

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

April 1, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members, Tracy Kozak; City Council Representative Eric Spear; Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts; Alternate George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: John Wyckoff, Elena Maltese; Alternate Joseph Almeida

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – March 4, 2009

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (6-0) to approve the minutes as presented.

B. Request for a one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness – 111 Maplewood Avenue – requested by Nip Lot 2, LLC and Nip Lot 5/6, LLC

Ms. Kozak made a motion to grant a one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Roberts. There was no discussion. The motion to grant a one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the project passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote. The Certificate of Appropriateness will now expire on May 7, 2010.

C. Petition of **March Twenty Two, LLC, owner, and Donna White, applicant,** for property located at **56 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install awning) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March 4, 2009 meeting to a work session/public hearing at the April 1, 2009 meeting.)*

- Ms. Donna White, applicant, was present to speak to the application. Ms. White said that a letter was submitted to the commission addressing some of the issues that were raised at the March 4, 2009 meeting. She explained that the light that was currently attached to the building would not be behind the awning and cause it to look illuminated. She said that the awning would project out 20 inches and the light fixture extends out 28 inches. She also added that the awning would hang down over the window about three inches.
- Mr. Melchior informed the commission who were not present at the last meeting of the three challenges pertaining to the proposal. Some of the commission felt that the awning did not work with the sign band and covered up all of the effort of the sign band. Mr. Melchior also stated that there was a concern that the existing light fixture would cause back lighting. The final challenge was the length of the awning and how that would fit within the module of the sign band. He said that the biggest issue was the sign band.

- Ms. White stated that her landlord did not have an objection to the use of the awning. She added that the awning fit perfectly and if she would have had the awning made for this location; it would have been the same exact size. She pointed out that the awning represents who they are.
- Ms. Roberts asked how the awning would be attached to the building. Ms. White said it was very lightweight with a metal frame and brackets on the end. She was not sure if there was a support piece in the middle.
- Chairman Dika wanted to point out that the building was in the historic district and the commission took great pains with deliberations when the building was being built. She said that the fact that the landlord approved of the awning should not enter into the commission's decision.
- Chairman Dika asked if the awning was being used as an awning. Ms. White said it has been labeled an awning by the company that made it. Chairman Dika commented that she has not traditionally approved of awnings used as signs in the historic district and to her, this looked like a sign and not an awning.
- Chairman Dika added that at the prior location, the building was one entity. At this new location, the proposed awning was quite a dramatic demarcation from the other signage on the building. She asked Ms. White if there was any other type of signage that she would be willing to move forward with. Ms. White replied no, it would just be an added expense for her small business during tough times.
- Councilor Spear pointed out that projecting signs were very different from awnings and so they could not be compared.
- Ms. White asked if the concern was that it would hang over the sidewalk. Chairman Dika explained that the awning was a very contemporary look on a building that went through great pains to fit into the historic district. Ms. White said that it seemed to fit fine when it was two blocks up the street. She added that the awning was done in good taste and the location was in an artsy community located close to Prescott Park.
- Councilor Spear felt that the break was too abrupt going from the awning above the windows to the sign band. He was not comfortable with the way it looked.
- Ms. Kozak asked about the material of the awning. Ms. White said that it had a vinyl type of feeling to it. Ms. Kozak said that she did not mind a contemporary sign but she was troubled by it not fitting in with the lines of the building and having it extend 4-6 inches below the sign board. She said that it broke an important element of the building. Ms. White stated that she thought the awning fit perfectly. Ms. Roberts felt it was the horizontal line of the building and the height of the awning relative to the sign board that was the issue.
- Ms. Roberts thought that the canvas company might be able to take the canvas off of the frame and fit it onto something else.
- Vice Chairman Katz stated that he hated to see anything wasted but he felt that the sign board was a determinant factor with this application. He thought it was possible to demount the canvas from the frame and have it fit onto a new frame that would sit inside the sign band. He said he thought the commission would be satisfied if this were a direction that was to be explored and it would save some of the applicant's investment in it. Chairman Dika commented that she would still not be satisfied as she considered it a sign and not an awning.
- Ms. White said that she was not satisfied with this alternative. She could not understand why the awning does not fit fine now when it fit fine eight years ago on a building two blocks away. The neighborhood was just as historic then as it is now.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that in its former location it was on neutral ground. With this building, the sign band running the width of the building is an integral part of the structure of the building. He added that he felt the awning would do damage to the architectural feature of the building because it destroys the line and continuity of the building.

- Mr. Melchior felt that was the same objection at last month's meeting. He said that the idea to come to a work session was to discuss other ideas. He did not see any compromise on Ms. White's part.
- Ms. White stated that she thought the light was the problem. Mr. Melchior pointed out that three different commissioners mentioned the sign band at last month's meeting.
- Vice Chairman Katz commented that sometimes these applications are a series of compromises and this was a compromise he was willing to make. And it would help the applicant retrieve some of the awning.
- Chairman Dika said she did not feel it was an awning because it did not function as an awning. She felt it was a sign and should be flush with the surface of the sign board. Anything short of that Chairman Dika said she would not vote for.
- Ms. White asked if something definitive could be worked out so that she could receive an approval this evening.
- Vice Chairman Katz suggested the commission stipulate that the sign fit within the sign band and also fit within the upper and lower trim caps of the sign band. The commissioners were in agreement.
- Chairman Dika thought the sign should be flat to the sign board. Ms. Kozak interjected that "flat" was subjective. She said that she did not mind if the sign stuck out, she just did not like the fact that it would hang down below the sign board.
- Mr. Melchior agreed with Ms. Kozak and said that the depth was not the issue as long as the integrity of the sign board was maintained.
- Councilor Spear felt that the sign should be flush mounted within the framing. He did not know how many inches the mounting would require. Chairman Dika agreed with Councilor Spear and pointed out that she was concerned about shadow lines.
- Mr. Clum added that if the sign were flush mounted then it would not need to go before the City Council for approval.

Ms. Roberts made a motion to move out of the work session and into a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. The motion passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Melchior made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following amendments:

- 1) That the sign is flush mounted to the signboard.
- 2) That the mounting occur between the upper and lower rail cap of the signboard and does not extend beyond the horizontal limits.
- 3) That the sign will not extend beyond the vertical extents of the storefront.
(The storefront includes the windows to the right and the door to the left.)

The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. There was no additional discussion. The motion passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

Chairman Dika explained to the applicant that if there are any changes from what was agreed upon this evening, she would need to come back before the commissioners for an amendment to the approval.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Fifty/Fifty-Two Market Street Realty, owner, Peter R. Egelston, trustee, and John F. Merrigan, applicant**, for property located at **56 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (restore existing cupola at rear of building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 33 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. John Merrigan, representing the owner, was present to speak to the application. He explained that he would like to replace what is existing right now in kind.

Chairman Dika stated that it was a very interesting structure. Mr. Merrigan said that the visibility was such that he would like to use Azek for the trim. The dentil molding would be replaced as is. He continued to say that the windows would be changed to six windows with two awning style windows that would be motorized to open from the bottom. The windows would be aluminum clad, bronze color, with attached muttoms and spacer bars in the middle.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. Merrigan if he had any history on the structure. Mr. Merrigan replied that his history did not go back very far but there used to be a flower shop located in the building.

Ms. Roberts asked what an awning window was. Mr. Merrigan explained that it was one large window that would open from the bottom and would swing outward. It would allow for ventilation. Ms. Roberts said she would be concerned about setting precedence with this type of window. Vice Chairman Katz asked if it would look identical to the other windows. Mr. Merrigan replied yes.

Ms. Roberts asked about the dentil molding. Mr. Merrigan said it would be replicated either out of Azek or cedar if the Azek did not work.

Vice Chairman Katz asked about the bronze clad exterior of the windows. Mr. Merrigan explained that the windows would be wrapped in a bronze colored aluminum. Vice Chairman Katz was more interested in the wood exterior trim which makes up most of the exterior. Mr. Merrigan said that anything other than what comes from the Marvin window manufacturers will be constructed of Azek. Vice Chairman Katz asked if everything that was currently made of wood would be replaced with Azek. Mr. Merrigan replied yes.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Roberts stated that she would vote in favor of the motion but had concern with setting precedence with the awning windows. She said there would be limited situations where this application would be feasible.

Mr. Clum said that the windows will be an aluminum clad exterior yet the specifications for the windows state a bronze clad exterior. Mr. Merrigan said he would abide by what was submitted with the Marvin specifications.

Hearing no other discussion, the motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

2. Petition of **Coventry Assets, Ltd., owner**, for property located at **10 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing first floor storefront windows on Pleasant St. side, replace with folding windows and screens) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 82 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Arilda Densch of McHenry Architecture was present to speak to the application. She explained that they would like to replace the windows facing Pleasant Street. She added that the wood paneling and the granite just below the windows would remain. She also explained that the existing window panels to the right and left of the existing windows would be mimicked in the new storefront window system.

Page three showed the five panels across the window opening. Ms. Densch said that the windows would be folding windows and were shown in the closed position in the drawing.

Page four showed the folding windows in the open position. Ms. Densch explained that the windows fold inward so as to not obstruct the sidewalk. The windows will also have a fixed screen panel with 16 mesh which was requested by the health officer. Ms. Densch added that the screens would only be removable for cleaning or repair. They would be removed during the winter months.

Ms. Roberts asked if there was any plan to place signage on the glass. Ms. Densch said that it was not anticipated and had not been discussed.

Mr. Melchior asked if the hinges would be on the exterior of the windows. Ms. Densch replied yes, that the hinges would show on the exterior when the windows were in the closed position.

Chairman Dika asked if the window system would be similar to the windows on the Agave Restaurant. Ms. Densch responded no, as that window was custom made. She explained that these windows would be of metal construction and would be painted to match the existing painting of the building.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Roberts stated that she would be voting against the motion for two reasons. The first reason being that she found the windows to be inappropriate to the historic district particularly the core of the district. The second reason was that she found the window configuration of the Porter Street side and the Pleasant Street side to be inappropriate.

Vice Chairman Katz commented that he felt they had good luck with the similar window treatment on State Street. He felt it was an evolution of building use of which he saw no problem with. He did not think it did any damage to the integrity of the historic district.

Ms. Kozak said that she thought the proposal was appropriate. She felt the new windows were more historic looking with the new vertical divisions in them than the existing windows.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a 4-2 vote with Chairman Dika and Ms. Roberts voting in opposition.

3. Petition of **Brent Schmitt and Alexandra A. Chan, owners**, for property located at **300 Cass Street, Unit 2**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct deck with spiral stairs to grade) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing window with a door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 21-2 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project, was present to speak to the application. She explained that there were a couple changes to the project since last month's work session. She said that the railing height had been changed to 42 inches. She gave the commission revised drawings reflecting that change. Ms. Whitney also pointed out that they decided to up-size the

spiral stair to 5'6" wide instead of 5 feet wide. She said that just the stairs would probably be seen from Middle Street.

Ms. Whitney also explained that they would be building the deck with a roof system just in case a porch was constructed below the deck in the future. The vertical posts would be wrapped in Azek. Also, a Marvin SDL aluminum clad French door would be placed where there was currently a window. The French door will match an interior French door.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Melchior made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Melchior commented that it was a very thorough and well thought out solution to a vertical problem.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Joseph J. and Jennifer Almeida, owners**, for property located at **33 Blossom Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct shed dormer on rear elevation) and allow a new free standing structure (construct 8'x12' shed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Kozak stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote.

Mr. Joseph Almeida, owner of the property, was present to speak to the application. He submitted a letter of support from an abutter and additional photo documentation.

He explained that the photo documentation showed other shed dormers and sheds in his immediate neighborhoods and within the South end. He also included some additional detail of the shed.

Mr. Almeida stated that a revised site plan was included in the packet. He said he would be referring to the site plan stamped March 20, 2009.

Page two of the plans showed the proposed changes highlighted in yellow. Mr. Almeida explained that all of the double hung windows in the shed and in the shed dormer would match the windows that were replaced most recently on the house. He said he was proposing to use Brosco windows.

Mr. Almeida said that he knew that the Commission would not like a dormer that goes all the way to the ridge but in this case, it would have to do because of the ceiling heights inside. He added that he was keeping the shed dormer eight feet from the side gable which he thought helped to make it fit in.

Chairman Dika asked what the pitch of the dormer was. Mr. Almeida said that it was a very shallow pitch, a 1/12 pitch. He pointed out that it matched the pitch of the rear carriage house dormer.

Mr. Almeida explained that the proposed shed had a greenhouse-like roof to it. The material was lexan which was a clear glass product that resisted yellowing. It would allow the shed to be used more for a greenhouse than a shed which was the intent. He pointed out that he included a small awning window for venting purposes. The siding would be an eight inch wide vertical tongue and groove board and would be painted white.

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

Chairman Dika stated that she was disappointed with the pitch on the dormer. She commented that they have approved others and she knows that the applicant needs the interior space. She said that the applicant has done a nice job of keeping it authentic.

Ms. Roberts asked if the door in the garden shed would have muntins. Mr. Almeida replied no, and explained that the muntins on a French door are much wider than the muntins on the house and he thought it would look awkward.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Dika asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Melchior made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Roberts stated that she was concerned about the windows, the scale of the picture window, and the lexan material. She felt they were inappropriate for the historic district. She was not in favor of setting precedence.

Vice Chairman Katz commented that the shed seems to be trying to decide whether it is a shed or a greenhouse. He said that he had no problem with that and it seemed to strike a happy balance between the two. Mr. Melchior said that it did not present a problem with him.

Chairman Dika said that she looked at the shed as a greenhouse and so she found it acceptable as far as the window placement was concerned.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a 4-1 vote with Ms. Roberts voting in opposition.

5. Petition of **Parade Office, LLC, owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (change window/door patterns and window design on building on Lot 1) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Melchior stated that he would be recusing himself from the discussion and vote.

Ms. Lisa DeStefano, Mr. Jeff Johnston, Mr. Josh Anderson, and Mr. Matt Labonte were present to speak to the application.

Ms. DeStefano explained that phase one of the project was moving forward. The existing building would be demolished at the end of April or the first of May.

Ms. DeStefano stated that a Residence Inn would be the hotel occupying one of the buildings so as a result, they were requesting some minor amendments to accommodate the requirements of the Residence Inn.

Page 4b showed the hotel building as it faces Portwalk Way. Ms. DeStefano explained that they were proposing changes to the rhythm of the windows. She felt the change was a marked improvement to what was previous proposed and approved. She said that the change in the rhythm of the windows had to do with room placement and size. Additionally, they have layered on some relief in the façade of the building where it is noted as the “2’-0” Bay Projection.”

Mr. Anderson gave the commissioners some supplemental material to review.

Ms. DeStefano pointed out that now that they know what type of mechanical equipment they will need on the roof, they have eliminated some of the screening. She said that a lot of the mechanicals are located in the rooms. She continued to go through the rest of the changes which involved window placement and bay projections.

Ms. DeStefano explained the supplemental information that showed the new proposed windows. It would be a single hung unit with a grill below. The canopy drawing submitted showed a change in the shape of the canopy. The height and material would remain the same.

Chairman Dika asked if the lower section of the windows that were being proposed was for an air conditioner. Ms. DeStefano said the grill was where the mechanicals would be for each room. Councilor Spear asked if the Hilton had the same mechanical system. Ms. DeStefano replied no, but it would be similar to what the Sheraton had except that the grills at the Sheraton were built into the wall and were not part of a punched opening. Chairman Dika asked if the unit would be flush with the window. Ms. DeStefano replied yes, there would be no projection.

Ms. Kozak asked about the masonry between the bays of the windows. Ms. DeStefano explained that graphically, it was not representing what it was like previously approved. The original drawings were done by Elkus Manfredi and they are now being done by Pro Con, Inc. She pointed out that there was a different corbelling of the brick but it would not be projecting forward.

Councilor Spear asked about the small squares on the third floor of the Portwalk Place elevation. Ms. DeStefano said that those small squares had not been specified yet.

Chairman Dika commented that she liked the bay projection. Ms. Roberts agreed. They felt it was an improvement.

Ms. Roberts asked if the ground floor level openings on The Hill elevation would actually open to the outside. Ms. DeStefano said that the area that was rendered in color was a pool behind the openings. She said that there would not be doors in that area. To the right of that was an exit door for a staircase. She continued to say that the part of the building that was further away and not rendered in color was designed to look like storefront all of the way around so that the building would not appear to have a front or a back. Ms. Roberts asked if someone standing on the outside would be able to see inside. Ms. DeStefano replied that she was not certain what the tenants would do but she would like to see life all the way around to grab interest.

Ms. Kozak asked what the canopy would be constructed of. Ms. DeStefano said it would be constructed of finish material. Ms. Roberts asked if the canopy acted as a sign. Ms. DeStefano replied yes.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz commented that the applicant was straight forward with their rationale for the changes.

Ms. Kozak did not see any reason why the changes were any less historically appropriate. Proportionally, she felt it was a great improvement.

Ms. Roberts stated that she had mixed feelings about the grills in the windows but she agreed that the new projections of the bays added a lot and was a terrific addition.

Chairman Dika commented that she was not fond of the new window as she was the previous design but was appreciative of the non intrusive air conditioning system.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Friends of the Music Hall and 82-86 Congress, LLC, owners**, for properties located at **28 Chestnut Street and 82-86 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add lighting to the exterior of the buildings). Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 7 and Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 45 and lie within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Terrence Parker of Terra Firma Landscape Architecture and Mr. Lee Frank of the Music Hall were present to speak to the application. Mr. Parker said that he was also representing Mr. Mark McNabb of 82-86 Congress Street, LLC.
- Mr. Parker stated that the objective of the project was to make a beautiful space of the area for the citizens of Portsmouth. He said he tried to take into consideration some of the safety issues associated with the site such as roof drainage, grading issues and adequate lighting.
- Mr. Parker said that he had met with the city manager and DPW staff prior to even engaging in the design to get input from the city. He said that they also met with the abutters for their input. Mr. Parker explained that the design the commissioners would see tonight was the one plan that most pleased the clients. The plan was then presented to the city staff and was met with enthusiasm.
- Chairman Dika asked what the use of Chestnut Street would be. Mr. Parker said that it would be an open street. There would be no change to the loading zones. The street width would not change and the sitting walls would not restrict any vehicular movement. He added that this plan would accommodate buses and free them up from parking on Porter Street and blocking the loading areas of five restaurants.
- Mr. Parker showed the commissioners the telephone pole that would be removed to give more space for the buses and the sitting areas.
- Mr. Parker explained that all of the roof leaders would be placed underground. He pointed out that it was treacherous when the roof water drains onto the sidewalk and then freezes.
- The lighting fixtures that were being proposed were the Park Ridge series. Mr. Parker said that they preferred these types of lights because they were dark sky friendly and had a downcast of light. The lights, of which there would be six, would be stationed along Chestnut Street and down Porter Street. Mr. Parker showed the commissioners a picture

of the original lamps there were on the Music Hall. The plan was to put them back up on the Music Hall building.

- Ms. Roberts asked when there was snow, how would the snow be handled after a storm. Mr. Parker thought it would continue to be handled the way it is now. The sidewalks would be maintained by the Music Hall.
- Ms. Kozak asked the material to be used, particularly between the stone plinth and the sitting wall. Mr. Parker said they would be of the same material, solid granite. He added that there would be a banding pattern in the street.
- Mr. Parker showed the commissioners an additional lighting fixture that could be installed flush with the sitting wall. Vice Chairman Katz asked what the spacing would be for lights like that. Mr. Parker said probably about five feet apart. He added that the lighting would increase visibility.
- Vice Chairman Katz wondered where the commission had purview over lighting in landscaping. Chairman Dika said that the commission does not deal with landscaping so the light fixtures and the pavers would be within their purview. Chairman Dika asked what the material would be for the pavers. Mr. Parker indicated that they were looking at a concrete paver that had granite chips imbedded in it. He added that you could get different tones of granite and seemed to wear well. It also had a course texture to keep it from getting slippery.
- Chairman Dika asked what the planters would be constructed of. Mr. Parker said that they would be solid granite and would be between 18" and 24" high as they moved down the street. He continued to say that they would be broken up to accommodate different sitting groups.
- Ms. Roberts commented that she liked that the lighting would be dark sky friendly. She also said that she would be opposed to the lighting within the granite sitting walls. Mr. Parker explained that lights in the walls would cast the light down to light the immediate area for pedestrians. Vice Chairman Katz liked the idea.
- Ms. Kozak stated that it was nice that they were using historic materials.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. Review of additional changes to HDC Rules and Procedures draft document

Chairman Dika stated that changes were recommended a while ago and so now it was difficult to remember what those changes were at that time.

Mr. Melchior said that the attached memorandum from Mr. Taintor seemed to capture all of the major changes.

Councilor Spear felt that there should be clarification in the Rules and Procedures regarding commissioners who are presenting a project before the commission and so, are recusing themselves from the entire meeting. Considerable discussion regarding this subject followed. It was suggested that Rick Taintor, the city's consultant, and Bob Sullivan, city attorney work on that wording.

Ms. Kozak had a question on Section 1, 1.c. regarding the makeup of the commissioners. She wondered if it was “at least two, no more than two, or exactly two, members shall reside in the historic district”. It was suggested that it should probably read “at least two.”

Mr. Clum pointed out that a lot of the information contained in the document was things the city staff deals with and not necessarily the commission but the city certainly wanted their input.

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:10 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on May 6, 2009.