

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**December 3, 2014
to be reconvened on December 10, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak;
Members John Wyckoff, George Melchior, Dan Rawling; City
Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Planning Board
Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Reagan Ruedig,
Vincent Lombardi

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

*The Board's action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- November 5, 2014

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** the November 5, 2014 minutes. Mr. Rawling seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

II. REQUESTS FOR ONE YEAR EXTENSION

A. Request for one year extension of the Certificate of Approval for 138-140 Maplewood Avenue application – requested by Donna P. Pantelelakos Revocable Trust

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **grant** the one-year extension of the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded.*

*The motion to grant the one-year extension of the Certificate of Approval **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

B. Request for a one year extension of the Certificate of Approval for 18 Mt. Vernon Street application – requested by Nina Shore

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **grant** the one-year extension of the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

*The motion to grant the one-year extension of the Certificate of Approval **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Bruce A. Erickson and Elizabeth A. Levey-Pruyn, owners**, for property located at **35 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (remove slate roof, replace with asphalt, replace metal roofing material with zinc or copper, remove and relocate one window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 29 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 5, 2014 meeting to the December 3, 2014 meeting.)*

Councilor Kennedy left at this point in the meeting.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Mr. Bruce Erickson apologized for the no-shows at previous meetings, stating that he had been struggling with the roof issue for weeks. He found that the roof condition was worse than originally thought, and to get a warranty, the roof would have to come off piece by piece and then be put back on. An asphalt roof was needed in order to have a warranty. He discovered that there was a formula change in the zinc roofing material and it could not be installed in less than 45 degrees, which was a problem. He felt that, because the dormer roof was on and the new bump-out roof was in, it made no sense to put metal on the roof because no one would see it. He also had a tight budget. He wanted to put up asphalt instead and stated that he would keep it uniform and get a warranty.

Mr. Gladhill asked Mr. Erickson if he had pursued faux slate material. Mr. Erickson stated that he had, but he felt it looked too fake and worse than asphalt. Mr. Gladhill stated that there were various manufacturers to choose from and it would look better than an asphalt roof. Mr. Melchior asked whether the issue was that the roof underneath the slate was in bad condition. Mr. Erickson said it was both, and he didn't feel he had enough slate to do the entire house and that labor was also an issue. Mr. Melchior said he had compromised on other aspects of the proposal previously simply because Mr. Erickson said he would retain the slate roof, and he might not support asphalt. Mr. Erickson stated that keeping the slate was not feasible and that it was not a bait-and-switch tactic.

Mr. Rawling stated that he was familiar with problems with slate roofs and they often appeared to be in good shape were not. He also didn't want to shortchange the synthetic slate product. He felt that there were reasonable alternatives because the home was in a prominent location with lots of visibility. In addition to the other changes made to the house, he felt that keeping a slate roof or something close to it was a very significant part of the house.

Ms. Ruedig said she would prefer the prefab because it would mimic the look of a slate roof, and she asked Mr. Erickson if he had considered re-using the slate in the lower areas where it would be more visible. Mr. Erickson agreed that he had considered it but felt it made no sense to have slate in one place and asphalt in another. Ms. Ruedig said she'd prefer to see as much of the slate retained as possible. Mr. Erickson said he had seven roof planes and asked how he would pick and choose which roof it would be. Ms. Ruedig suggested only the first-floor areas.

Mr. Wyckoff asked to see a sample, and Mr. Erickson passed the sample around. Mr. Gladhill asked if Mr. Erickson planned on using real brick for the chimney, and Mr. Erickson stated that he would use a veneer on top of the wooden structure, which had been previously approved.

Chairman Almeida said it was a difficult decision because in past applications, retaining the slate had proven to be the right thing to do and added esthetics and value to the house. He didn't think it was inappropriate to have architectural asphalt shingles, but the house lose its special characteristics. He suggested considering faux slate to be cost-effective and maintain and achieve warranty and having it on the main entrance and the low roofs. It could be a combination of faux and real slate. Mr. Erickson noted that the gable pieces were being redone and that the scallop shingles would remain, but it was costly.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it wasn't a work session and he preferred that the applicant spend his time restoring the trim to the house. Mr. Rawling noted that fairly expensive materials and roofing procedure were originally proposed in the design proposal, and synthetic slate was an alternative and would fall into the amount of the original proposal, so he didn't feel that the Board was asking for a dramatic change by asking for synthetic slate.

Mr. Gladhill questioned why the warranty was related to putting the slate roof back. Mr. Erickson replied that that the slate had to be taken off one piece at a time, which would be time-consuming and costly. Mr. Gladhill asked if the reason Mr. Erickson had an issue with zinc was due to the seasonal temperature, and Mr. Erickson said it was because the family that controlled zinc in New England changed their formula and roofers didn't like using it.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one was present to speak to the application, so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

Vice-Chair Kozak commended Mr. Erickson for doing an expensive restoration on a house she had considered a lost cause. She was thrilled that it was being saved and understood the cost involved. She felt that a roof was a temporary thing and that the slate had been on the house for 100 years. It was conceivable that someone would put something else up in the future. If it was a monumental building on a primary way and had visibility from a close range, she would fight

to save the slate, but the house was on a dead-end side street with limited views, so she didn't think anyone would get close enough to appreciate the slate.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it would preserve the integrity of the District. Most of the houses seen in the south end were asphalt shingles and there were very few wood shingles left in the District. He agreed with Vice-Chair Kozak that a roof was a temporary protection against the elements, and Mr. Erickson's roof had failed. He also agreed that it would not be that visible.

Mr. Melchior stated that he would not vote in support for reasons stated earlier, namely, the considerations he had previously made only because of the slate roof. He felt that the comments about practicality, budget, esthetics, being temporary were not really true because there was nothing temporary about a slate roof. It would outlast all of them. Economically, a properly-installed slate roof was far more economical than any other roof. He asked if an asphalt roof was now the solution in Portsmouth. The Board had denied one applicant from using asphalt but now they were leaning toward it.

Mr. Rawling stated that the alterations of the dormer as well as the chimney demolition were part of the package that said the more prominent elevation would be preserved, so he could not support allowing the asphalt shingle to replace the slate and felt that there were better alternatives.

Ms. Ruedig said she appreciated the time Mr. Erickson took to figure out what to do, and she knew it was a difficult problem, but she could not support it because there was a more creative way to preserve the look and some of the features of the house. The slate could be reapplied on the first-floor section to preserve that look, and then the asphalt could be put on the newer parts of the roof. Replicating the look of the slate in any way possible was preferable to black asphalt shingles. Mr. Gladhill stated that he would not support it because the applicant was going from a slate roof and taking several steps down by going to asphalt, which would not preserve the integrity of the District. Any assessor would say slate roof is more valuable than asphalt, and it would not enhance the architecture and historic character of the building.

Chairman Almeida stated that he wanted to give the applicant the opportunity to table the petition and suggested that it be continued to the following week. Mr. Erickson agreed.

*Chairman Almeida asked the maker of the motion if they wished to **withdraw** the motion. Vice-Chair Kozak **withdrew** her motion, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion to remove the original motion **passed** with all in favor, 7-0.*

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **continue** review of the application to the December 10, 2014 meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion to continue **passed** with all in favor, 7-0.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

2. Petition of **Michael R. and Denise Todd, owners**, for property located at **262-264 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing)

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.

3. Petition of **Mark Wentworth Home, owner**, for property located at **346 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing iron railings with new iron railings) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

4. Petition of **Roxy James Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **110 Chapel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing fencing) and allow a new free standing structure (install new fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 3 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

5. Petition of **Worth Development Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **113 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install mechanical equipment on rooftop) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one was present to speak to the application, so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Consent Agenda Items #2, #3, #4, and #5. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

6. Petition of **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace roof, windows, siding and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Doug Bates, President of the Association, was present to speak to the petition along with Mr. Chuck Thibodeau, the property manager, and Mr. Leroy Smith, the construction representative.

Mr. Bates stated that the structure was unique and contemporary and went through the packet with the Commission. He emphasized the sliding glass doors and the shed roof entrance. He

noted that all the upgrades spoke to the appearance and lifestyle of the building. The roof would be replaced by architectural shingles and the eaves would be slightly extended due to water runoff problems. A small section of the tar and gravel roof would be replaced by a membrane roof. The existing skylights, except for the one over the employee entrance, would stay. There were no changes in the windows except for the ones that would be removed. He felt that the best solution for the building was to replace all the wood with AZEK. The existing cedar shingles would be replaced by cedar impressions, and he showed a mockup to the Board.

Mr. Gladhill asked what the trim material was, and Mr. Thibodeau said it was AZEK. Mr. Bates thought it would make the building look professional and contemporary. Mr. Lombardi felt that one of the attractive parts of the building was the texture of the cedar shingle and found the faux cedar disturbing. He thought it would be distracting because it would be flat on a building with a lot of texture.

Vice-Chair Kozak commended their goal for a weather-tight building but felt that one problem with cedar impressions was the shadows. What was so remarkable about natural shingles was the texture from the light. She felt there were two big differences in the product, one being a different look and shadow line, and the shingles being cut and the scallops which would get worse. She felt a perfect compromise would be fiber cement, which was rigid and flat. Mr. Smith said they researched those and found that they were failing on City buildings. Vice-Chair Kozak suggested that he check out the Hardy product.

Mr. Rawling stated that the building was significant in its time period and location and designed to respond to its contemporary context. There were not many buildings like it, and they needed to pay respect to the detail that went into its design. Portsmouth was a weathered, shingle, rough, waterfront world, and the Chamber represented the City. The changes proposed in the window designs were significant changes to the fenestration patterns of the building, turning into vertical elements, which he felt were different than the proportional openings in the existing patterns that reflected old wharf buildings. The quality of line work around the window panes and sashes needed to be considered. He referenced the notes about the AZEK panel being applied and noted that it had a different characteristic design detail than the simple shingle expressions on the other parts of the building. Therefore, he could not support the window changes and the synthetic shingles. He felt that the front of the building should be wood, and the rest could be AZEK.

Ms. Ruedig agreed and stated that she had noticed the infilling of all the vertical shingles on the corners or the strip across the front door, which was not part of the traditional vocabulary of buildings. She felt that the vinyl shingle looked plastic and that they had to preserve the cedar shingles. She asked Mr. Smith why they switched to architectural shingles. Mr. Smith replied that the whole complex had architectural shingles and they wanted to keep the colors that were there but step it up to make it contemporary looking. Ms. Ruedig felt that the prefab looked more modern than the architectural shingles.

Mr. Wyckoff had a problem with the Commissioners respecting certain elements of the building that were poorly designed and thrown together. Two courses of wooden shingles over a door were bound to fail, and he felt there would be a lot of rot. He did not see a problem with the

window and sliding glass door replacements, but he had a problem with the vinyl siding and people coming into the City and seeing it. Mr. Rawling asked about the color of the roof and if it was a replacement roof to match the shingles. Mr. Bates said it was the original roof.

Chairman Almeida stated that when he first saw the application, he felt the same as the other Commissioners, but the mockup convinced him to be more accepting of the installation. He suggested that the application be continued to the next week's meeting. He had no issues with the window changes and thought the AZEK would be fine on the building, but perhaps authentic wood shingles could be used on the front and a combination on the sides and back. Using composite materials on the building was not offensive to him, but the faking of the shingle was a bigger problem. Mr. Bates said he would be happy to do it on the front.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested the stipulation that the front of the building be finished with wood. Mr. Lombardi felt that the side view of the building was also very visible to the street and preferred that the side look as good as the front. Chairman Almeida said that he had not included it because the opposite side would have the parking.

Mr. Wyckoff thought that the Board had to consider the context of the building and the fact that it sat 100 feet from the street. He felt that people wouldn't even look at the vinyl shingles, but when they pulled up to the building, they would see wooden shingles on the front of the building, and that was what counted.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Joseph Cunningham of 195 Washington Street stated that he operated a business on Maplewood Avenue and could see the building from his office. He did not feel that anyone would see a big difference. He thought that breaking up the windows would make it more esthetically pleasing and that the single-pane glass was not something the City should emulate. Putting wood on the front would be a big improvement, and the more substantial trim would look better and bolder than thin trim. He felt that the applicants would do what they said they would do, and they were not trying to disguise the building as an old building.

No one else rose to speak so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **continue** the application to the January 7, 2015 meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion to continue **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

7. Petition of **Portwalk HI, LLC, owner**, and **Bob Wongsachua, applicant**, for property located at **35 Portwalk Place**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install awnings, add louver venting above door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Mr. Jamie Broadbent was present to speak to the application. He stated that they were proposing the addition of five awnings to the Hampton Inn. Two awnings would face Portwalk Place and three awnings would face Deer Street. He passed out samples of the material to the Board and said it was a clear cedar with a white stain. The awnings would be grouped together over two bays apiece and would provide shelter upon entering the space. He showed the elevations and discussed the louver over the back door that would be removed. He felt that the different awnings over different storefronts would add variety and give character to the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Lombardi asked about the existing louver over the door. Mr. Broadbent said it was a proposed louver, adding that the original design was glass and would revert back to glass. The door would remain. Mr. Gladhill asked about icicles forming on the material and whether it was sloped. Mr. Broadbent replied that it was sloped and had a clear material over it to shed water that was open on the top to direct the water down.

Mr. Rawling stated that the design guidelines for surrounding areas discouraged the use of frosted film on the windows. He thought it was an interesting design for the awnings but felt it was discouraging that all the City awnings were turning into signboards and offering no function in sheltering pedestrians. He also felt that the building was designed to have the two-story glazing fronts as a break in the rhythm, but the awning design brought it all down and negated the original design intent of the building. It projected awnings for signboards at a one-story level. If the awnings were real, they would slope back and not have that heaviness. He felt that it was interesting design but not proper for the building. Mr. Broadbent felt that the two-story awning broke at every bay and maintained the two-story feel.

Mr. Gladhill asked Mr. Cracknell whether it was a non-traditional awning because usually awnings were cloth material, and the applicant's awnings were made out of wood and jutted out much shorter than a traditional awning. He asked at what point an awning was an awning and at what point it was a sign. Mr. Cracknell replied that any sign going on any awning was considered a sign area. The area allowed on the wall could be calculated and a permit could be issued, and it would not be the whole awning but the space around it. As soon as a message was on an awning, it became a sign.

Chairman Almeida stated that he appreciated the design but agreed that it provided a limited amount of protection, but if it was projected out further, it would protect more as an awning. He liked the wood and the detail on the underside of the awning. He felt it would be an improvement if the filming of the door, if necessary, could be creative and graphic.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that it didn't read as an awning to her but as a building element because it wasn't transparent. She felt it would be perceived as a solid-built element that would look like a piece of architecture. She liked the wood and the contemporary slant but felt that the placement was awkward because it was not aligned with the trim/band. It was neither an awning nor a building element currently.

Mr. Gladhill was still uncomfortable with the issue of water coming down and felt it could be a safety issue. Mr. Wyckoff told him that it wasn't in the Commission's purview and was a Planning Board issue.

Mr. Broadbent stated that he would discuss with the owner the comments about making the awning deeper, raising the proportion so it fit the banding, and the graphics idea.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the application, so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **continue** the application to the December 10, 2014 meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded. The motion to continue **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

8. Petition of **Ten State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **10 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (change window manufacturer, coordinate MEP/FP systems design, and screening, modifications to some roof elements) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 4 and lies within the CD4 and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself and Vice-Chair Kozak took his place.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Mr. Rob Harbeson was present to speak to the application. He stated that he had an updated perspective and elevations. He stated that the masonry enclosure would be extended to read as a full tower element, the tide clock would be retained, the elevator vent would be painted to match the brick, and the conservatory would be enlarged. The window group would be tightened up and a secondary door would go into the mechanical area. The parapet wall would be raised and the cap would be gray. The deck rail would be changed out from glass to a horizontal cable rail, and the framing of the decks would be increased in depth and have a trim band added. All the posts and deck trim would be painted slate gray.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Harbeson to further explain the context of the building, and Mr. Harbeson did so. Mr. Rawling stated that he was glad to see the tide clock. He felt that the changes all looked good, with the exception of the removal of the sailcloth shades on the top that gave the building personality and distinction. Mr. Harbeson stated that they were concerned about safety and maintenance issues and that the shades could not be in certain locations. Mr. Rawling felt that the shades could work, especially if people used the roof decks because they would want protection. He also felt that an appropriate piece of architectural design would prevent people from having deck furniture

Mr. Gladhill referred to the notation on the plan where the tide clock was ‘to be determined’ and ask the reason for it. Mr. Harbeson stated that the tide clock would definitely be on the building.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the application, so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Rawling moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That the tide clock shall be installed as presented.*
- 2) That the sail shades shall be retained as previously designed and approved.*

Mr. Rawling stated that the shading and protection was going to be installed in one form or another, and it was important that they had something in their purview. Ms. Ruedig agreed but said she preferred that the applicant come back with another option if the sail shade was not something they didn’t want to pursue. Mr. Cracknell stated that the Board either had to continue the application or vote on it, in which case the stipulation would hold. If the element was removed from the vote, the applicant had the right to come back with a substitution. Mr. Wyckoff confirmed that the motion was to approve the entire project with the exception of the sail cloth. Mr. Gladhill wanted to add the stipulation that the tide clock TBD notation be removed and that it be made clearer that the tide clock would be put on the building.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that she would support the project and had no problem with the elimination of the sail shades because every new building in the City had furniture on roof decks, and she felt that the Planning Board would address it.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Almeida called for the vote. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

9. Petition of **Sylvia H. Marple Revocable Trust of 2012, owner**, for property located at **4 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (expand fire escape stairs to third floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 22 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Alex Ross of Ross Engineering was present to speak to the application. He stated that the unit was surrounded by other units with fire escapes to the 2nd and 3rd floors. In his unit, he only had a fire escape to the 2nd floor and needed it extended to the 3rd floor. He wanted it to be functional and in keeping with the surrounding look. He distributed a handout to the Commission showing the location of the proposed fire escape. Since the 3rd floor was McHenry Architecture and only had one window as a means of egress, the fire escape would provide

another means and make it safer and code-conforming. He stated that he met with the Chief Building Inspector and Mr. McHenry on site, and both were pleased with the design. He showed the spiral staircases in abutting units. Their unit just has a straight run, but he would expand the existing fire escape to the 3rd floor with a spiral design that would be steel, black, and the same dimensions as the other fire escapes.

Mr. Gladhill verified that the Building Inspector had no problem with the lack of a door. Mr. Ross stated that the Inspector was fine with using the window and happy with some means of egress. Chairman Almeida expressed the importance of the location, even though it was the back, and felt that the addition did not detract from it at all. He said it was a wonderful design.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the application, so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Mr. Melchior seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **303 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **303 Islington Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct third floor dormers and construct rear addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 11 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone the application to the December 10, 2014 meeting.)*

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **postpone** the work session to December 10, 2014. Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion to postpone **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

B. Work Session requested by **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar panels) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business A and Historic Districts.

The project manager Mr. Chuck Thibodeau and the solar designer Mr. Jack Bingham were present to speak to the application. Mr. Thibodeau explained how the back of the building faced the water and how flat the roof on the rear was. There were three building on site that had the rear elevation, and he was requested that solar panels be placed in those locations.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the panels had to be lifted up at that angle. Mr. Bingham said there were compromises involved due to pitch, orientation, and so on, but the benefits of tilting were downplayed. The wind and snow caused them to lose production in the winter, but production went up in the summer. It wasn't ideal, but functional. Mr. Lombardi asked if it was a southern exposure and was told that one was southeast and two were southwest.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they had a site plan and was told that they did not. Mr. Bingham showed the layout and the angled pitches of the roofs with open spaces and stated that one roof was visible but the other two were not. Mr. Rawling said he was supportive of the idea in general but felt there would be challenges with the roof layout and appurtenances. He especially felt that the Board needed a good sense of the reflectivity of the surfaces and asked the applicant to show the Board the degree of light reflectance and loss at a future work session.

Mr. Gladhill said he had no problem with the panels if they could not be seen from a public way and he said he would tour the neighborhood to see the different angles and visibility. Mr. Lombardi asked if it would be a shared array on the three buildings. Mr. Thibodeau said it would be used specifically for the common areas. Mr. Wyckoff asked what type of panel it would be. Mr. Bingham stated that it was a blue polycrystalline with a pattern, but no specific panel had been chosen and they had some flexibility. Ms. Ruedig said that they were new buildings, so the Board could be flexible. She preferred simple black grids, however.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that it was a perfect opportunity to use solar panels because it was a new building, not a focal one, and would be hard to see from a primary way. She also felt that the panels would go with the era of the architecture. Chairman Almeida agreed and thought it was more important that the panels were appropriate rather than being seen. Mr. Wyckoff discussed a potential problem with the hip roofs on the end of the buildings cutting a triangular swath through the panels. Mr. Bingham said he could stagger the panels or draw a straight line.

Chairman Almeida told the applicant that there was a lot of support for his application but they just needed to provide the details.

The Commission voted to continue review of the application at the January 2015 meeting.

C. Work Session requested by **Hayscales Real Estate Trust, owner**, for property located at **236 Union Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct two family residential home) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 22 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts.

Mr. Richard Lo representing the applicant was there to speak to the petition. He stated that the property was at the edge of the Historic District and on a side street. Middle Street was a mixture of buildings, and he showed the nature of the existing structures in the zone. Most were residential with a few commercial properties, with a variety of single-family and multi-family properties. The scale of the buildings was 2-1/2 stories and predominantly gable forms. Most had been altered to some degree. He noted that the subject property was not considered a

contributing property. The existing building was a woodshop structure and used to be an auto body shop. He wanted to demolish the entire structure and replace it with a residential one that would look like a single-family house, but he wanted to retain the possibility of making it a two-family structure. Off-street parking and driveways were discussed. The portion of the house closest to the street would be compliant with all zoning setbacks. He proposed to use some of the footprint of the existing building for a garage and parking. Mr. Wyckoff asked if he had gotten a variance for that yet. Mr. Lo said he had not but had a preliminary discussion to see how practical it would be. He showed elevations and discussed the window openings, the roof, the rear slope, and the fact that the building toward the back changed in character. He thought that the roof form respected the neighborhood and worked well with a contemporary structure.

Ms. Ruedig stated that the massing fit in very well as well as the rooflines and window patterns, and she had no problem with the demolition of the existing building. Mr. Lombardi said he appreciated new architecture in a modern building and preferred that to a faux old building.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he also had no problem with the demolition. He thought the applicant had done a good job with the massing and form and also identifying the context in that zone. His only concern was the detailing on the modern structure and suggested that Mr. Lo draw some details from the other buildings. Mr. Gladhill stated that he wanted it to fit in with the surrounding neighborhood and was eager to see more detailed drawings.

Mr. Rawling thought that the general massing and concept was good but felt that the front elevation and sides were quite stark, especially the windows. The windows looked undersized and needed detail, maybe even some horizontal head extensions to put some dimension and shadow. He asked if the garage would have the 'magic' door. Mr. Lo said that it would and that carriage doors would give it a fine reveal. Mr. Rawling felt it could be too much flat wall and suggested breaking up the horizontal aspect. Mr. Lo agreed and said the carriage portion was more challenging than the rest because it would face the street. Mr. Rawling thought that having the wall and roof material the same on the garage could be heavy and overwhelming. They further discussed the roof and cladding material.

Chairman Almeida thought it was a wonderful design and asked that the mechanical units be designed to fit in and not stick out. He thought the horizontal siding was wonderful in adding to the historic elements in the street.

Mr. Lombardi asked what would be done with windows. Mr. Lo said they would use high-performance windows, most likely triple glazed, and they had flexibility.

Mr. Wyckoff thought the structure had a Scandinavian design with a traditional form but a change in materials and windows. Mr. Rawling stated that as one went deeper into the neighborhood, there was a lot of modernization done to the houses, so having a transitional piece would be good. Mr. Wyckoff thought that the applicant could go to the BOA for the form approval and come back to the HDC with details.

The Commission voted to continue review of the application at the January 2015 meeting.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that she was leaving her position after 7-1/2 years at the end of the month due to personal family issues but hoped to continue serving the City in some way.

Chairman Almeida told her he was devastated when she gave her notice and that she would be terribly missed. He spoke of her great logic and clarity. He also noted that the Commission had come far in getting the tools they identified, and as each one left through the coming years, they would know those tools would be used. He told Vice-Chair Kozak that she had been a part of that.

V. ADJOURNMENT

*At 9:40 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault

HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on January 7, 2015.