

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

June 4, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, City Council Representative Eric Spear, and Alternates Joseph Almeida, George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Elena Maltese

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – May 7, 2008

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

B. Request for Re-hearing – 49 Sheafe Street application – submitted by Jonathan Watson Sobel Revocable Trust

Chairman Dika asked the Commission if they felt there was good reason to re-hear the application. Vice Chairman Katz stated that although no new information or changes were presented, the applicant has cited that procedural errors occurred and that was reason enough to request the re-hearing. He said that no harm would be done to re-hear it, in fact; maybe a less charged atmosphere would be beneficial.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to re-hear the application at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that the application had a number of things working against it. One was that nearly half of the Commission was not in office during the work sessions. He also said that at the time of the public hearing, the atmosphere was very charged. He thought maybe the Commission could have done something more to lessen the tension. For that reason, he would like to re-hear the application.

Chairman Dika agreed and added that she thought the work session/public hearing added to the tension of the whole evening. She said that she would support the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated he agreed with the problem with the work session/public hearing. He did not feel that it worked well. He was wondering what could be done to lessen the tension. He was not sure what could be done to address it for a future re-hearing. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not agree with the procedural errors that were cited in the Motion for Re-hearing.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a re-hearing of the application to be heard at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission passed by a 6-1 vote with Mr. Melchior voting in opposition.

Chairman Dika pointed out that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission would be July 2, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.

C. Petition of **Jamer Realty, Inc., owner**, for property located at **178 Fleet Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install cedar clapboards over **Request to Postpone** in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 2-4 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 7, 2008 meeting to the June 4, 2008 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application to the July 2, 2008 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

D. Petition of **Jamer Realty, Inc., owner**, and **Legends Billiards, applicant**, for property located at **80 Hanover Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing flat windows with taller removable windows) as per plans on file in the **Request to Postpone** Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 2-4 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *This item was postponed at the May 7, 2008 meeting to the June 4, 2008 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application to the July 2, 2008 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **M. H. Wentworth Home for the Chronic Invalid, owner**, for property located at **346 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install three signs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is

shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lots 10 and 16 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

Chairman Dika pointed out that Ms. Kozak would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE COMMISSION

Mr. Bob Iafolla of Myriad Management Group, Ms. Mary Ann Dunham of the Mark Wentworth Home and Mr. Tom Ingebritson of JSA Architects were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Iafolla stated that he had photos of various signs in the area for the Commission’s review. He explained that this was probably their seventh appearance before the Commission with regards to this project. He said that he hoped the Commission had a chance to drive by the site because he felt it was a landmark validation of the efforts of the Commission. Chairman Dika complimented the applicants for their hard work and added that she felt the cooperation between the two groups has resulted in a very attractive building.

Mr. Iafolla said that the reason they were before them this evening was to seek permission to hang three signs to direct traffic on the site. He explained that the original sign hung on the building but was obscured by two mature trees. They would like to have a free standing sign that would be bottom lit. The other two signs would not be lit. He pointed out that they have already received Board of Adjustment approval.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he found the signs very tasteful, more so than the examples that were submitted in the photos. He felt they would fit in well with the neighborhood.

2. Petition of **Richard A. Porzio, owner**, for property located at **56 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install two skylights) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 33 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

Chairman Dika stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE COMMISSION

Mr. Richard Porzio was present to speak to the application. He explained that he would like to install two skylights on the west side of his house.

Vice Chairman Katz asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Almeida asked if there was any flexibility to the placement of the skylights in the vertical position. Mr. Porzio explained that the placement is dictated by what is happening on the inside. He said that he was installing a bathroom.

Ms. Kozak asked on what slope of the roof the windows would be placed. Mr. Porzio showed Ms. Kozak from the submitted photos where they would be placed.

Vice Chairman Katz asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise he declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Almeida made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Vice Chairman Katz asked for discussion.

Mr. Almeida commented that the house has had tasteful renovations and so he thought the skylights would fit in very well. He pointed out that the neighboring houses have skylights as well.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that the application fulfills all of the requirements for skylights, one being no skylights on the front of the house, and two, that the skylights are no larger than the dominant windows of the house. He said he was perfectly comfortable with the application.

Hearing no other discussion, Vice Chairman Katz called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that the last two applications required a Commissioner to recuse him or herself. He said that given what was being discussed with the Planning Department, if the two Commissioners had to sit out the entire meeting, there would not have been a quorum. He said he wanted to point that out. Chairman Dika replied that she hoped that there would be more discussion about it at a later date.

3. Petition of **Janine Contillo and Michael J. Vitale, owners**, for property located at **442 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (reconstruct entrance steps) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 78 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Janine Contillo was present to speak to the application. She stated that her front steps are very old and the banister is falling down. She explained that to make them safer, they are proposing to change the direction of them to run parallel to the house. Ms. Contillo pointed out that there is another house on the street with the same type of steps that they are proposing.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how the underneath structure was designed. Ms. Contillo said that her husband chose the solid wood design as he thought it was a cleaner look. Mr. Wyckoff asked why she chose a railing height of 42". Ms. Contillo replied that the builder suggested the 42" height. Mr. Wyckoff said that he felt it was an awkward height. He explained that in Maine the

required height is 42” but in New Hampshire it is 36”. Mr. Clum confirmed that that was correct for a single family home. Ms. Contillo stated that they could be flexible with the railing height.

Mr. Almeida told Ms. Contillo that the example that they have chosen was a very appropriate one. He said that he was hoping that her design would be able to include a stringer and perhaps open lattice instead of the solid board look. He felt it was more appropriate to the structure. Ms. Contillo said that she was agreeable to that.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested going into work session mode to work out some of the details. He added that he was disappointed with the contemporary look.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to move into a work session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Work Session -

- Mr. Almeida stated that the applicant has provided a very reasonable example of a front step. He suggested that the application state that she is going to replicate the example given.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he would like to see the vertical elements spaced a little wider. He said that the stairs needed an eight inch wide horizontal base at the bottom and the rails should be 36” in height. He also said that he would like to see the same posts and caps as the example stairs.
- Ms. Kozak added that exposing the stringer and widening the vertical boards would help.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the vertical boards be 3 ½” pickets with 1” spacing between them. He added that a mud sill and frieze of 1” X 8” be added.
- Chairman Dika asked Ms. Contillo if this was acceptable to her. Ms. Contillo replied yes.

Ms. Kozak made a motion to move in a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Ms. Contillo stated that she agreed with the suggested changes.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the posts and caps match what is at 458 Marcy Street.
- 2) That a 36” rail height is used.
- 3) That an 8” frieze board and mud sill is used.
- 4) That the pickets underneath are 3 ½” in width and spaced 1” apart.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Jason Lander, owner**, for property located at **536 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 56 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jason Lander, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that he was proposing to build a fence that was shown in the submitted plans. He said the fence would be located on the southwest corner of his property and would run westward. It would be approximately 30 feet of fence. Mr. Lander pointed out that a neighbor behind him has the same fence he is proposing and the two fences will meet up.

Mr. Lander pointed out that he would be using a 5’5” wood post instead of what was shown in the submitted plans.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if it was a pre-manufactured fence. Mr. Lander replied yes.

Chairman Dika asked how much space would be between the bottom of the fence and grade. Mr. Lander replied that it would be no more than 4”.

Mr. Almeida asked if the ground was level. Mr. Lander replied no, it was not and the fence would have to step down toward the house.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Kozak stated that the fence was in scale with the surroundings and was appropriate to the neighborhood and its setting.

Hearing no more discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

5. Petition of **Gates Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **T’Rouge, LLC**, applicant, for property located at 213 Gates Street, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 8 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Corey Colwell of MSC, Inc. and Mr. Dan Desrochers, owner, were present to speak to the application. Mr. Colwell passed out a color copy of the display he would be referring to during the presentation.

Mr. Colwell stated that they would like to remove the one story garage adjacent to Mechanic Street. The garage sits about five feet from the City right of way and about three feet from the property line. He explained that the City's assessing records showed that the garage was constructed in the 1950's and an inspection of the garage showed modern day nails, asphalt shingles, and circular sawed lumber.

Mr. Colwell explained that the purpose for removing the garage was threefold. It would allow the necessary room for a third parking space and a much safer parking condition. It would also eliminate a curb cut directly adjacent to another curb cut and finally, removing the garage would increase open space by 5%. He added that they would be adding landscaping as well.

Mr. Colwell said that the submitted photos showed a deteriorating structure with rotting wood and missing shingles. He added that the garage has no historical significance. By removing it, it will improve traffic flow through the site and provide safer parking.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about a picket fence that was indicated on the site plan. Mr. Colwell explained that there is an existing fence there and that there was no proposal to put a new fence in.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was clapboard over the sheathing on the garage. Mr. Colwell replied yes and that the sheathing could be seen on the inside of the garage.

Mr. Almeida commented that the removal of the garage would be an improvement to the site. He said that they are seeing a lot of these smaller garages go as they are useless today.

Mr. Clum asked if the small picket fence to the left of the garage would be removed. Mr. Colwell replied yes.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Almeida made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Almeida reiterated that the removal of the garage would be an improvement to the site and would provided added safety. It also would provide a needed parking space.

Chairman Dika commented that it was a small building and was non-contributing to the community.

Ms. Kozak spoke in favor of the motion. She said that it was not an historic structure but it was a small outbuilding. She said that in a way, these small outbuildings define the neighborhoods however; this one was not significant and it did not merit keeping it.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

6. Petition of **Kathryn Saunders, owner**, for property located at **140 Newcastle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (replace porch

posts and rails, add lattice screening) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 26 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Kathryn Saunders, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. She stated that she has been before the Commission twice before. She explained that she would like to improve the porch. Currently it has 42” high railings with 4”x 4” posts. She would like to replace the posts with 8” round columns and a railing of 36” in height. She added that she would also like to shield the concrete block below the porch with lattice.

Mr. Almeida commented the applicant on her clever way of showing the before and after pictures of the project. He asked if the lattice would be horizontal lattice. Ms. Saunders replied yes. Mr. Almeida asked if the lattice would be wood. Ms. Saunders replied yes.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be vertical trim pieces on the lattice. Ms. Saunders replied yes.

Mr. Melchior wanted to verify that the columns would not overhang the decking. Ms. Saunders replied that there would be a 6” wide beam and there would be a slight overhang of the columns which was consistent with a typical installation.

Mr. Almeida asked if the vertical trim pieces would be at the corners as well. Ms. Saunders replied yes.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the changes were appropriate for the age of the house. The columns, the railing and hiding the cement block was an improvement.

Hearing no more discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

7. Petition of **Chad and Laura Morin, LLC, owner**, for property located at **36 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add windows and skylights to Ladd Street elevation, add concrete pad and lattice screening for mechanicals at rear elevation), allow demolition of an existing structure (remove a portion of rear roof) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct roof deck and pergola, install Nana Wall exterior doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 29 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Rob Harbeson of DeStefano Architects was present to speak to the application. He stated that the submitted plans were almost identical to the ones reviewed at the prior work session.

Mr. Harbeson walked the Commission through the plans and highlighted the following items: the proposed roof plan that included the installation of skylights, a pergola, a roof deck, Nana wall, an additional guard rail and the addition of two mechanical units on an extension of the concrete pad with screening around them. He pointed out the proposed windows on the Ladd Street elevation. On the rear elevation, two new windows will be added with a new gutter and downspouts. Mr. Harbeson stated that he wished to amend the application to include an additional gutter at the request of an abutter. He pointed out that the snow guards would remain.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the Nana wall. Mr. Harbeson explained that the nana wall was needed to access the roof deck. The single panel would work like a door. The double doors would fold away so that the entire door area can be open.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the gutter installation. Mr. Harbeson explained that the slope of the roof would drain to the back of the building to the gutter and downspout. He said they have tried to beef up the eave condition with trim board and molding to hide that condition to make it appear to look like a heavy trim band.

Mr. Melchior wanted to verify that the new windows would have precast concrete sills. Mr. Harbeson said that the existing stone sills will be retained and they will try to match that as closely as possible with the new windows.

Ms. Kozak asked about the location of the canopy and how it would be supported. Mr. Harbeson explained that they have not investigated all of the shapes that are possible with the canopy. He said it would be similar to what was submitted in the plans. He added that the canopy would be supported off of the building and the posts on the outer edge of the deck would be temporary. Ms. Kozak asked Mr. Clum if the canopy would be considered temporary and thus not within the Commission's purview. Mr. Clum said that the Commission has reviewed things that were seasonal in nature so he felt it was within their purview. Mr. Almeida pointed out that in the work session, the canopy was considered more of an umbrella and the consensus of the Commission was at the time that it was something that they did not want to review. He said this might be something that the Commission would want to exempt in the future. Chairman Dika added that it was an unusual design and was something that they have not seen in the District.

Mr. Almeida asked Mr. Harbeson to explain the amended gutter. Mr. Harbeson explained the gutter would be resting on the abutter's roof. He added that this was at the abutter's request.

Mr. Almeida stated that he was not in agreement with the vinyl screening that was being proposed to cover the mechanical equipment. Mr. Harbeson said that he was open to another material. It was not in an area that was highly visible.

Mr. Wyckoff had a concern with the canopy because of its contemporary design in addition to the other contemporary features being proposed. He asked for more details on how the canopy would work. Mr. Harbeson said that it was a very tight piece of canvas that acts as a shade or canopy. It would be 7-8 feet from the ground. Mr. Wyckoff commented with that much tension the posts would have to be very strong. Mr. Harbeson said that it was their hope to design a post that could be removable. The canopy would be a seasonal use. Chairman Dika asked if the canopy could be removed from the proposal and revisited at a later date when more information was available. Mr. Harbeson said yes, he was agreeable to that.

Chairman Dika asked about the screening for the mechanicals. Mr. Harbeson stated that four AC units exist now and they are hoping to only add one more. Mr. Almeida said he was questioning

the need for screening at all. He added that putting vinyl lattice up was a mistake. He wondered if the screening could be reviewed at a later date once the project was complete. Mr. Harbeson was agreeable to that. Chairman Dika said that a site walk would be required.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Melchior made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the canopy proposal is removed from the application.
- 2) That a site walk is held following completion of the project to determine if the mechanicals require screening around them.
- 3) That an additional gutter is added to the rear of the structure.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the project has been worked over in the work session. He said that because of the visibility and accessibility and location of the project, they were allowing some details that they would not ordinarily approve in another location. He felt it was appropriate in that location.

Councilor Spear commented that the Commission is seeing more roof decks. He wondered if they should be considering visibility from other roofs. He stated he was fine with this application but just wanted to point it out.

Hearing no more discussion, the motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application with the following stipulations passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

- 4) That the canopy proposal is removed from the application.
- 5) That a site walk is held following completion of the project to determine if the mechanicals require screening around them.
- 6) That an additional gutter is added to the rear of the structure.

8. Petition of **Kristin Goodwillie, owner**, for property located at **17 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing windows, add new windows and doors, remove garage doors, lower entry door, add chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 53 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. She explained that there were a couple small changes made since the work session last month. She pointed out that on the street side elevation she was proposing to lower the entry door, rework

the surround around it and add a transom light. She said that on the elevation that was set back, originally she had proposed adding a double French door. Instead she was now proposing to put a single double hung window and add a single French door that would be located behind the entry wall which would screen it from the street. She said that they would be keeping the heavy overhanging detail that runs horizontally and would re-shingle that elevation.

On the pond side elevation, Ms. Whitney explained that she was proposing to replace the existing windows and would be adding new ones as well.

Ms. Whitney said that on the lower right side elevation, she would be replacing the two upper windows and would also be adding two more windows below those. In the entry area, she is proposing two new windows in that location.

Ms. Whitney pointed out that the left side elevation cannot be seen from the street. She proposed adding and removing windows. Also on this side, she was proposing to install a 5' French door with eight lights. She explained that all of the windows would be Andersen Woodright windows with SDL. She added that she may be using Azek for the trim, at least on the water side of the structure.

Finally, Ms. Whitney explained that they would be adding a couple fireplaces and so a chimney would be running up the side of the structure on the bridge side elevation. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it would be a true masonry chimney. Ms. Whitney replied yes with no cap at this time.

Mr. Wyckoff mentioned that with regard to the street elevation, the building now will look like a house. Ms. Whitney replied that the building was originally a stable.

Mr. Almeida asked if the fireplaces would be wood fireplaces. Ms. Whitney replied that at this time, the owner was considering wood burning fireplaces.

Mr. Almeida asked about a reverse cottage window in the proposal. He said that he did not see it in the specification sheets. Ms. Whitney pointed out that she had circled the wrong window. She should have circled the window to the right of the one circled.

Mr. Almeida asked if the patio door grill patterns would match the windows. Ms. Whitney explained that they would have the same grill pattern as she was using the same manufacturer for both windows and doors. Mr. Almeida pointed out that she was proposing quite a bit of windows in the building but he felt it was appropriate.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Melchior made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application with the change of the window on the spec sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Melchior commented that it was a nice design. Chairman Dika added that it was appropriate.

The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application with the change of window on the spec sheet passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Councilor Spear made a motion to move into Work Sessions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Baer Real Estate, LLC, owner**, for property located at **51 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use, multi-story building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 33 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Jen Ramsey, representative for the applicant was present to speak to the application. She stated that she had further developments concerning the site. She informed the Commission that traffic and parking studies would be done this month. She said that traffic should be fairly heavy during the month to get a good read on traffic flow and frequency. She said that there has been some indication but she was not committing to it, that Hanover Street can support the traffic that this site would bring in. Ms. Ramsey explained that they are still looking at underground parking. She said that they are looking at Parker Street for the access. They are still looking at off street parking on Tanner Court and are looking to have the in and out traffic flow happen on one street.
- Ms. Ramsey stated that they are looking at more alternative materials such as the Centria product that was approved with the 117 Bow Street project. She said it has some nice profiles to it that they might consider for some of the larger bays that project off of the building.
- On the south elevation, Ms. Ramsey said that they were still proceeding with the look of two buildings on the site. She explained that they were exploring the possibility of building it in phases, A, B, and C. C would be the back building. She pointed out that the front was designed to look like two separate buildings.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked which section would be considered “phase one.” Ms. Ramsey said that that was still being determined but current conversation had it as the larger building, located closest to downtown. Ms. Ramsey replied that they were thinking of that building as being mostly brick with a granite band line and perhaps a metal panel on the projecting bays. The storefronts would have glassy fronts with punched openings above. The second, third, fourth and half stories would be residential with retail space on the first floor with parking below grade.
- Mr. Wyckoff said it was very important that if they intend to construct it in phases then the side of the buildings have to be presented as finished with window openings and not a blank face waiting for another building to be built.
- Mr. Melchior asked if the underground parking would be under the entire structure even if it is built in stages. Ms. Ramsey replied yes.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that they were getting some feeling from the Islington Street Corridor project and the neighborhood groups that they want to tone down the scale of

the buildings heading off down Islington Street. He suggested taking the left side building and scaling it down.

- Vice Chairman Katz reminded the Commission of Mr. David Holden's comments that the Commission should proceed with the requirements that are presented at that time. So until something happens with the Islington Street Corridor project, the Commission is to proceed as usual. He added that in his opinion when clapboard is mixed with brick, the results are not that satisfying.
- Mr. Wyckoff talked about some of the similarities with this project and the Martingale project.
- Chairman Dika asked the Commission if anyone had a problem with the size of the proposed building.
- Councilor Spear asked Ms. Ramsey what the motivation for changing the materials on the building was. Ms. Ramsey replied that it was to scale down the building. He said he could understand the material changes from right to left, but he wasn't fooled with the material changes from top to bottom.
- Ms. Kozak said it was important to bring down the scale and changing the material in some ways was a good way to do that.
- Mr. Almeida stated that he did not have an issue with building size but he felt the dormers are growing in size and they are stretching across the roof.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that in his opinion, the building would be an easier sale if that section were a four story building.
- Chairman Dika asked to move onto the review of the Tanner Street elevation.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that they have started to define the massing of this structure by adding grill patterns in the windows and providing trim details. She said that the bumped out bays would be an area where they would be looking to use the Centria metal product along with brick. With the parking below grade, it will allow retail all along the first floor.
- Mr. Wyckoff wondered if she needed to duplicate the front look on the side. He thought that maybe the bays could be reduced in size. Ms. Ramsey said that there might be a way to reduce the look of it by using a certain color with the Centria product.
- Mr. Melchior asked why one particular bump out was off center. Ms. Ramsey replied that part of the reason was the internal floor plan but she also wanted to break up the symmetrical look and give it some interest. Mr. Wyckoff and Chairman Dika commented that it looked awkward.
- Mr. Melchior asked Ms. Ramsey if she was looking at a change of material to clapboard with the gable ends. Ms. Ramsey replied that they were still looking to use brick with a heavy wood eave band.
- Mr. Almeida commented that he liked the streetscape drawing of the view up Tanner Court. He said it would be important to show both sides of the street for the perspective.
- Chairman Dika asked that they move onto the Tanner Court elevation.
- Ms. Ramsey said they were showing a row house block with this elevation. She explained that they have put more space between the New Englander faces and suppressed the wall further back so that there is more of a break between the front face of the building. She said that they have made a two family row house because of the grade situation in that area followed by a row of three houses. She added that they were also pushing the building back to allow on street parking and sidewalks.

- Ms. Kozak asked about the materials for this elevation. Ms. Ramsey replied that they were thinking of using clapboards for the New Englander faces. The pedestrian pass way would probably be trimmed out with Azek. Mr. Wyckoff commented that he liked the pedestrian way.
- Vice Chairman Katz felt that the design was very successful. He added that the amount and placing of the details gives it richness. He said it lives with the neighborhood.
- Mr. Almeida said that in his opinion, this was the most important side of the project. He disagreed with Vice Chairman Katz in that he liked the last version of the elevation better. He did not like seeing more windows and in a repetitive fashion. He thought the new design was very formal and not quite residential enough for Tanner Court.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he thought the biggest offensive to the design was the two story bays with the rails above them. He felt that was a little too much.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked how one can simplify it without making it look like cost cutting.
- Chairman Dika agreed with Mr. Almeida that the Tanner Court elevation was too formal.
- Ms. Kozak cautioned about trying to mimic what was across the street from the building. She thought the scale was perfect and she did not have any trouble with it. Mr. Wyckoff felt the scale was right as well.
- Mr. Melchior stated that he was not completely sold on dropping down the grade on the last section of the building. He pointed out that when the stairs are taken away, they also took away their ventilation for parking.
- Chairman Dika asked to move onto the Parker Street elevation.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that this is the elevation where the lower level parking entrance will be located. She said that were proposing hardiplank panels along the top floor. She also said that they were thinking of pulling the top floor in a bit as well.
- Chairman Dika asked if the chimney would have clay pots on top of them. Ms. Ramsey replied that they were looking to have working fireplaces and might possibly use clay pots as ventilation.
- Mr. Almeida noted the steepness of Parker Street.
- Ms. Ramsey asked the Commission what they thought of the dormers on this elevation.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he was not comfortable with the elevation. He thought it had a dormitory look and had a lack of detail. He also did not like the change of material.
- Mr. Melchior agreed and said that it does not seem to be consistent with the other facades.
- Mr. Almeida stated that the dormers are growing in size on this elevation as well.
- Vice Chairman Katz suggested that a roof plan would be great to see in the future.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that page 6 of the plans were the details. Detail 1 was the granite bands that would be seen on the smaller Islington Street building. Detail 2 was a typical window head and sill. She added that the dormer eave detail was the typical detail.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that if the back section of the smaller Islington Street building were set back about four feet, it might minimize the impact. He also commented that he does not like to see the same roofing materials used for separate roofs. Mr. Almeida said it was a bit premature to be discussing materials.
- Ms. Ramsey said that page 8 showed the storefront details for the front building.

- Mr. Wyckoff commented that the balustrades on Tanner Court were overkill. Mr. Almeida and Mr. Melchior agreed.
- Ms. Ramsey said that they are referring to the smaller building on Islington Street as building B. She explained that they were proposing to bring the brick all the way down in an effort to simplify it. On building A, granite bases would be used.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked the Commission how they felt about the massing on Tanner Court. He said that it worked for him. Mr. Wyckoff said that it was okay, but the formality was over the top. Chairman Dika and Mr. Almeida replied that they were okay with the massing.
- Chairman Dika asked if it was possible to physically mark the corner of the buildings so the Commission will have a sense of the size of the structures. Ms. Ramsey said she would have someone do that.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that once the traffic studies are done, they will meet with the Technical Advisory Committee to review the results. From that meeting, she said they would probably have three proposals to approach the site.
- Mr. Almeida commented that on the Eagle Photo building, the change of materials and the window sizes and patterns change to help break up the building. He felt that that approach might be applied to the page 2 plans.
- Ms. Kozak said that she did not have a problem with it looking like one building. She encouraged the applicant to try to do something different than Congress Street. She pointed out that Islington Street is not a street of buildings. Chairman Dika and Councilor Spear agreed.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:45 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on July 2, 2008.