

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**September 10, 2008
reconvened from September 3, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena Maltese; City Council Representative Eric Spear, Alternate Joseph Almeida

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts; Alternate George Melchior

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – August 13, 2008

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

B. Petition of **Joseph G. Cunningham, owner**, for property located at **195 Washington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove asbestos siding, repair, replace, and restore clapboard siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 78 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts. *(This item was postponed at the September 3, 2008 meeting to the September 10, 2008 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Joe Cunningham was present to speak to the application. He explained that he and his wife were before the Commission the week prior seeking approval for the removal of the siding and the replacement of the trim. He passed out new plans and explained in detail how the new trim would look and how it would be installed. He also brought a sample of the moulding detailing for the Commission to look at.

Mr. Almeida commented that the sample of the moulding detail at the last meeting was quite heavy. He said that this new sample was significantly better.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the application. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Iain Moodie, the applicant's contractor spoke to the Commission about the project. He explained that he has been doing more exploration of the house and has discovered more rot than expected. He said that the windows are currently unacceptable and he cannot work with them. He said that an HDC application was in the works for the replacement of all of the windows but he was going to have to replace them some of them before he received HDC approval because they were in such bad shape. Mr. Moodie told the Commission he has ordered Andersen 400 series windows with the appropriate sash and a 9 over 6 grill pattern on the ground level and 6 over 6 on the upper floors. He went on to say that if the Commission does not approve of the windows, then he will remove them.

Mr. Clum commented that the change in light pattern would need HDC approval and he urged the applicant to bring cut sheets to the Commission.

Mr. Moodie pointed out that the Commission has approved the Andersen 400 series on several other projects so he was assuming that they would be fine for this application.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the only problem he could see was that he has changed the whole basis of the windows by putting them on the outside of the sheathing in a more contemporary style. Mr. Moodie pointed out that he did the same application at 97 South Street and it was not intrusive.

Ms. Maltese stated that she was appreciative of the fact that the applicant was informing them that he was going to be doing this. She said that the applicant would still be coming to them for approval. Mr. Moodie added that he was very much aware that the Commission could turn the application down but right now, he has to put something in the openings. He said he would remove the windows if they are not approved. Mr. Cunningham clarified that there were seven windows that needed replaced immediately.

Chairman Dika told Mr. Moodie that he was taking a great risk because if the windows do not meet the Commission's approval he will have to remove the windows at great expense. Mr. Moodie replied that he was going by precedence of the Commission.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the proposed 9 over 6 windows on the ground level. Mr. Moodie said that he based his decision on what was in the area. He added that the lower level window casings were larger than second floor window casings. The attic windows would be 6 over 3 because that was what was there now. Mr. Wyckoff stated that Mr. Moodie was correct in stating that the Commission has approved the Andersen 400 series simulated divided lights in the past.

Chairman Dika thanked Mr. Moodie for his honesty. Mr. Cunningham said that they would have the application and the appropriate paperwork in by the end of the week for the October meeting.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika closed the public hearing and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Ms. Maltese said that the one outstanding detail has been clarified and that the application should receive approval.

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.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

11. Petition of **March Twenty Two, LLC, owner, and Peggy Lamb and Steve Joselow, applicants**, for property located at **58 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (add lighting to storefront elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios, along with Mr. Steve Joselow and Ms. Peggy Lamb, owners of the property were present to speak to the application.

Ms. Ramsey had two handouts to give the Commission, a letter from an abutter in support of the project and photos of the building lit at night.

Ms. Ramsey said that the application was essentially the same as before except that they added photos of similar lighting in the area.

She talked about the photos of the building when lit at night and pointed out that the up lighting was casting a very soft, subtle glow. She pointed out that the Rosa Restaurant’s neon sign band cast a similar glow in its building located next door to 68 State Street. The down lights are stronger and similar to other lights in town.

Ms. Ramsey pointed out that the up lights are controllable and said that the owner would be willing to work with the HDC for an appropriate setting. Chairman Dika said that was a generous offer but she did not feel that it was something the Commission would want to bother with.

Mr. Almeida commented that it was difficult to read the photos as they were very grainy. Ms. Ramsey agreed but pointed out that the photos showed the amount of light on the street at night.

She said that there was quite a lot of light at that end of the street with the addition of the lights from the shipyard and the bridge. She added that the street is quite active.

Mr. Almeida commented that the 58 State Street building was the only building with spot lighting.

Ms. Maltese asked if the applicant was willing to remove the up lights for the benefit for the application. She said that she still stands by her comments that up lighting should be reserved for prominent structures, such as the steeple. She felt this would set a precedence that is not in Portsmouth.

Ms. Kozak agreed that it was different from what they see but she has not changed her position. She did not think that lighting was historic and had to be viewed in a contemporary setting because it was a contemporary invention. She said that they needed to look at the fixtures themselves for historic appropriateness and she thought the proposal was perfectly appropriate. Ms. Kozak pointed out that someone can put a light in their yard and light up the entire building and the HDC can say nothing about it. Chairman Dika agreed.

Vice Chairman Katz asked where in Article X was it said that the three up lights adversely affected the neighborhood as far as its historical integrity was concerned. He thought the effect would be so minimal that it would hardly be discovered.

Mr. Almeida said that most of his questions were about the fixture housings. Ms. Ramsey said that there would be on conduit across the face of the building.

Councilor Spear asked if the Commission approves conduit. Mr. Clum no, the Commission has never approved conduits. Mr. Joselow pointed out that the conduit was covered by a sign band.

Mr. Joselow stated that they chose the lighting to fit in with what they had seen around Portsmouth. He thought that the up lighting added elegance to the building.

Ms. Ramsey described the down lights and said that they would be made of copper and would be located over every entry door.

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 Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he would be changing his vote from last month. He felt it was a minute detail. Originally, he had problem with the up lighting but he felt that Ms. Kozak made a good point concerning the fixtures versus the light that is cast from them. He wanted to caution

however that flashing strobe lights would not be something they would like and the Commission just needed to be aware of that possibility.

Ms. Maltese said that all details are important. She pointed out that lighting was a feature or otherwise they would not be reviewing it. She did not think it could be viewed as minute because signage has always had lighting to light up the signs and signs that light up themselves do not need an up light to do it. There is one building in town that is lit up and that is the steeple. She did not feel it was appropriate to Portsmouth. She said that she could not get past the lighting of a building in this way in downtown Portsmouth.

Mr. Almeida stated that he would be reluctantly supporting the motion. In speaking about the down lights, he said that they were borderline appropriate. He pointed out that there are a lot of these same types of fixtures in the downtown but he thought they could do better than this and hoped that future applications would take that into consideration.

Chairman Dika said that she was sensitive to Ms. Maltese’s comments however, it was a complex issue and she was not quite sure what the basis of a decision to vote against it would be. She said she would be supporting the motion.

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 6-1 vote with Ms. Maltese voting in opposition.

Mr. Clum stated that he wanted to make it clear to the Commission that the Planning Department does not bring lighting fixtures before the Commission unless they are commercial lighting fixtures or multiples of lighting fixtures. He said that it was not in the ordinance and they did not want to bother the Commission with small projects.

V. 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. Ramsey explained that the packet before them showed just the features that have changed since the last work session.
- Ms. Ramsey said that the color rendering showed the use of a larger tile. The color and glazing were still choices that needed to be made. They would be looking to use metal panels for some of the bays of the building. The retail storefronts would be in a bronze color.
- She said that they have really tried to simplify the building.

- Page two showed how the phasing of the project would take place. She said that the developer feels the project makes sense financially but it does not make sense to build it all at once. Ms. Ramsey explained they were considering a Phase A and a Phase B.
- Ms. Maltese asked what the Commission's reaction was at the last meeting concerning the building in phases. Chairman Dika replied that there was quite a bit of concern. Ms. Ramsey explained that once Phase A is built, Phase B will come, it was just a matter of financing.
- Ms. Maltese asked Mr. Clum if the Commission gave an approval for a phased construction, could the Commission force the developer or a new owner to build the rest of the project. Mr. Clum replied probably not.
- Page two showed the back view of the building. She said that they have added some decks up on the roof between the dormers.
- Page three showed the Tanner Court elevation, which was the residential structure. She said that they have eliminated the gable structure on top of the bay itself. She said that they have also brought some of the bays down to the first floor so there are only first and second floor bays. The windows have also been simplified. Mr. Wyckoff commented that he was pleased with the door entry and porch.
- Mr. Almeida asked about the small window at the entry level. Ms. Ramsey said that internally, that area would be some sort of a mud room. Mr. Almeida thought that there was still work to be done with the entries. He thought they looked informal and looked like back doors.
- Ms. Maltese said that she was distracted with all of the bays and how each one was different. Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that they will never be able to look at all of the details at once because the street was probably about 20 feet wide. Ms. Maltese said that she would like to see them more similar. Mr. Almeida commented that he liked the fact that they were all different. Ms. Kozak said that she supported the diversity and the repetition. She thought it was very similar to Back Bay in Boston.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the chimneys had to be as tall as they were. Ms. Ramsey replied that they might be a little taller than they need to be just for some prominence. She said that they could play with the height.
- Ms. Kozak pointed out that the reason the entries looked diminutive was because the roofs over them are so much larger.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that the rest of the packet contained details. She said that they were similar details that they have seen elsewhere.
- Mr. Almeida commented that composite materials would be an appropriate use on this building. He thought Azek would be appropriate.
- Vice Chairman Katz said that there was discomfort at the last meeting with the bays on the side elevation of the front building. He wondered if that had been addressed for this work session. Mr. Wyckoff said it was contemporary styling with a metal covering. Ms. Maltese commented that they can never build a 1900's building unless it was built in the 1900's. She said that there are architectural compliments to the building and there is a clear language being spoken with it. She was thrilled to see contemporary uses to buildings and not pretending to be an old building when it is not. Mr. Wyckoff pointed out the brackets that would be supporting the bays. He said that the brackets helped with the contemporary look.

- Vice Chairman Katz urged the Commission to get all of their concerns out in the open now. He did not want an “October surprise” with an issue that might not possibly be able to be reconciled at the last minute.
- Mr. Almeida asked Ms. Ramsey if they had considered jumbo brick for the front building. Ms. Ramsey replied that she was meeting with the mason tomorrow to discuss options. Mr. Almeida explained to the Commission that a jumbo brick was the same dimensions as a regular brick in every way except that it was 16” long instead of 8” long. Mr. Wyckoff had a concern of seeing the standard size cement blocks on the building. He thought it would look too busy.
- Chairman Dika stated that the partial building of the project should be something the applicant gives more thought about.
- No one from the public wished to speak about the project.

No one was present to speak to the Work Session B application. Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to the end of the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. The applicants arrived later in the meeting.

B. Work Session requested by **Naber Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **515 – 517 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove fire damaged area at rear of building) and allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild area adding second story) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (reconstruct front entry). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 17 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

- Mr. Salim Naber, property owner, and Mr. Adnan Al-Darraji, contractor, were present to speak to the application. He explained that in the last work session, they talked about doing additional renovations to the front of the building. He said that now they just want to do the back area and the right side of the building because of time constraints.
- Mr. Al-Darraji said that they would use 4” to the weather clapboard siding on the addition. Ms. Maltese asked if he would use the same type of detailing as was currently there. Mr. Al-Darraji replied yes. He added that he would like to clapboard the cement block area as well. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he would rather see the cement block stay as is. He felt it would be such a large expanse of clapboard if the cement block were covered. Mr. Naber said that they would leave if for the time being and revisit it when they make additional changes to the building in the future.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked if there were any plans for a complete renovation in the future. Mr. Naber replied that they would like to do that in the future. Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that this was a building that has suffered some hard times. He added that he did not have any objections to the project and said it would be an improvement.
- Ms. Maltese stated that she felt comfortable with leaving the cinder block as it is for now with the addition.
- There was detailed discussion about the proposed Andersen windows and their appropriateness to the project.

- Mr. Al-Darraji pointed out that he would use a transition strip between the old section and the new addition.

C. Work session requested by **Touati and Barnes, LLC, owner**, and **Robert Dockham, applicant**, for property located at **198 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovate existing building) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new addition). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 20 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Carla Goodknight, architect for the project and Mr. Robert Dockham, applicant, were present to speak to the application.
- Ms. Goodknight said that at the last work session, they arrived at a couple of options for dealing with the existing building on the site. It was decided that renovating the existing building with an addition off of the back of the building was the best option.
- Page three of the plans showed an entry level porch as a transitional piece connecting the existing building and the new addition.
- Page 4 showed the restored building with two dormers added and the roof line changed to accommodate the existing ell on the back of the building.
- Ms. Goodknight explained that the building would be an “L” shaped building. She said that there was approximately 70 feet from Islington Street to the beginning of the back addition. She pointed out that the bump out on the right side of the house was part of the existing footprint.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that it looked like they were introducing Victorian details in the renovation on the side elevation. He thought it should retain the colonial aspect of the front building.
- Ms. Maltese said that it seemed like the larger building was eating the smaller one. She added that the proposed addition did not feel like an extension of the existing building. She suggested that it might work to have the addition as a completely separate structure on the lot. Ms. Maltese felt the massing on the site was extreme.
- Ms. Goodknight stated that they were trying to maximize parking on the site. She explained that the addition would be three full floors with at grade parking underneath. Ms. Maltese said that it was the actual size of the structure that made her uncomfortable. Mr. Almeida said that he felt the same way. Ms. Maltese and Mr. Almeida did not think the two structures needed to be connected. Ms. Goodknight replied that there are issues with doing that such as egress and elevator circulation.
- There was considerable discussion concerning the connector piece between the two buildings.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that the larger structure will be 70 feet back from the road. He did not think that the addition would even be seen. He also pointed out the Mark Wentworth Home as an example of a large addition connected to a smaller existing structure. He felt the connection could be worked on.
- Chairman Dika and Mr. Almeida said that the connection was the problem for them.
- Ms. Kozak commented that the revised plans have come leaps and bounds over the last plans. She felt it was on its way to accomplishing what the Commission is looking for.

- Mr. Almeida suggested a model and thought it would be helpful.
- Vice Chairman Katz wondered if removing the dormer in the gable would help. Ms. Goodknight said that they will look at the third floor and what they need to get by.
- Mr. Almeida asked if it was possible to demolish the front building. Ms. Goodknight explained that the zero lot line plays into the reason for keeping it. Chairman Dika explained that that option was discussed at last month's meeting.
- Mr. Almeida pointed out that the overhangs on the building looked excessively large.
- No one in the public wished to speak to the application.

D. Work session requested by **Evon Cooper, owner**, and **Geoff Rallis, applicant**, for property located at **287 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear addition on existing foundation). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 36 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

Mr. Evon Cooper requested that the application be postponed to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to the next regularly scheduled meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

E. Work Session requested by **Blue Star Properties, LLC, owner**, and **Bungalow Development Group, applicant**, for property located at **233 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 14 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Carla Goodknight, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. She stated that they were proposing a mixed use building. They were also looking to obtain on grade parking, terracing, and green space with the site. She said that they were proposing four floors because they would like to achieve that vertical proportion to the building. They would like to do a heavier base for the retail on the first floor. There would be two floors of office space with the fourth floor becoming residential space. The tower portion would project up to the roof and would serve as access out onto the roof where they are proposing a roof garden.
- Ms. Goodknight said that they would like the building to have an industrial northern tier feel.
- Ms. Maltese stated that she appreciated the design. He said the greening of the roof was a wonderful use of new technology. The tower was a clear statement of newer construction. She liked the larger fenestration.

- Mr. Wyckoff agreed and said it was important to take all four sides of the building seriously. He said that he liked the tower but wanted the applicant to be aware that the Westin project has a similar tower and he did not want that to be emulated.
- Ms. Goodknight stated that they would be introducing underground parking, a one level parking deck to support the building.
- Councilor Spear thought it would look better if the entire building was pushed up to the corner of Vaughan and Green Streets with the parking behind it. As the northern tier develops, walking in the sidewalks works best with the building up next to the sidewalk.
- Ms. Maltese commented that she liked where the building was situated because there was no real corner.
- Vice Chairman Katz said that he would rather see underground parking than a parking lot at grade.
- Ms. Goodknight explained that many buildings are driven by parking. She said that this building narrows down quite a bit. She added that they did not want to turn their backs on the railroad tracks as there would be substantial visibility from everyone staying at the Westin.
- Mr. Almeida asked what the allowable building footprint was for the area. Ms. Goodknight confirmed that they were in Central Business A district with 0 lot line setbacks. Mr. Almeida liked how the building sat on the lot with the green space all around it. It also allowed for some very nice gathering spaces. He also pointed out that this was an opportunity to do something contemporary in the Historic District with the materials on the building. Ms. Maltese agreed.
- Ms. Kozak applauded the green roof. She asked if this would be the first green roof in Portsmouth. Ms. Goodknight clarified that it would be a roof deck with greenery as part of it. MS. Kozak asked if it would function as a sustainable roof. Ms. Goodknight said that portions of it would.
- Ms. Kozak commented that the strongest feature in the design was the tower. She pointed out that the curved portion on the opposite end of the tower was causing inconsistency in terms of what the materials are trying to say.
- Mr. Almeida asked if there would be a canopy on the main entry. Ms. Goodknight said that they may at the main entry.
- Vice Chairman Katz said that this was one of the more novel and potentially exciting projects that have been before them.

F. Work Session requested by **Emile R. Jr. and Allison K. Bussiere, owners**, for property located at **678 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear addition). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 30 and lies within General Residence A and Historic A districts.

- Ms. Amy Dutton, architect for the project and Mr. Emile Bussiere, owner of the property were present to speak to the application.
- Ms. Dutton explained that they would like to add a garage with a breezeway and a room above. She said that they were trying to mimic the gable from the front elevation with

the gable on the garage. There would be a cupola on top. There would also be a relatively flat roof over a screened porch.

- Mr. Bussiere pointed out that there would be no changes to the front of the house.
- Ms. Maltese asked Ms. Dutton to describe the rear porch. Ms. Dutton said that it would be a screened in porch and the lattice below would match the front porch.
- The Commission gave Ms. Dutton suggestions on what type of drawings to submit when she comes back for a public hearing.
- Ms. Maltese was satisfied with the size and massing of the addition.
- Mr. Almeida thought that maybe there would be problems with how the three roofs would intersect.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked the Commission if they had trouble with the small shed roof over the garage doors. Mr. Almeida asked what its purpose was. Ms. Dutton said it was to break up the elevation. There was considerable discussion concerning other options. Mr. Bussiere asked the Commission if they would like to see the roof in copper. Mr. Almeida said that he would like to see copper there. Ms. Kozak replied that it could be anything that they wanted it to be as long as it was detailed properly.

G. Work Session requested by **Joe M. and Pamela F. Hunt, owners**, for property located at **80 State Street at Wright Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of existing structure (demolish one story structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use, multi-story building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 18 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Jen Ramsey of Somma Studios was present to speak to the application. She explained that she was presenting a very preliminary package. The proposal was for a mixed use structure possibly housing a boutique hotel. Ms. Ramsey said that the site is currently the parking lot for the Rosa Restaurant. It faces Wright Avenue, the City parking lot and the Memorial Bridge. She felt that it was a lovely location as it faced the water.
- Ms. Ramsey pointed out that the residential property to the left of the lot from State Street was an important structure. She said that they were keeping that structure in mind since the two structures would be side by side.
- She said that they were thinking of an “L” shaped building that fronts State Street and Wright Avenue. They were also thinking about tiered decks off of the back of the building that would overlook the Connie Bean parking lot and the residential home’s back courtyard.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that they were just showing one elevation to start with. The side of the two story addition of the residential home has doors and windows right on the lot line. She said that they have held the proposed building off five feet at that point. She added that they might do below grade parking and the access to that parking would be from State Street.
- Ms. Ramsey said that they were proposing a five story structure with retail, hotel lobby, and possibly a restaurant on the first floor, condominiums on the second floor, and the boutique hotel on the third, fourth, and fifth floors. As for the proposed materials, Ms.

Ramsey said that they were looking at more contemporary materials on the lower floors with the fourth floor being much glassier with dormers on the roof section.

- Chairman Dika commented that she was concerned with the massing, especially with regards to the beautiful historic house right next door.
- Ms. Maltese thought that five stories were too much. She pointed out that the State Street corridor ends with the house and a structure of this size would absolutely humble it.
- Mr. Almeida felt that the building needed to be pulled back even further on the State Street side in respect for the residential house.
- Ms. Maltese had a concern about the underground parking entrance being on State Street with no formal front of the structure. Some of the Commissioners agreed with her.
- Councilor Spear commented that the Connie Bean Center should not enter into the discussion but instead it was really the historic residential home that should.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that the proposed height of the structure would be comparable to the 68 State Street building.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not think that this was the location to introduce modern details. Mr. Almeida pointed out that it was a gateway.
- Ms. Kozak commented that she did not think that the State Street side and the side facing the water have to be the same. She felt they were totally different context.
- Ms. Ramsey suggested that there could be two separate buildings on the lot with the boutique hotel comprising one of the buildings.
- Mr. Almeida did not think that the vehicular entrance off of State Street was appropriate. Having it off of Wright Avenue might be better. Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that he did not think it would be appealing to see the vehicular entrance when you are coming off of the Memorial Bridge into Portsmouth.
- Chairman Dika stated that she felt that this project was Ms. Ramsey's most challenging project. Mr. Wyckoff added that it was a tough site.
- Mr. Almeida clarified that the issues of the project were the height, the detailing, and the parking garage entrance.
- Chairman Dika asked if anyone from the public wished to comment.
- Mr. Dick Duchard, speaking for the Portsmouth Advocates stated he was very keen on following the project because it was a gateway to the City and the gateway to the downtown Historic District. He said he would be following the project very carefully.

VI. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. Review of HDC Rules and Regulations Draft document

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the review of the document until the October 1, 2008 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Ms. Maltese felt the Commission needed more time to review the document.

The motion to postpone the review of the document until the October 1, 2008 meeting passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

In other business, Councilor Spear asked for further discussion on conduits. Concerning the 58 State Street application, he wondered if the Commission had purview over conduits on a

building. Ms. Maltese and Mr. Wyckoff responded yes. Councilor Spear asked how the conduit on the front of the 58 State Street building happened. Ms. Maltese said that they would have to look back at the original approval. Ms. Maltese pointed out that the conduit will not be visible once the sign band is installed.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:50 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 October 8, 2008.