

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**December 14, 2011
reconvened from December 7, 2011**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena Whittaker, Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Joseph Almeida, George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Anthony Coviello

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – November 2, 2011

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to approve the minutes as presented.

B. 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. *(This item was postponed at the December 7, 2011 meeting to a work session/public hearing at the December 14, 2011 meeting.)*

Chairman Dika read the petition into the record and then stated she would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote. Vice Chairman Katz conducted the public hearing.

WORK SESSION

- Attorney Haden Gerrish, Mr. Roger Creighton, contractor for the project, and Ms. Amy Gant, owner of the property were present to speak to the application.
- Attorney Gerrish stated that they have made adjustments to the application based on the concerns raised at the last two meetings. He pointed out that the front façade was very important to the historic setting and to the look and feel of the neighborhood; therefore, they were proposing to restore the four first floor windows. The windows above would be Marvin double hung wood exterior windows.

- Mr. Creighton explained in more detail that the first floor windows would be restored and tightened up against the weather. He said that they would glaze them if necessary and add a coat of paint to freshen them up. The upper windows on the front façade would be a Marvin Tilt Pac window. He explained in detail how they would be made to fit the openings. They would be simulated divided light with a spacer bar that would be painted black. The muntin widths would be 5/8". Ms. Kozak, Mr. Almeida and Mr. Wyckoff thought it was a great solution.
- Mr. Creighton said that the rest of the house would have Marvin Ultimate windows. They would be a bronze color, simulated divided light with a black spacer bar and a 5/8" muntin width. The screens would be half screens and would have a 14 degree bevel frame on the bottom. He added that the glass would be clear and would not have any coating.
- Mr. Almeida stated that he appreciated all of the work that was put into the application. Mr. Wyckoff added that it was a nice window.

Mr. Almeida made a motion to close the work session and move into a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Whittaker. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Gerrish stated that he would like to amend the proposal with the following changes: the four first floor windows on the front façade would be restored. The five second floor windows on the front façade would be replaced with Marvin Tilt Pac windows. The remaining 22 windows on the three remaining sides of the house would be replaced with Marvin Ultimate windows.

Vice Chairman Katz 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 and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Vice Chairman Katz asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the windows were preserving the integrity of the house and the neighborhood. He felt it was a good compromise and a good, tight solution for the homeowner.

Hearing no other discussion, Vice Chairman Katz called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as amended passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Chairman Dika stated that the applicant and her representatives jumped through hoops to meet the Commission's requirements. She thanked them and stated that they would use this application as an example for others.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

7. Petition of **City of Portsmouth, owner, and Prescott Park Arts Festival, applicant**, for property located at Marcy Street (Prescott Park), wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of existing structures (demolish three support buildings) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new support building) and allow new construction to an existing structure (major renovations to and expansion of the pavilion building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 1 and lies within the Municipal and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Steve McHenry and Mr. Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architecture, Mr. Ben Anderson of Prescott Arts Festival, and Mr. Dan Plummer, a member of the Prescott Park Board of Trustees were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry stated that they have had a couple of work sessions with the Commission and the end result was very close to what they reviewed at the last work session. He added that they would be before the Planning Board tomorrow evening.

Mr. McHenry explained that the pavilion building housed both the food service and the bathrooms. He pointed out that the three support buildings were scattered out in front of the pavilion. The proposal was to consolidate the three wooden structures into one building and to add a major addition and renovations to the existing pavilion building. In the pavilion building, the kitchen facilities and the bathrooms would be expanded. At this point, Mr. McHenry guided the Commission through the submitted plans. He pointed out that pages A-12 through A-16 describe the support building.

Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that page A-8 showed two gutter profiles. Mr. McHenry said that was a mistake. He stated that they preferred the gutter profile in the upper right hand corner of the page. It was a pro-image gutter with an angular look to it.

Mr. Gladhill asked how high the mechanicals would be above the roof line. Mr. McHenry said that they were shown correctly in elevation and were drawn to scale. He did not have the dimension. Ms. Whittaker asked if the mechanicals would be seen above the lattice. Mr. McHenry replied yes, but pointed out that from below it was unlikely that they would be seen. Chairman Dika commented that she did not recall the screening during the work sessions. Mr. McHenry said it was part of the initial design.

Mr. McHenry explained to the Commission that the support building was designed to be similar to the historic Sheafe warehouse.

Ms. Kozak stated that she was surprised to see that nothing much had changed with the support building since the first work session. She asked what the thought process was behind the design. Mr. McHenry said they wanted to make it consistent with the desires of the Board of Trustees to make it consistent with the Sheafe warehouse. He said that he recalled prior discussion with the Commission about the opportunity to do more but this was as far as they felt they could take it.

Mr. Almeida commented that he really liked the support building. He felt it was interesting and pointed out that it was a utility building that served a very specific purpose. He appreciated all of the detailing and felt it was an appropriate addition to the park.

Ms. Whittaker said that she still had concern with the mechanical stacks because they would be seen from a distance. She asked if they would be a glistening silver color. Mr. McHenry said that the finish would have a brushed aluminum look but he added that if it was the desire of the Commission to paint them so they would “disappear”, he was willing to do that. Mr. Wyckoff did not think it would do any harm. Mr. Melchior pointed out that it added a maintenance liability. Mr. McHenry said they would have to make sure it was something the manufacturer was okay with and he would make the effort to inform the Commission of the process. Mr. Almeida commented that there was an effort made to shroud it with screening.

Mr. Gladhill pointed out that the Sheafe warehouse had wood shingles but the support building had asphalt shingles. He wondered if that was a cost factor. Mr. McHenry 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

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the stipulation that an attempt is made to paint the fan if possible and that the Pro-Image gutter is installed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Whittaker. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated there was a good effort made to maintain the special character of the area. He felt they did a good job of replicating the existing and surrounding building.

Ms. Kozak said that she was comfortable with the pavilion building. It was not a great departure from what was there but it was an improvement. She felt the support building was charming but that she preferred to see it built on the other side of the park. She did not feel it was the right place for it where it was being proposed. Ms. Kozak pointed out that this was Prescott Park as it is today and as it was built eighty years ago. She felt the support building would fit well in Strawberry Banke. She did not think the Sheafe warehouse at the entrance to the park was appropriate and it did not fit the context or the proper time period.

Ms. Whittaker stated that she thought the support building was in context with the context of theatre. She said you would see a building like this in the Berkshires, all over New England at outdoor theatres, and in England. She added that she appreciated the fact that they worked hard to not have a back side to the building.

Chairman Dika agreed with Ms. Kozak. She pointed out that the formal gardens are immediately beside where this building would be. She thought a more formal building would be appropriate.

Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that if the building was in brick, it would certainly not look right.

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 stipulations passed by a vote of 5-2 with Chairman Dika and Ms. Kozak voting in opposition:

- 1) That an attempt is made to paint the fan if possible.
- 2) That the Pro-Image gutter is installed.

8. Petition of **William Jeffrey Bolster, owner**, for property located at **44 Gardner Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace five windows), as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 42 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jeff Bolster, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that his home was built in 1905 and had many generations of windows in it. They would like to replace five windows now and the other windows would be replaced over the next several years. He said that the window they were proposing was a Marvin Ultimate aluminum clad double hung window. He added that Selectwood would do the work. Two of the five windows would be full tear outs to repair some damage and the other three windows would be replacement inserts.

Mr. Wyckoff expressed his concern with the full tear out windows and that a fake sill would have to be used. Mr. Bolster said that any trim that was removed would be replicated to match the existing.

Ms. Whittaker asked if the muntin size was 7/8". Mr. Bolster said that was his recollection. Mr. Wyckoff thought the 5/8" muntin was more appropriate but he felt the 7/8" would work. Mr. Almeida agreed.

Mr. Bolster confirmed that the window pattern would remain two over one.

Chairman Dika asked the Commission if they felt a blanket approval could be granted for the entire house. The Commission was in agreement.

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 stipulations:

- 1) That the windows will have a 5/8” muntin width.
- 2) That approval is given to replace the remaining windows in the structure provided the same window specifications are used.

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

Ms. Kozak stated that it was a very straightforward application. She said it was a good window and appropriate to the house.

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 stipulations passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

- 1) That the windows will have a 5/8” muntin width.
- 2) That approval is given to replace the remaining windows in the structure provided the same window specifications are used.

9. Petition of **Mark H. Brenner, owner**, for property located at **31-33 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 11 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Mark Brenner, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that an exterior wooden door over the roof fell apart when opened. He said he had his carpenter replace it with a metal door, so he was asking for an after the fact approval.

Chairman Dika stated that she went to the site and could not see the door. Mr. Brenner said that the only way to see the door was to get up onto the roof.

Ms. Whittaker asked about the size of the door. Mr. Brenner said that it was a shorter door. He said he could not take a picture of it because his neighbor would not let him on his roof.

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. Whittaker 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.

Ms. Whittaker stated that this appeared to be a metal fire door and she understood why the applicant had to go ahead with the replacement. She pointed out that it was not visible.

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 (7-0) vote.

10. **Petition of Olde Port Development Group, LLC, owner, and Theresa Fittante and Meaghan Vanhoogan, applicants,** for property located at **537 Islington Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two dormers on rear of building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 157 as Lot 4 and lies within the Business and Historic Districts.

This application was withdrawn from further consideration by the applicant.

11. **Petition of Parade Office, LLC, owner,** for property located at **195 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use, multi story building) 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, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Prior to the presentation by the applicant, Ms. Whittaker pointed out that there was only one member from the public present to hear and speak to the application. Mr. Almeida added that it was very disappointing to hear complaints about the HDC decisions after they are made when there are so many opportunities for the public to speak to them.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jeff Johnston and Mr. Tim Levine, representing Cathartes Private Investments, Ms. Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects, and Mr. Matt Worth of Pro Con Construction were present to speak to the application. Mr. Johnston stated that this was their final phase of the project and he thanked the Commission for all of their time in the work sessions.

Chairman Dika cautioned the Commission by saying that this was a huge project. She asked them to please pay very close attention to the details so as to not miss anything.

Ms. DeStefano also thanked the Commission for their efforts. She told the Commission that they have also been working with the Planning Department and would present their final proposal to

the Planning Board tomorrow evening. She added that they have met with all City staff and Public Works so the project has been fully vetted.

Ms. DeStefano stated that one of the changes made was the addition of retail space as the building wrapped around the street. She noted that a supplemental package was given to them this evening. She said that it did not replace what they already had. She added that the first two sheets of the packet referred to the elevation drawings and referred to them as Facades 1,2, 3, and 4. A model was also presented and displayed throughout the presentation.

Ms. DeStefano guided the Commission through the perspective drawings. On the Maplewood Avenue and Hanover Street perspective, she pointed out the retail wrapping the corner. The Maplewood Avenue perspective showed the green wall and the screening that hid the parking beyond it. Resting spots were also visible as well as a pergola and lighting.

Chairman Dika asked about the proposed benches and asked Ms. DeStefano to point out their locations. Ms. DeStefano said that there were three benches proposed on the Maplewood Avenue elevation.

Ms. DeStefano informed the Commission that they were before the Trees and Greenery Committee this morning and the green space had been approved with a few changes to the variety of trees proposed. Ms. Kozak asked about the structure that supported the green wall and what would be seen in the winter months. Ms. DeStefano said that there would be evergreens that would provide winter interest. There would also be hosta and hydrangea and other plantings that would add color and texture. She added that this was the sunny side of the building. The screening being proposed was on Page D-8. The brick wall behind the screening was shown on Page 8 and 9 of the supplemental package.

The perspective looking up Maplewood Avenue at Deer Street showed the hotel building as it wrapped around the corner.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the dumpster area on the Maplewood Avenue elevation. Ms. DeStefano explained that the dumpster area which would be referred to as the "gatehouse" had been reduced in size from three doors to one door and which also allowed more green space.

The next perspective was the view from Russell Street heading on Deer Street to Maplewood Avenue. This perspective showed the approach of Port Walk Place and the porte cochere in the background. She also pointed out an enlarged brick crosswalk that was a result of working with the Planning Department on pedestrian safety.

Ms. DeStefano talked about the space between the Marriott and the residential building which showed a pocket park. Mr. Almeida pointed out the fence enclosure around a transformer beyond the park. He asked if the Commission would be dealing with that. Ms. DeStefano replied no. Mr. Almeida commented that he regretted approving the enclosure. Mr. Wyckoff said that he thought the color of the enclosure was the problem.

The next view was from Vaughan Mall showing the corner of the building on Hanover Street and Port Walk Place. Chairman Dika commented on a single column at that corner of the building.

The final perspective was looking up Hanover Street to Maplewood Avenue. The arch leading to the internal parking was visible on this elevation.

Mr. Almeida asked what caliper of trees would be planted. Mr. Levine stated that they would be standard sized trees.

At this point in the presentation, Ms. DeStefano shifted the discussion to the detailing of the building.

Ms. DeStefano pointed out that they had one amendment to the application. Page 7 of the supplemental packet showed a ganged set of double hung windows on Façade 1. She said they would like to put a space between the double hung windows.

Ms. Whittaker asked what the floor to ceiling height was for Façade 1. Ms. DeStefano thought it was about 16 feet.

Ms. Kozak suggested a banding on Façade 1 to break up the upper level of the building. She thought it would help to anchor the building. Ms. DeStefano said she was amendable to that change.

Chairman Dika pointed out that the column on the corner of that façade was round and it was the only round form on the building. Ms. DeStefano said that it was a very substantial column. Ms. Kozak said that she had the same concern but she was not opposed to a column in that place. Mr. Wyckoff commented that he did not have a problem with the column but he suggested that the addition of half columns would make it look more solid. Mr. Almeida added that he appreciated the column as it was. He said it was a corner column and he sees it used in Boston all of the time. Vice Chairman Katz and Ms. Whittaker agreed with Mr. Almeida.

Ms. DeStefano talked about the materials to be used on the building. Chairman Dika stated that she was uncomfortable with the diamond pattern. She said she could not envision how it would look. Mr. Wyckoff said he was a little uncomfortable with it but as an infill building, it might be more interesting than brick. Mr. Johnston passed the Commission a photo of an existing building in Portland, Maine with the same diamond material. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be any casings around the double hung windows. Ms. DeStefano said no. Ms. Kozak asked if there would be any window sills. Ms. DeStefano said that there would be. She added that the reason for the diamond pattern was to use something a little different in the area. Ms. Kozak asked what the joint width was between the diamond patterns. Mr. Worth said it would be about ½ inch. Mr. Levine informed the Commission that the diamond pattern on the Portland, Maine building was in the historic district and was a very successful building.

Mr. Gladhill asked what the material was of the diamond panels. Mr. Levine said it was cementitious material. Ms. DeStefano added that the material was similar to the olive green material on the residential building.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he appreciated what they did in Portland and it looked very good in that context of a very contemporary building. He thought the proposed structure looked like an infill commercial building from the 1920's. He thought they had bitten into both worlds and he was uncomfortable with it.

Mr. Almeida said that he appreciated the diamond pattern. He pointed out that the lines were very fine, it was a very contemporary skin and there was not much of it. He did not think it was inappropriate. Vice Chairman Katz agreed with Mr. Almeida. Mr. Melchior reminded the Commission that they were not an architectural review board but instead they were to determine what was appropriate and he felt it was appropriate. Ms. Whittaker agreed. Ms. Kozak added that she was okay with the diamond pattern.

Ms. Kozak thought that the divided light pattern on the French doors should be similar to the rest of the fenestration. Mr. Melchior agreed. He added that the double hung windows did not speak to the vertical language of the storefront. Ms. DeStefano said that they could center the windows over the mullions below and also eliminate some of the mullions on the French doors.

Ms. DeStefano stated that Façade 3 was their main focus of the building and was the most traditional and most detailed façade. She showed the Commission the color palette they were proposing.

Mr. Almeida commented that the color of brick proposed for Façade 3 was the nicest brick of them all. Ms. Whittaker and Mr. Wyckoff agreed.

Ms. DeStefano stated that Façade 4 was the majority of the hotel building. It started on Port Walk Place, wrapped down Deer Street, and then wrapped the corner onto Maplewood Avenue. She pointed out that the building had a very strong base with the appearance of three stories that sit on top of it. Mr. Almeida commented that he thought the two story base was very successful. Mr. Melchior agreed but he felt it was partly successful because of the light pattern at the first level.

Ms. DeStefano moved on to Façade 5 and pointed out the grade change on Hanover Street. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there were steps within the building that accommodated the grade change. Ms. DeStefano explained that one would enter the lobby and then go up stairs to the floor plate. She said handicapped access would need to be planned internally.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the entrance to the lower level parking area. Ms. DeStefano said that there was some distance before it sloped down to the lower level. She said there would be a gate arm but that it would be recessed back from the face of the building.

Mr. Melchior asked if there would be any transition lighting on this façade. He also asked what the public would see at night. Ms. DeStefano said that there would have to be security lighting and that the lighting must be night sky friendly. She said that they have met the needs and concerns of the Planning Board. Mr. Melchior asked if the illuminators would be seen when heading down the ramp. Ms. DeStefano said that she did not have the answer to that since they

had not yet done the interior design. She added that they would be coming back to the Commission for roof mechanicals so they could add as a stipulation that they come back with a lighting plan as well. Mr. Almeida commented that the Popover building was very successful, but it was disappointing to see fluorescently lit illuminated concrete block on the interior of their lower level parking garage. Ms. DeStefano stated that they would be willing to extend the finish of the storefronts into the building a total of 24 feet.

Façade 6 showed the screened wall connecting the ends of the hotel building and the residential building. Ms. DeStefano pointed out that the guardhouse used to have three operable doors but they now have only two. She also said that the reason for the brick behind some of the screening was to give the length of the wall some variety. She added that the color palette for Façade 6 was very simple, a simple brick, a precast gray color, and the granite base and planters.

Ms. Kozak asked what the material was for the building in back of Façade 6 at the first floor because even though it was 100+ feet away, she thought it would be seen. Ms. DeStefano told Ms. Kozak that she had drawings of the backs and rears of the building and would present them a little later in the presentation.

Mr. Almeida commented that he thought he was seeing a weak spot on perspective 1B. There was discussion about carrying the detail around the corner to match the banding on Page E2.15.

Ms. Whittaker wondered why the diamond pattern was not on the back of the building. Ms. DeStefano explained that all of the building had the same colors on the back of them but not the patterns. Ms. Whittaker said that she was concerned that the Maplewood Avenue building may not be broken up enough. Ms. DeStefano said that the whole back façade was cementitious material but in different sizes and patterns. There would be no metal and no clapboard on the back as well.

Mr. Melchior pointed out that the windows did not align on the back façade on the left side of the building. Ms. DeStefano said that the programming was added to the retail space in that area. She did not think it could be seen because the building overhangs in that area. Mr. Melchior said that a five story building was being proposed across the street that would have a view right down into the courtyard so he felt it could be seen. Ms. DeStefano said that was a good point so they could add the centering of those windows to the list of stipulations.

Ms. DeStefano submitted photo copies of the materials boards for the record.

Ms. Whittaker stated that the Commission has had the package for a while to review but the supplemental package was just given to them this evening.

Ms. Kozak asked about the roof line. Ms. DeStefano explained that wherever there was a change in parapet wall, there would be a return of eight feet.

Mr. Wyckoff asked where meters would be mounted. Ms. DeStefano said there was a lot of opportunity to hide them. She added that they will have mechanical rooms in the lower levels of

the building but she assured the Commission that nothing would be exposed on the street facades.

Mr. Almeida asked about the rooftop mechanicals. Ms. DeStefano said they would come back for that. She said that once this has been approved they would get the engineers fully on board.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if all of the window openings would have the HVAC units. Ms. DeStefano replied yes.

At this point in the presentation, Ms. DeStefano went through the list of amendments to the application. She stated the change to the horizontal banding on Façade 1, the adjusted divided lights in the French door system on Façade 2, also on Façade 2, the double hung windows would be centered above the mullions of the storefront below, that a lighting plan for the garage would be submitted, that building material would return 24 feet under the arched opening where it aligned with the grade change, and lastly, to adjust the pilaster location to the left so that it was centered to the left of the window fenestration above.

Mr. Almeida asked Ms. DeStefano if she was looking for approval of the awnings. Ms. DeStefano said she would come back for those.

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.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Attorney John Springer, representing Harborside Associates, an abutter to the project spoke to the petition. He stated that he had a question regarding the preservation of historic resources of the City. He explained that there had been an issue in the past regarding the Port Walk project and compliance of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act about the archeological and historical resources on the property. He wondered if this issue had been raised with the board and if so, how the compliance with Section 106 was achieved. He asked that either the Commission or the applicant address the question.

Mr. Levine stated that it was a very good, apt, and relevant question to raise. He said that there was no specific jurisdiction that he knew of relevant to Section 106 by the local board. He said that it was important and so they had taken it upon themselves to commission a study with their consultant, IAC, who also did work for the City and who did their archeological work on Lot 2. He informed the Commission that a report had been prepared by IAC and a copy was included in the plans that were submitted to the Planning Board. He said that the report identified three areas on that site that might potentially contain historic resources and added that it was their intention to follow the recommendations of that report. He submitted a copy for the Commission's file.

Chairman Dika informed Attorney Springer that the Commission did deal with this at a work session and they did express their concern even though it was not within their purview.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the amendments stated by the applicant. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz.

Mr. Gladhill asked if something was discovered such as a foundation or part of an historic house structure, did it then become the Commission's purview. Mr. Almeida thought that if it did not extend eighteen inches above the ground then it would not be within their purview.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that they have had a number of work sessions for the project. He felt the applicant had done a very good job of preserving the integrity of the district by taking a very large development and giving it individual character. He said the design complemented the City's architecture.

Vice Chairman Katz said that he thought the project would be transformative for this section of the City and felt it would be a destination where people would want to gather. He added that he was looking forward to seeing it come to fruition.

Mr. Almeida stated that he wanted everyone involved with the project to leave feeling very confident that they did everything that they should do on this project. He said that the buildings have gotten better and better from Phase One to this phase. He felt people were going to like this building when it was complete and they would see Port Walk in its completion with a better understanding of what the Commission has seen throughout the whole process.

Chairman Dika said that there were some aspects of the project that she did not like, like some of the new materials and the color of some of the materials but they were not deal breakers. She noted that the applicant has worked very hard on it. She also said that she was still concerned about Maplewood Avenue and encouraged the applicant to continue to think of what might bring people around the corner past the retail.

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 stipulations passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

- 1) On Façade #1, the horizontal banding above the third floor windows shall be changed to a darker brick.
- 2) On Façade #2, the divided lights in the French door system shall be adjusted by maintaining one horizontal mullion in the middle and eliminating the other vertical and horizontal mullions above and below.
- 3) On Façade #2, the double hung windows shall be separated and centered on the storefront windows below.
- 4) On Façade #5, the streetscape on either side of the entrance tunnel to the parking structure shall return 24 feet under the arched openings.
- 5) On Page E2.12V, the pilaster location shall be centered with the window fenestration above.

- 6) All proposed changes to the building design, including but not limited to driveway, lighting, mechanicals, signs, and awnings shall require a new application and approval by the HDC.

III. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

B. Work Session requested by **233 Vaughan Street LLC, owner**, for property located at **233 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (change first floor parking and interior commercial/retail space). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 9 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 2, 2011 meeting to the December 7, 2011 meeting.)*

This application was withdrawn from further consideration by the applicant.

C. Petition of **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow construction to an existing structure (add third floor to existing building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 7, 2011 meeting to the December 7, 2011.)*

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to postpone the application to the January 4, 2012 meeting.

D. Work Session requested by **North Mill Realty Trust, owner**, for property located at **319 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add windows, canopy, doors, and cladding). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 9 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Steve McHenry and Mr. Brandon Holben of McHenry Architecture and Mr. Chris Greiner of 3S ArtSpace were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry reminded the Commission that they were before them for a work session with the same applicant but a different location. He said that they now had an opportunity with the former Lollipop Tree building. Mr. McHenry explained that the goal of 3S ArtSpace was to provide three functions: performance space, a non-profit gallery, and a farm to table restaurant.
- Mr. McHenry said that the building was built as an industrial building so they wanted to create a dominate central entry where one did not currently exist. He also said that the exterior cladding would be as low key as possible. The one story addition to the building would be completely enshrouded with greenery so as to not confuse where the main entry was located.

- Mr. McHenry pointed out that the streetscape was open curb and parking right up to the building. He said they wanted to create an urban sculptured garden and public space in front of the building to enliven it.
- Mr. Almeida commented that he thought they found the answer to what would pull people down Maplewood Avenue. He said his first reaction was that he loved it. Ms. Whittaker agreed and pointed out the refashioned old Portsmouth Herald building. She felt this was a great use for the space. Mr. Wyckoff agreed.
- Mr. Melchior stated that he also agreed and added that he liked the previous proposal as well. He pointed out that he thought the contemporary accents could be bolder, the overhang could be more organic, and the transitions of materials could be bolder.
- Mr. McHenry informed the Commission that this was a start up non-profit endeavor and they were really enjoying the rough, industrial nature of the interior of the building. Although the building will have a lot of activity going on within it, Mr. McHenry said that the spaces would be sparse. He felt the exterior should reflect that also.
- Ms. Kozak commented that this project was exciting and she felt this was the most appropriate building type to take this kind of leap. She noted that there was not much context around it except that it was facing two federal style buildings. She felt they needed to discuss how this building would sit in the area. She also asked if they would be creating a new context of modernism in this end of town and if so, where would they draw the line.
- Ms. Whittaker stated that she saw the old Portsmouth Herald building as the context. Mr. Almeida added that the Herald building had canopies that were very similar in strength and large window openings similar to this proposal. He felt there was a context forming in the area by default. Chairman Dika agreed but said that she remembered what the Portsmouth Herald building was supposed to look like and it was the economy that changed it to a more contemporary look. She added that was not supposed to be the context. Mr. McHenry said that it was very difficult to judge context in that area. Mr. Almeida pointed out that they should not forget the 233 Vaughan Street project as well which provided context.
- Vice Chairman Katz said he was asking himself if the design was a little bit too playful. He asked how this design related to Portsmouth as Portsmouth. He said it was an exciting prospect and he was open to anything.
- Mr. McHenry stated that this was their first public presentation of the project and they have gotten great feedback on it but he agreed that there was a point where it could get a little Disney World. He wanted it to look simple and refined as well as simple and playful. That would give it the opportunity to not look dated in six years.
- Mr. McHenry also said that was about sustainable design because this might not be the permanent home for 3S ArtSpace.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that the key word was refined. He felt the design was a bit too playful in this configuration. He thought maybe it was the variety of colors.
- Mr. McHenry said that the goal of 3S was to be a community space that was alive day and night. He explained that the restaurant would be going morning, noon, and night; there would be series of community activities that would bring educational opportunities, as well as entertainment geared to all ages. Mr. McHenry added that the second floor would have artists' studios.

- Mr. Almeida stated that first impressions are very important. He said that what was happening on the inside of the building would speak volumes as to what the building was trying to say on the outside. He hoped that they would not stomp out too much of the playfulness. Ms. Whittaker agreed. Mr. Almeida added that this building and the use of the building and the organization were doing something very different and the building wants to be very different.
- Mr. Gladhill said that since there was a restaurant proposed, would they have on site parking. Mr. McHenry replied no, that it would require an impact fee.
- Vice Chairman Katz expressed his concern with the difference in texture and material between the first and second floors. He added that he was happy with the direction the project was taking and he thought it was an exciting prospect.
- Mr. Greiner noted that the word playful had come up several times. He asked what in the design was playful. Mr. Wyckoff stated for him it was the orange horizontal line. Mr. Almeida said he thought maybe it was the extra large letters. Mr. McHenry said that may change depending on how the letters would be classified, signage, canopy, etc. Vice Chairman Katz thought there was sensory overkill with the project to a certain extent. He pointed out that the sculpture and the letters were both asking for his attention.
- Chairman Dika stated that she was glad to see that the project was still moving forward.

In other business, Chairman Dika that the Commission had been granted the right to have a meeting with the DOT Memorial bridge team if they so desired. She pointed out that there were other items that could be discussed such as lighting, designs for plaques and how they are placed, and possibly the cables. She asked the Commission if they would like a meeting.

Ms. Whittaker stated that if the City Council felt it was the Historic District Commission’s purview then that would be one thing but she felt her opportunity to speak to it was when the design team spoke to the City. Mr. Almeida agreed and said that the time to speak to the bridge design had passed. He said that just tonight, the Commission pointed out the fact that people were not present to speak to Port Walk. He added that they would be furious tomorrow morning if people began to second guess the approved design. He felt it was important that the Commission played by the same rules.

Mr. Wyckoff said that it was a courtesy by the design team to extend this invitation, but he did not think it was necessary.

Vice Chairman Katz felt it was a chance to learn more about the structure that they would be looking at for the next two years and a chance to interact with the engineer.

Ms. Kozak stated she was frustrated with the ordinance that allows them to review docks that extend out into the river but did not allow them to give input on the bridge which will be a behemoth backdrop to the City. She said she would love the opportunity to give input if there was anyone who would listen.

Mr. Melchior explained all of the processes the DOT had to go through. He felt it would be a waste of their time to meet with them. They would not affect any change.

Mr. Almeida encouraged the Commission to visit the DOT website. He said it was incredibly detailed with drawing after drawing.

In additional business, Chairman Dika informed the Commission that tonight would be her last meeting as she was resigning from her position on the Commission. The Commission expressed their sorrow at hearing the news, thanked her for her service, and told her she would be missed.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:00 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 March 7, 2012.