

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

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**7:00 p.m.**

**February 21, 2007  
reconvened from February 14, 2007**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman John Rice, Vice-Chairman David Adams, Richard Katz, Ellen Fineberg; City Council Representative Ned Reynolds, Planning Board Representative Jerry Hetjmanek; and Alternate Sandra Dika and Alternate John Wyckoff

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** John Golumb

**ALSO PRESENT:** David Holden, Planning Director

---

**I. OLD BUSINESS**

1. Approval of minutes – January 10, 2007

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.

Approval of minutes – January 31, 2007

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.

2. Petition of **Harbor Corp., LLC** for property located at **Deer Street, Russell Street, and Maplewood Avenue** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure and connecting walkway to 250 Market Street (+/- 204 room hotel, conference facilities, retail space, condominium units, and a +/- 743 space parking garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 119, as Lot 1-1C, Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 28, Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 21, and Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was tabled at the January 31, 2007 meeting.)*

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to remove the application from the tabled status. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fineberg. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Chairman Rice stated that the public hearing on this application was closed at the January 31, 2007 meeting. He told the audience that if they came this evening to speak to the petition, they would not be able to. The time to speak was at the meeting on January 31. He reminded everyone that at the last meeting, the Commission found several areas of the proposal that were

deficient in regards to specifics. As a result, they tabled the application to give the applicant time to respond and provide supporting documentation for those specific areas. Chairman Rice stated they would only be discussing those specific areas this evening.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if the applicant would be able to explain the recent submittal material. Chairman Rice replied yes. He also stated for the record that two letters concerning the project were submitted at this evening's meeting, one from the law office of Keane and McDonald and the other from Mr. Shawn Rafferty.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Lee Griswold, representative of Harbor Corp., spoke to the petition. He stated that over the past months, they have made a lot of progress in regards to fine tuning the project. He felt that they have taken a good design, and made it that much better. Mr. Griswold pointed out that this was the ninth session regarding the project and he felt it was time to call the question and to vote in favor of it.

Attorney Malcolm McNeill stated that they intended to address the specific questions of the Commission from the last meeting. He said that Ms. Ludwig, architect for the project would discuss the various issues after which, the Commission could ask their questions. He reminded the Commission that with a project of this size, no project can be perfect but he felt that they have reached the stage where all design review standards under Section 10-1004 have been met.

Ms. Nancy Ludwig from Icon Architecture spoke next. She stated that she made a list of the comments that they ended their last session with. She reminded the Commission that they wanted more information on awnings, bays, the bridge, exterior lighting, materials, mechanical equipment, the porte-cochere (auto drop off area), and the roof top garden with particular emphasis on the trellis.

Ms. Ludwig began her presentation with an explanation of the changes to the bridge. She said that their proposal still expresses the arched connection between the Sheraton and the Westin but is now delineated in a steel structure composed of tubed steel and hanging steel and they have allow the arch to project above the walkway which is 5 feet wide. She said that the structure is a simple glazed tube connection between the two buildings and is supported by the arch which breaks above it. Ms. Ludwig stated that they preferred to see the bridge in an oyster white color which will tie in with the color palette of the Westin.

Ms. Fineberg responded that she prefers the white color for the bridge. Ms. Dika stated that she felt the design was inspiring. Other commissioners thought it was great.

Ms. Ludwig went on to explain the new bridge structure. She said that because there are tall arches below it, she felt it was best to put a beveled under soffit on it. She felt that it softened the connection to the masonry back wall. She said that the bays would be detailed in azek.

Ms. Ludwig mentioned that there were questions at the last meeting about the porte-cochere. She pointed out from the plans the expression of the tall storefront area coming through, the pavement

material on the pedestrian way, the softening in the ceiling which will occur around the main beam line, the up lighting and the exterior lighting in that area.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if the material for the large storefront window arrangement would be glazing. Ms. Ludwig replied that it would be set in the line of glazing.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she was disappointed that there was no real front door to the building. Ms. Ludwig replied that the front door is really the penetration into the building, the porte-cochere itself.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was pleased with the new design of the bridge. He wondered if the City seal could be attached to the bridge. Ms. Ludwig replied that she remembered from previous discussions that they did not want something that would be bright and would draw ones eye up. She was not sure that it would be appropriate on an overhead structure. Chairman Rice commented that they could have that discussion at a later date.

Ms. Ludwig moved on to plans for the roof top terrace. She said that they have modified the entry canopy over the garage pedestrian entry to match the arch over the garage structure as it comes across the entry drive. They also took the arch away from the trellis as now it seemed awkward and too tall. She pointed out that they have simplified the trellis constructed with simple steel tube sections and it would be painted oyster white.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the solid wall below the roof top garden. She asked what type of material would be used there. Ms. Ludwig said that there would be some mechanical equipment up above so there would be screening around that. She mentioned that the hotel guests will be looking at it so the plan was to plant it and sculpt it as part of the roof top garden. A water feature was another possibility. She said at this point, the materials to be used have not been determined.

Ms. Fineberg asked if there were any ground floor entry doors to the convention center. Ms. Ludwig replied that there are only egress doors. She explained that the main entrance to the convention center was through the hotel.

Ms. Dika commented that she liked the way they unified the arches. She liked the trellis better as well. Chairman Rice added that he felt it softened the whole area.

Ms. Ludwig stated that there were questions about elevations at the last meeting. She pointed out that in their packets was more specific information regarding them.

Ms. Ludwig addressed the location of mechanical equipment. She said that since the last meeting, they have worked with the mechanical engineer to lay out the sizes of the equipment. She continued say that there will be a piece of equipment on the roof garden that will handle the mechanical loads for the exhibit hall. She said that main element for the hotel, which would be a boiler, would be located underground. The chillers for the system are on the roof behind a false roof plane. Ms. Ludwig stated that the kitchen has not been designed yet but there will be numerous pieces of equipment associated with that. She added that there will a series of condensers for the condominiums as well. Chairman Rice asked if any of the condensers would

be visible from the street. Ms. Ludwig replied no, because one cannot get back far enough from the hotel to see them.

Chairman Rice asked Mr. Holden if a final mechanical plan had to be submitted. Mr. Holden replied that he thought they would want one for the record. Ms. Ludwig stated that they could supply one when they know exactly where everything will be located. Chairman Rice added that it is common to see a final mechanical plan after an approval.

Vice Chairman Adams stated that he thought it was nice to see that the applicant has pursued the process of finding the largest units and placing them in areas where they will not be part of the visual impact.

City Councilor Ned Reynolds arrived at this point in the meeting.

Ms. Ludwig stated that they would like to use awnings on the retail portions of the building. She said at the last meeting, it was pointed out that the Commission preferred awnings that were retractable. She added that her staff did a survey of the downtown awnings and discovered that there were as many retractable awnings as non retractable ones. Ms. Ludwig mentioned that they have been in touch with a local awning company who indicated that fixed awnings would be more appropriate. Chairman Rice mentioned that the Commission recently approved a fixed awning with a loose valance.

Ms. Michelle Waldron of Icon Architecture stated the fixed awning holds up better with wind loads and longevity. Councilor Reynolds stated that he has noticed that the current awnings he has seen have a depth that comes out just far enough to drip on your head when you walk beneath them. He continued to say that it is further complicated when the weather turns cold and the drips turn to ice on the sidewalks. He said he would consider a fixed awning with a deeper coverage area. Ms. Dika stated that during the last heavy freeze, she noticed the merchants out knocking the ice off of their awnings. She felt that that would cut into its longevity.

Chairman Rice stated that he thought they could approve the concept of a fixed awning and then they could come back with the details.

Ms. Ludwig stated that that concluded her presentation.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, Chairman Rice asked Mr. Holden if they needed another motion. Mr. Holden advised that they start with a new motion and clarify for the record who would be voting.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Councilor Reynolds stated that he would recuse himself from the vote since he was not present for the entire discussion. Chairman Rice instructed Mr. Wyckoff that he would be voting in Councilor Reynolds place.

Mr. Hetjmanek made a motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulation that the applicant comes back to the Commission for final approval of the mechanical plan and the awnings. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dika. Chairman Rice asked if there was discussion.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she had raised the question earlier in the discussion about what materials would be used on the east wall of the garage and Ms. Ludwig had stated that they had not been determined. She wondered if that should be included in the motion.

Ms. Fineberg asked to amend the motion to include that the materials to be used on the east wall of the garage receive final Commission approval. Mr. Hetjmanek stated that the amendment was acceptable to the maker of the motion. Ms. Dika stated that she was in agreement as well.

Mr. Holden asked for a clarification as to the lighting. Councilor Reynolds indicated that he was not clear on how it would be handled.

Ms. Ludwig responded that the lighting was shown on the elevation pages. She said that there would be a sconce type of light on each column. She added that there were cut sheets included in their packets that showed the lighting plan for the porte-cochere.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the cut sheet showing the decking that would be used. She asked where that would be. Ms. Ludwig replied that it would be used on the courtyard roof over the ballroom.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, he called for the vote.

The motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulations that the mechanical plan, the awnings, and the materials to be used on the east wall of the garage receive final Commission approval passed by a 6-1 vote with Vice Chairman Adams voting in opposition.

## II. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by **Mark Bodi, owner**, for property located at **121 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (new two story structure to rear of building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 48 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Lisa DeStefano, architect for the project, spoke to the application. Mr. Mike Murphy from DeStefano Architects was present as well. Ms. DeStefano stated that the owner would like to put on an addition to the rear of the property. She added that the property backs up to Sheafe Street and that that will be the only street that the addition will be seen from.
- Ms. DeStefano pointed out that there are a lot of brick structures and wood frame additions with gable ends facing out to Sheafe Street.
- Ms. DeStefano stated that the addition is proposed in the back of the building at the gable end and would eliminate the deck and would align with the railing of the existing staircase. She added that the stairs would be staying in the same location and that there would be covered parking.

- She said that they were working with the abutter on how the addition would work with his portion of the building. She added that they are proposing to still carry some deck area with the same detailing that was there, the same window proportions, and replicating the same entry door.
- Chairman Rice asked about the proposed rounded balcony. Ms. DeStefano replied that the balcony had a curve to it. Chairman Rice stated that given the rigid symmetry of the building, he felt the way the balconies were expressed were a little ornate. Ms. DeStefano said that that could easily be adjusted.
- Chairman Rice asked about doors and the lights over the doors. He said that the windows on the back of the building have mullions. Ms. DeStefano replied that the existing doors do not have mullions but have a transom above. She said that they could look at different window patterns but what they were going for was less glass on top and more down below.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the Commission approved of the tapered craftsman style columns that are supporting the deck. He said that he would rather see square columns with a wrap at the top and a wooden base. Ms. DeStefano replied that they wanted to put something sturdy on the base. She said that they are looking at a granite base but that they will consider a square column.
- Mr. Holden advised Ms. DeStefano to make sure that they are not intruding in the right of way.
- Ms. Fineberg asked if the addition would be taller than the structure next to it. Ms. DeStefano replied that it was about a half a story taller.
- Vice Chairman Adams stated that there are transoms over the entry doors on the second floor of the building. He said that he is assuming that they will maintain a consistent head height with the windows on either side of it. He added that it makes more sense to forgo the transom on the third floor and swap it for a window on the gable end. He felt it was more common to see a window in the gable end than a transom over the door. Mr. Wyckoff and Chairman Rice thought that was an excellent idea.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if they would consider an awning since the doors are currently unprotected. Ms. DeStefano replied that she would rather plan for gutters.
- Chairman Rice invited interested parties from the public to give their comments.
- Attorney Michael King, representing Mark Connelly of 123 State Street, the other unit in this condominium association, spoke to the proposal. He stated that Mr. Connelly had concern about the symmetry of the building with an addition on one side and not on the other side. He added that as to scale, the roof line of the addition is higher than the buildings on its left and right. In addition, he felt the side windows facing the common area were inconsistent with any other building in the neighborhood.
- Ms. Dika asked Attorney King if the association has voted on this issue. Attorney King replied not that he knew of.
- Mr. Holden stated that the City does not have an issue at this point. He said that the City needs the application and the application has to be signed by the association in order to be accepted.

B) Work Session requested by **Parade Office, LLC**, for property located **195 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (mixed use building of retail, hotel, office, and residential units). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Jeff Johnston spoke to the project. He reminded the Commission that this was Phase II of the project. He said that the proposal included the demolition of the Parade Office Mall. The vision was to create a pedestrian oriented mixed use development on the site that will be in character with the City. He said that they have been guided by the Master Plan and the Northern Tier Study.
- Ms. Lisa DeStefano, architect for the project, spoke next. She said that when planning the site, pedestrian access was near the top of their list. She stated that the design team was looking closely at how to bring people through the site and on to other parts of the City. She added that they will be able to meet all of the zoning requirements. Ms. DeStefano said that they have also looked at the proposed rewrite of the zoning ordinance, pursuant to the new Master Plan.
- Mr. David Manfredie of Elkus Manfredie said that this was an extraordinary opportunity to create a mixed use that will keep the area alive year round. He added that they did not want to create an island but to make a connected series of blocks. He said that they would like to create a new street connected to the City grid, with buildings, parking on the street, and parking below grade so that the area would be a walkable precinct. Mr. Manfredie said that it was important that the buildings they propose fit the scale of Portsmouth. He explained that the proposal is for four different building pads and the creation of a new street that breaks down the scale of the site. They are trying to create a pedestrian precinct that is edged by retail on both sides. The retail turns the corner and comes out on Hanover Street and Deer Street. He stated that the buildings would have a mix of uses - hotel, residential, office, and retail. All of the uses would bring different people on different days and at different times. There will be parking below grade that covers almost the entire site. He added that what make these kinds of places successful are good tenants, parallel parking, wide sidewalks and comfortable walking paths.
- Mr. Tom Kinslow, of Elkus Manfredie stated that he would go over the traffic pattern for the site. He said that after reviewing old plans, they discovered that there was a Vaughan Street at one time in that area. He said that they are proposing wider sidewalks for pedestrian travel, sidewalk cafes, and outdoor retail displays. Mr. Kinslow explained that the newly created street would be a one way street. He said that the hotel would function off of a porte-cochere, similar to the Hilton.
- Mr. Kinslow explained the plan that showed the break between the buildings. He said that they have pushed the retail out a bit so that the pedestrian is not looking at the full height of the building. They would be looking at the awnings and the storefronts.
- Ms. DeStefano pointed out that they are trying to bring a livelihood to the area by having wider sidewalks for outside dining areas with the additional possibility to display produce or other wares.

- Mr. Kinslow mentioned that there would be common entries to the offices in the buildings.
- Chairman Rice asked for comments about the site. He said it was not in their purview but it would be helpful in their discussion.
- Vice Chairman Adams stated that the concept was a sensible departure from urban planning. He felt it was a fabulous opportunity for the community.
- Councilor Raynolds felt it was important to take the opportunity to restore a historic street that had once been on the site.
- Ms. Dika said that she was pleased to see that the team spent a lot of time thinking about the concept by reviewing the Northern Tier Study and the Master Plan.
- Mr. Katz stated that he saw the first floor of the buildings as having prominence and everything above it as paying the rent. He did not think that that was a bad thing. He stated that he was excited about the prospect.
- Mr. Hetjmanek stated that he liked it because there were site lines through it and the idea of the street breaks it up. He thought it was very pedestrian friendly with wide sidewalks and trees throughout.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he hoped that they would stay with the division of the bays with a colonnade. He thought that was a nice touch. He said that he hoped they would stay with brick on the rounded corners.
- Ms. DeStefano stated that even though the street would be a private one, they are still proposing to do granite curbing, the sidewalk, and the period lighting which will also be around the perimeter of the area.
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission for their comments on the hotel building and the residential building.
- Ms. Dika asked about the height of the buildings. Mr. Kinslow replied that everything was less than 60 feet without the mechanicals. He said that the mechanical overrides would be about 12 ½ feet above the roof deck.
- Ms. Fineberg stated that she liked the rounded corners on the buildings. She added that there are a number of buildings in the community with rounded corners and she liked seeing it echoed.
- Vice Chairman Adams stated some of the period buildings have corners that are not smoothly rounded with the side walls of the building. In this case, he felt that the smoothness of the sidewall running to the rounded corner, like what was used at the Hilton Garden falls short. He would like them to take another look at it. He also said that the storefronts that were separated from the plane of the building were an uncharacteristic element in the community. He added that he felt that the 14-16 foot height of the storefront portion of the building was too tall. Vice Chairman Adams said that while he is enthralled by much of what they are proposing, it looks like a four story building that was being placed on top of something.
- Mr. Katz stated that the farther they get away from the City core the more they should explore the freedom to expand the range of design options. He said that he did not think that the project diminishes the state of Portsmouth's historic heritage. He felt it was a good opportunity to explore it and see where it goes.
- Councilor Raynolds stated that he was okay with the project. He agreed with Mr. Katz that this project is not in the core and so he feels less constrained.



- Mr. Dika said that the element of the mansard roof has become a way of keeping the building heights lower than if a gabled roof was being used. She continued to say that there are a lot of tall mansard roofed buildings in Portsmouth. She felt it was getting tedious.
- Ms. DeStefano said they are always going to try to keep the horizontal band to anchor what is the top of the fourth story. She said that they are also introducing another material (possibly zinc shingles) to get the attic floor to read as something different without having to do a mansard roof.
- Mr. Kinslow showed the Commission a picture of a building where zinc shingles were used. Ms. DeStefano added that it was not a real reflective material.
- Councilor Reynolds said that he felt there was too much red brick. He would like to encourage the use of other materials.
- Chairman Rice stated that what he felt they were trying to do is to create a sense of place that is pedestrian friendly. He felt that the buildings were a little rigid and not lively enough.
- Ms. DeStefano replied that the images that they are showing are more for looking at the massing and scale. When they come back, they will have more of the energy brought back into the building.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the buildings could each be in a different material. As to the height issue, he felt that there was paranoia in Portsmouth about making something too tall. He pointed out that Victorian buildings were built 50 or 60 feet high and a flagpole was proudly put on top of it.
- Mr. Kinslow stated that they are using traditional elements to break down the mass.
- Mr. Holden stated that what surprised him about the design was how the retail component sticks out significantly. He said he did not necessarily object to it, he has just not seen it replicated anywhere else.
- Chairman Rice said that the space just needs to be defined better to add the liveliness and the sense of place that they are trying to create.
- Mr. Holden advised them to work on the site aspects before they get too far down the road.
- Ms. DeStefano said that they have had some meetings with the City and they are ongoing.
- Ms. Fineberg said she will be interested in seeing some of the decorative elements. She does not want it to look like a college campus.
- Ms. DeStefano said that they would be back for another work session.

Councilor Reynolds left at this point in the meeting.

C) Work Session requested by **Eric D. Peterson, owner**, for property located at **43 Sheafe Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing ell) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new ell). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 20 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Mr. Eric Peterson stated that he was proposing to put a 12' X 14' addition on his Federalist style house. He said he would like to demolish a shed and chimney to make

way for the addition. He added that the addition would be smaller than the shed because he wanted to back it off of the property line. The shed is currently built right up to the property line. Mr. Peterson pointed out that it is not correct that he shares a common wall with the abutter, the Sobels. He stated that the Sobels brick wall was collapsing into his shed.

- Mr. Peterson said that there would be no changes to the east elevation. On the south elevation, the one story gray shed would be removed. He said that the roof peak line would be consistent all the way from one end to the other.
- Ms. Fineberg asked if the addition was stepped back. Mr. Peterson replied yes, that the addition would be set back 11 feet.
- Chairman Rice stated that since he was stepping the addition back from the main house a few feet, wouldn't it make sense to also drop the roof ridge line down so that it looks like an addition. Mr. Peterson agreed with the suggestion. Vice Chairman Adams interjected and said that eaves are classic architecture and typically done that way so as not to compete with the main structure.
- Mr. Peterson said that he did not have a problem with modifying the design. He added that his real goal was to gain the square footage to make the house a more comfortable size.
- Vice Chairman Adams asked if the corner board of the existing building could be retained. Mr. Peterson replied that it made sense to do that.
- Mr. Peterson stated that there was about 34" separating his building from the abutter's building.
- Chairman Rice asked for comments on the west elevation. Vice Chairman Adams stated that there might be enough space for a gable window in the attic. Mr. Peterson commented that it would be advantageous to have ventilation on both sides of the attic.
- Chairman Rice had a concern about the fenestration on the new addition. Ms. Fineberg asked how far the abutter's deck came to the addition. She wondered if the applicant would want windows on the side that came so close to the deck. Mr. Peterson explained that the deck ended at a certain point and would not interfere with the proposed windows.
- Vice Chairman Adams asked who owns the 34" between the buildings. Mr. Peterson said that it was his understanding that they shared it. He said that he knew that the Sobels were planning some renovations of their own and he had some concerns about their plans.
- Mr. Katz asked about the transom lights above the double doors and the windows above it on the west elevation. He had some concern about them but he then determined that they would only be visible by looking over a fence by an abutting neighbor on the south side.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested that Mr. Peterson measure the glass size to get the overall measurement of the window. Mr. Peterson replied that that was his intention. He said that he wanted to match the 6 over 6 style. He added that he would like to put in the transom light on the first floor.
- Ms. Fineberg stated that she was fine with the transom light but she did not think that the sidelights were characteristic of the style of the house.
- Vice Chairman Adams said that he was uncomfortable with the three windows together. He felt that the removal of the middle window would be a good solution. Mr. Peterson

asked if he felt the middle window should be removed on the north side as well. Vice Chairman Adams replied yes.

- Vice Chairman Adams suggested using cementitious clapboard on the rear wall that faces the abutter. Mr. Peterson commented that he wanted to get the most out of the lot and that meant moving closer to the boundary line. He said that by using the cementitious material it would cut down on maintenance and would be fire resistant.
- Vice Chairman Adams also suggested that he speak with Mr. Clum about the windows that he was proposing to put in the rear because the closer you get to the property line, the more the window size diminishes.
- Mr. Steve McHenry, local architect stated that within 5 feet of the property line, there is zero fenestration.
- Mr. Peterson replied that if he cannot have any windows on the north elevation, then he would have to redesign the structure.
- Mr. Sobel, the abutter, clarified that the narrow strip between the lots is a portion of his property. He showed an accepted and recorded plot plan for the Sobel property. He said that there was no common area running between the two houses. The lot line does run exactly along Mr. Peterson's house so he felt that the 5 foot rule would apply.
- Mr. Sobel stated that he was present in support of the applicant and has offered to coordinate his garage project with Mr. Peterson's project in terms of possibly pouring a common footing so that both properties can build off of it.

D) Work Session requested by **82-86 Congress, LLC, owner**, for property located at **82-86 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add one story structure to existing building, add rooftop HVAC equipment, renovate storefronts and existing windows). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 45 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Steve McHenry, architect for the project, explained the proposal. He said that the building in question is commonly referred to as the Bull Moose Music building. It is also connected to the building behind it on Chestnut Street. He explained that in 1999, they created an elevator core and a new entry that served both the new structure as well as the second floor of the Bull Moose building. He said that more space is needed and as a result, he was proposing to build another floor on top of the two story structure.
- Mr. McHenry walked the Commission through the plans. One of the extensive renovations will be to do over the storefront. He pointed out that the building was supposed to have a large glass entry on Chestnut Street. He said that they plan to build it.
- Mr. McHenry stated that they do not plan to replicate the brick that is on the lower two floors.
- Mr. McHenry said that the addition has a corner that is unusual. He said that it is a light well that shines into the corner space. He said that they have tried to do a pattern of windows that does not replicate what happens on the floor below. He added that they would be holding the vertical lines. Mr. McHenry pointed out that they are proposing to remove the brick piers and plate glass windows and use a metal clad storefront system with infill tall windows and a narrower band of fascia above the storefront system. He added that the awning will remain for now.

- Vice Chairman Adams told Mr. McHenry that the light well was an extremely interesting design.
- Mr. McHenry pointed out that there would be mechanical equipment on the roof.
- Mr. McHenry stated that he was looking to design something that was livelier and brighter. He felt that the tall glazing on the storefront system and the detailing of the curve section helped to accomplish that.
- Vice Chairman Adams asked Mr. McHenry if he would be able to maintain the look of the masonry pier on the Chestnut Street elevation. Mr. McHenry replied that page three showed that they would align.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked what type of material would be used. Mr. McHenry explained that current building codes have stringent regulations for projects of this type. They need to go through seismic mitigation in doing it. He said to do a complete seismic mitigated building structure requires that an enormous amount of new structure be placed. He added that it is a judgment made by the structural engineer that the mass of the building above cannot exceed a certain amount before requiring seismic mitigation. He said that the idea is to make the floor as light as possible. So they would not want to use brick masonry because it would be too heavy.
- Mr. McHenry stated that the choices of materials are metal cladding and alloyed shingles. He said that another choice would be a cementitious panel similar to Hardi.
- Vice Chairman Adams asked about the EFIS. Mr. McHenry said that it stands for expanded insulated finish system. He said that that is what has been used at Harbor Place. He explained to the Commission how it is applied. Mr. McHenry pointed out that a problem with EFIS is that if not properly vented, condensation will cause it to bubble out. He said that as long as it is installed properly, it can last forever. He pointed out that the Pic and Pay building is a good example of the use of EFIS material.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that EFIS material can be very tender. Mr. McHenry replied that there are lots of different installations.
- Mr. McHenry said that his client currently is leaning toward the cement panels and synthetic trim. Vice Chairman Adams said he would be comfortable with the corner piece having some sort of metal roofing and side wall. Mr. McHenry said that they envision the eave over the top edge as well as the roof over the corner piece to be copper clad, similar to 117 Bow Street.
- Vice Chairman Adams stated that he preferred to see a stucco like material in the areas where they are creating new wall surfaces. Mr. McHenry agreed. Vice Chairman Adams added that color is not within the Commission's purview but he felt that color selection would be an important part of how the addition works in regards to its massing.
- Mr. McHenry explained that they do not plan to replace the windows on the second floor. The new windows will be Eagle metal clad windows. There will be a metal storefront system with added trim and they are still determining what the size and shape of the glass awning will be. He also added that they plan to replace the planters at the back corner of the building with granite caps. He said that skateboarders have damaged the current planters.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked the Commission if they were comfortable with the massing and the design.
- Ms. Fineberg stated that she did not have an objection to adding the third story. She said that she was not comfortable with the windows but she could not put her finger on what it

was exactly. Mr. McHenry replied that they are not constrained by height so they have been able to take advantage of that. He said they wanted to create a contrast with the window system while keeping proportionally the same line. Vice Chairman Adams stated that arching the tops of the windows make them look lighter. He also thought that they lightened the third floor addition in regard to mass.

- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he thought the problem was that the second floor windows were flat in contrast to the third floor ones that have arched tops with caps and cornices. He suggested that they might want to add a cap to the windows and cover the brick piers with a metal that matches what will be used on the third floor. He thought it made it look like the addition had just been set on top of a two story building. He felt something needed to be done to the building to accept this third floor addition. Mr. Wyckoff added that he was not comfortable with the small, projecting roof over the corner windows that are underneath the rounded portion. He felt it was too flat.
- Chairman Rice said that he agreed.
- Mr. Katz stated that he did not think the third floor looked added on to. He said the safe thing to do would have been to simplify the corner, make it an extension of everything else and bring the cornice around, but he added what fun is that? He did not agree that the second floor windows needed any work. In his opinion, he felt the third floor looked like it belonged there. He did agree that maybe some more work could be done with the corner.
- Mr. McHenry said that a good view of the structure was on page 7 of the plans. He stated that it was always a temptation to make things symmetrical, aligned horizontal and vertically. He added that the building is an “odd duck” and that there is tension involved with it. He said the design was playing on that tension and doing something a little frivolous than the lining up and solving the problem vertically and horizontally with the same materials. He added that the building catches your attention when looking at the building from the Vaughan Mall.
- Mr. Katz stated that he would support the design.
- Mr. McHenry stated that he would like to look at the design some more and come back before the Commission.
- Ms. Dika stated that she agreed with Mr. Katz. She felt the design had good balance and that it was imaginative.
- Mr. McHenry stated that he would be back for another work session.

Mr. Holden reminded the Commissioners that they were given a draft copy of the HDC Rules and Regulations at the beginning of the meeting. He said that some minor changes have been made and he would like the Commissioners to review the copy and give their comments at the March meeting.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the voting procedure for Chairman and Vice Chairman at the March meeting. Mr. Katz asked Mr. Holden if a member could request a secret ballot. Mr. Holden replied that he thought they could but that he would find out for certain before the next meeting.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

At 10:40 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good  
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on March 14, 2007.