

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**November 13, 2013
reconvened from November 6, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak;
Members Richard Katz, John Wyckoff, City Council
Representative Esther Kennedy; Alternates Dan Rawling, Reagan
Ruedig

MEMBERS EXCUSED: George Melchior; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill

ALSO PRESENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (CONTINUED)

Approval of minutes - February 13, 2013

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **approve** the February 13, 2013 minutes as presented. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** with 6 in favor. (Vice-Chair Kozak abstained).*

Approval of minutes - August 7, 2013 (complete version)

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the August 7, 2013 minutes as presented. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

II. OLD BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARING)

A. Update on Form Based Code (continued)

Mr. Cracknell gave an update on the HDC Action Plan. The Zoning Amendment was before the City Council for approval of the electronic version for major projects. The City Council had the notification reading on October 21 and would have the first reading on December 18. The Planning Board scheduled a public hearing for the zoning amendments on November 21, and the second reading was scheduled for a public hearing on December 2. He encouraged the Commissioners to attend the meetings.

The Form-Based Code went before the City Council on October 21. The Planning Board held their meeting on October 24 then continued it October 31 and amended the Character-Based Zoning as a result of the two public hearings. They put forward a positive recommendation to the

City Council for a zoning amendment for the first reading on December 18. The City Council scheduled a public hearing on December 2.

The HDC series of policies related to posting electronic plans on the website would be used that evening for the first time so that the public could see what was being discussed at the podium and the table. The HDC had been using the Letter of Decision Form since the beginning of October and referencing the findings of fact and review criteria for every project. If prepared under the Action Sheet within five days of the meeting, the form would suffice for a rehearing request without the actual minutes.

Mr. Wyckoff said that, upon reading the Ordinance related to findings of fact and purpose of intent, he thought everything under purpose and intent was only for the review and not the findings of fact. He was confused as to why the Commission should be reviewing when they usually used only their four review criteria. Mr. Cracknell said the review criteria stated that the HDC “shall review an application and consider whether it was consistent and furthered the purpose of objectives set forward”. He thought it referenced the Ordinance and it was important for the person making the motion and the Commission discussing the motion that the criteria be referenced. The Commission needed to reference specifically what the review criteria was and whether they were consistent with the general purposes and intents of the Ordinance.

After the Decision Review Form, there was the four-step review process for work sessions on major projects. The HDC would have to act on it soon and use it as a general policy for major projects. The modifications of the public input within the work sessions would be imbedded in the document.

Vice-Chair Kozak wanted to explain to the public in detail the proposed four-step work process for big projects that included evaluation of surrounding context, massing, facades, styles, and elevations. Mr. Rawling said they should make it clear that even though they were trying to get it down to a four-step process, it may take an applicant more than one meeting to get through a particular step along the way. Mr. Cracknell said a big project could get approved in two meetings if it were well designed and supported. The intention was to get through it expeditiously and get to the formal process to provide better opportunities for public input before having ten work sessions. The HDC appropriation request had been given to the City Council for the notification and public hearing scheduled for November 18. The City Council would vote on the appropriation request for \$150,000 for the three projects the HDC proposed. Chairman Almeida asked if the City Council had seen an example of the document and said it was critical. Mr. Cracknell wasn't sure but would check on it.

Other items were to complete and update the historic inventory that was done in 1982 that the HDC did not have survey data for, to assist the Planning Department and other City departments with the design guidelines for the character-based districts, and to work on the downtown Form-Based Code project. He had a Powerpoint presentation on the interim guidelines that he had presented to the Planning Board on the Form-Based Code that would be helpful for the HDC members who were not able to go to the meeting, and the presentation also covered some architectural guidelines for larger projects.

Vice-Chair Kozak commended Mr. Cracknell for the phenomenal task he had put together. The HDC had been talking about it for the past five years and they recognized that they had to be more effective when they hit stumbling blocks, so they identified tools and it was finally coming to fruition. She said the document was helpful in understanding the itemized list of their initiatives, and she asked if it would be on the City website. Mr. Cracknell said that it would and said the Powerpoint presentation was already on the Planning Department's website. He went through some of the highlights about how human scale and the past 300 years of evolving transitional and architectural details made downtown Portsmouth special. People were basically concerned with scale, building height, placement and style of the buildings.

He discussed their study area of 80 acres and 400 properties and said that almost a third of the downtown area was surface parking lot, which was a dramatically different landscape from the WW1 era. Seventy percent of the target area had been redeveloped since WW1. They had showed a map of recent and pending developments like the Connie Bean Building. The red areas represented the non-contributing properties and parking areas, and 15 acres would be redeveloped in the next 20-30 years because they were underutilized. Out of the 400 properties, 25% of the buildings were focal and deemed highly valuable and character-defining. What happened around these buildings was crucial. Fifty-percent of those 361 buildings were contributing and defined the character of Portsmouth, and 10% were non-contributing buildings.

Some of the buildings were extremely large and tall and had an impact on the neighboring homes and streetscape. The Form-Based Code was broken into three sections: the regulating plan, the building form standards, and the architectural design guidelines. There were fifteen main elements that included location, size, footprint, height, roof type, material, dormers, bays, porches, and steps. They had a 5-day Design Charette and developed a draft Form-Based Code that they presented to the Planning Board in September. Mr. Cracknell discussed the four main elements of Character-Based Zoning: the regulation plan (zoning map), the three character districts (CBA, CBB, and MRO), development standards, and design guidelines. He also discussed the building heights that were broken down into six sub-districts. He said flexibility was important in terms of writing the design guidelines and how they were applied by boards like the HDC.

Councilor Kennedy asked Mr. Cracknell if he could designate the section that the first reading of the Ordinance about the Commissions' Rules and Procedures was in so that the public could locate it. He said they would be found in the Clerk's office and the Planning Department and would make it had a section number so it could be easily found.

Councilor Kennedy said she had trouble with the mechanical and telecommunications equipment language under the Interim Architectural Designs and Guideline. She was thought the term 'should be' perhaps should be something stronger. Mr. Cracknell said there were 320 guidelines and they should all use 'should' or 'encourage' because none of them were standard. It was meant to send a direction but not say 'thou shall do it this way'. Councilor Kennedy thought they were doing it to make the process clearer to the public. Mr. Cracknell said it wasn't perfect but it pointed in the appropriate direction.

Mr. Katz did not understand why the presentation and discussion were not held after the meeting because people were waiting for many work sessions. Mr. Cracknell said it was old business and they moved it forward in the Old Business section of the meeting, but could continue it to the end of the meeting. Chairman Almeida said it was supposed to be a 15-minute overview and they needed to move on.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to continue the discussion at the end of the meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded and all were in favor (7-0). Because of the lengthy agenda, the Commission did not have a chance to revisit the topic at the end of the meeting.

B. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Middle Union Condominium Association, owner, and Paula A. Chalfin, applicant**, for property located at **496 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a two story addition and a one story addition on rear of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 21-1 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 6, 2013 meeting to the November 13, 2013 meeting.)*

There was a conflict that postponed the work session to later in the evening. It appears on Page 18.

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **postpone** the discussion to later in the meeting. Mr. Katz seconded.*

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

10. Petition of **Michael R. and Denise Todd, owners**, for property located at **262-264 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct boxed bay on front elevation, remove existing rear stairs and construct new two story deck structure) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (changes to three season rooms on west elevation, replace windows, replace siding and trim with composite materials, add gutters and downspouts, replace roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 5 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Brendan McNamara presented on behalf of the owners Michael and Denise Todd. He passed out a photo that showed the property to the left of the subject property (254 South Street) for the Commission to look at. He said the 262 South Street property had been purchased by the same owners of 254 South Street. The house was a 2-family structure and was in poor condition. He wanted to fully remodel the interior and exterior but keep the existing footprint as it was to reflect the general appearance of the New Englander style. He would align the house with the one at 254 South Street, which had a brick and stone foundation. The house was a work structure

with a lower basement and a substandard appearance. He would install the same material and windows as 254 South Street and would put a matching bay window on the front. Most of the work would happen in the rear. There was an existing addition with a 3 season porch. There was an unattractive second means of egress that would be demolished. He was going to sprinker the building to eliminate the need for the second egress. The odd rear roof would be hidden with a 2-story balcony. The rear addition would be concealed by a balustrade.

The photos showed the condition of the house. It would continue to be a two-family dwelling. He would shuffle things around on the south elevation. The lot coverage would remain the same, and he would use the same approach he had with the 254 South Street property, with crown moldings, plank packaging on the side and AZEK trim. The 8' corner board was larger than expected due to the integration of the two doors and their dimensions. On the east side elevation seen from the river on South Road, he added windows but there was no real window rhythm on that side. The west side had very few changes. He had done skin changes to the rear and formalized the porches.

Councilor Kennedy said she was confused as to what he was adding on to the west elevation, and Mr. McNamara said he was adding very little. The second point of egress was being removed, and there was no addition to the structure. It was a porch and stairway system with a balcony and steps. He showed the 3-season porch and said he was enclosing part of it. He would do a structural change by removing a broken porch roof, so two roofs would be removed instead of one.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the shed roof on the far right and the roof on the left side were rubber roofs, and Mr. McNamara said they were. She asked about the steep angle roof, and he said they were architectural shingles. She asked if the ridge was aligned on the east elevation. Mr. McNamara said the ridge on the right side roof was more to the left and the line would break it down to be 6" lower. Vice-Chair Kozak said she was concerned about using a rubber roof on a pitched roof and asked what the pitch was. He told her it was a 2 pitch. The roof on the rear left was a 10 pitch and moved to a 2 pitch on the flat roof. The opposite side was similar to the 2 pitch and could not be seen from the ground, so they were using a rubber roof to avoid problems with it. Vice-Chair Kozak said she wasn't sure about the distance view of the shed roof. Mr. McNamara said the neighbors would see it from their second stories.

Chairman Almeida asked for a consensus on the roof issue. Mr. Rawling was concerned about the piece on the west elevation. It was a simple house with no detail anywhere, and then there was the piece on the back with panels all over the place. A simpler approach was needed to be more in keeping with the back of the house. Mr. McNamara said the back had looked too strange with clapboards, so he tried to get some differentiation. Mr. Rawling said it looked like it got attached from another house. He also preferred that the window on the side of the house that looked like an awning be a double hung pattern instead. Mr. McNamara said the awning was for privacy for the bathroom. Mr. Rawling said it was too uncharacteristic and would be noticeable. Mr. McNamara said the adjoining property was right on the boundary, so there was a 6' separation between the two properties and it was difficult to see the windows on the side, especially with no one walking by there, but he would accept a stipulation.

Mr. Wyckoff said he was concerned with that particular window and all of the F windows because they were awkward proportionally and went against the HDC vertical guidelines. Mr. McNamara said there was very low head room at that point. Mr. Wyckoff asked why the windows were different from the east elevation, and why the west elevation was characterized as being monolithic if it was clapboard but the east side wasn't. Mr. McNamara said it was due to the break in the roof line on the east elevation. The kitchen was the newest elevation, so the windows were coming against the kitchen counter and the bottom of the window could not be lower than 3', whereas the east elevation had nothing to stop the windows from being lower. Standing in the driveway on the east elevation, there was no sense of the break in the roof because the soffit line ran continuously.

Mr. Wyckoff said the panel detail wrap around the corner of the 2nd floor in the south elevation was out of proportion and asked if it was drawn incorrectly. Mr. McNamara said the elevations were accurate, but it was the porch aspect on the rear addition that was awkward. The panel setup reflected the existing porch, which was aligned to the new porch. Mr. Wyckoff said it didn't seem like a porch. He thought the panels going against the door on the south elevation looked like a smaller place on the floor plan. Mr. McNamara said the elevations were accurate but the floor plan was schematic. Chairman Almeida asked about the option of replacing the panel on the back with clapboard. Mr. Wyckoff said it would remove the 'funhouse' appeal of the back of the building. Ms. Ruedig agreed with Mr. Wyckoff about the panel section on the south elevation. Even though it faced the woods, she preferred clapboard and found it bizarre that it was a slanted panel. The boxed bays on the north elevation façade were a strange proportion of 6/6, and she asked if the width could be reduced to make it two 2/2 windows. Mr. McNamara said it was not consistent with the bay window of the adjoining house and that it was going to 3/3 because it was the closest pane size to the bay window. Mr. Ruedig said she preferred 2/2 even though the windows were smaller. They were paired together and still a large window opening. Mr. McNamara said if it had to go to 2/2, he would prefer the B window, otherwise it wouldn't look right. Chairman Almeida said it would look like the same window as the house next to it. Mr. McNamara said there were three side windows on the base, so the front facing windows were three times the size of the side window of the bay, and he could do something like that. Chairman Almeida told him to just match the B window in the bay.

Mr. Wyckoff was concerned about the bay construction because it looked like it had no means of support. It was either a traditional New Englander or not. The bay could be reduced in size and would accommodate the proportional windows if it were not quite as wide. It looked like a contemporary box stuck on the house with no base.

Chairman Almeida thought the application as presented met their criteria and was a wonderful restoration. Some of the comments were improvements that they could request as stipulations. Mr. Katz said he would approve the application. Councilor Kennedy said there were issues with the windows and the roof over the bay. She thought the back portion on the west elevation was a problem because it was a very different design on a simplistic house. Mr. Rawling asked if the house had a chimney and if it would be retained. Mr. McNamara said it had a concrete block exposed chimney that was not referenced in the application. Chairman Almeida asked the Commission if they were concerned about the chimney. Councilor Kennedy said she'd have to look at it because it wasn't part of the application.

Mr. McNamara asked the Commission to clarify the stipulations. Chairman Almeida said asphalt shingles should replace the rubber and clapboards should replace the paneling on the rear porch section. The bay windows should be reduced to the B size but retain the trim.

Vice-Chair Kozak was concerned about the white aluminum roofing on the box bay and the porch on the front doors because it wasn't seen in the District. She asked Mr. McNamara if he would consider something more traditional. Mr. McNamara said it was a cost issue and that there was white aluminum on the 254 South Street bay and top of the door. Vice-Chair Kozak said they were flat roofs that couldn't be seen from the street. Chairman Almeida asked if a membrane would be more appropriate and was told a copper one would, but not a rubber one. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if he was proposing a standing seam, and Mr. McNamara said he meant a solid sheet. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the bay window that projected out. Mr. McNamara said he could eliminate the bay window entirely.

Councilor Kennedy said they needed a work session. Vice-Chair Kozak agreed because there were too many stipulations.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **postpone** the work session/public hearing to the December 4, 2013 meeting for additional review. Mr. Katz seconded.*

Vice-Chair Kozak said there were at least six stipulations and other concerns that needed due process. Mr. Katz agreed that there were issues that had to be resolved in a work session. Councilor Kennedy said they needed updates on the chimney.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with 6 in favor and 1 opposed. Chairman Almeida voted opposed.*

Mr. Gladhill arrived at this point in the meeting.

11. *(Work Session/Public Hearing)* Petition of **143 Daniel Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **143 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish gymnasium building) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct mixed use, multi-story building) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (restore existing building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 19 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

WORK SESSION

Carla Goodknight and Bill Bartel of CJ Architects and owner, Steve Wilson were present.

Ms. Goodknight told the Commission that she would start with the original package and would discuss the project in three sections: the Army Navy building, the Chapel Street building, and the

Daniel Street building. She said TAC requested a change to the plaza, and she passed out a supplement showing the change as well as photos of the buildings. The change involved continuous stairs on platform instead of planters. Mr. Wyckoff said it had made more sense with the planters because with the new configuration, someone could fall off the platform. Vice-Chair Kozak asked about handrails. Ms. Goodknight said they were looking into handrails or a monolithic granite block and said she would provide details at the next meeting.

Ms. Goodknight went through the existing conditions in the Army Navy building and said the front entry door would be replaced and the vestibule door panel would be put into the replacement door. The 1st and 2nd floor windows would be restored with new storms, and the rear entry door and the sashes in the dormers would be replaced. They had several options of replacements for the basement windows.

On sheet 1.1, the only change was the use of half screens instead of aluminum storms on the dormers. The 1st and 2nd window sashes would be restored. There was no change to the iron railing over the entrance. The front door would be new but the side panels and transom would remain. Sheet 1.2 showed the east elevation. Ms. Goodknight said they were proposing a new window unit to replace the door and a new window unit at the gable end. The west elevation would have the same repairs. The top floor needed new sashes because they were not original, whereas the 1st and 2nd floor ones were original and would be restored with storms. The basement windows would be replaced and would keep the existing security screens. Sheet 1.3 showed the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor window treatments as the same, with the addition of a new JELD-WEN fiberglass rear entry door. Sheet 1.4 showed more details of the front doors. The existing moldings and transoms would be restored, and a new wood flat panel entry door with glass in the center panels and black panels above and below would be installed that was modeled after the original vestibule door. Sheet 1.5 showed the storm door and the window section half screen detail with a sash for the upper window.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the brick mold covered the flange of the storm and if the frame of the storm was proud, equal or recessed to the molding. Ms. Goodknight showed the Commission a sample of the storm and they discussed the casings, and its hanging. Vice-Chair Kozak asked about the window installation details and how the windows would sit in the openings. She was concerned with the plane and frame of the windows in relation to the casing. Ms. Goodknight said the 1st and 2nd floor windows were restorations and the 3rd floor windows would have the sashes replaced and the frame to remain. Chairman Almeida asked if an interior storm was considered. Mr. Wilson said it was, but it made the heavy windows difficult to operate. Councilor Kennedy asked what shape the sashes were in. Mr. Wilson said they were structurally solid and good quality. There was 10% of glass that had to be replaced, and they would rebuild the weights and balancers.

Councilor Kennedy said the HDC encouraged wooden doors instead of fiberglass doors. Ms. Goodknight said they were doing a custom wood door at the main entry on Daniel Street but a fiberglass at the rear because it was the back of the building with no public way and it was maintainable. Mr. Katz said they had allowed it in past projects. Mr. Wilson said it would be painted with a smooth finish. Vice-Chair Kozak said the simulated divided lights on the windows were at eye level on Daniel Street and would require spacer bars between the muttins. Chairman

Almeida asked if there would be PVC vents protruding, and Mr. Wilson said no, that the existing plumbing vents would be flashed in copper.

Ms. Goodknight then presented the Chapel Street building section. She showed the gutter locations and said the plaza had been elevated. The custom wood front door would have a covered entry. The exterior plaza over the parking entry had custom shutter details and a brick veneer foundation. Sheet 2.1 showed the PVC trim with painted Hardiplank siding and shutters. The gutters were PVC molded with copper downspouts, and the trim was flat panel PVC. The double hung windows would be Pella with alternatives of Marvin or Eagle, and a custom PVC lattice would be built under the deck. The basement windows would be infilled with glass block. The foundation would be brick veneer and the roof asphalt.

Sheet 2.2 showed the back of the building with the same elements of window units, trim, siding, railing, and brick veneer foundation. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if it was a thin brick because it didn't protrude from the face of the structure. Ms. Goodknight said it was thick and was applied directly because of the lower level. Sheet 2.3 showed the connector piece with a copper roof accent entryway into the upper levels. The same details carried around the building with previously-mentioned materials. Chairman Almeida mentioned the door location being far to the left. Ms. Goodknight said an interior egress stairway enveloped the space to the right. Chairman Almeida said he saw a tiny sliver of clapboard going down the side that was too close and asked if she could move it slightly or get rid of the platform pieces. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the door with the half round window over it was visible through the alley. Ms. Goodknight said it was the terminus and was centered on the alley.

Sheet 2.4 showed 3D depictions of the Chapel Street building. Chairman Almeida asked if the corner boards with pilasters and caps should be brought forth. Vice-Chair Kozak said they were not seen on existing buildings so it wasn't important. Mr. Wyckoff said it would be a future requirement to show how the downspouts went into the ground. Ms. Goodknight said they could do them in iron casing. Sheet 2.5 showed the building in context, and Sheet 2.6 showed window sizes and layouts. Section 2.7 was a review of the materials.

Councilor Kennedy said she was uncomfortable with the two little windows on Sheet 2.2. Mr. Katz asked if the windows opened on a stairway and was told no. He asked if they could be seen from anywhere and was told they could be seen from inside the Wright Avenue building. Ms. Ruedig said the circular windows in the gables were not a traditional design and preferred that they not be there if they had no function. Mr. Wyckoff and Councilor Kennedy agreed. Ms. Goodknight said they would be removed.

Ms. Ruedig said the palladium top of the doorway on Sheet 2.3 was not brick and didn't have the same context as the building next to it. She felt it should be more contextual with the wood frame building that it was trying to emulate. She also had a problem with the half round window on the alleyway. Mr. Wilson said they wanted to maintain the arched window look from the old gymnasium and thought it gave some relief from the brick down the alley. If they broadened the top and made an address sign, it would be consistent with the Army Navy building. Councilor Kennedy asked what the railing material was. Ms. Goodknight said it was copper-coated metal on the Daniel Street side and PVC painted on Chapel Street. Ms. Goodknight showed samples of

the Pella windows. Mr. Rawling asked if they were clad windows and Ms. Goodknight said they were. He suggested that the trim and jambs match.

Councilor Kennedy asked if it was a work session and a public hearing. Ms. Goodknight said they were doing the public hearing afterwards and seeking approval for Section 1, the Army Navy building changes. Councilor Kennedy said the public needed to know what they were going to do. Ms. Goodknight said they would also want stipulations for the Chapel Street building. Chairman Almeida said the work session was for the entire project. Ms. Goodknight said the public hearing was for approval for Section 1 and Section 2 with stipulations, and Section 3 was for review and public comment. Mr. Gladhill said it had been advertised as a complete project but they could give it partial approval. Mr. Wilson said Section 1 for the Army Navy building restoration was critical because they couldn't remove the existing storm windows and paint the old sashes without the new storm windows on site.

Ms. Goodknight then talked about Section 3, the Gymnasium section, and the existing conditions and different views of it from the bridge and the park. She said they could preserve the integrity of the District by exposing the side of the Army Navy building instead of demolishing it, thereby giving it a connection to the gymnasium and open space for pedestrians. The State Street side of the building showed how the building was not compatible with the existing building. The site plan was updated with the continuous stairs. The grading would be adjusted, and the green space and pedestrian alleys would connect to the two new structures. Mr. Wyckoff asked how the steps would go from two to three on the Daniel Street side. Ms. Goodknight said the grade would change. Mr. Wilson said they had a conflict with the building code, so they would adjust the grading of the bricks to make a slight deviation.

Ms. Goodknight showed the Pella fixed storefront system consisting of wood doors with arch top entries and granite keystone elements and sills, a granite storefront wrapping around the base, recessed balcony space, dormers in a faux slate, custom brick banding under the eave line and a molded brick at the top of the storefront, all of which recalled details from the 1940s structure. The gutter was molded with copper downspouts. Councilor Kennedy asked about the condition of the existing windows. Mr. Wilson said they were huge double hung windows and not of good quality. They were 14' and would increase the building height by 3 or 4 feet. Vice-Chair Kozak said the palladium door juxtaposed with the windows with divided light was awkward because it looked like a single window and made the door look trite. She suggested separating the flanking windows into two sashes that were mullioned to make it more convincing. Ms. Ruedig thought the building would seem much taller because the eave lines didn't match.

Ms. Goodknight showed a rendering of the alley with the entry door and the proposed doors on the rest of the Daniel Street elevation. The roof lines worked together to make a symmetrical composition at the top. The elevation that abutted the Wright Avenue Building had no real access because the buildings were close. Ms. Goodknight also showed the window specifications.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Joe Caldarola of 170 Dennett Street said there were elements of big buildings that were softened by smaller ones. As ugly as the gymnasium looked from the bridge, it had character that

contributed to the scale and character of the area. It was 30' high and smaller than the main building, so it could be seen before the larger one and related more to the State Street building heights and felt approachable. He built spec houses and tried not to make them look like spec houses. He felt the project was going in the right direction but still looked like a spec house. The older building had wide corners and the new one had narrow corners and was a bigger building, so the heavy custom trim look was lost. He felt that they should increase the drama of the trim at the corner and top detail. They should make the shutters look like they were real because they were too flat and lost their character. The triangular gables were too big and too far out on the new building. The window trim on the old building was wider and taller and had more detail, and copying that detail would help on the new building. Varying the mud sill might help, and a more dramatic turn around the balcony to separate the corner board effect would also help. He thought the front porches were too monotone white for Portsmouth and that the panels didn't quite work because they were too simple and not historic looking. He had an issue with the scale. The gymnasium softened the scale because it was lower, and it would be nice to have the eave line lower than the Connie Bean building. Chairman Almeida told him that the building was elevated 30' because of the plaza and underground parking. If it dropped down, the eave lines would align. Mr. Caldarola agreed with Vice-Chair Kozak that the arched window on the entrance of the new building didn't work because of the mixing of Craftsman and palladium details.

Ms. Kerrie Vaultrot said she was Chair of the Buildings and Grounds Committee for the Warner House and was glad there was finally a rendering of the Warner House context available. She didn't want the new building to overshadow the Warner House. The cornice line made it look larger, and she thought the underground parking could be addressed differently. She wanted to see more attention paid to the Daniel Street side and see how it would impact the 300-year-old Warner House.

Mr. Ryan Patrick of 38 Chapel Street said he bought his house three years before and wondered what they would do with the Connie Bean Building. He liked the storefront side and the underground parking in the back, but he felt that there was a lot of building going on and they needed to be conscious of changing the city skyline. Certain buildings looked too proud for certain areas. He thought the two buildings were large. When he lived in D.C., no building could be taller than the Washington Monument so the character of the city would be kept. Developers needed to be conscious that they didn't overbuild Portsmouth.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street thought the entire project was an improvement to the area, especially the new section. The gymnasium was ugly and big. People had a lot of memories, but it was time for it to come down. When seen in context with the Wright Avenue building coming in from the bridge, it fit in perfectly. She thought the pedestrian alleys were welcoming, and that it was an overall great project.

Mr. Rick Becksted, Jr. of Islington Street thought the new building was big and didn't match the lines. He had issues with the Form-Based Zoning, and the new building level of 35' didn't match the original level of the Connie Bean building. The roofline itself and the contour with the building on the left seemed odd. They should make it blend in more and align the windows better to make it more appealing.

Mr. Peter Loughlin of Thaxter Road asked the Commission to make sure that they added the public's comments to the public comment section. He felt it would be crazy to keep the Connie Bean Center and wondered if the City should have sold it. There were rational arguments on both sides. The argument as to whether the gymnasium should be kept was with the City Council. The City Council had the option to spend a million dollars for a new roof and make it code compliance, or sell it, and they chose to sell it. Mr. Wilson should not be responsible for salvaging the building for those who wanted to keep the memories. A letter to the editor six weeks before about 143 Daniel Street said the views of the North Church would be gone if the new building went up. He showed the Commission four photos of the view of the North Church from the bridge proving that the view would not be affected. He thought the removal of the gymnasium would be a godsend and the new building would be a plus.

Ms. Barbara McMillan of 84 Hillside Drive said that all three components of the proposal reflected the character and historic feeling of Portsmouth and she was very much in favor. The Connie Bean project was a great preservation and restoration opportunity and was being handled well. The Chapel Street building reflected the neighborhood without being a cookie cutter replica of the houses, and it incorporated some of the different parts of the existing building. The new building would provide a beautiful gateway to the City and it would resemble what was in place before 1941. It would also separate the two buildings and remove the feeling of two large buildings. It was a chance to preserve and restore what was important in Portsmouth and what it looked like before the urban renewal. She hoped they could continue to go in that direction.

Ms. Ruth Griffin of 479 Richards Avenue said she lived in Portsmouth and was a property taxpayer and was vocal on many issues. She was not vocal on architectural design but did have an eye for beauty. Mr. Wilson had let her borrow the plans to look at, and she had seen the photo of the view coming from the bridge. The new building had an open rounded area that was more welcoming into the City than the old gymnasium with the sharp corners and the cold appearance. The memories of the gymnasium didn't add to the beauty of the downtown area. When coming into the City from Maplewood Avenue, there was a long stretch of high buildings that blocked the view of the North Church. The new proposal made it feel like you were really coming into a beautiful city. She hoped that the HDC would consider her comments about the appropriateness of the project and vote to approve it.

Mr. Bernie Pelech of 175 Thaxter Road said he had lived in Portsmouth for 45 years. He thought the proposal was fantastic and was a great gateway presentation for people coming over the bridge. The developer and architects should be commended and their work was worthy of certificate of appropriateness.

There was no else to speak to the application, so Chairman Almeida closed the public discussion.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Carla Goodknight of CJ Architects said he had gone through Section 1, the Army Navy building renovation, and said that there were no stipulations noted during the work session.

Section 2, The Chapel Street building, had discussions about the downspout termination being an iron pipe. They had also discussed removing the circular windows at the Chapel Street elevation. The palladium window would remain as presented with its rectangular transom. The size and scale would be comparable to the drawing. Section 3 needed documentation for materials. Gutter locations had to be addressed. They were looking at mulls for the storefront windows and for the palladium motif over the storefront doors. She asked if there were additional stipulations for Section 3. Mr. Wyckoff said the HDC had past projects that had incomplete roof ventilation equipment scheduled that had been taken care of afterwards. Chairman Almeida said they needed comments on Section 3 from the Commissioners and the public. They had just heard several discussion points from the public that he wasn't sure qualified for stipulations.

Councilor Kennedy said the public had brought up a few things in Section 2 that she liked, one of which was the trim on the corners of the Chapel Street building. Ms. Goodknight found it interesting that the HDC applications looked for façade and trim simplification. Some of the original ornate treatments for the Daniel Street building were also simplified. Simplification seemed to be more favorable with the Board because public comment asked for more ornamentation. Councilor Kennedy didn't see it as that. She had just asked that the corners be more reflective. There had also been good comments about the shutters. Mr. Wilson said that, as the owner, he liked the idea of broadening the corner boards to 7 ¼" and would accept it as a stipulation. He would make it authentic but not too ornate. He could broaden the skirt board to 11" or so to show less brick. He would be happy to comply with the stipulation to bring the building down and give it more pronounced definition on the corners.

Chairman Almeida asked if they were using real shutters that would be operable, sized to cover the window, and hung properly, and Ms. Goodknight said yes.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Joe Caldarola of 170 Dennett Street said that the 7 ¼" corner board was spec house size and could be bought pre-made. On the smaller building, the corner board looked 12" wide, so he didn't understand it.

Ms. Kerri Vaultrot asked the Commission if they were voting on the entire project. Chairman Almeida said it was possible because it had been advertised. They could vote on it partially, however. Ms. Vaultrot said there had not been a rendering of the Warner House in the public packet and she was wary of seeing it approved without the public having seen it. She wanted to take it to her Board meeting and also wanted additional views relative to the Warner House. She was excited about the window restoration and preservation on the Connie Bean Building, the overall proposed new construction and the replacement of the gymnasium, but she didn't think there had been enough information given to vote on the gymnasium and fully understand the implications to the Warner House.

Mr. Wilson referenced the supportive letters from Peggy Lamb and Steve Joselow at 58 State Street, who were not able to attend the meeting. They said the Connie Bean Building was visible from their house and they had followed the petition closely. The proposal to replace the gymnasium and put in pedestrian walkways was ideal and aesthetically appealing and functional.

Chairman Almeida said he had read the letter as well as the ones from Marie Bodi and Clare Kittredge.

Ms. Ruedig of 70 Highland Street stated she was speaking as a member of the public and had a few comments. The project was going in a positive direction, but they should not vote on the entire project yet. The first part was well presented and acceptable. Because of all the public comment and discussion, another work session was needed with public comment before the Commission should consider voting on the other two sections of the application.

There was a question raised by Mr. Katz as to whether it was appropriate for Ms. Ruedig to speak to the application.

There was no else to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Gladhill made a motion to grant a waiver for partial approval of the Certificate of Approval as presented for Phase 1. Councilor Kennedy seconded.

Mr. Gladhill said they had many work sessions but had received information at the last moment. He had asked for the rendering months ago and finally received it that evening. There were still missing details on the roof, gutter, and other items. For an application of that size, it was more than just a few stipulations. They should have a complete application before approval. He felt that the third phase of the project needed more time to review before voting on it. Councilor Kennedy agreed. The third phase had no material specifications. If the HDC asked it of one applicant, they had to ask it of everyone. She could not approve the 3rd Stage until the application was fully presented.

Mr. Katz asked Mr. Gladhill specifically what he was holding out from approval. Mr. Gladhill said the application had to be complete, and when brought to a public hearing, they should not be getting supplemental information at the last minute. All the discussed changes should be listed on the application. He saw renderings just that night of views he had requested months before. Mr. Katz asked what they were voting on that night. Mr. Gladhill said it was the waiver of the Phase 1 restoration.

Chairman Almeida said it had been stated that the Commission had what they needed for Building 2. They had great input from the public and the Commission. They could tweak it for months, but he thought it was appropriate and ready to vote on.

Mr. Katz said that putting a partial approval on Phase 1 as presented necessitated the approval of the gymnasium demolition because the Connie Bean Building couldn't be restored without removing the gymnasium. Chairman Almeida said the Commission had to make a decision at some point, and he was clear as to what the applicant was asking for. They needed to move forward, and he suggested that Building #2 be included. Vice-Chair Kozak said the public commented on a number of stipulations that were not fully addressed, like the trim, the water

table height, and the palladium door. Mr. Katz said they were stipulations that had been addressed in a motion to approve. Mr. Gladhill said they weren't typical stipulations yet.

Chairman Almeida called for the vote for partial approval for Phase 1. The motion failed by a vote of 4-3. The motion failed.

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application as stipulated in its entirety. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.

Mr. Wyckoff referred to the criteria of defining character of the surrounding properties and said the building's detail reflected what was on Daniel Street so it met the criteria. It also met the criteria of existing structure restoration, being a significant structure, and its exterior design and texture was in keeping with the District. It would foster the heritage and economic wellbeing of the District by allowing a few retail units as well as restoring the building. For those reasons, he felt it was a good project and should not hold up the approval vote because of the downspout location and so on. The presentation had mentioned that it was a brick building with a granite base, and the windows had been shown, so the material specifications were there. He didn't understand why some Commissioners were getting a different representation of the building.

Mr. Katz said the application would be approved and/or upheld. The applicant had done yeoman's work in presenting a complete and sympathetic application use of the structure and had undertaken extensive restoration of the Army Navy Building. If there were people lamenting the demise of the gymnasium, they should take their complaints to the City Council, who sold the building without stipulations. Any applicant who bought it in good faith expected that the HDC would not do last-minute delaying tactics. If it didn't pass that evening and didn't pass in a rehearing, it would go to the BOA, and then to court. Property rights would be upheld. He wanted a clarification of a motion to approve the entire complex as presented with stipulations stated by the applicant.

Mr. Gladhill said his waiver was not to stop the demolition of the gymnasium but was because of an incomplete application. It was important that when they approve an application, it be complete. There were no last-minute tactics to prevent the demolition.

Councilor Kennedy amended the motion to approve the restoration as stated in Sections 1 & 2 and have the 3rd section come back with a more complete packet. Mr. Gladhill seconded. The amendment to the motion passed by a vote of 4-3.

Vice-Chair Kozak said she respected the Warner House's request to have more time to review the new rendering. She applauded Phase 1 because it was a faithful restoration. Phase 2 on Chapel Street could be appropriate and it fit in well with its surroundings. It was a creative interpretation of a new building in an old setting, and the scale was good. If it were an empty lot, it would be a great new building. In reading the Ordinance, she found nothing about demolition except that they review it. It was left to interpretation. The argument to provide a more historic new building could apply to any building downtown. There were a lot of imperfect buildings downtown that were contributing but not great. The gymnasium was contributing and had elements that the HDC had talked about, like the molded brick, arched windows, and

symmetrical façade. The existing building had value. She cited the criteria of encouraging the use of existing buildings that could be adapted. She would not vote for the demolition of the gymnasium.

Mr. Katz asked how they could approve the restoration without demolishing the gym. Chairman Almeida said they couldn't. He didn't want to walk away without making some progress that evening. There was a motion on the floor that they had to vote on, and if the Commission felt it should be amended, they should do it and move on.

*The Commission voted that the request be **partially approved** as presented with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That approval is given for the Section 1 and Section 2 plans only. Note that with this approval, the HDC understands and acknowledge that the existing gym building addition will be demolished as proposed.*
- 2) That the downspout termination on the Section 2 plan will be in an iron pipe.*
- 3) That the circular windows on the chapel Street elevation of the Section 2 plans will be removed.*
- 4) That the palladium window on the Daniel Street elevation of the Section 2 plans will be removed and will be replaced with a transom window whose size will be comparable to what is shown on the plans or to a sign band also shown on the plans.*
- 5) That the 1" clapboard next to the proposed door on the Daniel Street elevation of the Section 2 plans will be removed.*
- 6) That Pella windows shall be used on the Section 1 and Section 2 proposed structures.*
- 7) The Section 2 plans will be revised to show a 71/4" cornerboard and a 101/2" skirtboard.*

*The motion **passed** with 5 in favor and 2 opposed. Councilor Kennedy and Ms. Kozak voted in opposition.*

Councilor Kennedy left at this point in the meeting.

Chairman Almeida mentioned two applicants asked to postpone their work sessions until the next month, Work Session D for 30 Maplewood LLC, and Work Session E for the General Porter Condominium Association.

IV. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Judith L. Hiller and John B. Wilkens, owners**, for property located at **18 Manning Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add dormer on north elevation, relocate side entrance to rear elevation, replace double windows on 3rd floor with French doors and balcony) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 67 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

The owners Ms. Judy Hiller and Mr. John Wilkens were present.

Ms. Hiller told the Commission she wanted permission for three minor changes. One was the relocation of the side door to the rear of the property, which was the original location. She wanted to add a dormer over the 3rd floor landing going up to the attic space to allow head space. She wanted to remove the half sash and half vent double windows on the 3rd floor of the rear elevation and replace them with French doors and a small balcony. She handed out photos, one of which showed the existing railing on the side entrance and the interior where the original door location was.

Chairman Almeida asked if the framing of the balcony on the back would be finished so that no framing would be exposed. Ms. Hiller said it would and she would paint it white. The side door was non-conforming and on the rear location of the back of the property and would have to go to the BOA. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if there was any lattice below the porch. Ms. Hiller said lattice covered the side opening but she could bring it around the whole porch.

Chairman Almeida said the HDC typically requested that exposed framing be minimized, and he preferred something more decorative to support the balcony. Mr. Wilkins said they were thinking of using the same type of ornamentation as the A frame genre itself. Ms. Ruedig said they would have to see more details. Chairman Almeida said he needed more detail on the porch skirting and asked if they planned to continue the eave trim all the way to the new gable. Mr. Wilkins said yes. Mr. Wyckoff wanted to see a cross-section of the windows because they weren't showing any sill on the bottom. They would need to create a wooden sill underneath the casing. Chairman Almeida said he would like to see a photo of the existing window and know how they were going to install the windows.

The Commission recommended a public hearing.

Note: The following item was deferred earlier in the meeting.

B. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Middle Union Condominium Association, owner**, and **Paula A. Chalfin, applicant**, for property located at **496 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a two story addition and a one story addition on rear of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 21-1 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 6, 2013 meeting to the November 13, 2013 meeting.)*

Vice-Chair Kozak recused herself from the work session.

WORK SESSION

The developer Mr. Bob Cook and the applicant Ms. Paula Chalfin were present. Mr. Cook told the Commission that he had minor changes on the elevations and other details since the last meeting that they had incorporated into the drawing as a final presentation. On the elevation where there were two small rectangular windows, he had put a longer vertical window in the stairwell, which simplified the elevation and illuminated the stairway. He also put a hip roof on

the storage roof. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the new window had the same casing, and Mr. Cook told him it did and it matched the windows on the front.

Mr. Cook changed the bathroom window above the shed to a smaller pane, which was a standard size window. He included some drafting corrections on the roof plan and on elevation 1.4, where the cornice was now continuous. Chairman Almeida asked him if the foundation was stone. Mr. Cook said it was, and that it would have a brick shelf with no concrete.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There was no one in the public wishing to speak.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to move to a public hearing. Mr. Katz seconded. The motion passed unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Cook told the Commission that he was presenting his updated elevations and plan with corrections from the previous work session.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

There was no one to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Katz made a motion to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

Mr. Katz said he had passed the house many times and the changes were appropriate to the structure, its history and appearance, and he was glad to see that it was getting the attention it needed.

Mr. Wyckoff said the changes were very sympathetic and preserved the integrity of the District and maintained its special character. The building was significant and it complemented and enhanced the District.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

IV. WORK SESSIONS (continued)

B. Work Session requested by **Bradley Boisvert and Karen Bannon Boisvert, owners**, for property located at **124 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add elevator at rear of building, construct stair access, construct walkout decks and add doors at 2nd and 4th levels, construct dormer, add skylights, and

replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 55 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

Brandon Holben with McHenry Architecture and owners Bradley Boisvert and Karen Bannon Boisvert were present.

Mr. Holben told the Commission he wanted to renovate the interior of the building. The rooftop modifications would allow a rear deck. He would add a lower deck off the main living level, so there would be two decks plus the big addition to make the unit accessible. On the exterior, he would replace all the 2/2 windows on the front in kind. The top level had 1/1 windows, but he would make them 2/2 because they were large for a 3rd story.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the 2/2 windows were the original fenestration. Mr. Boisvert said they were probably the original windows. Vice-Chair Kozak knew that the house was built in 1815.

Mr. Holben showed the proposed 2nd and 4th floor plans where the deck would be. He would add access to the exterior by putting a stairway down to the yard from the kitchen level. The 4th floor had the addition of a dormer to create the walk-out space. The renovations on the front included window replacements and upper clad copper material to provide skylights along the ridge top.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the roof pitch would change. Mr. Holben said it would on the rear, but the front slope was staying the same. He was also proposing firewall extensions to accommodate the roof. Chairman Almeida thought the front side would be similar to the Market Street context where the roof pitch was changed and copper was put all along the edge. It changed the roof plane on the rear and was worth looking at.

Mr. Wyckoff said it was not a vertical line going up. The skylight was on a curve and looked like a contemporary expression on the back because of the way it was drawn with the elevator. Chairman Almeida said that the public did not like reproducing faux materials for real ones.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked if it could be viewed from Court Street or Strawberry Banke and other vantage points from further away. She wanted to make sure it wouldn't be a new height and shape on the skyline. Mr. Boisvert told her that it wasn't visible. She said she would have a hard time justifying changing the roofscape on State Street as well because she thought it would be visible. Ms. Ruedig agreed and said it was a focal point of the District. Mr. Rawling said he was concerned with the visibility from Strawberry Banke. Chairman Almeida suggested that they do a site walk.

Mr. Wyckoff wondered if the applicants could accomplish what they wanted without altering the front face of the roof and whether they could start at the ridge. Mr. Boisvert said they were trying to capture the headroom of the floor area by building a skylight. Mr. Gladhill said he had concerns with the front roof on State Street because it wasn't the typical back of the building situation. It did not fit in with the District. Chairman Almeida said they could entertain a contemporary expression that did not try to replicate, but he wished that more of the historic building was visible. Mr. Holben said the two buildings next door blocked the view. Chairman Almeida said he didn't want the historic elements hidden. Ms. Ruedig was unsure about the

expression of the wood timber framing and thought it looked like something in Nevada. She suggested more of a Craftsman style.

Mr. Boisvert talked about putting the elevator aside, the 4th floor deck, the parapet wall treatment and the raising of the roof to create the walkout from the ridge. Vice-Chair Kozak and Mr. Gladhill said they would do a site walk to take in the neighborhood context. Mr. Boisvert said they could put a structure on the driveway to provide a private court way instead of raising the roof, and that would hide the back view. Chairman Almeida asked if the building was a multiunit one. Mr. Boisvert said it was a single family building with an office on the 1st floor.

Chairman Almeida said he didn't want to discourage applicants from doing major renovations, but there was a give and take. They needed to allow some modernization of building restorations or people would turn their backs on them. Mr. Wyckoff said they could minimize the 4th-floor dormer and get a more traditional fire escape. The tower, elevator and stairs could have an iron look to get away from the clapboards. He wasn't worried about the Court Street skyline because they were just going up 7'. He could approve it if the back dormer was minimized.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There was no one to speak to the work session.

*Vice-Chair Kozak made a motion to **continue** review of the application to the December 4, 2013 meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

C. Work Session requested by **Dale W. and Sharyn W. Smith, owners, and Green and Company, applicant**, for property located at **275 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 8 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the October 9, 2013 meeting to the November 13, 2013 meeting.)*

Steve McHenry of McHenry Architects, Brandon Holben, Project Architect, Rick and Michael Green, applicants, and Attorney Bernie Pelech presented.

Mr. McHenry told the Commission that his team had created a hybrid scheme for them to review that addressed their past comments. He presented the site configuration and constraints, eave lines and building heights, and a description of the New Englander. He showed an outline of the New Englander and its relationship to their project to give a better picture of the setback from the neighboring buildings and the visual intrusion from the proposed new buildings. He said they altered the rear elevation and lowered the portion in the rear to make it compatible with the neighborhood scaling. He showed a scheme of two ell-shaped interlocking buildings that looked like separate buildings with a parking lot below. A graphic representation of the primary and secondary street patterns showed the major elements protruding out. The primary street pattern showed a close geometric relationship to the fronts of the buildings on Islington Street, and the

side streets were similar in scale to the residential neighbors and consistent with the Islington Street Action Plan setbacks and open spaces. He also showed the exterior finish materials through the 3D models with green improvements, sidewalk setbacks, main elevations and eave lines.

Mr. McHenry said he wanted to increase the depth between the masses, and he tried to pull back 4th floor elements so the buildings appeared to be three instead of two. Flat roofs and Craftsman-type shallow pitched roofs were designed, and he toned down the siding elements and worked on the detail, trim, window proportions, and doorways. They updated the model to create gradation changes down the side streets. They had a neighborhood meeting with the group at the Pearl to address their concerns, and some people were supportive while others were not. The big issue was still the New Englander and he needed an answer from the Commission as to whether they would approve its demolition or not.

Ms. Ruedig asked if the pitch of the gable roofs was the same as the New Englander. Mr. McHenry said the gable roof pitch was about a 4 pitch and the house pitch was a 2 pitch. He and his team had agreed that they could change the pitch without changing the overall design. Ms. Ruedig was agreeable and said the Craftsman style was popular.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought it was a great improvement, but suggested that they trade the hierarchy between the ground and top floors because the top seemed a bit top-heavy. The top floors were the same proportion as the bottom floors, but the building needed to be more delicate on the upper floors and heavier in the base. Mr. Wyckoff said they could make the windows smaller and reduce the ceiling height on the top floor. Vice-Chair Kozak said that the spaces that came up between the projecting gables on the second elevations looked like a sloped roof between the dormers but was actually a setback for the deck and balcony. She suggested that the hard edges of the rooftop decks be softened to tie in with form-based transition comments.

Mr. Wyckoff thought the middle structure with the open roof was too large and open and made it look like something at an airport. He suggested that they simplify the materials and replace the disparate elements like the vertical siding and pieces of metal with clapboard. They could make it look like a wooden mill instead of a contemporary building. Mr. McHenry told him that it was just a sketch and that it would be more refined at the next meeting.

Mr. Katz thought the massing was successful but wasn't sure if the Craftsman style was cohesive. He said materials were important and cautioned them to pay attention to the returns on the siding. Mr. Rawling said the footprint was successful, but the articulation of the porches and bays was exaggerated to the point that they lost their previous scaling qualities. There were three tall, skinny towers with steep pitched gable roofs, and the pedestrian scale was extremely different from the adjacent properties. It resembled a chalet to him.

Mr. Gladhill said he had liked seeing the light and air through the two buildings, and now they seemed too large in the front and on the sides. Wide buildings usually had something in-between them. He also thought the demolition of the New Englander went against the HDC review criteria. Mr. Rawling noted that there were some repetitious structures along Islington Street, but

the new building had unique styling. There was variation in the detailing but there could be more variation in the three components.

Chairman Almeida thought the separation of the buildings was a success. They had deep recesses between them, but he thought they could be differentiated more. The base of the building should be explored more because each floor looked the same and exaggerated the building height. He liked the way the corners champed back to an angle but thought it should also occur on the other buildings. The three caps on the roof pitches suggested that the three buildings were alike, but they weren't. He thought the masses should be separated more on the side streets.

Attorney Pelech said the critical issue was the New Englander. They were in the unique situation of having to maintain the sense of neighborhood, but the Historic District in that area was the antithesis because it was one lot deep along Islington Street, which was counterproductive to the neighborhood concept. Islington Street was a busy commercial corridor, and they were trying to replace a very commercial structure with a residential structure that would connect the neighborhood in the back, yet they were in the CBB zone. They had to bring all those factors together to reflect the characteristics of the District, and it did not include the New Englanders behind it. They needed to move forward on the New Englander issue.

Mr. Gladhill said the review criteria mentioned surrounding structures three times. Mr. Katz said the criteria was implicit by stating 'in the District'. Mr. Gladhill said they had to go by what was written, and Mr. Katz told him he was expanding on what was written. Chairman Almeida said he had been on the fence about the New Englander until he knew the scale. Mr. McHenry had shown a piece of the building that was much lower than the New Englander and much further away from the adjacent house than the New Englander was. He wanted to hear from the neighborhood residents to see if they supported the demolition. Mr. McHenry wanted to supply letters from neighbors who supported it, and the more they clarified how much they were opening the area up along the back, the more people would understand it. Chairman Almeida said if the building loomed over the remaining house, it might be different, but 10' more of space was being allowed, so he was closer to approving its removal.

Mr. Katz said a case could be made that the New Englander was inappropriate because it bore no relation to the project and was not reflective of the surrounding buildings. Mr. Wyckoff said he could see the New Englander removed, for the benefit of the community and a project of that size, and to hold the project up just to save one New Englander among a hundred other New Englanders in the immediate area was crazy.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought the plans had improved and also wanted to hear from the abutters. The Commission could not ignore the Master Plan goal of limiting intrusions into residential neighborhoods from larger developments. She was not convinced that the project would change the nature of the neighborhood, but she felt the New Englander was an integral part.

Mr. Rawling thought the neighborhood wanted the quality and character of their neighborhood to exist and perhaps were not overly concerned with protecting the New Englander but instead were concerned with what would happen next to it. He thought the project team had made some good gestures but weren't quite there yet. Mr. Michael Green knew the Commission had done a site

walk and he told them to do another one because the rear of the building where the loading docks and the junk vehicles were was what the neighborhood currently had. The developers were trying to accommodate the requirements of the new owners as well as the neighborhood. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that by preserving the New Englander, the Commission was preserving the building on Islington Street that was a monolithic cement block with no windows and a loading dock filled with junk.

Mr. Green said the property had been on the market for ten years, and the cement block would stay until it was replaced by a project that made sense. The owners had been willing to close the doors and let it decay.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Rick Becksted, Jr. of Islington Street said he loved the New Englander home, and if it were to be moved instead of demolished, it might be acceptable, but the minute they demolished it, they would open the door to everyone else. He attended the Islington Street Neighborhood Association meeting and listened to people talk about the 51 Islington Street building that literally cast a shadow over their neighborhood. The proposed building was one story too high. He said it wasn't a gable roof but just a modern building that would stand out because it didn't blend in with everything else.

Mr. Jean Laurent of 249 Islington Street said the building would kill his neighborhood. It was too big in a quaint historic neighborhood. The footprint would have 30 units and parking for 60 vehicles. The street was tiny, yet 60 vehicles would come out onto it. The building was not just out of character, it was out of sanity.

Mr. Joe Caldarola of 170 Dennett Street said he had a much stronger reaction to the project than the one on 143 Daniel Street. The issues raised by the Commission, like the lack of variation on the street and the building separation and differentiation, didn't make sense. There were no adjoining properties that matched the scale and style of the new building, and he asked what happened to traditional details. He thought there were two ways to develop the property, high intensity or low intensity. They could build the underground parking in keeping with what was already on the street. There was no economic agreement that said they had to overbuild on a property to improve it. He saw this as another big step to destroy the City's scale. Every other building was 2-1/2 stories, and the proposed building was four stories.

Mr. Rick Green, one of the applicants, thought it was unfortunate that only the people who objected to the project showed up at the meetings. There was a tremendous amount of people who were positive about the project. The overall height fit in with the other buildings. The slopes and pitches on the roofs would increase and make it conform more. Maybe if the people in favor of the project wrote more letters, that would work because he felt there were a lot more residents in favor of the project than against it.

Mr. Wyckoff said it was a lot easier to be passionate about things you were against. When anger was involved, it made it easier to express one's opinion. Chairman Almeida said he didn't hear anger, he just heard concerns from residents.

*Vice-Chair Kozak made a motion to **continue** review of the application to the December 4, 2013 meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded.*

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

D. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct new, mixed use, four story structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. 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 continued at the October 9, 2013 meeting to the November 13, 2013 meeting.)*

*Vice-Chair Kozak made a motion to **postpone** review of the application to the December 4, 2013 meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded.*

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

E. Work Session requested by **General Porter Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **32 Livermore Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to previously approved designs (changes to rear stairs, railing, entryway, foundation) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (installation of HVAC equipment and removal of fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 20 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the October 9, 2013 meeting to the November 13, 2013 meeting.)*

*Vice-Chair Kozak made a motion to **postpone** review of the application to the December 4, 2013 meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded.*

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 12:25 a.m., it was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
Acting HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on April 16, 2014.