

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**November 9, 2011
reconvened from November 2, 2011**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Planning Department Representative William Gladhill; Alternate George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Elena Whittaker; Alternate Joseph Almeida; City Council Representative Anthony Coviello

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

IV. OLD BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

A. Approval of minutes – September 14, 2011

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

B. Petition of **Christopher S. Martin and Thomas W. Martin, Jr., owners**, for property located at **508 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to all demolition of an existing structure (remove chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 57 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts. (*This item was postponed at the November 2, 2011 meeting to the November 9, 2011 meeting.*)

WORK SESSION

- Mr. Christopher Martin and Mr. T.J. Martin, owners of the property were present to speak to the application.
- Chairman Dika explained to the public that at the last meeting, there was some discomfort with the removal of the chimney so the applicants were asked to come back with an alternative proposal.
- Mr. Christopher Martin stated that they had been in touch with a chimney installation and repair contractor, Merrie Chimney Sweep, and have learned of a product called Flexi Brick that could be used to build a faux chimney. He explained that the synthetic chimney would be constructed with steel supports that would hold the frame and would be coated with a rigid polystyrene two inches thick. The Flexi Brick and mortar would be on the exterior. The brick they were proposing was the standard size in the burnt red color.

- Vice Chairman Katz asked who would be doing the installation. Mr. Martin said that they would be doing it and that they were confident they could achieve the desired results.
- Ms. Kozak asked how the top and bottom of the chimney would be treated. Mr. Martin explained that the bottom would lie under the shingles with four brackets that would be attached to the rafters. The top would be similar to what was shown in the picture. Ms. Kozak pointed out that the Salter Street chimney had an aluminum cap flash. She wondered if they would be doing that. Mr. Martin said that could do that if it was the desire of the Commission. He thought it would give the chimney a more useable look.
- Mr. Melchior asked if the proposed structure would go over the existing chimney. Mr. Martin replied, no, it would replace the chimney.
- Ms. Kozak had a concern with the top of the chimney. She wondered if there was a way to add another layer at the top to make it look a little more authentic. Mr. Martin said that there wasn't with this flexi-brick.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked the Commission if anyone remembered approving the 34 Salter Street chimney. Chairman Dika said that she remembered.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that there was no flashing visible on the chimney but he was not overly concerned with it.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the chimney was functioning. Mr. Martin replied no. Mr. Wyckoff also asked if they would be replacing the roof. Mr. Martin said that the roof has already been replaced.
- Mr. Melchior asked why the applicant was not rebuilding the chimney. Ms. Kozak explained that the chimney was structurally unsound. Mr. Melchior did not like the idea of putting a fake chimney in its place.
- Ms. Kozak pointed out that the faux chimney could still be used for venting.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt the house was important. He thought there were a lot of elements on the house that might be discovered when the siding was removed. It was not a typical New Englander.

At this point in the meeting, the application moved to a public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Martin proposed to replace the older chimney with a synthetic flexi-brick chimney, in the same location and of the same dimensions and the same cornering techniques. It would have steel supports, a polystyrene coating, and the patented flexi-brick and mortar appearance.

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 Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That a faux chimney with an aluminum cap flash is constructed in accordance with the submitted plans dated November 9, 2011.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that the Commission has contended with these situations before. He said that sometimes technology warrants the lack of need for a chimney. He explained that the Commission felt the chimney was an important architectural feature of the house and the applicants seemed amenable to going in this direction.

Ms. Kozak added that in terms of precedence setting, this chimney was on a secondary elevation whose primary value was the silhouette of the structure. She felt this was an appropriate solution in this case.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation passed by a vote of 5-1 with Mr. Melchior voting in opposition:

- 1) That a faux chimney with an aluminum cap flash is constructed in accordance with the submitted plans dated November 9, 2011.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

8. Petition of **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **161 Deer Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (move signage/lettering from valance to face of the awning) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 17 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jessie Aikman of Back Channel Canvas Shop, representing the applicant, was present to speak to the application. She stated that the applicant would like to change the lettering from the valance to the face of the awning.

Mr. Wyckoff asked for clarification as to the design of the valance. Ms. Aikman said that it would be a straight, nine inch fabric valance.

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. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that this was a straightforward valance and awning that has been approved many times in the historic district. He thought it was appropriate.

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

9. Petition of **F.A. Gray, Inc. owner, and Jamie LaFleur, applicant,** for property located at **32 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install awning) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 16 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jessie Aikman of Back Channel Canvas Shop, representing the owner of the Banks Gallery, was present to speak to the application. She stated that the applicant would like to install a simple retractable awning to help shield the sun from shining in the front store windows.

Ms. Aikman said that when she was before the Commission a couple months ago, there was discussion about covering doorways with awnings so she included as part of her packet various storefronts where side entrances were not covered with the awning.

Chairman Dika confirmed that the Commission has had discussion about whether awnings should run the entire expanse of the building but that they have approved partial awnings. Ms. Aikman said that the building owner did not want to cover the entire building.

Ms. Kozak asked if the slope of the awning could match the awning that was next to it. Ms. Aikman said that the awning was adjustable. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it would be the same angle as the one next to it. Ms. Aikman said that it could be. Mr. Wyckoff commented that it made sense to match the angles.

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 Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the angle of the awning will be adjusted to match the angle of the awning next door.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Kozak stated that this was an awning that was seen all over this end of town and was in keeping with the area.

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

- 1) That the angle of the awning will be adjusted to match the angle of the awning next door.

10. Petition of **Deer Street Associates, owner, and Centrix Bank, applicant**, for property located at **163 Deer Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install HVAC unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 17 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Karen Beaulieu and Mr. Steve Witt, both representing Centrix Bank were present to speak to the application. Ms. Beaulieu stated that they were requesting approval to install an HVAC unit. She explained that the unit had already been installed because the existing one had failed.

Chairman Dika asked how long ago the unit was installed. Ms. Beaulieu said it was replaced in July. She added that she was out on leave when the unit failed and did not realize that they were located in the Historic District. She also noted that the contractor pulled the permit after the fact.

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

Vice Chairman Katz said that the location had the least impact for passersby.

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

11. Petition of **National Block II, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add frosted vinyl material to first floor windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 40 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Hugh Jencks, vice president and wealth advisor with UBS Financial Services was present to speak to the application. He stated that his company occupies the first and second floor of the National Block building. He explained that the request was to allow frosted vinyl appliqué panels on the existing nine foot high windows on the Congress and Fleet Street sides of the building. The frosting would cover the glass from a height of about two feet to about six feet. The rest of the window would remain as is. The frosting would be applied to the interior of the window and the color would be a neutral shade of gray. He added that the business required confidentiality and discretion to protect the privacy of their interaction with their clients.

Chairman Dika commented that it was nice to see the building being used. She added that this was a non-traditional treatment of the windows and since the vinyl was on the inside of the building, she was looking for direction from the Planning Department as to whether this was within the Commission’s purview. Mr. Rick Taintor, Planning Director, was present at the meeting and rose to address Chairman Dika’s question.

Mr. Taintor stated that the department has struggled with this window treatment as well. He said that if one put a sign on the inside of a window, the City would have purview over that sign. He pointed out that if the vinyl material had signage on it, then it would be considered a sign. If it did not, he said the Commission would need to determine whether meaningful fenestration was a goal of the Commission and the City. He also thought it was a judgment call – at what point does a partially opaque material become an obstruction to a window. He felt they could review it and use their best judgment. Mr. Wyckoff felt it was a good idea to review it.

Vice Chairman Katz said that the application was very straightforward. He wondered why the applicant had to go through this process. He was trying to understand why they were reviewing this application when they were not able to review the faux street art that went up this summer.

Chairman Dika commented that this was a non-traditional way to provide privacy to their clientele. She wondered why they had not considered more traditional options such as shutters or curtains. Mr. Jencks said that the design of the space was modern and minimalist and they did not want to block the windows. He felt the light and the storefront look of the building would have been impacted by those other options.

Mr. Melchior stated that the Commission could deal with these on a case by case basis and he pointed out that it was a treatment that was reversible.

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 Approval of the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that the application would have minimal impact to the district and he had serious doubts as to whether the Commission should even be reviewing these types of applications.

Mr. Gladhill said that it was a reversible treatment but he felt that a band of solid color going around the building looked uninviting compared to the other storefronts on Congress Street. He said that he could not support the motion.

Ms. Kozak stated that she had the same concern but at the same time, she felt it fell under the window treatment category. She did not think it was within the Commission’s purview.

Chairman Dika pointed out that the director of the Planning Department felt they had purview. She added that she was concerned with the way it was done. She said that she would not support it.

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

12. Petition of **Paul T. Marino, owner**, for property located at **287 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove aluminum siding, replace porch roofing material, replace front steps and railings, and replace front door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 46 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Paul Marino, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that he would like to remove the aluminum siding on his home to expose the clapboards underneath. He felt the clapboards were in good shape. He also said that he would like to replace the front door with the wood door that was originally on the structure. He also stated that he was proposing to put copper over the front door porch awning and the front window bay. Lastly, he showed the Commission a photo of wrought iron railings he would like to install.

Chairman Dika commented that this was an exciting project. Mr. Wyckoff said that there might be some repair work needed. He informed the owner that the Commission saved this home several years ago from demolition. He also pointed out that the house next door was identical to this one and was built by the same carpenter. He felt for that reason alone that it was an important reason to keep the house.

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. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was exciting to see this type of renovation and an owner who was excited about it.

Chairman Dika complimented Mr. Marino on his detailed and easy to follow plans.

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

13. Petition of **Robert L. Vaccaro, owner**, for property located at **411 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove slate roof, replace with simulated slate roof) and allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar panels) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 2 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Robert Vaccaro, owner of the property, Mr. Dan Rawling, architect for the project, and Mr. George Horricks from Harmony Energy Works were present to speak to the application. Mr. Vaccaro stated that he was before the Commission a month ago for a work session. He said that he was proposing to replace the existing slate roof with a faux slate roof. He pointed out that it was the same product that was approved by the HDC for the porch approximately ten years ago. Mr. Rawling added that the faux product was molded from slate which would give some variation in the roof.

Mr. Vaccaro said that the second part of the proposal was to add solar panels to the roof. He explained that the panels would not be seen from Middle Street or the side streets. They would only be seen from Merrimac Street. He showed a diagram of where the panels would be placed. The panels would have a black frame with small white dots that would give the surface some texture.

Mr. Gladhill asked that if the roof were to remain slate, could the solar panels be installed on it. Mr. Vaccaro replied not easily and it was probably not a good idea.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the panels were ugly. He asked what it was that the panels would provide. Mr. Horricks said that the panels would handle about 60% of all energy usage in the building. He felt that was pretty significant.

Mr. Gladhill asked how far off of the roof would the panels project. Mr. Horricks said that they would be about three inches off of the roof to provide good ventilation. Mr. Gladhill asked how thick they were. Mr. Horricks said they were 1.6 inches thick.

Mr. Rawling pointed out that the layout of the panels was a little different from what was proposed at the work session. He said the layout was in a more organized pattern.

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 Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that this house was one of the gems of Middle Street. It has been meticulously maintained with a very sensitive addition on the back of it. In an effort to lessen our dependence on fossil fuels, he felt that this was one of the more sensitive applications for solar energy that he has seen. He pointed out that the panels would not be visible except from Merrimac Street so he felt the trade off was worth it.

Mr. Gladhill commented that he would be sad to see the slate roof go.

Chairman Dika said that it was clear that there was very little visibility of the panels and only on Merrimac Street. She felt that the panel configuration had been neatened up.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he would support the application simply because of the location of the southeast sections of the roof.

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

14. Petition of **Nip Lot 2, LLC and Nip Lot 5/6, LLC, owners, and Public Service of New Hampshire, applicant**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install switch cabinet) as per plans on file

in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 8 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Mike Coffey of Public Service of New Hampshire was present to speak to the application. He stated that he was seeking approval to place two switch cabinets at 111 Maplewood Avenue. The submitted tax maps showed the approximate locations of the units. He explained that there has been discussion with the Planning Department about future development in that area and the need for these units. He also said that the owner of the property has requested to be allowed to place screening around the units if necessary.

Mr. Gladhill asked if the screening would be plant life. Mr. Coffey thought the owner was interested in some sort of natural masonry screening. He said that PSNH would be happy to comply as long as the screening did not impede access with the units.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that the Deer Street unit previously approved stood alone. He said that by putting a fence around it, it would have drawn attention to it. He thought that they would probably want some screening with this site. Mr. Coffey explained that the lot was currently under site review.

Mr. Gladhill said that he would like to see some screening. Mr. Coffey reiterated that they were glad to work with the City and with the owner to provide screening that was suitable.

Chairman Dika felt they could not approve the application until they saw the proposal for the screening. Mr. Wyckoff said that he felt just the opposite. He pointed out that anything that they build around the units now would only be temporary because the entire site was going to be torn apart because of construction. Mr. Melchior agreed and added that as long as there is accommodation for the room required for the screening, he was satisfied. Mr. Coffey said that it could be a stipulation as part of the approval.

Mr. Taintor recommended that the approval be flexible enough so that the unit could be moved slightly since the applicant has not filed a subdivision plan or a site plan. He assured the Commission that he would be conferring with Public Works on this project.

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. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That any screening or change of location receives Historic District Commission approval.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill. There was no additional discussion.

The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote:

- 1) That any screening or change of location receives Historic District Commission approval.

15. Petition of **Amy K. Gant, owner**, for property located at **17 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 36 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Chairman Dika recused herself from the discussion and vote. Vice Chairman Katz conducted the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Haden Gerrish, representing the owner, was present to speak to the application. He stated that the proposal was to replace the existing windows in the structure with new updated windows. He said they would like to use Harvey Majesty windows. Mr. Gerrish had a sample of the window with him which he showed to the Commission. He explained that the exterior of the window was aluminum and the interior was wood. The grills would be 5/8” in width. The exterior color would be a dark bronze color that would match the exterior of the house.

Vice Chairman Katz asked if this was a replacement unit. Mr. Gerrish replied yes.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he had some heartburn over the application because he thought there were original windows in the house, at least 150-200 years old. He explained to the applicant that the Commission has been talking about their concern at losing historic windows in the district. He felt there were other options available to improve the existing windows and he thought the application should be postponed to a work session with a site walk.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application for a work session and site walk. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak.

Mr. Gerrish agreed that the windows were old and that there were a few examples of wavy glass on the front windows but added that a lot of the glass has been replaced as well. He said that the windows were not entirely historic since some of the windows have been updated. It was their intention to duplicate the existing windows as closely as possible.

Mr. Wyckoff said that this was not going to be an easy approval. He thought it was possible to use replacement windows on the side and the back of the house. He added that he also had some concern with the choice of window proposed also.

Vice Chairman Katz took a poll of the Commission to see if they were in agreement with Mr. Wyckoff's observations and recommendation. All of the Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Gerrish stated that he would like to request a site walk.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Katz called for the vote on the motion. The motion to postpone the application to the December 7, 2011 meeting for a work session and site walk passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

VI. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

B. Work Session requested by **Parade Office, LLC, owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed us, multi-story building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within Central Business, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects, Mr. Jeff Johnston of Cathartes Private Investments, and Mr. Matt Worth of Pro Con Inc., were present to speak to the application.
- Ms. DeStefano stated that this was their third work session with Port Walk Phase Three. She said that they recently received approval from the Technical Advisory Committee and has filed their application with the Planning Board. She pointed out that there have been some program changes that have come about because of the TAC approval.
- Ms. DeStefano said that there has been a lot of discussion concerning the pedestrian experience on Hanover Street, the corner of Hanover Street and Maplewood Avenue, down Maplewood Avenue and the corner of Deer Street and Maplewood Avenue. She said that they were showing new elevations with retail on the two corners. Mr. Johnston explained they would market the space for retail from day one and would have display cases on the exterior façades.
- On the Port Walk Place elevation, Ms. DeStefano pointed out the green space between the Residence Inn and the residential building. She said they would be reinforcing the corner by adding awnings.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the column on that corner would be a cast iron column or a fiberglass column. Ms. DeStefano said it would be a substantial column because it would need to support what was happening beyond it.
- Chairman Dika commented that the building was still massive and rectangular in shape with some detailing. Ms. Kozak stated that she liked it. Mr. Wyckoff agreed.

- Mr. Gladhill said that the single column looked “lonely.” It was catching his eye when he looked at that elevation.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not think the building looked massive. He pointed out that Hanover Street was now the street of four and five story buildings.
- Ms. DeStefano stated that the residential entrance to the building would be a terra cotta cementitious material, similar to the olive green material on the residential building. Chairman Dika commented that she has heard some unpleasant comments concerning the green color and the material of the residential building.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he remembered the first design for the building and asked what happened to the large blocks that looked almost like granite. Ms. DeStefano explained that the scale and proportion of the punched window openings and the floor to ceiling heights was different. They now have a four story building above retail and the pattern and scale has changed.
- There was detailed discussion concerning the terra cotta material which was a rain screen material.
- Ms. DeStefano showed the center of the building where the entryway to the surface parking was. She pointed out the marquee that would have copper. Mr. Wyckoff asked if daylight would be seen through the marquee overhang. Ms. DeStefano replied yes. Mr. Melchior asked if the building would have the same look on the Maplewood Avenue side. Ms. DeStefano replied yes, except that they would not be using brick on the back side but a cementitious material instead.
- Ms. DeStefano stated that the hotel portion of the building would have a different base height. She also pointed out that all of the hotel rooms would have HVAC units under each window.
- Mr. Melchior commented that there were a lot of awnings on this elevation. Ms. DeStefano agreed that this was the shady side of the street but she said that awnings helped to show scale and they add color and vibrancy to the retail storefronts.
- As the building wrapped the corner onto Deer Street, Ms. DeStefano pointed out that the Deer Street façade was much shorter than the Hanover Street façade. As a result, they designed the building to be uniform all the way around. She explained that its size was the normal building block size in Portsmouth so they were not breaking it up. She said that they have added more interest to the corner since it was now going to be hotel space. Chairman Dika asked the Commissioners if they were okay with this change. Ms. Kozak felt it was sized right.
- Ms. DeStefano talked about the materials that would be used on the back side of the building. Ms. Kozak asked if there would be corner boards where the cementitious siding was being used. Mr. Worth said they would use pilasters.
- On the Maplewood Avenue elevation, Ms. DeStefano explained that there would be retail space on the Deer Street /Maplewood Avenue corner with hotel space above.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked about the possibility of moving the signal boxes on this elevation. Mr. Worth said that the signal box on the corner of Hanover St. and Maplewood Avenue would have to be moved because it was on the property. The box on the corner of Deer Street and Maplewood Avenue would remain where it was. Mr. Johnston explained that they would coordinate with the City about the locations.
- Chairman Dika stated that she was concerned about the pedestrian use on Maplewood Avenue and wondered what would draw people into the area. Mr. Johnston informed the

Commission that they have engaged the services of local landscape architect, Robbie Woodburn to help them plan the green space. Ms. DeStefano explained that the infill structure was stepped back three feet to accommodate the plantings as well as to screen the parking structure beyond. She reminded the Commission that they could not have trees on this elevation because of Fairpoint equipment that was located underground in that area.

- Mr. Melchior asked if cars would be seen beyond the infill area. Ms. DeStefano replied no. She showed the screening material approved by the HDC at the 99 Bow Street that was screening their trash receptacle. She said they would use something similar to that. Mr. Johnston added that they were sensitive to the fact that they do not want to see car lights coming from that area.
- Ms. Kozak thought it could be a very nice experience walking along the street. She said that the greenery would make it bearable for the long walk along that elevation.
- Ms. DeStefano also showed the area where the dumpster and generators would be located on the elevation.
- There was discussion concerning the use of larger versus smaller piers along the infill structure. There would also be benches and planters along that expanse as well.
- Chairman Dika expressed concern about the trash area and how trash would be removed. Ms. DeStefano said trash would be removed every day at 7:00 a.m. Mr. Worth explained that it has been designed for the garbage truck to stop along Maplewood Avenue, pick up trash and then be gone for the day. Ms. Kozak suggested solid doors to hide the trash and generators area.
- Chairman Dika said that she still thought the Maplewood Avenue elevation was a long expanse of space that did not lead you into the building. Mr. Wyckoff commented that he thought it was successful. Mr. Gladhill said that he liked the idea of the green space. He felt that was what that end of town needed. Mr. Johnston informed the Commission that they were going for LEED certification and sustainability.
- On the Hanover Street elevation, Ms. DeStefano pointed out the retail displays on the corner of Hanover Street and Maplewood Avenue. She noted that trees would be able to be planted on the Hanover Street elevation.
- Mr. Melchior commented that three materials were shown on the Hanover Street elevation.
- Chairman Dika thought it would be helpful to have a model, a virtual tour, or a site walk to see the size of the building. Mr. Wyckoff said that he agreed. He also commented that he was having trouble with the use of spandrel glass in the aluminum extruded storefront system.
- Vice Chairman Katz reminded the applicants that three Commissioners were absent and would probably have some strong opinions about various elements of the project.
- Ms. DeStefano said that they would provide more perspectives to show scale and context. Mr. Johnston stated that they would like to have those perspectives for the joint work session scheduled for November 17.
- Ms. DeStefano commented that she thought they were going in the right direction. She said that they were looking to come back for a public hearing in December. She added that she was open to a work session/public hearing.
- Chairman Dika asked if anyone from the public wished to comment.

- Mr. Dan Rawling, no address given, stated that he liked the direction the project was going. He said that he did not have any doubt that the building on Port Walk Place would shape up and be gorgeous. He did have concern; however, with the Maplewood Avenue elevation. He thought that the trash area had too much prominence and his eye was drawn to it. He added that the green space was a good idea.
- Vice Chairman Katz reminded everyone that they should not forget what would be going on across the street on Maplewood Avenue. He said this would be a well traveled area.
- Mr. Johnston informed the Commission that he has had a positive meeting with Steve Kelm, the developer across the street and has talked about the pedestrian connection.
- Chairman Dika commented that the applicant has made progress; however, she would like to see more thought given to the Maplewood Avenue elevation. Mr. Gladhill said that he would like to see a perspective drawing looking down Maplewood Avenue.

 Mr. Melchior left at this point in the meeting.

C. Work Session requested by **121/123 State Street Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **121/123 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (extend rear deck, add screening). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 48 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

- Chairman Dika stated that a site walk was held on Saturday morning, November 5.
- Ms. Lisa DeStefano, architect for the project and Ms. Marie Bodi, one of the owners of the property was present to speak to the application. Ms. DeStefano stated that the owners of the property would like to add an extension on to the existing deck. The extension would increase the size of the deck by 5’9”. She pointed out that there were a series of existing mechanical units that they would like to screen with vertical and horizontal lattice as well.
- Ms. DeStefano showed the Commission before and after renderings.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the lattice would be painted white. Ms. DeStefano said it would match the trim. Mr. Wyckoff wondered if a darker color would make it less visible. Ms. DeStefano said she could go either way.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the existing deck would be demolished and rebuilt. Ms. DeStefano said no, they were looking to just extend it. Mr. Wyckoff commented that the new deck would look basically the same as it does now.
- Mr. Gladhill asked if they would be removing two trees. Ms. DeStefano replied yes. Chairman Dika thought the applicant would need to go before the Trees and Greenery Committee for permission to remove the trees. Ms. DeStefano said that she would check with the Planning Department concerning the tree removal.
- Ms. DeStefano told the Commission they would return for a public hearing in December.

D. Petition of **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein petitioner **Request To Postpone** existing structure (add third floor to existing building). Said property is shown on Assessor's Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application to the December 7, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill. The motion passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

In additional business, there was discussion about the upcoming meeting on November 29 regarding the replacement of the Memorial Bridge. Chairman Dika encouraged the Commissioners to attend. There was discussion about being in touch via a letter to the bridge design team. Chairman Dika said that she thought they would have more power if they moved forward as an HDC. She added that she would be in touch with the Commissioners who were not present to get their opinions on the idea.

There was discussion concerning the project currently underway at 13 Salter Street.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:40 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 January 4, 2012.