

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**June 10, 2015
reconvened from June 3, 2015
to be reconvened on June 17, 2015**

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

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

- A. May 6, 2015
- B. May 13, 2015
- C. May 27, 2015

*Mr. Lombardi made a motion to **approve** the three sets of minutes. Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

1. Petition of **Tanner Bridge Development, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct a three story mixed use building with parking below grade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Mr. Steve McHenry and project architects Mr. Brandon Holben and Mr. Jeremiah Johnson were present to speak to the petition. Mr. McHenry reviewed the package. He also presented the history of the existing building as well as the exterior lighting fixtures.

Councilor Kennedy asked if there was an elevator shaft, and Mr. McHenry stated that it was enclosed. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the light fixtures on the pilasters would be, and Mr. McHenry said they would be 3,000. Mr. Wyckoff inquired about the public art on the side of the building. Mr. McHenry stated that it was a blank wall and that he would cross it off because it was too tight to have any art of that scale. Chairman Almeida said he would ask the abutters whether the art was something that they would enjoy. Mr. Lombardi asked if there were other changes from the previous work session, and Mr. McHenry said they addressed issues about the way the dormers were delineated and included the light fixtures. Councilor Kennedy asked who would maintain the fence, and Mr. McHenry said it would be the condominium association.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked Mr. McHenry whether he would agree to a stipulation for photographic evidence of the building's interior and exterior and its history to submit to the Planning Department, and Mr. McHenry agreed. Ms. Ruedig asked if there were plans for archaeological work while excavating the garage. Mr. McHenry said he would recommend it to the owner. Mr. Wyckoff suggested that a stipulation be made that an archaeologist be present at the beginning of the excavation because he thought there could be two foundations. Mr. McHenry said he had photos from the Athenaeum showing no other buildings.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Bill Brassil of 70 Islington Street thanked everyone for the process and felt that the project was acceptable, even though it wasn't ideal from a neighbor's point of view. He was concerned about the wall and thought that a stipulation was necessary saying that the Buckminster residents had a say about what went on that wall.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) When the barn is taken down, an archaeological person will be on the grounds at the time of demolition;*
- 2) When the ground is dug for the garage, the art wall will be removed, and*
- 3) That the green wall will always remain green.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked Councilor Kennedy to include his stipulation that the interior and exterior of the building be photographed and submitted to the City and the Athenaeum, as well as

the building's history. Councilor Kennedy agreed to amend her motion to include Vice-Chair's stipulation. Chairman Almeida asked for a clarification from Councilor Kennedy about her green wall stipulation because he thought she meant fauna. Councilor Kennedy replied that she meant that nothing would be added to the fence, like metal decorated flowers.

*The motion was **amended** to read as follows:*

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That the green wall shall remain green (planted with natural materials) with no added artwork.*
- 2) That a photographic inventory shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to issuance of a building permit.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy stated that the developer had preserved the integrity of the building by bringing the project down to an acceptable level and that it would be compatible with surrounding designs because the Commission would have photos of the remodeled barn. Mr. Wyckoff agreed with Councilor Kennedy and was happy with the reduction of the scale and the storefronts. Ms. Ruedig stated that she would not approve the petition. She agreed that the massing had come a long way and that the garage issue had improved, but she still did not see the design as compatible with the surroundings, and she didn't think that it would enhance the District. She thought that it was a safe design but felt that the developer could have made it more creative. She pointed out that there were no other mansard roofs in the surrounding context.

*The motion **passed** with 5 in favor and 2 opposed (Ms. Ruedig and Vice-Chair Gladhill)*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **pull** the HarborCorp Conditional Use Permit (CUP) petition out of order so that it could be heard before the HarborCorp Certificate of Approval petition. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

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

2. **Petition of North End Properties, LLC, owner, and Deer Street Development Company, Inc., doing business in NH as HarborCorp of Portsmouth, applicant,** for property located on **Russell Street, Deer Street, and Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a Conditional Use Permit (construct a multi-story, mixed-use building where the height exceeds the 45' maximum height restriction) 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, Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12, Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 1-1A, Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 1-1C,

and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the May 27, 2015 meeting to the June 10, 2015 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project developer Mr. Chris Thompson, Ms. Carla Goodnight and Mr. Bill Bartell of CJ Architects, and Attorney Susan Duprey were present to speak to the petition.

Mr. Thompson stated that they had worked hard and found ways to integrate art into the project, to push sustainability, elements, and the facades, to balance pedestrian issues, and to cut back carbonates. He said the cubic footage of the building was about 300,000 cubic feet less than a 45-foot building crossing the site, so they viewed the building as more elegant than massive. Ms. Goodnight reviewed the package, doing a tour around the building using the City's 3D model and focusing on materials and scaling elements.

Attorney Susan Duprey stated that the standard in granting the CUP was whether or not the project contributed to the context, the quality, and the overall historic character of neighboring properties and the District as a whole. Most of what surrounded the project was not historic, but the team had respected the historic pieces that were left by including the rooftop garden and plaza. She believed that they met every one of the CPU requirements. She noted that their building had been compared to Portwalk many times but felt that the two projects were not the same because Portwalk had a flat roof, a flat-looking façade, and a uniform appearance, while their building had varied rooflines, undulated, and had a varied appearance. She believed that the project would enliven the area. The argument that the building would not fit in with the Master Plan was the same argument that was presented to the Planning Board, and she further elaborated by saying it had been claimed that the Planning Board should determine that the building should meet the Master Plan, but the Master Plan was adopted earlier, so it couldn't be that the City thought the 60-foot building would not fit into the Master Plan. Surrounding buildings were typically 60 feet, and after the Master Plan was adopted, the City approved a building that was taller than 60 feet. The City had consistently interpreted the Master Plan as allowing buildings that were over 45 feet. Ms. Duprey said she hoped that the Commission would consider what should really be a part of the CUP as opposed to the COA. She noted that Mr. Thompson had offered to maintain all the landscaping on private and City property and had also offered to have a portion of the rooftop garden open from 9 to 9 every day for the public. The project contributed to the infrastructure in the area by rebuilding streets and sidewalks, replacing lighting, and updating utilities, and had provided funding for the railroad and cemetery and made a contribution to art in the plaza.

Councilor Kennedy said that she was confused about the walkway. Ms. Goodnight showed the diagram of the pedestrian connection between the Sheraton and the project, saying that there had been interest in the bridge element being removed, so the project decided that they preferred the look without the bridge because it was more open and allowed more light in.

Chairman Almeida then opened up the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Bob Marchewka of 327 Sagamore Avenue stated that he owned a building on the Hill and said that the Hill would almost be surrounded by new development. He thought that the Portwalk and Hilton developments had turned out well for the Hill by highlighting its historic qualities, and he felt that HarborCorp would do the same, so he was in favor of the project.

Mr. Paul Ford of 816 Middle Street stated that the inclusion of a conference center was a wonderful component that could bring in more business during the winter.

At this point, Chairman Almeida reminded everyone that they should be speaking to the granting of the CUP, and he asked Mr. Cracknell to define what the CUP was. Mr. Cracknell stated that the CUP was primarily an application to the HDC to allow a building to be taller than 45 feet or 3-1/2 stories, which was the limit of the building height scale allowed in the District. It would be issued or denied by the HDC and allowed a building to go up to a max of 60 feet. The proposed project exceeded the 45 feet, which was the reason that the project was requesting the CUP. Mr. Cracknell said that it was about massing and scaling at that point. Chairman Almeida then read the official CUP rules into the record for the public's benefit.

Mr. Jeff Kisiel of Portsmouth stated that 410 people who were in favor of the CUP and the COA signed a petition in June, and he urged the Commission to approve the project.

Mr. Steve Robertson of 47 Concord Way stated that he also leased office space at the Kearsarge House and that he was in favor of the project at its current height and setting.

Mr. Blair McCracken of 212 Pleasant Street stated that he wanted to know how many people voted against the project in Mr. Kisiel's survey. He appreciated the 3D model because it showed how big the building was and its impact, but he felt that it would act as a wall between two sections of the City. He said that some residents were calling it the 'new' Boston.

Ms. Dixie Tarbell of 25 Driftwood Lane said that she was in favor of the CUP because she felt that HarborCorp met the rules and that people would still have everything intact about Portsmouth that they had before, whether it was the 'new' Boston or not.

Ms. Linda Cunningham of 579 Sagamore Avenue stated that she was against the CPU approval because she was concerned about the massiveness of the building and its multiple uses.

Mr. Jack Thorsen of 120 Richards Avenue stated that there was a potentially large public benefit from the project because it would increase the City's walkability, and he was in favor of it.

Ms. Penelope Morrow of 36 Richmond Street stated that she was against the project primarily because of its length and felt that it would be another wall like Portwalk.

Ms. Patricia Bagley of 213 Pleasant Street stated that she was against the project because she was concerned about the mass, traffic and safety and didn't feel that it met the Master Plan.

Mr. David Nord of Portsmouth said he was against the project mainly because of its mass and height, and he strongly felt that the Commission needed for further deliberate.

Ms. Diane Guilbert and Mr. John Guilbert of 15 Thornton Street stated that they were against the granting of the CUP. They gave a presentation that Mr. Jerry Zelin had prepared, and they indicated that the developer had used bait-and-switch tactics concerning the building height and did not meet the CUP criteria.

Mr. Michael Palace of 35 Elwyn Avenue said that he was against the project because he felt that it was too tall, and should not be what people saw when coming into the City.

Mr. Kim Rogers of 579 Sagamore Avenue stated that he was also representing Deer Street Associates and was an abutter. He was in favor of the building because of its historic materials, variable facades, and a better human scale than Portwalk.

Mr. Jason Boucher of 65 Wibird Street stated that he was in favor of the project because that its scope fit into the area and it wasn't like Boston at all. He said the conference center was needed.

Mr. Dick Bagley of 213 Pleasant Street stated that he was against the project and felt that the building would be better divided, saying that many other citizens he knew felt the same way.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said she approved the granting of the CUP because she strongly believed it met all the requirements, including the accessible spaces, donations from the developer for City improvements, high quality building materials and great scaling elements.

Mr. Shaun Rafferty of 1157 South Street said he was against the project because he felt that it disregarded the Master Plan, what not historic in nature, and was a massive wall of a building.

Mr. Lance Holman of 228 Highland Street stated that he was opposed to the project because the height variations did not achieve the sense of different buildings and was one massive structure.

Mr. Drew Schulthess of 14 Central Avenue stated that he was in favor of granting the CUP. He owned a downtown business and thought the project would entice people to come to Portsmouth.

Mr. Paul Mann of Portsmouth stated that the project did not qualify for the CUP because it would negatively affect the context, quality and historic character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Peter Weeks of Dennett Street stated that he was in favor of the CUP issuance because the developer had made the changes that were requested and he felt that it was a good project.

Ms. Duprey rose to speak, saying that the project not only positively contributed to the City's historic character but also to the context, quality and the overall historic character of the neighboring properties and the District as a whole. She emphasized that the project maintained and enhanced the Downtown area's historic role as a commercial, social, civic and cultural center, so it met the Master Plan requirements.

Chairman Almeida reminded the Commission to consider what the CUP meant and whether or not the project met its requirements.

Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that the Planning Board recommended that 3D artwork be put in the north end plaza and asked whether Ms. Duprey was now considering just contributing to it. Ms. Duprey said they thought it would be easier to contribute but would be involved with the process. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that he wanted assurance that the artwork would be 3D. Ms. Duprey said they would have to work with the City because it wasn't under their control.

Ms. Ruedig stated that she thought the CUP was poorly written and confusing and found it frustrating to deal with. She asked Chairman Almeida whether the Commission had to judge the project by all six items. Chairman Almeida replied that the Commission could either grant or deny the CUP but that changes could still be made to the design. Mr. Lombardi stated that he thought the project met the CUP requirement headings but the surplus garage spaces would be open to the public other than when there are large conferences. Mr. Cracknell then clarified the categories for the public, emphasizing that there were dozens of proposed public benefits associated with the CUP. Mr. Lombardi asked about the period lighting, and Ms. Goodnight replied that the developer was following the City's street lamp specifications. Mr. Lombardi asked the specific times that the surplus garage spaces would be open to the public. Mr. Thompson replied that he didn't think conferences would fill the garage on a daily basis, except for large ones, and that a number of the parking spaces would be available.

Mr. Lombardi asked what was meant by the Market Street roundabout project making a fair financial contribution, and Mr. Cracknell replied that the developer would commit \$25,000 toward the project. Mr. Lombardi asked what the legal limit of people was allowed in the conference center and what 44,000 square feet meant in terms of size. Mr. Thompson replied that they had suggested a self-imposed limit of 750 attendees but that the room could hold more than that. Mr. Lombardi also noted that the bike lanes seemed to be located in places with large trucks. Mr. Thompson stated that they had reviewed dedicated bike lanes with the City staff and traffic engineer and would take final direction from the City.

Councilor Kennedy stated that give or take had been a process on the project, and what she had heard the most from the public was that the building was too big and too long. She asked whether anything could be done to break up the building. Mr. Thompson said that he believed his team had cut and pushed as much as possible, and while they were not able to break up the building into 2-3 pieces, they were able to make it look like it was.

Mr. Shea stated that he believed the developer met all six criteria of the CUP and noted that the Vaughn Street cut-through issue was a design one that had nothing to do with the CUP. Mr. Wyckoff agreed with Mr. Shea that the six criteria had been made and that the new cut-through at Whole Foods had much improved. He also remarked that most of the people that he knew were in favor of the building and did not want to break it up.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the railroad company could not allow the railroad cut-through, and he noted that the developer would contribute toward making the existing crossing safer for pedestrians. He also stated that the properties surrounding the project, like Wells Fargo, the VFW, Portwalk, the Sheraton, and 233 Vaughan Street were all buildings from the late 20th or early 21st century with the exception of the homes on the Hill, and the project was better designed than those buildings, so it would more than contribute to the context, quality, and

historic character of neighboring properties. Mr. Rawling stated that he supported the application because he couldn't find any CPU items that the applicant didn't meet.

No one else rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Chairman Almeida asked that the motion reference the language of the CUP. He also noted that the Commission had a memo from the Planning Department that discussed how a decision might be made, and he trusted that the Commission had read it.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Conditional Use Permit as submitted with the following stipulations:*

- 1) that the project would provide public open spaces, the north end plaza, the rooftop garden (from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.) and that 50% of it would be open to the public, the Green Street plaza, the Vaughn Street and Russell Street pocket parks along with maintenance;*
- 2) that \$50,000 be donated to the North End plaza 3D artwork;*
- 3) that \$20,000 be donated to the North End cemetery;*
- 4) that there be a parking garage and underground parking and no surface parking lot;*
- 5) that the various facades and styles of the building pay homage to the historic past; and*
- 6) any significant archaeological finds would be publicly displayed in some area of the building.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy asked the Commission to add a stipulation that alternative parking would be provided if there were more than 750 people because she felt that the number could change. She also said she agreed with the public that the building could be divided and hoped in the future that the railroad pass-through became more accessible.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that they hadn't discussed the entry to the City from Market Street and that it was a parking lot presently, but the project would create an avenue which Portsmouth should be proud of. He agreed that the building was big but felt that the area was suited for a larger building and that it would be wonderful to view as people came into the City. Ms. Ruedig agreed that the project wasn't so much about height as it was about design. She felt that the developer went above and beyond and improved the areas around the building, using high-quality building materials, and qualified for the CPU as far as height. She also felt that the developer went above and beyond by designing the public-accessible places and donating to artwork and the restoration of the cemetery. She said she was in favor of granting the CPU.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that he was leery of making a stipulation about parking at that point and felt that it was more of a Planning Board issue, and he asked the Planning Director, Mr. Rick Taintor, to speak to it. Mr. Taintor stated that the applicant had provided offsite parking outside the Downtown community and the topic was scheduled for the next Planning Board meeting. The Planning Board had a parking consultant and the latest revision of the site plan with

responses to it, and they were actively working on the offsite parking issue. He requested that if there was a stipulation, it be broad enough so that the Planning Board would not have to go back to the HDC. Councilor Kennedy replied that all she was requesting was that the developer put in writing what he had said he would do in case the building was sold. She asked where they would document the fact that the developer would provide alternate parking if there were more than 750 people in the conference center. Mr. Taintor stated that Mr. Thompson's simple statement didn't concern him and that the Planning Board would be more specific.

Mr. Cracknell stated that he drafted a framework for a potential decision on the project that had six pieces because the CPU formal process was very different from the Certificate of Approval in terms of the procedures and the criteria. He then read the six sections of the document and asked that, if the Commission chose to use his document, they make a few minor amendments to it as follows:

- 1) Accept the new plan that showed a slightly different entrance to Whole Foods, with more open space and a retail space added next to the parking entrance at the end of Portwalk Place and revise it as 'Site Layout Plan', prepared by FS&T, revised 6-9-15 and received 6-10-15;
- 2) That the second change be relabeled #5 on page 4 as 'Program Elements and Stipulations', to make it clear that those elements were actually stipulations;
- 3) That the term 3D artwork be inserted after 'public art work' as 'preferably 3D', at least until Art-Speak or the City or a third party had a chance to review it;
- 4) that the developer contribute \$25,000 toward the proposed roundabout along the Russell and Market Street intersection;
- 5) Since data presented at the beginning of the presentation was a significant change to what Mr. Cracknell estimated the volume to be of the proposed building, and that evening had been presented as 3.5 million cubic feet instead of 4 million cubic feet, he asked that it be changed from 4.9 million on the 4th line to 5.1 million as presented, that the 4.5 become 3.5 million, and the 7% become 30% as presented that night; and
- 6) That a fourth item be added under the section F. View Corridor Preservation Elements as 'Market Street' with a commentary that the Russell Street pocket park, the roundabout, and the bullnose building support the Gateway improvement to the Historic District.

Chairman Almeida noted that he had asked Mr. Cracknell to put the summary together in case the Commission voted in favor of the CPU so that they could adopt it with the stipulations.

Mr. Rawling said he supported the document and thought that a design was needed for the public art. He suggested a stipulation that a design was needed and that the artwork should be provided, as well as a further study about the artwork design and other locations where it would be more appropriate so that the Commission would not be locked into putting something in the plaza that might not work. Mr. Lombardi questioned limiting the artwork to a historical monument, saying that it needed to be open, and Chairman Almeida agreed. Mr. Wyckoff stated that Art-Speak had some responsibility and would be the ones involved in the artwork, and he also supported using the document, saying that he had not been aware of the amount of detail in it, like the charging stations in the garage for electric vehicles.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that he would amend his motion to withdraw his stipulations and refer to all the stipulations in the document written by Mr. Cracknell dated June 10, 2015 Draft

Approval for the CUP. He said that he wanted to include the 3D art stipulation and the other six stipulations that Mr. Cracknell had mentioned. Mr. Rawling said that he would support Vice-Chair Gladhill's comments. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

The Portsmouth Historic District Commission (HDC) hereby grants a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the entirety of the building up to a maximum height of 60 feet (as defined by the Zoning Ordinance and shown on the submitted plans, as revised to except for appurtenances which may exceed 60 feet, in accordance with the Portsmouth Zoning Ordinance) with the actual specific building height to be in substantial compliance with the heights shown on the submitted plans, elevations, and renderings (see Site Layout Plans – Sheets A1.1 –A1.3B and “Elevations”, prepared by Harriman, received June 3, 2015). This approval is also based upon the Applicant providing the program elements listed in paragraph 5, at its sole expense, which the HDC hereby finds support the granting of this CUP in conformance with Section 10.535.13 of the Portsmouth Zoning Ordinance.

1. SUBMITTED PLANS

Application and Project Narratives:

- “Conditional Use Permit Application – HarborCorp of Portsmouth”, prepared by Susan Duprey, Esq., Devine Millimet, Attorneys at Law, 111 Amherst Street, Manchester, New Hampshire, 03101, dated and received March 13th, 2015.
- “Comments on HDC Application for Approval – North End Portsmouth”, prepared by CJ Architects, received 5-20-15;

Plans, Elevations, Rendering and other Exhibits:

- “Site Layout Plans” (10 sheets) for the North End Portsmouth Project, received June 3rd, 2015 and revised to 5-12-15;
- “HDC Application for Approval Amended on: May 27, 2015”, prepared by CJ Architects/ Platz Associates/ Harriman, received 5-20-15;
- “Elevations: (26 sheets) for the North End Portsmouth Project, received June 3rd, 2015 and revised to 5-6-15;
- “Rev 1: Updated Exhibits per Amendments to Certificate of Appropriateness Application” (27 sheets), received June 3rd, 2015;
- “HDC Application for Approval Amended on: June 10th, 2015” (97 sheets), received June 3rd, 2015 and revised to 5-27-15;
- “HDC Application for Approval Amended on: June 10th, 2015” (2 sheets- Bridge Connection Options), received June 3rd, 2015 and revised to 5-27-15;
- “Site Walk Agenda and Minutes”, prepared by Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner, Portsmouth Planning Department, dated 5-27-15 and approved 6-10-15;
- “Planning Board Comments – HarborCorp Conditional Use Permit for Height”, prepared by Jessa Berna, Associate Planner, Portsmouth Planning Department, dated May 26, 2015;
- Revised “Site Layout Plan”, Prepared by Fay, Spofford and Thorndike, Revised to 6-9-15 and received 6-10-15.

2. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Section 10.535.13 of the Zoning Ordinance authorizes the HDC to grant a conditional use permit to allow an increase in building height above the maximum structure height specified in Section 10.531, up to a maximum of 50 feet in the CBA district or 60 feet in the CBB district, only if the proposed building and site design positively contribute to the context, quality and the overall historic character of the neighboring properties and the district as a whole, including, but not limited to the following provisions:

- A. Publicly accessible open space areas such as widened sidewalks, plazas, pocket parks, playgrounds or other significant public open space areas;
- B. Underground parking in lieu of surface parking;
- C. The use of high-quality building materials in the building design including, but not limited to: slate or copper roofing; copper gutters and downspouts; restoration brick; granite sills, lintels, foundations, stoops and steps; and wood windows along the façade elevation;
- D. Significant scaling elements in the building design such as increased setbacks, stepbacks, reduced footprint and volume, the use of pitched roof forms, banding, quoining and other massing techniques to maintain a pedestrian scale along the façade;
- E. Significant restoration or reconstruction of a “focal” or “contributing” building;
- F. Permanent protection of a significant view corridor.

This provision was adopted under the statutory provisions for “innovative land use controls” in RSA 674:21. The administrative requirements under these provisions are as follows:

II. An innovative land use control adopted under RSA 674:16 may be required when supported by the master plan and shall contain within it the standards which shall guide the person or board which administers the ordinance. An innovative land use control ordinance may provide for administration, including the granting of conditional or special use permits, by the planning board, board of selectmen, zoning board of adjustment, or such other person or board as the ordinance may designate. If the administration of the innovative provisions of the ordinance is not vested in the planning board, any proposal submitted under this section shall be reviewed by the planning board prior to final consideration by the administrator. In such a case, the planning board shall set forth its comments on the proposal in writing and the administrator shall, to the extent that the planning board's comments are not directly incorporated into its decision, set forth its findings and decisions on the planning board's comments (RSA 674:21, II).

3. CUP REVIEW PROCESS

After opening the public hearing for this application on April 1st, 2015, the HDC referred the application to the Planning Board for review and comment. At the April 16, 2015, meeting the Planning Board voted to close the public hearing on this application. At the May 21st meeting the Planning Board provided the following comments:

- Public access to the rooftop garden should be guaranteed at all times the facility is open in order to ensure the extent of this public benefit.

- In addition to the \$20,000 donation to the North End Cemetery, a 3-dimensional tribute to the North End is desired in the plaza on the corner of Russell Street and Deer Street.

The Planning Board also asked the applicant to provide a letter responding to the seven points in the memo dated April 10, 2015 from Nicholas Cracknell, on behalf of the HDC, to the Planning Board. The Planning Board comments and the response letter from the applicant are included in the list of plans, elevations, renderings and other exhibits for this project.

4. GENERAL FINDINGS

After nearly 18 months of public review, the HDC has determined that the revised plans, elevations, renderings and other exhibits reflect the program elements and public benefits required for consideration under the CUP. The following program elements have been included in the proposed project design and the HDC has determined that these elements reflect the goals, purpose and intent of the CUP for allowing an increase in building height within the CBB District.

5. PROGRAM ELEMENTS: FINDINGS & STIPULATIONS

A. CIVIC SPACE ELEMENTS:

1. The North End Plaza – Located at the intersection of Deer and Russell Streets, the proposed plaza is approximately 8,000 SF, the specific details of which shall be determined by the Planning Board’s final site plan approval as the same may be amended from time to time, shall be constructed by the Applicant at its sole expense. This program element offers opportunities for programming, sculpture and public gathering.

Stipulation(s) - This plaza shall be owned and maintained by the City, except that Applicant shall, at the request of the City, maintain all landscaping it installs, and is subject to the City Council granting any necessary approvals and/ or easements for this plaza. Applicant may apply to the City Council for the necessary licenses, easements and approvals to operate a café/restaurant which shall be open to the public and located adjacent to its building on this plaza. The Applicant will provide \$50,000 toward installation of a public artwork, preferably 3-Dimensional, as well as donating land from the Sheraton Hotel property in order to relocate and realign the Russell Street intersection.
2. A Rooftop Garden and Park – Located at the intersection of Russell and Deer Streets, this program element offers opportunities for public viewing the North End Plaza, “The Hill” as well as the steeple on the North Church.

Stipulation(s) - At least 50% of this approximately 8,000 SF rooftop garden shall be open to the public from at least 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. daily. This area will be the area closest to the public entrance to the Rooftop Garden and Park off of Deer Street. This garden and park shall be constructed by Applicant at its expense and owned and maintained by the Applicant.
3. The Green Street Plaza – Located at the intersection of Russell and Green Streets, this program element will help reduce the scale and massing of the proposed building as

well as provide an opportunity for public gathering and an attractive gateway treatment to the North End.

Stipulation(s) - The hardscape and landscaping of this plaza, the specific details of which shall be determined by the Planning Board's final site plan approval as the same may be amended from time to time, shall be constructed by Applicant at its sole expense but owned and maintained by the City, except that Applicant shall, at the request of the City, maintain all landscaping it installs, and is subject to the City Council granting any necessary approvals and/ or easements for this plaza. Applicant may apply to the City Council for the necessary licenses, easements and approvals to operate a café/restaurant which shall be open to the public and located adjacent to its building on this plaza.

4. The Russell Street Pocket Park – This program element will help beautify the Market Street corridor along the gateway to the project and the North End.

Stipulation(s) - This park shall be constructed, owned and maintained by Applicant at its sole expense and open to the public at all hours, except that the City shall own and maintain the sidewalk in this park.

5. The Vaughan Street Pocket Park – The proposed park is located on Vaughan Street and this program element will help beautify the Maplewood Ave. corridor, offer a public seating area, and help reduce the scale and mass of the proposed building.

Stipulation(s) – This park shall be constructed by the Applicant at its sole expense but owned and maintained by the City, except that Applicant shall, at the request of the City, maintain all landscaping it installs, and is subject to the City Council granting any necessary approvals and/or easements for this plaza.

6. Brick Sidewalks – This program element will provide better pedestrian circulation and safety along the building edge as well as to other buildings within the surrounding neighborhood. The wide sidewalks also help to reduce the scale and massing of the building.

Stipulation(s) - The proposed brick sidewalks shall be constructed at Applicant's sole expense but owned and maintained by the City, except that Applicant shall, at the request of the City, maintain all landscaping it installs, the width of which shall be determined by the Planning Board's final site plan approval as the same may be amended by the Planning Board from time to time – all subject to the City Council granting any necessary approvals and easements for these sidewalks.

7. The Deer Street Passageway - This program element will provide visibility at the street-level through the building to other properties within the North End. It also provides additional opportunities for publically accessible entryways and storefronts to wrap the corners of the passageway adding pedestrian interest and reducing the scale and massing of the building.

Stipulation(s) - The passageway, the final dimensions of which shall be determined by the Planning Board's site plan approval, shall be constructed and maintained by the Applicant at its sole expense.

B. PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION-RELATED ELEMENTS:

1. Underground Parking - To support pedestrian activity on the street-level as well as protect the character of the Historic District approximately 28% (147 spaces) of the proposed off-street parking is located underground and completely out of public view. Another 40% (210 spaces) are proposed to be screened with liner buildings and 32% (166 spaces) are proposed to be screened with decorative panels on the upper floors of the building. Only 1% (6-9 spaces) would be visible from a pedestrian on the public way.

Stipulation(s) - The final parking plan is being reviewed and approved by the Planning Board under Site Plan Review.

2. Parking Supply & Management - To support expected peak parking needs, 523 spaces are proposed whereas the Zoning Ordinance only requires 97 spaces. 221 spaces are included in an existing easement to the Sheraton Hotel property. Thus, an extra 205 spaces will be provided as surplus parking. Note that a valet management system may increase this surplus by up to 100 spaces. All surplus parking spaces will be open to the public on days other than when large conferences are expected. The proposed parking plan shows between 3 and 4 times the required level of off-street parking.

Stipulation(s) - The final parking plan is being reviewed and approved by the Planning Board under Site Plan Review.

3. Fuel-Efficiency/ Stipulation(s) - To support fuel-efficient vehicles, charging stations will be included in the garage as well as parking for carpooling, vanpooling and fuel-efficient vehicles as determined by the Planning Board.

4. Alternative Transportation/ Stipulation(s) - To support alternative transportation modes, bicycle parking and storage areas shall be provided within the building and along the sidewalk and plaza areas. Bike lanes have been added to Russell and Deer Street as well as sharrows for shared lanes, as determined by the Planning Board.

5. Bus and Truck Parking/ Stipulation(s) - To accommodate the hotel and conference center parking needs, 2 bus parking spaces shall be provided on Russell Street as shown. All deliveries and loading areas shall be located mid-block along the rear of the building and include screening elements as determined by the Planning Board.

6. On-Street Parking/ Stipulation(s) - To provide pedestrian safety as well as maintain some of the existing on-street parking, on-street parking spaces shall be maintained on Russell and Deer Streets as determined by the Planning Board.

7. Crosswalks/ Stipulation(s) - To enhance pedestrian safety and circulation, raised and textured crosswalks shall be provided on Russell and Deer Streets, as determined by the Planning Board,. All crosswalks on Russell Street will also carry the bricks through the entrance drives to enhance pedestrian safety as determined by the Planning Board.

8. Traffic Calming – As part of the concept plan for the roundabout, an internal island of approximately 1,200 SF is being considered which would provide an opportunity for a raised garden and/or statuary.

Stipulation(s) - To enhance traffic circulation and the views entering the downtown along Market Street the project proposes a contribution of land and \$25,000 toward the proposed roundabout located along the Russell and Market Street intersection.

9. Sidewalks/ Stipulation(s) - To enhance pedestrian circulation, safety, and reduce the scale and massing of the building, all of the proposed sidewalks shall be constructed of brick. Except for a very small section of the proposed building along Maplewood Ave. and the service entrance driveway, all sidewalks shall range from 8 to 50 feet in width as determined by the Planning Board.

C. BUILDING DESIGN ELEMENTS:

Stipulation(s) - In order to mitigate the impact of a building height above 45 feet or 3.5 stories, the proposed building shall use high-quality building materials as shown and presented including but not limited to granite, copper or restoration brick. The following summarizes the high-quality building elements included in the proposed building design and the construction drawings shall be in substantial compliance with the following:

1. High-Quality Building Design Elements / Stipulation(s) – Of the twenty separate building façade segments, the percentage of the segments using each of the following high-quality building materials shall generally be as follows: metal or slate roofs (20%); copper flashing (20%); decorative metal or wood railings (80%); decorative metal panels, artwork or timber beams (50%); restoration brick (70%); granite sills, lintels or foundations (65%); traditional storefront panels (30%); operable windows (55%); and wooden storefront doors (10%).

D. BUILDING SCALING ELEMENTS:

Stipulation(s) - In order to mitigate the impact of a building height above 45 feet or 3.5 stories, the following scaling elements have been proposed and the construction drawings shall be in substantial compliance with the following:

1. Reduced Building Coverage – The Zoning Ordinance allows up to 95% of the property to be used for the footprint of a building(s). The three contiguous lots total approximately 85,650 SF which would allow up a building footprint of up to 81,368 SF. The proposed site plan shows a building footprint of approximately 77,000 SF which represents 90% coverage; or a 5% reduction from the maximum permitted coverage. Note that parcel identified as Map 199 Lot 4 (the proposed Russell Street Pocket Park) is 9,765 SF which represents another 10% of the larger project that will remain as open space.
2. Reduced Building Volume – The Zoning Ordinance does not directly regulate building volume through a Floor Area Ratio requirement however, using a 5 story

- building as the benchmark, the maximum coverage and height requirements would yield a building of approximately 406,000 SF of Gross Floor Area (GFA). The proposed volume (excluding underground parking areas) is approximately 260,000 SF of GFA; a 36% reduction. Understanding that nearly 40% of the proposed building façade along Deer and Russell Streets have high floor-to-ceiling heights (in a relatively tall 3 story form) a cubic foot assessment illustrates that approximately 5.1m FT³ in building volume would be allowed under the zoning requirements. The proposed building is approximately 3.5m FT³; representing a 30% reduction from the maximum permitted volume.
3. Building Height – Under the definition of building height in the Zoning Ordinance, sheets A.1.1 and A.1.3A show that the average height of the proposed building is approximately 57.2 feet. Measuring from the higher roof structure, most segments of the building are between 53-60 feet in height.
 4. Perceived Building Height – The perceived height of the building along the sidewalk shows that the average building height is significantly reduced due to the use of scaling elements such as stepbacks and sloped roofs. The average perceived height at the sidewalk is approximately 49 feet; a 15% reduction. Note that the average perceived height is further reduced to 46 feet when only the portions of the façade are considered that are located along a public sidewalk.
 5. Building Design Elements – Of the twenty separate building façade segments, the percentage of the segments using each of the following scaling elements is as follows: increased setbacks (100%); stepbacks (65%); pitched roofs (58%); brick pilasters or firewalls (60%); horizontal or cornice banding (85%); awnings, brackets, dormers or roof canopies (90%); varied window patterns or openings (100%); and projecting signs and lighting (50%).

E. HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENTS:

1. Old North Cemetery/ Stipulation(s) – As part of the Maplewood Ave. streetscape, the Applicant shall make a financial contribution of \$20,000 to support efforts to preserve and repair the stone retaining wall at the historic Old North Cemetery.
2. Archeological Resources/ Stipulation(s) – The Applicant shall commission an archaeological study of the project area with Kathleen Wheeler of Independent Archaeological Consulting, and shall exhibit any significant archaeological findings from Dr. Wheeler's investigations in the project. Any notable historic artifacts will be exhibited within the publically accessible common areas within the hotel/ conference center.

F. VIEW CORRIDOR PRESERVATION ELEMENTS:

1. The Hill and North Church Steeple – These areas will be visible from the proposed Rooftop Garden and Park and shall be accessible to the public as outlined under paragraph A.
2. Old North Cemetery – This area will be visible from the Vaughan Street Pocket Park.

3. North End – This area will be visible from both passageways leading from Russell and Deer Streets through the proposed building. The Deer Street passageway will connect directly to Maplewood Ave. and provide views to Vaughan Street.
4. Market Street Gateway – The proposed gateway improvements with the roundabout, Russell Street Pocket Park, Green Street Plaza and the bullnose design of the proposed building along Green and Russell Streets will have a positive impact on this gateway into the Historic District and the downtown.

6. DESIGN CHANGES/ MODIFICATIONS:

Stipulations(s) - City Council Licenses, Easements and Approvals - Should the City Council not grant any of the easements or approvals necessary to provide any of these project elements (except those relating to the Russell Street intersection realignment, the North End or the Green Street Plazas as well as for cafes and restaurants), then Applicant shall be relieved of the requirement to provide the public elements listed above. All other project elements shall be in substantial compliance with the proposed design submitted as presented.

Stipulations(s) - Program or Design Changes – Any subsequent design change to the exterior of the building from the approved plans, elevations or details shall be reviewed by the Planning Director. The Director shall determine whether the proposed change is in substantial compliance with the approved plans, elevations or details. Any change determined not to be in substantial compliance with the approved plans, elevations or details shall require an amendment to the CUP.

*The motion **passed**, with 6 in favor and 1 opposed (Councilor Kennedy).*

1. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **North End Master Development, LP, owner, and Deer Street Development Company, DBA HarborCorp of Portsmouth, applicant**, for property located at **Deer Street, Russell Street, and Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (5 story mixed use development to include a hotel/event center, parking structure, condominiums, and retail space) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plans 118, 119, 124, and 125 as Lots 28, 1-1A, 1-1C, 4, 12, and 21 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the May 27, 2015 meeting to the June 10, 2015 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Carla Goodnight and Mr. Bill Bartell of CJ Architects, Mr. Chris Thompson and Attorney Susan Duprey were present to speak to the petition.

Ms. Goodnight reviewed the incorporated changes made from the previous work session. The window that the Commission suggested was added at the corner of the retail to make it more compatible with the lower storefront. Materials from below the tower element were incorporated. The cut-through was made into a more visual access by making it a larger connection to Vaughn Street. The Commission had also asked that interest and elements be

added along the cut-through wall, so glass was introduced to the coffee shop area in Whole Foods as well as boxes for historical representation, and the train station motif architecture was incorporated into the garage elements along with the artwork. Transitional elements were introduced between two façade designs to push back the convention center entryway. The glass area along the stairs and elevators was pulled up and the proportions changed by a 10-foot decrease in mass. The café plaza front area was narrowed and the space in the intersection was contained in the plaza. The planter areas were opened up, a portion of the rooftop garden would be for the public's use, and the dormers were redesigned. A major change was the removal of the bridge to the Sheraton Hotel. At the Green Street flagship entrance, a granite base element was added and the dining area was pulled back. A continuous banding and unification of the two floors above the cut-through was articulated by additional horizontal banding and setting back the top floor. Ms. Goodnight said they added 10-ft. and 6-ft. setbacks to the window patterns that the Commission said were not satisfactory. The canopy over Whole Foods was reduced and the arch brick was defined with granite keystones. The pilasters were increased to a 16" depth, and the sidewalk portion of the Vaughn Street cut-through was raised.

Chairman Almeida asked the Commissioners for comments. Council Kennedy suggested discussing the removal of the overpass connector. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked how Ms. Goodnight was able to remove the contentious connector, and Ms. Goodnight replied that it was more of a program functionality element and that they had support space within the conference center itself. Mr. Lombardi asked if there were rooms under the hotel overpass, and Ms. Goodnight said there were not. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked Ms. Goodnight how they would ventilate the building without louvers, and Ms. Goodnight said it would be an internal system. Mr. Shea stated that he was disappointed that the bridge was removed because he thought it broke up the long façade, but Chairman Almeida said he liked the project better without it.

Chairman Almeida stated that he received comments from the public about the brick selection and the amount of it used on the project. Ms. Goodnight described the three types of brick chosen. Chairman Almeida said that the images the Commission in the past showed a variation of brick, but what was shown in the presentation did not show a conceivable difference. He advised that the brick selection needed to be well thought-out on the two end buildings and was afraid that Brick #1 had excessive amounts of flashing, and added that the Commission typically made decisions contingent on mockups. Chairman Almeida suggested the brick on the back of the hotel building and on the Popover Building. Ms. Goodnight asked that the Commission approve a mockup at the time of construction rather than select it without seeing it in place. Mr. Wyckoff agreed, suggesting that it include the window that would be used in the brick wall. Mr. Rawling suggested waterstruck brick to replace Brick #1 to give it variation.

Chairman Almeida inquired about the door materials. Ms. Goodnight said wooden doors were done on buildings like the flagship, and that the modern storefront expressions and the retail on the garage would also have wooden doors. Councilor Kennedy asked about the hardware and whether granite had been considered for the memorial bricks. Ms. Goodnight replied that the hardware would be presented at a later date and that the present material was more appropriate for the bricks. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked why the awnings were missing on some balconies on the garage, and Ms. Goodnight said they picked up the detail from the lower awnings.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street stated that it was a better building due to all the changes made, and she asked the Commission not to nitpick it to death.

Ms. Dixie Tarbell of 25 Driftwood Lane stated that she hadn't thought the building could get better, but it did. She said the building was functional and elegant and asked that it be approved.

No one else rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt lucky to be a part of the project at that particular time in history, and that it was an amazing project for Portsmouth and in a challenging location. He believed that the building would preserve the integrity of the District because it preserved the district that surrounded it. The developer had made contributions to take care of historical problems like the cemetery, so the project met the assessment of historical significance. Also, there were no significant historic buildings nearby except for the ones on the Hill, and a lot of the Hill's residents were happy with the project. The building would maintain the special character of the neighborhood because it complemented and enhanced the architectural and historic character. It would promote the education, pleasure and welfare of the District to residents and visitors by including a historian on the dig to look for artifacts that would be placed in shadowboxes and would also include photos of what the City used to be. The roof garden would promote pleasure and welfare by allowing people to stroll and look out at the City views. The building would be consistent with the special character of surrounding properties and compatible with their design because most of the structures were late 20th and early 21st century properties, and it would be an improvement over most of the surrounding properties. Relating to the historic and architectural value of existing and historic structures, the project had taken elements of Portsmouth's past by designing the parking garage with details that were consistent with 19th century train stations. The project also used innovative technologies like the charging station for electric vehicles, the bike paths, and the new materials on the upper stories. Mr. Lombardi agreed with Mr. Wyckoff, noting that the views from the building added to the project and that the building picked up a lot of the relationship to the architectural features of the existing structure and historic structures.

Councilor Kennedy stated that she would not approve the project due to the size of the building. Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project had come far and that they had a much better building and design that would add vitality to the north end. He was happy that the team that Mr. Thompson built was very willing to work with the Commission, and he thought that the design elements paid tribute to Portsmouth's past but moved Portsmouth forward into the future. Mr. Rawling stated that the project team had done outstanding things for the community.

Ms. Ruedig stated that she had struggled a lot with the project because it was difficult for her as a preservationist to apply the Ordinance and understand what was appropriate in terms of its

context. She said she was concerned that the building would be a wall that would turn its back on the north end. She would have preferred some breaks in the mass but also realized that it was a large parcel with no through streets or established railroad crossings. She felt that the changing of the building's facades made it look separate, but it was still one big building. Ms. Ruedig also stated that the developer could have had a more dynamic and modern design, but she realized that they had worked hard within the constraints of being in the Historic District. She ultimately felt that the location was screaming for new architecture because it wasn't in the heart of the Historic District. Therefore, part of her did not want to approve the petition, but she would because she didn't see how it ran in opposition to the HDC's Ordinance and guidelines.

Mr. Lombardi said he felt that the building and its facilities would draw people to the Northern Tier rather than block them from it. He realized that the project created a significant barrier, but also realized that the railroad track would be blocked no matter what and that it was incumbent on the City Council to open up something through there. Ms. Ruedig emphasized that the Commission had received a lot of public comment, but most of the public had left, and she said she had the same concerns about usage, parking and traffic issues as the public who had spoken or sent letters, but it wasn't part of the HDC's purview.

Vice-Chair Gladhill remarked on a previous comment about how the building would look similar whether or not it was one big building or multiple buildings by saying that if the three lots were separately owned, the owners would try to maximize their lots, so he felt that the Commission had to do what they did best. Councilor Kennedy replied that Portwalk had put a road through, so there was always improvement, and she felt that the Commission had the right to change prior decisions. Mr. Shea stated that he viewed the project as a City block and not as separate buildings. Chairman Almeida stated that the Commission, the applicant, and the public should feel confident that they have done their job. He felt that the Commission did their job thoroughly and were writing a chapter of history because the project would become history in the north end. He said that the final result showed the influence from comments by the public, the applicants themselves, and the Planning Department, although he realized that not every comment could have been implemented. He was very proud of the project and thought the process was a good one. He also thought that the community should be proud of the project and that it was exciting for the Commission to be part of the design because it was a completely new borough to the City and would bring more people into the Historic District.

Mr. Cracknell read the three stipulations:

1. The connector bridge over Russell Street has been removed from the application. Any design change that seeks to include a bridge connector shall require a new application and public hearing before the Commission;
2. A mock-up (that includes a window) of the proposed bricks shall be provided for review and approval by the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair prior to installation of any brick walls within any building segment within the larger project;
3. A water-struck brick shall be used for Brick Type 1;
4. This approval is subject to the terms, conditions and stipulations approved under the Conditional Use Permit for this project that was approved on 6-10-15.

*The motion to grant the Certificate of Approval **passed** by a vote of 6 in favor and Councilor Kennedy opposed, with the following stipulations:*

- 1. The connector bridge over Russell Street has been removed from the application. Any design change that seeks to include a bridge connector shall require a new application and public hearing before the Commission;*
- 2. A mock-up (that includes a window) of the proposed bricks shall be provided for review and approval by the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair prior to installation of any brick walls within any building segment within the larger project;*
- 3. A water-struck brick shall be used for Brick Type 1;*
- 4. This approval is subject to the terms, conditions and stipulations approved under the Conditional Use Permit for this project that was approved on 6-10-15.*

IV. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 11:00 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on August 5, 2015.