historic District.

Chairman Rice stated that if the application was voted down, then the applicant could appeal the decision.

Chairman Rice called for the vote. The motion to approve the application as presented failed by a 5-2 vote.

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to rescind the previous vote. The motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application with the removal of the stainless steel caps and the addition of bluestone chimney caps. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dika. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Porter Street Townhouse Homeowners Association, owner, and James Horne, applicant**, for property located at **12-32 Porter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install automatic parking gate at exit point of property) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lots 46, 48-57 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Bernard Pelech, representing the condominium association spoke to the petition. He thanked the Commission for granting the rehearing. He stated that the Commission had already approved one gate on the Fleet Street side. The gate on the Church Street side was the one they are seeking approval for now. Attorney Pelech said that the homeowners association would like to present an option that might be favorable to the Commission. He said that they are proposing to encase the orange metal housing for the gate with some type of a wood recessed panel that would look like a large gate post. Attorney Pelech felt that a skilled craftsman could build an encasing structure which would look appropriate for the neighborhood and would still allow the gate to operate. For repair or maintenance, he said that one of the recessed panels could be removed for access. He added that they could do nothing with the arm. The Planning Board stipulated in their approval of the gates that the gate arms be reflective. Attorney Pelech stated that they could present the Commission with drawings at the next meeting.

Chairman Rice asked if the Commission had any questions.

Mr. Katz asked if this proposal would apply to the approved gate as well. Attorney Pelech replied that they had not considered that one but if the Commission desired it, they would probably be willing to include it. Chairman Rice stated that he thought it was an excellent solution to the problem. He said that they could probably approve the application pending drawings to being submitted to the Planning Department.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if the structure was going to fully encase the housing and how tall it would be. He said that currently, the housing is probably no more than 3 ½ feet. Attorney Pelech thought 4 or 4 ½ feet would be a more appropriate height for a gate post.

Chairman Rice asked if the Commission had any more questions. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application pending receipt of the drawings of the post in question. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Adams. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

2. Petition of **Perry Silverstein Revocable Trust 2001, owner**, for property located at **10 Commercial Alley, 19-25 Market Street, and off Penhallow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (add additional skylight to rear roof, add security light to east elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 9, 10, and 12 and lies in the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Perry Silverstein, owner of the property, spoke to the petition. He explained that he would like to add a motion detector light on the Penhallow Street façade above the exit door. He said it was a simple, single 300 watt motion detector light. He added that he would also like to add an additional skylight to the rear of the building. In 2004, he added apartments to the third floor and at the time had two skylights installed. He would like to use the same type of skylight for this application. Mr. Silverstein stated that the skylight would not be visible from the street. He continued to say that the reason he would like the skylight was to add additional light that will be blocked by the approved addition.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. Chairman Rice asked if there was any discussion.

Vice Chairman Adams stated that it was an appropriate place for a security light and it will not be on all of the time, only intermittently. He felt that the area that the skylight would be put in is completely shadowed from the street. He said that only those who live there would see it.

Chairman Rice called for the vote. The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous vote.

3. Petition of **Hart House Condominium Association, owner**, and **Joan Carr, applicant**, for property located at **306 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install two bluestone chimney caps) as per plans on file in

the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 75 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Joan Carr, one of the owners of the Hart House, spoke to the petition. She stated that it was a three story, three unit building. She said that they have been experiencing leakage during heavy rain storms. She added that it was recommended to fill the joints in the tiles and install bluestone chimney caps.

Chairman Rice asked if the Commission had any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Dika made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hetjmanek. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

4. Petition of **Harbour Place Group, LLC, owner**, for property located at **1 Harbour Place**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (approve details for proposed arch and railing on proposed recessed fifth floor balconies) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Bernard Pelech spoke on behalf of Harbor Place Group. He stated that Dann Batting, architect for the project was also present. He reminded the Commission that this application was approved several months ago but additional detail was to be provided about the archway and the rails for the fifth floor balconies.

Mr. Dann Batting stated that they needed to do demolition first to determine what was there in order to present a plan for the reconstruction. He said the building is a steel building with brick veneer. The existing windows have an aluminum frame that closes the gap between the interior finish and the brick veneer and is caulked on the outside. He explained that when they remove that, they are left with original interior finishing and the brick veneer on the outside. They needed to find a way to close the joint that is acceptable to the Commission, as well as weatherproof. He said that the simplest and least expensive solution was to remove the window unit, install a steel tube sill which will provide structure to support the railing and will also be deep enough to close the gap between the brick veneer and construction. It will be painted to match the color of all of the existing openings. Mr. Batting stated that they considered putting an arched frame around it but the cost was prohibitive. So their solution was to create a EIFS, which is an exterior finishing system, basically synthetic stucco with a smooth finish, onto the

molded item that would be approximately the same size as the window frame. He said that it is an easy material to make an arch out of and can be painted to match the exterior window finish on the building. He added that once those two items are in place, the fabricated rail system can be installed.

Chairman Rice asked about the durability of the EFIS system. Mr. Batting replied that it is extremely durable and very weather resistant. He added that maintained properly, it would last 50 years. He pointed out that the building at 2 International Drive has this system.

Ms. Fineberg asked if he had experience installing this system in an area that has a lot of exposure to wind and water. Mr. Batting replied that he could not tell her of a specific example on the waterfront but it was a system that is widely used throughout the world. Ms. Fineberg said that if it was to decompose, what would that look like. She asked if the surface would start to chip. Mr. Batting replied that they call it synthetic stucco; it is a cementitious material very similar to real stucco. He said if water got behind it, there could be deterioration. He explained that it was important that it be installed properly and that it be sealed.

Ms. Dika asked what type of maintenance the product requires. Mr. Batting responded that the paint may deteriorate and may need to be repainted. He pointed out that water is the enemy to all buildings. It would require inspection on a regular basis to check the weather seal as well.

Vice Chairman Adams stated that it was a troweled on material so he asked what texture would be achieved. Mr. Batting replied that their intention was to have a smooth finish.

Chairman Rice asked if there were anymore questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hetjmanek. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

5. Petition of **The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities of MA, owner**, for property located at **143 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace one window with door to match existing doors, replace rear door to match existing doors, replace rear steps with code compliant egress platform and steps, add screen fence at side door, add exterior lights) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 14 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Steve McHenry, architect for the project, spoke to the application. He stated that these are limited exterior changes to the building because the major work will be happening on the inside. He said that the changes are very sensitive to the historic nature of the site. Mr. McHenry pointed out that the site plan included in the packet was intended to give them an idea of the overall dimensions of the small staircase on the right of the carriage house and the location of the screen fence. He added that the exterior views in the packet showed the existing conditions as well as where the specific work was to be done. Mr. McHenry explained that they would like to replace one window with a door. It would be solid wood door with tongue and groove construction. The interior renovations to this area will be a small kitchen to support some of the outdoor functions that occur on the site. He said that they would also like to replace the rear door with a door to match the existing doors. He continued to say that they would like to replace the rear stairs with code compliant egress stairs. In addition, they are proposing to add screen fence to shield refuse barrels from public view. The last request was to add exterior lights.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. McHenry about the style of fence that he chose. Mr. McHenry replied that the detail on the fence mimics a new fence that is located at the back of the property. He said he was just picking up on what was already there.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Dika made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fineberg. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

6. Petition of **Adel Semmar and Mounsif Ghninou, owners, and Millpond Millwork and Construction, applicant**, for property located at **119 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install tile on façade, add new signage, paint existing sign band area) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Dennis Smith of Millpond Millwork and Construction spoke to the petition. He said that the applicant would like to dress up the front of the façade so that it ties in better with the restaurant theme. He brought a sample of the tile to show the Commission. He pointed out the proposed tile would be 8”x 8”. Mr. Smith stated that they would be applying the tile to the area above the windows. The new signage would be where the sign band is. He added that there was existing hardware for an awning and they would like to ask for that at a future date.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if the work required any changes to the door or windows. Mr. Smith replied no.

Mr. Smith stated that the bull nose would go on the top course of brick. He said that the brick will not be visible as it will go up against the storefront. He added that the idea was to get away from the metal storefront look.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if the owners owned the storefront. Ms. Smith replied yes, they are condos now and he had a letter from the condo association approving of the renovations.

Vice Chairman Adams pointed out that at the top, it is not smooth. Mr. Smith replied they would use a type of plywood where they would adhere the sub straight cement board to that or remove it and just have a cement board. At this point, he was not sure what application they would use. Vice Chairman Adams asked what they would see when they look up at that area. Mr. Smith replied they should just see the tile. He added that they may see the cement board but it could be painted to match the tile. He said that it was his intent to make it look like the tile so they could add an 1 ¼" of tile if the Commission liked that approach better.

Mr. Golumb asked what was behind the board that Vice Chairman Adams was asking about. Mr. Smith replied that it was glass on the front where the curve is and on the other part it is partial glass.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Rice asked if there was any discussion.

Chairman Rice stated that it was completely out of character with what is downtown. Mr. Wyckoff said that he agreed with the Chairman but pointed out that the building was a cement block structure built in the early 1970's. He felt that the applicant was probably going to remove the wooden top façade since it hangs down over the glass.

Vice Chairman Adams asked what would happen when the wood is removed. Mr. Wyckoff replied that they would place the cement board right onto the storefront channel. He said that as long as the applicant has a return on the bottom that will cover it so that they do not see any of the sub straight, he did not see a problem with it.

Vice Chairman Adams stated that this is a problem because one person has control over a piece of a building. He said that he did not think that this was appropriate for the street.

Mr. Katz stated that that particular area of Congress Street has an eclectic nature about it. He continued to say that you can look around and see all kinds of different storefronts. He said that he thought it would be a great addition to the area.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, he called for the vote. The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a vote of 6 – 1 with Vice Chairman Adams voting in opposition.

7. Petition of **Jamer Realty, Inc., owner**, and **Beth Gross-Santos, applicant**, for property located at **41 Vaughan Mall**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove barn boards to expose brick façade, install awning, and install glass display area) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan117 as Lot 2-3 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

A representative of Jamer Realty, Inc. spoke to the petition. He stated that the store space was most recently the Portsmouth Ballroom. He said that they would like to bring it back to its original look by removing the barn board and exposing the brick façade underneath. He added that he felt the brick was in good shape by what they could see and by looking at the storefront next to them.

Chairman Rice asked if they were going to put up awnings. Ms. Beth Gross-Santos, the tenant of the building replied yes, that there was a sketch of the proposed awnings in the packets. She added that the awning would be retractable and would be placed on the Vaughan Mall side of the building.

Chairman Rice asked about the proposal to create a glass display area. The representative replied that on the Fleet Street side, there was an entry way that they would like to make into a glass display case. Chairman Rice asked if they had submitted drawings of this display case. The representative replied no.

Chairman Rice stated that he felt they had enough information about the barn board removal and the awning to move forward. He felt they could approve those but not the glass display area. He said that the applicant could come back for approval of the display area at a later date.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if the sashes would remain. The representative replied yes, they would leave the doors and windows as they exist.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if they knew when the building was built. Ms. Gross-Santos replied that it was built in 1910. Vice Chairman Adams asked that in 1910, were there windows and doors in these locations. The representative replied that there was the possibility that they might find an old window sealed up. Vice Chairman Adams said that the worst case scenario

would be that they would find problems behind the barn boards. Mr. Clum suggested that they approve the application and if they find out that the underlining sub straight is not what they expected; they could come back to the Commission.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the roof on the Fleet Street side. He asked if they would be removing that. The representative replied no, that it would be staying. Mr. Wyckoff felt that style roof did not match with the proposed storefront and was not appropriate for the City.

Chairman Rice felt they would be overstepping their bounds to say that they would not approve the application without altering the roof.

Ms. Fineberg pointed out that if the applicant repairs the roof as is, it does not require Commission review.

Ms. Dika stated that she was glad to see that they were doing something with the building.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented with the removal of the proposal for the glass display area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. Chairman Rice asked if there was discussion.

Vice Chairman Adams said that he agreed with Mr. Wyckoff. He felt that this was worth a shot for this building.

The motion to approve the application as presented with the removal of the glass display area passed by a unanimous vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A) Petition of **KRS Realty, LLC, owner**, and **Kim Buxton, applicant**, for property located at **78 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install awning over entrance) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 36 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was tabled to a work session at the January 3, 2007 meeting.)*

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to remove the application from the tabled status. The motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Ms. Jesse Aikman stated that she brought drawings and pictures, as well as an updated model. She said that they would like to reduce the size of the awning. It is now 12" narrower in width and 6" shorter in height. She added that the updated model has piping on it.

Chairman Rice asked if this would be a retractable awning. Ms. Aikman replied that it would be tight on the frame but it would not be retractable. She continued to say that it had a fluttering valance and had piping on it to soften the look. She said that there are other awnings in town similar to it. Ms. Aikman stated that she felt that with a rounded window, they needed to stay with a rounded awning.

Chairman Rice pointed out that if they approve this awning, then they will be setting a new precedence. That precedent would be that when they approve something like this, that the lower valance be loose.

Ms. Fineberg asked if that has always been their preference. Chairman Rice replied that their preference has always been retractable awnings. He said that they have rarely approved awnings that had fixed frames. Ms. Aikman asked about the awnings at the Hilton Garden Inn. She pointed out that they had awnings with fixed frames. Ms. Fineberg pointed out the Bank of America awnings and Mr. Wyckoff pointed out the Portsmouth Health Food Store.

Ms. Fineberg said that she agreed with Ms. Aikman that the piping on the awning helped to break it up into smaller sections and softens the look.

Ms. Dika stated that she felt that the window had beautiful architectural detail with the fan window and it would be a shame to cover it up.

Mr. Katz asked how old the window was. Chairman Rice replied that it was installed around 1990. Mr. Katz pointed out that they are not covering up something that is historic.

Vice Chairman Adams stated that they have unique requests and he felt that this one could not be a more appropriate style of awning for an arched opening. He felt the applicant has come back to them with a modification to an earlier request. It is now smaller and has piping. He felt that since the awning will sit inside the arched brick frame, it will not detract from the arched look. Vice Chairman Adams stated that he was comfortable with the design.

Mr. Katz said that the piping added lightness to the structure and that negated any concerns that he would have with it.

Hearing no more discussion, Vice Chairman asked if they could move the application to the floor. Chairman Rice asked for a motion.

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to reopen the application as a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Chairman Rice asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as amended, with the new dimensions and the added piping. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hetjmanek. The motion passed by a 6-1 vote with Ms. Dika voting in opposition.

B) Work Session requested by **J.W. Sobel Revocable Trust, owner**, for property located at **49 Sheafe Street** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (two garages) and new free standing structures (two new garages). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 21 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

No one was present to speak to the application.

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to table the application to the end of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

C) Work Session requested by **68 State Street, LLC, owner, and Somma, applicant**, for property located at **68 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition (remove existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (5 story mixed use brick building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 13 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

Ms. Dika stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion.

Ms. Jen Ramsey was present to speak to the application. She stated that she would welcome comments on elevation options for the front of the building. She added that she would like them to look at several options for the storefront and two options for window configurations. She said that what they have done was to modify the storefront, remove the shutters, add awnings and change the dormer configurations slightly. Additionally, they have reduced the height of the building by one foot, four inches. She added that there is an 8 foot height differential from the neighboring 58 State Street and 12 foot differential from the neighboring Rosa Restaurant.

Ms. Ramsey said that she preferred the storefront option with granite piers, a strong header, in filled storefront style windows, granite base and wood paneling. She felt it was a more formal storefront.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the granite beam across the first floor would be wider. Ms. Ramsey replied that they would probably put a bracket on it and hang a sign from it. She said that they could widen it and give it more prominence.

Vice Chairman Adams asked what type of granite stone they would use. Ms. Ramsey replied that they had not made that determination yet, but that they were leaning toward using true granite. Mr. Wyckoff stated that the thought of a real granite storefront was very appealing.

Vice Chairman Adams stated that he felt it made sense to put in extra doors to allow flexibility in their use.

Chairman Rice asked Ms. Ramsey which storefront she preferred. She stated that she liked the windows on option J and the granite storefront, which was option F.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the awnings were proposed for a reason. Ms. Ramsey replied that they are not proposed for the purpose of shading the sun. She felt the look would give more prominence to the building. Ms. Fineberg added that the awnings would show that it is a different kind of building.

Vice Chairman Adams pointed out that the Matthew Marsh House, located next to Temple Israel, was a 4 story stand alone building. He said that after looking at the building in that area, he was more comfortable with a 4 story building. Vice Chairman Adams asked Ms. Ramsey if she could provide plans that showed the two buildings together so that he could compare them.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the panels above the doors would be wood or glass. Ms. Ramsey said that she thought they would be wood.

Ms. Ramsey pointed out that page 8 of the plans showed the back elevation. Page 9 showed the interior view of the courtyard. She said that the courtyard was not visible from many spots in the area. She also pointed out that there was a large tree in the back courtyard area that they are trying very hard to keep. Ms. Ramsey said that the courtyard would allow some light into the rooms. There might be a restaurant in that space as well.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she was very impressed with the design of the elevator override. She said however, that she thought that the awnings in the back looked a little fussy. Vice Chairman Adams stated that maybe the awnings would give the building some identity in the back as well.

Vice Chairman Adams made a comment about the parapet walls on the top floor. He said that he was not a fan of roof lines that break up like this design. He wondered why that design was necessary. He added that privacy walls viewed from the wrong angle would not look good. Ms. Ramsey asked if a rail system would be a better option. Vice Chairman Adams replied that he would be more comfortable with that.

Vice Chairman Adams pointed out that he did not see an area for mechanicals in the plans. Ms. Ramsey replied that they would have to look at that carefully as they start developing the inside further. Vice Chairman made a suggestion to create a room with louvers and use that as the compressor area. He said he would rather they lose floor space than to go up in height.

Vice Chairman Adams asked what roofing material they were thinking of. Ms. Ramey replied that they were thinking of using asphalt shingles. She added that fake slate would be appropriate for the building as well.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if any of the chimneys were functional. Ms. Ramsey replied yes and that they would like to incorporate fireplaces into some of the rooms.

Ms. Ramsey stated that she would like to come back for a public hearing in April. Ms. Fineberg mentioned that she thought a site walk would be helpful prior to that.

Mr. Adams made a motion to table the work session request of J. W. Sobel Revocable Trust to the March 7, 2007 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Commission, at 9:30 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission Meeting on March 7, 2007.