

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**December 10, 2014
reconvened from December 3, 2014**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chairman Joseph Almeida, George Melchior

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

Vice Chair Kozak conducted the meeting in Chairman Almeida's absence.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (CONTINUED)

- November 12, 2014
- November 19, 2014

Councilor Kennedy recused herself.

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (6-0) to approve both sets of minutes.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL

- 402 State Street
- Off Washington Street (Puddle Dock Pond Skating Rink)
- 77 Wentworth Street

Mr. Cracknell briefly described the nature of the items.

Ms. Ruedig moved to grant Administrative Approval for the three items. Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion passed unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.

III. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Frank and Irja Cilluffo, owners**, for property located at **179 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove

widows walk) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 15 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was approved at the September 10, 2014 meeting with the stipulation that proposed plans be submitted at December 3, 2014 meeting for final review and approval.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Paul Spurling showed the Commission a set of drawings and a sample. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the balusters for the rail system were original and was told that they were. He asked if the deck would be rebuilt, and Mr. Spurling said that it would. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be trim boards around the perimeter, and Mr. Spurling replied that the actual design was all part of the deck and that the keystones had been added. Councilor Kennedy thought Mr. Spurling had said it was different, and Mr. Spurling explained that the subassembly component was more engineering for longevity, so the design was in kind. Mr. Rawling asked how many original pinwheels remained and was told four. Mr. Wyckoff thought they must have been replaced more recently. Mr. Spurling told him they had found a date of 1984 on the end corner post and that some of the pieces dated back to the early 1900s, and any piece of the balustrade that was in decent condition would be returned for archiving on the property.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, so Vice-Chair Kozak closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy moved that the request be **approved** as presented with the revised plans dated December 3, 2014 as presented. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

Councilor Kennedy thanked the applicant for making the project fit in with the surrounding properties. Mr. Wyckoff said it was consistent in character.

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

2. 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 December 3, 2014 meeting to the December 10, 2014 meeting.)*

Councilor Kennedy recused herself because she was an abutter.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Erickson stated that when they tore the house apart, it was apparent that all the slate had to come off. They wanted to replace all the slate and the bump out with asphalt. Based on the Commission's feedback from the previous week, they found two slate pieces, which they had samples of. As for keeping some of the existing slate as suggested, they could keep the slate on the west and south elevations. Mr. Erickson added that they moved a window to the south elevation and needed permission for it to be moved to the street side.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the main body of the house with the new dormer would be shingled with the product as well as the roofs on the first floor. Mr. Erickson stated that the visible west and south elevations would either have slate put on them or would be left alone. However, they could not be left alone indefinitely, so the roofs would be replaced with slate. Ms. Ruedig felt that the asphalt product matched the existing slate better and thought it would make a difference because it would be visible and appreciated.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, so Vice-Chair closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved that the request be **approved** as presented with the revised plans date stamped December 10, 2014. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig stated that the replacement materials on the main roof would be in keeping with the look of slate and would retain the feel of the historical character of the house. She felt that it was very appropriate and would be a positive addition that would contribute to the surrounding context. The window would help the design of the front of the house and was in keeping with the original approval. Mr. Wyckoff agreed and thought the window helped the front façade. Its design was compatible with surrounding properties and also had innovative technology, and he thought it was important that they found a product simulating slate. Mr. Gladhill said he would not support it because he felt that replacing a slate roof with asphalt was detrimental.

*The motion **passed** by a 5-1 vote with Mr. Gladhill voting in opposition.*

3. 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. *(This item was postponed at the December 3, 2014 meeting to the December 10, 2014 meeting.*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jamie Broadbent was present to speak. He stated that he had some subtle changes based on previous feedback from the Board. The size of the awnings was increased from a 1.7' depth to 3' for a more proper awning. The awning on Deer Street could not get to 3', so it was 26 feet.

The proportions and size of the awnings and elevations had not changed. Mr. Broadbent felt that keeping the awnings lower was more functional. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the option for the glass panel being replaced by louvers was out, and Mr. Broadbent agreed and said they were keeping the screening for the bays. They would also do graphics on the frosted glass on the last façade. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it was currently frosted, and Mr. Broadbent said it wasn't. Mr. Rawling said he appreciated the effort to make them more awning-like but could not support the frosted panels on the windows. Ms. Ruedig asked if the frosting could be removed, and Mr. Broadbent said it could. Councilor Kennedy asked the rationale for having a wood awning. Mr. Broadbent said they felt it was a natural material that went well with the restaurant's design.

Ms. Rudig felt that Mr. Broadbent was using high-quality materials and it was an interesting design. Because it was a new building, she thought it was acceptable to have a contemporary design but hoped it would not end up looking bulky. She fully supported it. Mr. Lombardi stated that he also liked it because it was unique and attractive. He had been concerned about frosting the glass but was okay with it because it was applied mylar on the inside.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said that it was definitely something one did not normally see. He felt that the paneling should be done properly, and he wanted to see what the awning would look like before it went up to ensure that what the Board approved was fulfilled with what Portwalk agreed to do during the design process.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That the background molding and trim to the panels that was previously approved shall be implemented prior to the installation of the awning.*
- 2) That frosted glass shall not be used as presented.*
- 3) That the applicant shall seek a license from the City Council for allowing a 36" awning along the Deer Street facade.*

Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy stated that the applicant met the criteria for the design on the top. She agreed that the Commission had pushed hard not to have unclear glass. The application was shortened and she thought it should go to the City Council. Ms. Ruedig asked why, and Councilor Kennedy replied that applications typically went to the City Council for projections over the property, and to ensure that the glass was clear, she wanted the City's support. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he agreed with the comments on the awning but had trouble with the glass. He felt that people put a lot of things, like signs, on glass from the inside, and he wasn't sure if he agreed with the rationale about clear glass. Councilor Kennedy asked Mr. Cracknell to clarify the process. Mr. Cracknell did so, saying it was jurisdictional because it was applied directly to the glass. Based on precedent and the implications of frosted glass on the ground floor relative to the appearance and appropriateness of the building, it needed to be reviewed and approved by

the HDC. Mr. Rawling said it was specifically mentioned in the guidelines. He thought the awning would look different if it was shorter than the others. Ms. Ruedig said she would support the motion and didn't see a problem with the frosted glass because it was a reversible process.

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

IV. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

A. Work Session requested by **303 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **303 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct third floor dormers, 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 item was postponed at the December 3, 2014 meeting to the December 10, 2014 meeting.)*

The architect Mr. Steve McHenry, Mr. Jeremiah Johnson, Mr. Brandon Holben, and Mr. Ed Benway, owner, were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Johnson showed the massing options and stated that there was no increase in height or expansion in their dormers. Councilor Kennedy asked the history and age of the property. Mr. Benway said the building was built in 1910 and had been through various uses. Over the past five years, he had removed the vinyl siding and tried to restore the building by putting in a different window and was careful to restore it to its original state. He wanted to ensure that the building's offices and apartment blended in with the period and the neighborhood. The railings were similar to those in downtown Portsmouth. The addition in the back was small, and he wanted to bring it to its original character by squaring it off and putting a rooftop patio on it.

Ms. Ruedig thought the building was more of a 1850s building but felt that Mr. Benway had done a good job in restoring it. She did not wish to see the front changed because it looked good as it was. She had trouble accepting the dormers on the side of the building because several surrounding properties had clean gables, and she thought it would be more appropriate to mirror them. She had no problem with the addition on the back side because it wouldn't be visible from Islington Street. Mr. Gladhill agreed about the side façade and thought that dormers were inappropriate. Mr. Wyckoff disagreed because the buildings on Islington Street all had dormers, and he couldn't see how the Commission could single out the applicant's house and say they couldn't put dormers on. He asked Mr. Benway whether the windows over the projecting bays on the front façade would increase in height. Mr. Benway said they would not. Mr. Wyckoff asked why Mr. Benway was putting railings on, and Mr. Benway said it was for decorative purposes. Mr. Wyckoff advised Mr. Benway to be careful in picking out modern iron railings that were thin because the other ones on Islington Street were more substantial. He appreciated that Mr. Benway added modern elements to the new addition but wondered whether a parapet would surround the deck surface and if so, how Mr. Benway would drain the roof surface.

Councilor Kennedy discussed the criteria of surrounding properties and agreed about the dormers on Islington Street. She thought it would be fine for the back of the house and suggested that

Mr. Benway use examples from surrounding properties. Mr. Rawling stated that he could not support the dormers because most of Islington Street was without dormers or had them in a different style. He also thought the iron railings were not appropriate.

Vice-Chair Kozak was not opposed to the dormers because they were an established vernacular. She felt that the level of detail on the project house exceeded the other houses but felt that the configuration of the dormers was problematic. On the sides and back, she felt it would be effective to show the differentiation of the addition. She asked whether they were going to change the main front door. Mr. Holben stated that they weren't. Mr. Benway asked the Commission what they would like to see for dormers. Councilor Kennedy felt that an historic building would not have dormers. Mr. Rawling thought the dormers were broken up well but it was a significant change to the building and streetscape. Ms. Ruedig stated that dormers were subjective and not a problem with new construction, but she didn't feel they were appropriate for the building. Vice-Chair Kozak said that she would hate to see dormers outlawed and felt it had to be case-by-case. Dormers were mostly not approved by the Board. Mr. Benway asked if they would work if they were redesigned. Mr. Gladhill thought if there were three dormers of equal size with no infill, it might be okay, but he still thought it might not be appropriate for the front façade. Mr. Rawling said it would be difficult for him to accept dormers on Rockingham Street. Ms. Ruedig said she could approve dormers on Rockingham Street. Mr. Wyckoff thought that if the dormers were redesigned, they'd end up looking heavy. He felt that the ones on the front of the building should not be connected. He disagreed about the small railings and felt that as long as they were just decorative, they did not have to be 42" but could be 18" high.

Councilor Kennedy asked Mr. Cracknell if he thought the Building Inspector would require 42" railings. Mr. Cracknell thought Mr. Wyckoff said they would be functional balconies, which would need a 42" railing. He felt that both Mr. Rawling and Mr. Wyckoff were right. The model needed to reflect windows or doors, and if they were functional doors, the railings needed to be 42 inches.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment, so Vice-Chair Kozak closed the public session.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant indicated that they would return for a work session/public hearing.

B. Work Session requested by **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct three story mixed use building with below grade parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued to the December meeting.)*

The architect Mr. Steve McHenry and Mr. Brandon Holben were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry began with the design revision highlights and said he wanted to

discuss the differences between Option 9R and Option 10. Mr. Holben said they shifted the primary entry form on Bridge Street and pulled away the upper level from the Buckminster House and increased the setback. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the side setback from the Buckminster House was 11 feet. Mr. Holben stated that the front and rear setbacks were 11 feet. He noted that the quantity of the street-facing roof decks had been reduced. Councilor Kennedy stated that she saw it as two fronts and that Tanner Street had to be considered.

Mr. Holben stated that Option 9R was the 3-story building with a full mansard roof and Option 10 was a 3-story building with an attic penthouse. Both were reduced in square footage. Mr. McHenry said they tried to create visibility from all viewpoints and showed the differences in how the elevation stepped back in both options. Mr. Wyckoff asked why the windows were left out. Mr. McHenry said they were still working on the massing and would have more detailed drawings. Mr. Rawling said that he preferred a hybrid of the two, Option 9R's first two floors and the top floor of Option 10. He felt that Option 10 had a better appearance of balance. Mr. Lombardi felt that it looked more attractive with a smaller office. Councilor Kennedy said she would push for more doors and shops but thought the massing was still too big.

Ms. Ruedig thought they were going in the right direction because bringing the massing down was much better as well as lowering the roof line. She still felt that it was too big. She thought the spacing between the two abutting buildings was more appropriate and thought a penthouse could work, and it could be helpful to have one taller element and the rest lower. Mr. Lombardi thought the massing did not change between the two options from the perspective of the rear of the building and the views. The houses behind the building looked dwarfed by the mass. Mr. McHenry said it was a difficult site because it was on the edge of various zones. Mr. Lombardi was concerned about 'big building creep' and thought the tiny neighborhood was important. Mr. McHenry referred to the graphic showing the radius around the neighborhood and their definition of context and said it was the reason they chose the building to be highlighted and shown near the smaller buildings because it had already crept.

Mr. Gladhill still believed that an appearance of two separate buildings was better. He liked the penthouse in Option 10 but thought it overpowered the building and would be better if it was lopped off. Mr. Wyckoff said the central tower bothered him and thought that removing the penthouse and reducing the central tower so that it read as two Victorian buildings would be more successful. Mr. Rawling thought the section worked as a transitional element, and he further discussed the combination of the two schemes, saying that stepping and mid-size of the buildings were important. Mr. Wyckoff said he wasn't against a large building at the site, but the massing of the height bothered him and he didn't feel that it should be shrunk down because of the small houses on Tanner Street.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought that Option 10 had developed well and had a more cohesive design, but that Option 9R was trying to do too many things. Option 10 had the dividing tower in the middle that read as a singular element with the penthouse and was more effective in dividing the mass. Councilor Kennedy said she hoped the Commission had learned from past mistakes. It was a community, and there had to be some way to step the massing down. Mr. McHenry said there was a large open parking lot on Bridge Street that would have a pocket park at its south end to help anchor it, and felt it was necessary to relate to the larger buildings. Mr. Rawling

discussed the two-story street concept, the roof sloping, the setback, the neighborhood context, and the volume and dimensions of the windows. He felt there could be more differentiation between the left and right sides of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bill Brassil of 7 Islington Street thought the massing was too big and agreed with Mr. Rawling that they needed to protect the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Ed Carrier of 7 Islington Street asked for the height of the Buckminster House at the top of the ell and the maximum elevation of the building, which Mr. McHenry responded to. Mr. Carrier assumed that the building was a full story over the ell of the Buckminster House where the visual impact would be. He felt that the project was quite a few feet over the Buckminster House and that Option 10 was 10' higher than the Buckminster House. He thought that things were improving but agreed that the building took up the whole footprint. He told the Commission that they only had once chance to get it right.

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street noted that it was the green section of the Character-Based Zoning and allowed for attic space to do a short 4th floor. (Mr. Cracknell verified that it was the average going around the building). Mr. Becksted said the tower element was over. Mr. Cracknell said it would have to be proved that they were under the building height when it was averaged together and that it was 3-1/2 stories. The half-story was allowed. An attic was a habitable place, but it was more about volume control than being habitable. Mr. Becksted thought the zone should have been orange. He said an original foundation would be blasted and would have a strong effect on the Buckminster House. He was also concerned about the driveway that would be taken away. Councilor Kennedy asked Mr. Cracknell to define a half-story. Mr. Cracknell defined it as an attic being a story within a roof and not under the roof, and said it was allowed on top of a building depending on the District. Habitable space was not part of the equation.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant indicated that they would return for another work session.

C. Work Session requested by **HarborCorp LLC, owner**, for property located **Deer Street, Russell Street, and Maplewood Avenue** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use building containing hotel, conference center, condominiums, supermarket, and parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 21, Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 28 and Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued to the December meeting.)*

Mr. Chris Thompson, Ms. Carla Goodknight, and Ms. Susan Duprey were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Thompson said he hoped there was a way to focus on the garage on Deer Street and Maplewood Avenue and get specific direction to resolve it. He also wanted to discuss how they could create passages and breaks in the building. Councilor Kennedy asked whether

massing and setbacks had been fully discussed. Vice-Chair Kozak said they did not have a formal vote on going to the next level, just a strong consensus. Mr. Cracknell said they were transitioning from massing into the façade. Ms. Duprey said that the two different styles would be emphasized and hoped that a preference would be made so they could return with more finalized pieces. Ms. Goodknight went through the presentation. Councilor Kennedy asked if the walkway had to go to the City Council, and Mr. Cracknell replied that it did. Ms. Goodknight said they had added a retail entry and additional retail, and there was still a substantial opening at the end and a pedestrian alleyway maintained. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was a sidewalk and was told that there was. Ms. Goodknight discussed artistic representations and said her goal was to create something functional and modern. She discussed the retail parking, with its open grillwork and less brick. The masonry mass of the buildings was broken up but the buildings still looked compatible. Lighter metal elements flanking the centerpiece showed more of a collection of forms that related to each other rather than a monolithic form. She stated that she would focus on Segments 1, 2 and 3 individually. She discussed an option to add banners and make the façade interesting and showed a lighter metal grillwork system on the green roof to create a more industrial feel. Councilor Kennedy asked about a 10% green space. Ms. Goodknight showed two different options and discussed art work, textures, adding greenery on a trellis system and promoting the metal artwork display. She mentioned a metal curtain/wind panel. She wanted to promote the art of the North End with an architectural design by adding a 3D design or a surface display.

Ms. Goodknight showed an option of a transparent garage with more differentiation and asked the Commission if they preferred that or blending in like the other option. Ms. Ruedig thought the second, more industrial, option was interesting and wanted to know more about the materials. It seemed lighter in a way but heavy on the black structure. Councilor Kennedy thought the Commission still needed to consider the garage's massing because people would see it coming into Portsmouth. Mr. Gladhill had trouble relating the industrial look of the metal to the community because Portsmouth was never an industrial city. Ms. Goodknight said they had discussed building historical replicas and the site being transitional, and she thought the industrial could be a little lighter. Mr. Lombardi asked if there was an option that combined the best of both options because he felt that the industrial option looked heavy. Mr. Wyckoff agreed and hoped the applicant could find a compromise. He felt that it was unsettling to call it industrial because the bricks and the banners didn't gel. He objected to putting banners on buildings, and he wasn't sure if putting public art in that location was feasible. He hoped the applicant could come up with a better design for the back of the garage that took the best of the industrial aspect and compromised with the brick.

Mr. Rawling thought the garage went back to the original elevation and found the transition out of the base and the alternating between the brick top and the bases troubling. He thought it was disconcerting to have a two-story open space and also thought it wasn't historic. The trellis element's scale was more pleasing than the metal pieces and simulated windows, and he suggested geometric elements instead of a window pattern. Councilor Kennedy thought that the bottom needed to have more life, like doors and access. She did not see it as a transitional building and felt that the houses on the hill had to be honored. The greenery on the side of the building might cover up bad architecture but wouldn't work in the winter, and neither would the banners. She didn't want to see big bottom surface areas because it was the first thing people

would see coming into Portsmouth. She preferred an architectural structure where the building didn't look so massive and also wanted to see more green space.

Mr. Lombardi said he saw a series of brick monoliths and asked if there could be something other than vertical and horizontal to get some variation. Mr. Rawling agreed and suggested some elements to break up the roof articulation. Vice-Chair Kozak noted a lot of vertical blackness with straight walls around the entire building, with no thickness to them. It was a giant wall, and they could articulate more horizontals and break up the mass. She was also concerned about the metal grillwork because it could look like black grills against a void. Lighter colors or different materials of mesh would work to get different reflections. She also noted that the straight roof across the mass didn't follow the landscape or match the rhythm of the City. Mr. Rawling thought that changing the rhythm on the top floor of one of the buildings could make a difference. Mr. Wyckoff felt that Segment 3 was more successful. Councilor Kennedy was also leery of the grills because they could make the building look like a prison.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jon Gilbert of 15 Thornton Street stated that his concern was the mass of the building. He thought it would help if the overhead mass was reduced to show two buildings. He was also concerned about the back of the building because, coming from Maplewood Avenue, a high roofline would be seen. His third concern was the traffic on Maplewood Avenue, and he suggested doing away with the Maplewood Avenue entrance.

Mr. Jerry Zelin of 70 Kensington Road agreed with Mr. Gilbert. He thought the project was much more than it seemed because it included a hotel, 24 condos, and parking challenges. He felt that it was a humongous development, with three combined lots the length equal to the height of the Prudential Building. The footprint was 50% larger than Portwalk 3. He was shocked to hear that the HDC was transitioning from massing to the details when they had not utilized the necessary tools to look at the massing in context. They had seen a computerized model earlier, but there was nothing in 3D and the HDC didn't have the best information they needed to judge the mass of the building in context. The buildings on the hill were depicted as looming over the project, and that wasn't reality. Another slide indicated that the Whole Foods wall near the entrance was 93 feet, but the rendering showed three cars covering those 93 feet, which was inaccurate. He felt that it was premature to get into the façade of the building and move beyond massing without utilizing the available tools.

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1390 Islington Street agreed about the tools and wanted to see it in 3D so that the public could walk through the presentation. (Mr. Cracknell stated that the building had been brought into the City's 3D model and what was seen on the screen was what was seen online. It was the same data set). Mr. Becksted suggested making the columns larger instead of broken up in different sections, and then filling it with mesh screen.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street stated that she had gone to all the north end Charette sessions, where they discussed how the area should be different, taller and more industrial than the rest of the City, and she thought it was going in the right direction. It wasn't taller than Portwalk, and she didn't think that doors were needed everywhere. She felt that the

building had to be based on what was inside of it and also felt that there was plenty of green space. She said that an owner of one of the hill buildings said he was happy with the project and that it was so much better than looking at a parking lot.

Mr. Paul Mannle of 1490 Islington Street stated that he was also at the Charette sessions and that only some people had said taller or industrial would be better. He cited some prior comments from the Commission, such as safety walking through the connections, Maplewood Avenue seeming lost, and the pedestrian experience dying at Whole Foods. He didn't see how the design answered any of those concerns. It was basically a flat roof building on a hill. There was still a truck entrance on Maplewood Avenue, and he asked the Commission to think about an 18-wheeler making a left-hand turn and waiting for the traffic to clear.

No one else rose to speak, so Vice-Chair Kozak closed the public session.

Ms. Goodknight said she would revisit what was discussed at the previous meeting. She felt that they had not only avoided the back of house design, but there were hotel and residential units and offices to consider, and the garage resonated on both sides. She spoke more about the fenestration and granite banding. Ms. Duprey asked what the Commission's feeling was on the openings and the retail. Mr. Wyckoff thought they had done a good job on the two main entries to the center, but the parking garage was the biggest problem.

Vice-Chair Kozak said she wanted to put the massing behind them so they could discuss the style and materials, and she asked each Commissioner for a summary. Councilor Kennedy thought it was too massive for the lot and that the back side could perhaps have different tops to the roof. Mr. Rawling said that he wasn't ready to accept the general mass of the building because he had concerns about the flatness of it and would like roof forms added. Mr. Lombardi said that the area was one of larger buildings, so he could accept the mass but agreed that the back of the building was still problematic. He wanted more variation to break up the mass and also wanted to see more doors in the front center of the building. Mr. Gladhill said there was a lot of mass, but the lot and the function of the building had to be considered. He felt it had come a long way in massing and was lower than Portwalk. Mr. Wyckoff said he could accept the massing and noted that he had also gone to the Charettes and felt that it was like preaching to the choir if someone was against large buildings. He had talked to a lot of people who were enthusiastic about the project and who felt that it was a dynamic area. He said that he was presently comfortable with the building. Ms. Ruedig said she was comfortable with the building because it was an urban area, so they would get an urban building, but agreed that it should have more variation. Vice-Chair Kozak thought the massing was on the right track. The lowering of the mass facing the hill worked. The flat-top roofs modulating the massing didn't work well with the massing. She thought the end down Market Street was too tall. The pass-throughs were nice but she felt it would be an uncomfortable experience for the pedestrian to walk by, with cars coming in and out. The long straight roof could be broken up.

Ms. Duprey presumed that the massing was good, aside from the roof line, and doorways were preferred, which designated the wish for more retail. She said they would work on the garage and that they were doing all they could to make the back of the building look good. Utilitarian things would have to be back there. Ms. Goodknight said it was helpful to hear about the

roofline variations and how the collection of buildings was successful on Russell and Green Streets. There seemed to be a consensus on massing. She said she absorbed comments about horizontal and vertical banding and the parking garage, and she would try to blend the styles.

Councilor Kennedy asked whether the applicant would put the project into a 3D model and include texture, and Ms. Duprey said that they would.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant indicated they would return for another work session.

D. Work Session requested by **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue (46-64 Maplewood Avenue)**, wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (containing use, 3 1/2 to 5 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 the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued to the December meeting. The applicant has asked to postpone to the February 2015 meeting.)*

This item was postponed to the February 2015 meeting.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

The Commissioners said goodbye to Vice-Chair Kozak and wished her the best.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:45 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 February 4, 2015.