

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**June 5, 2013  
reconvened on June 12 & 19, 2013**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak; Members Richard Katz, John Wyckoff, , City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** George Melchior

**ALSO PRESENT:** Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....  
**I. OLD BUSINESS**

A. Petition of **Joseph Rizzo, owner**, for property located at **240 Union Street, #2**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace patio door, replace wood paneling with stone veneer) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 21-2 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(At the May 1, 2013 meeting, this item was continued to the June 5, 2013 meeting.)*

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Joe Rizzo walked the Commission through his proposal revisions to replace existing panels below his windowsills with raised MDL board and Azek.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about whether the routed detail would be straight or raised. He said traditionally this was led into the trim boards and warned that Azek was not stable in the winter cold and there would be a gap all around. Mr. Rizzo said he was using the raised panel as a faux decorative piece, and using Azek trim board with a beveled edge to make the squares. He showed samples.

Chairman Almeida asked if they were proposing any raised faux grain or if it would be smooth and paint ready. Mr. Rizzo said it would be a smooth finish and painted.

Mr. Rizzo said he found a salvaged historic door to replace the existing door.

**SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

There was no one from the public to speak to the petition so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

Mr. Wyckoff said the proposal appeared to be a successful renovation of a carriage house that was changed in the 1970's or 1980's into a living unit. He said the door was a wonderful idea and a very appropriate improvement. Mr. Katz agreed that his revisions were an improvement from the first presentation and it would look super.

*The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Petition of **Wright Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **67-77 State Street (Wright Avenue lot)**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use, multi-story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 18 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts. *(At the May 8, 2013 meeting, this item was continued to the June 5, 2013 meeting.)*

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey with Somma Studios presented signatures of people supporting the project, additional letters and some historic photos. She then proceeded to go through a brief history of the site and the latest revisions to the proposal from the last meeting.

Ms. Ramsey showed pictures of the area after the 1813 fire, as well as buildings demolished after the construction of the Memorial Bridge. She showed samples of buildings that were reminiscent of what they were proposing, including the Gloucester House with four floors and a mansard roof.

Ms. Ramsey showed another larger building that was the terminus at the end of the Memorial Bridge at one time. She also showed other buildings that used historic and modern elements that were carried forward in time because they worked well.

Ms. Ramsey said the overall square footage was 37,000 square feet. The main mass scaled at 40'10", but the top of the penthouse went up to 54'2". She said the average building height of eighty buildings they surveyed in the downtown area was 42 feet and the height of this building "read" as 41 feet from the street, going from three stories to five stories to the top of the penthouse.

Ms. Ramsey said the building would sit back anywhere from 13 feet to 20 feet along State Street and from 5 feet to 40 feet in some places along Wright Avenue where the City was proposing brick sidewalks and a series of street trees.

Ms. Ramsey said it would be a brick building with copper, and wood, a simulated slate roof, dormers, and a fourth floor penthouse structure. She showed the penthouse structure, the deck space and the condensers. She said they reduced the penthouse structure from previous plans. Chairman Almeida asked if any condensers and mechanicals would be seen from the ground. Ms. Ramsey said the mansard roof would create a parapet wall, which would cover the mechanicals.

Ms. Ramsey said the Wright Avenue side would be the pedestrian way with retail space on the first floor and faux storefront windows concealing parking behind that which would be accessed on the State Street side. Chairman Almeida asked if it would be possible to see fluorescent garage lights or vehicles from the parking garage. Ms. Ramsey said the only time anyone would see lights or vehicles would be when the State Street garage door went up.

Mr. Gladhill asked about venting for the closed garage. Ms. Ramsey said there would be recessed windows with vents on the Chapel Street and Daniel Street sides behind a fence.

Councilor Kennedy asked where the vents would be. Ms. Ramsey showed three shadow boxes that would be painted, louvered structures behind a 5-foot fence on the left side of the building. She said their exact locations would be further determined once they had a full mechanical plan. Mr. Rawling asked for clarification on the venting. Ms. Ramsey said they would make every effort to conceal venting on the back of the building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if any other utilities besides the gas meters would be located on these elevations. Ms. Ramsey said they would not except for a service garage door concealed behind a fence on Wright Avenue.

Councilor Kennedy asked what the fencing material would be. Ms. Ramsey said it would be a painted, composite material on Wright Avenue and wrapping around the back with gates on State Street. Councilor Kennedy said she thought they were going to use wood on the other fences. Ms. Ramsey said there were many trees and it was damp in the back so they were going to use Azek there for durability, but they would use wood in the front where it was more visible on the street side.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the retail space on Chapel Street. Ms. Ramsey said the conservatory was part of the retail space, but the door behind the fence would be for deliveries, and then the double set of doors would lead to the residential lobby.

Chairman Almeida asked about the second and third floor shadow boxes on the Daniel Street elevation. Ms. Ramsey said bathrooms were on the property lines and they couldn't put windows on that elevation. Chairman Almeida wondered if it would be possible to put actual windows in. Mr. Wyckoff said this section abutted the Connie Bean gymnasium less than 5 feet away so the view would never be seen.

Chairman Almeida asked if there were any eave vents or ridge venting. Ms. Ramsey said the venting would match the color of what was around it.

Ms. Ramsey said they changed the metal conservatory to wood with an antique stain and the roof was copper. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was an internal drain without a scupper and Ms. Ramsey said yes.

Ms. Ramsey said the door system was a nano wall. Mr. Wyckoff asked if all the doors were wood and stained. She said they were factory finished in a deep antique brown with a protective coating.

Mr. Katz asked if the wrought iron railing was manufactured locally, and Ms. Ramsey said the manufacturer was out of Massachusetts.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they were using full screens and Ms. Ramsey said they wanted to use full screens so they could open the top and bottom. Mr. Wyckoff said a full screen would obscure the window from any angle so the view of simulated divided lights would be lost. He said a half screen could be moved up or down. Ms. Ramsey said there would be a cacophony of top or bottom screens depending on the owners. Chairman Almeida said they talked about a screen on the inside that could be pulled down from the inside. Mr. Wyckoff said they should make an amendment to take the screens out of the approval and come back for screen approval at another time.

Chairman Almeida asked about the window trim on the copper clad bay and Ms. Ramsey said it would look as if the copper butted up against the windows. Mr. Wyckoff said the windows were actually trimmed in wood and then wrapped with copper.

Ms. Ramsey said the siding on the penthouse would be a zinc material. Chairman Almeida asked to specify that the upper sash inset would have 1" of reveal of copper and Ms. Ramsey agreed. Ms. Ramsey went through more details of the awnings, decking, and trellises on the penthouse detail and answered additional questions.

Chairman Almeida said the drawings they would be approving were 100% accurate, but the renderings were conceptual. Ms. Ramsey said she also included color and material specifications in the packet.

Mr. Rawling said he thought there were many improvements, but it would be an improvement to have more detailing, especially at the bay window. He said the big issue was the proportion of the dormers. He said the ADA window was one way of trying to scale it down. He also felt the dormers were oversized and over scaled for the building.

Mr. Wyckoff agreed that the detail on the bay was important; however, he did not share Mr. Rawling's concern about the proportion of the dormers as shown in comparison photos. He also had no concern with the penthouse. Mr. Katz agreed with Mr. Wyckoff.

Chairman Almeida referred to the property evaluation form. He said they had discussed styling, but had not discussed height, mass and scaling. Councilor Kennedy said she was not comfortable with the penthouse because it was the first thing visible coming over the bridge.

Ms. Ruedig said she was disappointed with the stylistic design of the building. She said the height and massing were better, but she did not think the style enhanced or acknowledged the immediate surroundings. She said a Victorian-like building recalling the Back Bay did not fit in this location. She said the Gloucester House was across the street at one time, but it was not there any more so it didn't pertain to the current character of the location. She said she still thought the location could support good contemporary architecture. She said it was not an addition to an existing building and new construction could fit into historic surroundings and be more appropriate than a fake building.

Mr. Wyckoff said he understood Ms. Ruedig's comments, but he didn't think it was the right time because it was a public hearing not a work session. He said they should have already worked through their opinions to determine whether they were going to vote for it or not, but it was not a chance to get last thoughts in on the building. He said it would be more appropriate to make a motion, get a second, and then have a discussion.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

1. Martha Fuller Clark of 152 Middle Street said she has lived in Portsmouth for the past 40 years. She said she was confused on what process they were going through because the project was not listed as a public hearing on the agenda, but it was listed under Old Business as continuing from the May 8, 2013 meeting, but there was no public hearing on May 8. She said she didn't believe the correct agenda was advertised. Mr. Cracknell said a public hearing had been advertised for the last meeting and was continued to this meeting so it was listed as Old Business on the agenda. He said the abutters were notified for the May 8, 2013 meeting and they didn't have to be notified for every continuance.

Ms. Clark said she taught American architectural history at University of New Hampshire in the 1970's, worked as an architectural historian and consultant from the 1970's to the 1990's, served on the HDC

from 1977 to 1980, and founded Portsmouth Advocates in 1981. She said she served as Board Chair of the Strawberry Banke Museum for the past two years until March of 2013 and she was continuing to serve on the board as well as serving as an advisor for the National Historic Trust for Historic Preservation. Ms. Clark said she spent many years making sure the architecture and historical integrity of the downtown area was protected and she didn't believe this proposal was appropriate for its location on Wright Avenue.

Ms. Clark reviewed the history of the surrounding area of Bow Street, Market Street, Market Square, Pleasant Street and State Street leading to Wright Avenue. She said the majority of the buildings were built at the beginning of the 19th century and were recognized as some of the most pristine examples of commercial Federal architecture remaining in New England today. She said they resulted from three major fires, one in 1802 in the middle of downtown, one in 1806 on Bow Street, and one in 1813 where nearly one hundred buildings from Court and State Streets were consumed all the way to the Piscataqua River. She said the more massive buildings built in the lower part of the downtown core beyond the North Church were built because of the ship building boom after the 1850's. She said the building they were proposing would be appropriate within this core, not in the heart of the finest collection of brick Federal buildings left standing in America today.

Ms. Clark said the HDC was established to foster and preserve the architectural and historic character and resources of the City of Portsmouth, as well as its sense of place. She said the building being proposed did not reflect the context, time period or sense of place of the surrounding buildings in that location. She said they were putting the heritage, economic historic and educational well-being of residents and visitors at risk, as these were the reason people chose to live in and visit Portsmouth. Ms. Clark said the HDC was supposed to consider the special and defining character of immediate surrounding properties, not properties a quarter to half a mile away. She said they were supposed to consider the architectural details, the design, height, scale, mass, roofs, facades and openings. She said this building design might be appropriate at the other end of State Street or Court Street, but said this design and the introduction of a mansard roof in the core of surrounding Federal building was in violation of the integrity of that part of the City. She said the alignment of the windows did not line up with the rest of the buildings on the street and it was out of scale. She said these renderings did not convey what this building was looking like from a distance. She asked them to stand at State Street and envision it. She asked how they could defend approving this building with the charge they had been given.

Mr. Duncan McCallum of State Street agreed with Ms. Clark and said the proposed building was too big, too massive, out of character for the area, and as the first thing seen when coming over the new Memorial Bridge, it would stick out like a sore thumb at 54' 2" high. He said he thought they were trying to make Portsmouth look like Cambridge, Massachusetts. Mr. McCallum said they started with something that was too big and it was still too big despite all the bargaining and revisions. Mr. McCallum urged the Commission to vote against the proposal.

Ms. Terry Gouchoe of 96 Highland Street thanked the HDC for giving so much of their time to retain Portsmouth's sense of place. She said the applicant had listened to comments and the project had come a long way, but she was still concerned with roof type, the proportion and rhythm of the windows, and the pedestrian experience on State Street.

Ms. Gouchoe said she questioned the appropriateness of a mansard roof on the northeast portion of State Street.

She said there was sporadic evidence for the roof type in the District, but post fire Federal buildings, along with the Georgian and Colonial Revival architecture on Daniel Street, characterized the immediate surrounding area. She said appropriateness falls within the HDC's purview and the introduction of a quasi-modern interpretation of a Second Empire building with a conservatory and elaborate metalwork

would be inappropriate to the area. She said openings were also in the HDC's purview and the windows and the wide carriage-style garage door on State Street did not look appropriate either.

Ms. Gouchoe said it was a gateway location and an anchor to State Street and they had one chance to get the design right. She said she agreed with Mr. Cracknell's statement quoted a month ago that not only did they need to make places better than they were; they also had to make excellent places. She said she didn't think this design had reached excellence yet. She asked the HDC not to approve the proposal at this time, and asked the applicant to reconsider the appropriateness of their design within the immediate context.

Mr. Kevin McDevitt of 117 Bow Street, a Portsmouth resident since 1997 said he owned several commercial properties and used to lease a restaurant facility out at the end of State Street, but the operation struggled, and eventually closed. He said that end of State Street suffered from a lack of pedestrian traffic, and also suffered from the recent street construction. He said it needed something to draw people in. He said although there were Federal Style buildings running down State Street there were other building styles as well. He said he lived at Rivers Edge and at Harbour Place, which was a large box and visible from the entrance of the Memorial Bridge as was the brewery condominium with the Bow Street theatre next to it. He said he remembered the Gloucester House years ago, which had the same style roof and there was another building next to it with a similar style roof. He said he thought the proposed design was beautiful and appropriately sized. He said the businesses at that end of the street would love to see the retail component to draw pedestrian traffic to that area. He said it had been a parking lot for a long time, and he thought proper development would generate tax revenue that would be beneficial for the City.

Ms. Patty Kennedy of 267 Marcy Street said she has been a Portsmouth homeowner for 18 years. She said she was in favor of the project and she had no personal or professional connection to anyone involved with the project. She said it was an appropriate structure that reflected and complimented the historic architecture of the city. She said the newly reduced height and mass of the building were in perfect scale with the industrial waterfront buildings in direct proximity. She said the (Second Empire) mansard style building included many of the same design elements of the coveted mansard homes that were throughout the Historic District. Ms. Kennedy said the brick walls, copper cladding, granite lintels, iron railing, slate roofs, and wood doors were the same high quality materials that were used in past generations to build the historic buildings they all valued. She said this design would be the antithesis of the plain boxy buildings that had been causing so much concern lately. She said the architectural excellence honored Portsmouth's existing historic buildings and would make a grand first impression to those entering the City from driving over the Memorial Bridge. She said the street level shops and restaurants would be accessible to everyone and the residential units would attract residents that would pay property taxes, become commercial patrons and involved citizens, bringing economic advantages to the City. She said it would send a confusing message to architects and developers for future projects if it were rejected.

Mr. Gibson Mike Kennedy of 267 Marcy Street congratulated the commissioners on their reappointments, which he said were well deserved. He said he might not agree with everything all the time, but he thought they were doing a fine job for which he was grateful and thought the City should be grateful to them as well.

Mr. Kennedy said he was speaking in favor of the project. He said he has lived in Portsmouth for 2½ years and liked the combination of stately historic buildings and the working waterfront. He said he liked the mix of galleries, museums, and restaurants in the area. He said the Historic District was an eclectic mix of old and new buildings that were charming and quirky. He said it was a city where people lived,

worked, and played for over 300 years and they would keep doing it. He said the proposed building would be just fine. He said he appreciated the give and take between the applicant and the Commission.

Mr. Keith Eveland said he would be living at 111 Bow Street in five years and was in opposition of the project. He said he had several concerns - one was that it was too big and not appropriate to the area, and the other was its relation to the changes to the Connie Bean Center. He said he didn't think there was enough information available online with one photo making the building look like something in Paris and the other photo showing six huge leafy trees obscuring an accurate view of the size and mass. He said the public needed more information and they shouldn't rush to approve the project. He said his third concern was about traffic congestion going onto and coming off the bridge, added patronage from the Rosa Restaurant across the street, as well as a restaurant or two in this building and the adjacent building and inadequate parking. He said they needed to look at the safety of the area. He said Mr. Steve McHenry who designed the Popovers Building referred him to a 3D program so they could get a 3D rendering of this building in relation to the buildings in the area before they made any decisions.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said she currently lived in one of the big boxy new buildings at Port Walk and thought this project was the antithesis of Port Walk. She had no problem with the height, the mass, the scale and was in favor of the project. She said she didn't think all buildings had to match. She agreed with Commissioner Ruedig that a contemporary building could go there, but that would never be accepted in this area of Portsmouth. Ms. DeStefano said she thought this design fit in nicely, keeping in mind that the alteration of the Connie Bean building would be taller. She said the small Kingsbury House beside it was much like the Rockingham and the Jones Paul Jones house with a small building and a larger building next to it. She said they had many work sessions and went through many changes over the past year. She said except for pedestrians walking down to Prescott Park during the warmer seasons, that end of town could use more restaurants, shops and adequate parking.

Mr. Joe Famularo of 141 Mill Pond Way said he has been a resident of Portsmouth for 1½ years and has lived in different parts of the city. He said he spent a lot of time downtown and loved going to the restaurants and theatre. He said he was in favor of the building, which was replacing a parking lot that was a blight upon the city. He said the building would bring revenue by taxes and people spending money in the restaurants, shops and residence.

Ms. Clare Kittredge said she lived in Portsmouth for 33 years and spent years as a reporter covering the HDC. She said the building was too big; the ornate style came from Paris and clashed with the plainer Federal styles and other historic buildings on State Street. She said she lived in Paris when she was little and loved the buildings there, but if her French cousins came to visit, they would want to see authentic, vintage Americana, not a version of French architecture. She said this building was the gateway of a historic American city and should shout old Portsmouth, not somewhere else. She said the styles on State Street were not identical, but they were not ornate and didn't compete with one another as they transitioned from downtown Portsmouth to Strawberry Banke and the bridge going into Maine. Ms. Kittredge read a critique of the building that said the design of this building and the Connie Bean building should be considered together. She said the building was too big, flamboyant and would dominate the neighborhood and change its character.

Mr. Todd O'Dowd of 51 Islington Street and a business owner in Portsmouth said the HDC had an impossible job governing taste when so many people had different opinions. He said many people had criticisms of the building he lived in, but if it were any smaller, the old high school building across the street would dwarf it. He said they in put a lot of time and came up with a building that fit the area. He said people were in Portsmouth for the ocean, restaurants, shops, music, arts, close proximity to Boston and the university and an eclectic building fit the area and he was in favor of it.

Mr. John Tomasini said he came to Portsmouth with his wife 2½ years ago from New York City where they lived and worked for many years. He said they were excited to live in a small city where so much was available. He said on their first day they looked at living in the State Street area and thought it was a terrible area, but now that they lived here he could see improvements and thought it would become a very nice part of the city. He said he would like to see Prescott Park developed further. He said taxes collected on projects like this would contribute to the development of the city. Mr. Tomasini said he didn't know anything about architecture, but thought the design worked well, and would be a nice visual introduction to the city from the bridge. He said they lived in Newburyport for a while and it seemed like Disneyworld in comparison to Portsmouth that was a real working city. He said he liked the diversity, they were delighted to be here, and they would be in support of the project.

Mr. Richard Nylander of 37 Franklin Street said a lot of attention had been spent on this and they came a long way from the beginning, but he was still concerned with the building's compatibility with this part of town. He said they needed to consider the whole area, looking at the big picture, not just the detailing. He said it was hard to tell what the visual impact would be like coming over the bridge, but he thought things always loom larger when built than they do on paper. He said the proposed addition to the Connie Bean Center should also be factored in to see what the two buildings would look like together. He said he didn't think the buildings would be sympathetic to one another and this building would not be sympathetic to the Warner House, one of Portsmouth's most iconic historic buildings so he was not in favor of the project.

Mr. Patrick Howe of 51 Islington Street for the past 11 years said he was in favor of the project and thought it has a pleasing look that complimented that part of town. He said larger buildings like Harbour Place, 117 and 121 Bow Street and the Connie Bean Center were in view when coming across the bridge. He said it was an improvement to what was there and the design was well done with the help of the HDC.

Mr. Chris Cilluffo said he has lived in town for 27 years and loved the historic value of "our town" which he thought should be called "Historical Portsmouth". He said it would be the "new" Portsmouth if they kept changing it. He said all the new buildings were taking over the historical town and he thought they needed to cut out the modernizing of the town so he was not in favor of the project.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Katz moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulations:*

1. A detailed plan for all proposed mechanical systems shall be submitted for approval from the HDC prior to the commencement of construction.
2. If required, the eave vent will be painted to match the soffit.
3. The fascia of the conservatory shall be a paintable material.
4. The downspouts on the conservatory shall be internal.
5. The upper sash of the windows on the copper bay should be inset by at least 1" from the window casing. In addition, windows on the copper bay will be trimmed with wood and clad with copper.
6. If used, a window screen detail shall be submitted for review and approval by the HDC.
7. Two inch by two inch slats shall be used on the trellis as shown on detail #1, page 14.
8. All renderings shall be considered conceptual as the revised elevation plans represent the final building design.
9. A copper gutter shall be added to the copper bay.

Vice-Chair Kozak *seconded the motion.*



Mr. Katz said this had been a long contentious process, which reinforced an observation made by Mr. Paul McEachern some years ago that “taste was taste”. He said people’s opinions seemed pretty much even in this case. He said they could look at Section 10.635.7 and impose impassioned statements about how an application was wanting, but someone else could look at the same section and find an application acceptable as was evident in the diversity of buildings throughout the District. He said photos from the dedication of the beautiful 21<sup>st</sup> Century Memorial Bridge many years ago showed the historical context that included buildings with mansard roofs, and another structure that was bigger than all the others. He said Harbour Place used to be a large power plant converted into commercial and residential use and now they had to decide how another building would work in the context of that building as well. He said this particular application went the extra distance using integrity of design, well-regarded materials and historic workmanship.

Mr. Katz said he appreciated that people felt growth was out of control and they were losing something, but Portsmouth was changing whether anyone liked it or not. He said people wanted to live and come to Portsmouth and you couldn’t shut off the lights and take in the welcome mat because some people didn’t want it to change. He said nothing was worse than a city in a state of stasis and he suggested people have a little faith and discover what was to come.

Vice-Chair Kozak said the demolition of the gas station was also part of the application and even though it didn’t fit in with the rest of the streetscape and no one would be sad to see it go, it too was a historic building which was discussed in past work sessions. Because it did not contribute to the surrounding buildings or the defining character of Portsmouth, she said she was in support of the demolition.

Vice-Chair Kozak said before the gas station, there was a looming large building that was probably a Federal structure, and before that, there may have been a little wood house in 1600. She said there was a continuum of history on the street and she recalled a clause in the ordinance that said, “Rejected was the notion that the city was stuck in one period of time”. She said they have to look at history as it evolves at a particular site and its context.

Vice-Chair Kozak said they were required to access the historic significance of the entire site as a whole. She said this site was in one of the most beautifully intact Federal neighborhoods in the country, which was important; but a significant part of its context was different because it was at the terminal viewpoint of the Memorial Bridge and Prescott Park, which were not there when the Federal structures were built. She said the buildings were built in reference to working wharfs and piers, but they were no longer there as a reference point for this building. She said this building would be bigger than the building next to it on State Street, and smaller than the building on Bow Street, but within view of the gateway to the city, this building needed to be a little stronger and prouder than its neighbors. She said she thought this building accomplished that. She said she would fear replicating neighboring buildings because it would diminish them. She said there were mansard buildings on both sides of the site at the turn of the last century, and there was precedence for this style so she was in support of the application.

Councilor Kennedy said she was still concerned with the compatibility of surrounding properties and overshadowing some great Federal buildings. She said there was historic proof of mansard roofs, but there was no historic proof of any penthouses on mansard roofs. She said they weren’t able to get a perspective, and she had a hard time accepting the idea of a gray penthouse on a mansard roof as the first thing seen when coming over the bridge. She said right now they see Federal buildings and a 1920’s or 1930’s gas station, which might be questionable, but it was still historic.

Councilor Kennedy said they had come a long way with the building design and plans, but more detail had been discussed but wasn't added to the plans. She said the plans needed to include the details for people to be fully informed to make a decision so she would not vote in favor of it.

Mr. Gladhill said they went through a long process. He said they had photographic documentation that there were mansard roofed buildings in the area and there were two buildings, one about the same size as the proposed building on the site at one time. He said it might appear larger, but no one could picture exactly the way things looked back then.

Mr. Gladhill said there was a lot of quality in the materials with real brick and real copper and a lot of detail, which would fit in the area unlike 55 Congress Street, which was a huge building with no detail and was in the middle of downtown. He did agree, however, with the apprehensiveness in how a penthouse on a mansard roof, visible from the Memorial Bridge would look, compared to somewhere else like the Northern Tier where there were no roads high enough to view penthouses. He said the bridge construction over the last year prevented them from getting a perspective so it was hard to imagine it.

Mr. Wyckoff said the architect had gone to great pains to give the penthouse some style and he thought it was possibly the best penthouse he had ever seen. He reminded everyone that the penthouse was directly related to the last ordinance change that pushed the top floor 25 feet back from the lot line. He said they would probably see more of them in future proposals.

Mr. Wyckoff said it would be nice if there were some sort of combined development with the Connie Bean Center, but they were two separate buildings with two separate owners and this was America and they couldn't combine their proposals or approvals. He said he was disappointed that a preliminary work session photo of the Connie Bean was published in the "Portsmouth Herald" because in no way was that an approved development. He said they would have a lot of work to do with the Connie Bean Center.

Mr. Wyckoff said there were Federal "jewels" across the street, but two of them at 58 and 68 State Street were new, built just five years before and he believed the same architect designed them. He said Harbour Place was a converted power plant and was also large with two floors added to the top. Mr. Wyckoff said the Memorial Bridge was going to be a brand new, state of the art, illuminated; 21<sup>st</sup> Century bridge that would set the tone along with a beautiful new building that would be one of the best buildings constructed in downtown Portsmouth. He said the building would be constructed with quality materials like copper and granite and details like a bay that would prevent it from looking like a box.

Mr. Rawling said State Street did have an intact collection of Federal buildings, but looking in a different direction you could see different sizes, different generations and a great deal of variety in styles throughout the neighborhood. He said it was not unusual to see buildings of different eras throughout the city filled in with buildings from other times as it developed. Mr. Rawling said he had a lot of respect for many of the speakers who spoke with a lot of knowledge and insight presented. He said everyone had a different perception of what could be done depending on which direction they looked. He said there were also historians of significant status that presented the Gloucester House as a model for the site as well.

Mr. Rawling said the building would be relatively the same size as the Connie Bean Center building and in close proximity to larger buildings, including some of the Federal buildings so they were not looking at a building that was oversized for the site. He said it started out exuberant, but there had been a lot of design evolution that had turned it into an articulated building with appropriate form, texture, and scale that wouldn't be frivolous or overwhelming to the Federal buildings adjacent to it.

Chairman Almeida said he also had a huge amount of respect for the comments made. He said he would share a lot of the concerns for honoring the Federal qualities of the neighborhood if this building was on

the other side of State Street within the complete row of Federal buildings with common heights, but this was not in that row. He said the larger of the new buildings immediately across the street spoke to that. He said this building was on the other side and at the end of the street on the corner facing Wright Avenue more than State Street. He said there was no question it was predominantly a Federal style district, but there was also a diversity of buildings in the area and he thought mimicking a Federal building would only make fun of the buildings across the street. He said he considered this a contemporary design, with traditional materials and features, not a fake. He said Mr. Katz' comments were well put and he echoed all of them.

*The motion passed, 6-1 with Councilor Kennedy opposing.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

- 1. Discussion of amending the zoning ordinance to require electronic submission of plans.

*Mr. Gladhill moved to postpone the discussion to the end of the meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded, and all were in favor.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 1. Petition of **Mill Gate Condominium Association, owner,** and **Kristin Goodwillie, applicant,** for property located at **17 South Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace clapboard at entryway with cedar shakes) as pre plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 53 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

As an abutter, Councilor Kennedy recused herself.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Gladhill moved to postpone the application to the end of the meeting until the applicant arrived to speak to the petition. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded, and all were in favor.*

\*\*\*\*\*

- 2. Petition of **Sheri M. Keniston, owner,** for property located at **569 Middle Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (misc. changes to storage shed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 15 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Property owner, Ms. Sheri Keniston said they received approval to build a shed, and they were presenting some revisions. She said the builder built barns and would use real wood with batten siding, and they would change the roof pitch, and use a brick bottom to make it more permanent. She said they wanted windows on the side and to move the doors to the driveway side to get a snow blower out. She said they wouldn't be visible from the street.

Mr. Gladhill asked what they would use for roof materials. The builder, Mr. Seth Levine said they would use sheeting covered with material to protect it from snow and ice, covered with asphalt shingles.

**SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

There was no one from the public to speak to the petition so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and Mr. Katz seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff said it was a straightforward application already approved and changing the design of the door wouldn't affect anyone or anything.

*The motion passed, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

3. Petition of **Michael R. and Denise Todd, owners**, for property located at **254 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (enclose portion of existing porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 4 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Brendan McNamara came before the Commission on behalf of the owners. He said he did the last remodeling design when the property was remodeled sometime between 2009 and 2010. He said the new owners wished to enclose part of the side porch to gain more interior space. Mr. McNamara said they would move the existing walls out and use the existing windows and doors. He said the definition of the porch would remain and they would use flat panels between the columns.

Mr. Gladhill asked for clarification on the front door and Mr. McNamara said the front door would remain the same.

Chairman Almeida asked about trim detail, and Mr. McNamara explained the bead trim.

Councilor Kennedy asked if there would be an eave and Mr. McNamara said the soffit eave would remain with no changes.

**SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

There was no one from the public to speak to the petition so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.*

Mr. Rawling said it was a straightforward and sympathetic renovation.

*The motion passed, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

4. Petition of **HH Wholesalers LLC, owner**, for property located at **601 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (changes to misc. windows, doors, and roof canopy) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 164 as Lot 7 and lies within the Business and Historic Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Brendan McNamara said the original request had been approved in December 2012. He said they were coming back with a few changes in response to changes in the building code regarding use and change of use that were more complicated than they originally understood. He said they were forced to put in a second access door. He said they substituted a window for the second door and enlarged the overhang over the two doors.

Mr. McNamara said demolition also revealed changes, and they found an issue with support on the front of the building. He said there were also changes in the floor levels at the rear part of the building.

Chairman Almeida said he was happy to see the trim package and was excited about the details on the back of the building.

Mr. Gladhill asked why they didn't put the second entrance on the left hand side of the building. Mr. McNamara said there were many regulations that applied to the building construction, and because of fire safety, the door could not be within ten feet of the boundary.

**SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

There was no one from the public to speak to the petition so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff said it was a previously approved design with few changes that were compatible with the rest of the faux New England design.

*The motion **passed**, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

5. Petition of **508 Islington Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Robert Maynard, applicant**, for property located at **508 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace street front windows with double hung windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 156 as Lot 2 and lies with the Mixed Residential Business and Historic Districts.

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **postpone** the application to the July 10, 2013 meeting at the applicant's request. Mr. Gladhill seconded and all in were in favor, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

Request To Postpone

6. Petition of **JEDA Revocable Trust, owner, Darle MacFadyen and Jeffrey Paolini, owners and trustees**, for property located at **272 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing porch) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct three season porch, construct rear deck landing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 37 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Darle MacFadyen said she bought the property off the trust in March 2013 though it was not reflected in the packet materials. She said when she first bought the property in 2010 she came before the Board to replace windows and siding and due to legal issues, work was delayed, but to date 85% of the work has been done. She said she had a work session for the front porch in 2011. She said windows still needed to be replaced at the 274 New Castle Avenue side of the duplex.

Ms. MacFadyen said the original structure was an 1820 front entry colonial "L" house at 274 New Castle Avenue and converted into a duplex with an addition, which made up most of the 272 New Castle Avenue unit that appeared to have been built in the early 1900's. She said the application was for 272 New Castle Avenue where she resided.

Ms. MacFadyen said the BOA granted a variance for the front porch and rear deck project at their last meeting the previous week. She said the 4' x 10' deck at the rear of the house was for egress in case of a fire and access to the rear yard. She said the size of the deck was because the addition was built around a tree trunk that expanded out from the foundation. Ms. MacFadyen said the deck would not be visible from the street and the plan was to use composite material.

Ms. MacFadyen said the front porch was unsound, unattractive and needed to be replaced and doing so would satisfy her insurance company. She said the new porch design would also help differentiate a separation of the units for visitors and emergency personnel because everyone went to the center entry despite instructions otherwise. She said she wanted to change the footprint to nestle it into the corner of the unit and move it back from the road, which would add aesthetics and symmetry to the building and functionality to her unit. She said she would use the same Anderson 6/6 windows and design structure as the current windows.

Mr. Wyckoff said he only saw a box with corner boards and windows, but was not seeing any fascia or soffit details and was concerned they would get into a work session mode. Ms. MacFadyen said they would follow the lines of the house. Mr. Wyckoff said there was no detail on the style on the plan. Chairman Almeida said they needed clarification on the detailing and they could make stipulations.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked what the foundation would be and Ms. MacFadyen said it would be held up with sonotubes. She said there was brick, concrete and granite stone used in different places of the foundation so they were going to see what was underneath the old porch once it was removed.

Chairman Almeida said the porch was a small area and asked if she might use a brick foundation for consistency. Vice-Chair Kozak said there wouldn't be a foundation wall if she was using sonotubes. Chairman Almeida said they wouldn't want exposed sonotubes. Ms. MacFadyen said they wouldn't leave the sonotubes exposed, but it wouldn't be an insulated space. She asked if they would accept latticework or if she needed to use a brick façade. Councilor Kennedy said there seemed to be quite a bit of brick visible and asked if everyone would be comfortable with a brick foundation. Chairman Almeida said it was not going to be a poured foundation to put brick on, but there was some lattice detail that could be continued. Mr. Wyckoff said that would work. Councilor Kennedy said she wasn't sure if they had

purview over rodents, but she lived in the neighborhood herself and wouldn't want lattice work under her porch because there were river rats in the area. She thought the brick would be better. Ms. MacFadyen said she could put something behind the latticework to prevent that.

Mr. Gladhill said it looked more like an addition than a porch in the drawings so he thought the continuation of brick would look better at the front of the house, which was on a major thoroughfare. Chairman Almeida said she would need a poured foundation or a footing for brick skirting if they were insisting on brick, which would add to her expense. Ms. MacFadyen agreed that would add to her costs for a three-season porch.

Mr. Wyckoff agreed that it looked more like an addition than a three-season porch with a door on the side and conventional windows and clapboards in between. He said she could make it look like a three season porch with sonotubes and lattice on the bottom and the addition of other details. He said he felt it was being treated lightly and the structure needed to be treated with respect because of its location.

Ms. MacFadyen said she didn't want to put an addition on the house because she had plenty of room, but she wanted some place to enjoy the view and a place that would satisfy her insurance company. She said she also wanted balance and symmetry between the front window and the addition to distinguish her section of the duplex as a separate entryway.

Mr. Katz said the issue might be different if it was at the back of the house, but they had a decision to make as far as the perceived function since it was so visible. He said if she wanted it to be a porch it would need to look like one by considering the placement of numerous large windows and screens to distinguish it from an addition. Ms. MacFadyen asked if she had to change the windows if using latticework and Mr. Katz said the windows she was proposing looked like they belonged as an addition to the house, not on a porch. Ms. MacFadyen said she was trying to maintain the integrity of the house by using similar windows, but she would gladly put in fewer windows. Ms. Ruedig said she could preserve the integrity of the house by enclosing the existing porch. Ms. MacFadyen said removing the existing porch would make more room for an additional parking place and she thought it would improve the aesthetics of the existing porch, and create a different entrance.

Mr. Wyckoff said they ran into a similar situation down the street near Blossom Street where they enclosed the porch with casement windows and there were questions of whether there was a continuous sill under the windows and if there were clapboards or panels under the windows. Chairman Almeida said they also looked at a similar case of an enclosed porch earlier with similar details to this proposal that used skirting board instead of brick, which would also be appropriate. Chairman Almeida suggested she looked at the enclosed porch at 254 South Street that they approved within five minutes.

Councilor Kennedy said they were getting into work session types of discussions and she didn't think it was fair to other applicants waiting.

Vice-Chair Kozak said her proposal could also be approved quickly if she went with a brick foundation. Chairman Almeida agreed, noting that it would appear as an addition instead of a porch. Ms. MacFadyen said it seemed like an unnecessary additional cost, and she was frustrated because her insurance company was going to cancel her if she didn't do something different to improve her emergency access.

Chairman Almeida said they would need to go into quick work session to resolve the issues. Mr. Katz asked if they might postpone the discussion and take the next applicant to be fair.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Katz moved to **postpone** the discussion to a work session later in the meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded and all in were in favor, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

7. Petition of **Cooper Malt, LLC, owner**, and **Jessica Kaiser, applicant**, for property located at **33 Jewell Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replacement of entry door and storefront windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 155 as Lot 5 and lies within the Business and Historic Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Tom Emerson, representing the owner and applicant said had a work session with the Commission before and reviewed the plans and the product details.

Chairman Almeida asked if the wood infill arch on page 5 would be sitting proud above the window frame and Mr. Emerson said yes it would sit approximately 3/4" proud above the window frame.

Ms. Ruedig asked if the painted steel channel was already bolted there, and Mr. Emerson said it would be added and bolted to the floor system.

**SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

There was no one from the public to speak to the petition so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion.*

*Vice-Chair Kozak said the detailing was in keeping with similar features found in the building, and the historic nature by keeping the wood arch and the industrial nature of the steel channel.*

*The motion **passed**, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

1. Petition of **Mill Gate Condominium Association, owner**, and **Kristin Goodwillie, applicant**, for property located at **17 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace clapboard at entryway with cedar shakes) as pre plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 53 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

As an abutter, Councilor Kennedy recused herself.

This item had been taken out of order until the applicant arrived, but no one appeared to speak to the application.



*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to postpone the application to the June 12, 2013 meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion and the motion passed, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

6. Petition of **JEDA Revocable Trust, owner, Darle MacFadyen and Jeffrey Paolini, owners and trustees**, for property located at **272 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing porch) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct three season porch, construct rear deck landing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 37 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

**WORK SESSION**

Chairman Almeida asked the applicant, Ms. Darle MacFadyen if she had reviewed the enclosed porch at 254 South Street. Ms. MacFadyen said it was a very nice drawing with more detail than she had. She said she thought it had to follow the look of the house. Chairman Almeida said they did not want a porch to look like an addition to the house floating on sonotubes without a foundation. He said if it looked less like an addition and more like a porch, it would be more acceptable to be on sonotubes with skirting.

Ms. MacFadyen asked if a porch would need a different style of windows, more windows or wider windows. Vice-Chair Kozak said she simply needed to choose whether she was going to do a full foundation or more windows. Ms. MacFadyen said she could add more windows.

Councilor Kennedy asked about longer windows. Ms. MacFadyen said she would rather have longer windows. Mr. Katz said she could follow a ratio of window to wall.

Mr. Wyckoff said he saw many problems that hadn't been discussed. He said there was a problem in that the windows on the house that were taller were inside the supporting fascia structure. He said the existing porch was 6 feet wide, and the proposed porch would be 11 feet wide. He said the roof was going to have a problem with the second floor windowsills, which would require the roof to flatten out tremendously even though it wasn't drawn that way. He said there would be no room for a proper soffit giving the appearance of a basic ranch, clapboarded roof with a short overhang, which wouldn't fit on a house of this style. He said it should have a crown fascia board and at least some shadow boards. He said it looked as if the drawings were improperly scaled, that the second floor window should be changed for more pitch, and the window on the right side needed to be changed so the addition could be properly proportioned. Vice-Chair Kozak said she might just be able to extend the roof over a bit more to make it work. Chairman Almeida said they needed to decide if they needed to use porch language or an addition. Ms. MacFadyen said she wanted a porch. Vice-Chair Kozak said if she used sonotubes, it would need latticework below.

Mr. Rawling said she could create the look of a porch by using continuous sills, pick up some detail, keep some substance between the windows, about 5 inches for support to the porch and for stud pockets to give a compatible appearance with the rest of the house. Chairman Almeida asked about use of clapboard on a porch. Mr. Rawlings said the existing porch had shingles at one time. Ms. Ruedig said she thought clapboard under the sills would be inappropriate.

Chairman Almeida said they needed to give clear direction to continue with the public hearing or they had to decide if she needed to come back at another time. He said they would need to speak to all of the stipulations if they strayed far from her current design.

Councilor Kennedy asked how many windows they were recommending and Mr. Wyckoff said he thought three windows with five inches of trim between each window and no tiny pieces of clapboard in between. Councilor Kennedy said it sounded like she should not over embellish and keep the trim between the windows plain. Mr. Cracknell said she would probably want three windows on the street side and four or five on the side. Councilor Kennedy asked the commissioners what size windows they would recommend. It was agreed that the windows would need to be scaled down. Mr. Wyckoff said he thought they would need to be about five feet high to keep them from looking awkward. Mr. Katz said she needed to lean on her building for some solutions.

Chairman Almeida asked the applicant if she could return with a new drawing. Ms. MacFadyen was amendable to that but asked if there was any way she could get the rear deck approved. After a brief discussion, the Commissioners decided that they would hear the complete application the following week.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **postpone** the application to the June 12, 2013 meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion and the motion **passed**, 7-0.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

- 1. Discussion of amending the zoning ordinance to require electronic submission of plans.

Discussion on this item was moved down from the agenda to the end of the meeting.

Mr. Cracknell said the Planning Department staff has been scanning applications for the Board of Adjustment, the Conservation Commission, the HDC, the Planning Board, and TAC and putting them on the webpage. He said it was particularly difficult with a large project which had many pages like the project on Wright Avenue. He said it would be easier if they required electronic PDF copies instead of just requesting them, especially for the bigger projects. He said they were proposing that all the boards and commissions changed their Rules and Regulations and the actual submission requirements of the Zoning Ordinances requiring that larger projects provide an electronic copy of their application. Mr. Cracknell said they were asking for support from the HDC to draft an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that would go before the City Council, requiring electronic submissions for major projects larger than \$50,000.

Councilor Kennedy said one of the sheets suggested that a work session be requested for any project over \$25,000. Mr. Cracknell said he didn't know if there was a conflict between the Rules and Regulations and the Zoning Ordinance, but he agreed they could do that. Vice-Chair Kozak said most copiers had scanners on them and it wouldn't be any harder for applicants to submit electronic copies for all applications, though they would still have to provide eleven copies. Mr. Cracknell said the Planning Department could still handle some of the smaller applications and stick to the monetary threshold of \$25,000.

Mr. Gladhill asked if all applications were going on the City website, and Mr. Cracknell said yes. Mr. Gladhill said the hardship was the plans for larger projects.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Councilor Kennedy moved to forward to the City Council the request for the amendment that all applications over \$25,000 be submitted electronically as well as with paper copy. Mr. Wyckoff seconded, and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0.*

**IV. DISCUSSION**

Chairman Almeida said the last time they went before the City Council he was asked to prioritize HDC needs and they came up with four items, which were the neighborhood pattern book, the visual guidelines book, the 3D model, and the survey of historic properties. He said he thought the visual guidelines book would be first, but he asked the Commissioners to give him their thoughts on the priorities.

Ms. Ruedig said the survey was funded and it would happen eventually so she didn't think it had to be high on the list because it would come. Mr. Wyckoff asked why the survey couldn't assist in setting up the 3D model. He said he thought it was important to include windows and not just blocks because seeing the windows affected the perception of massing and scale.

Mr. Cracknell said the City Manager requested that the HDC decide if they want to meet with the City Council on either Monday, August 5 or August 19 for a joint work session to help make a decision on what the priorities of the HDC were. Councilor Kennedy said she could recommend a longer meeting on a Wednesday night if they wanted more time. Mr. Wyckoff said he wasn't sure if they needed that much time. It was determined that they would have a work session with the City Council on Monday, August 19, 2013, 6-7 p.m.

Councilor Kennedy said a lot of big projects already had presentations in 3D and she wondered if it was something that could be requested. She said she was told that a building could be put up on Google Earth for free and many architectural firms were doing that. Chairman Almeida said Vice-Chair Kozak was shepherding the 3D modeling. Vice-Chair Kozak said she didn't think it would be much of a stretch for large projects because most of the large projects were already done in 3D. She said it might work in the short term, but she didn't know how effective putting a building into Google Earth would be. She said they needed a real 3D map of the City so she would prefer to wait and get it right. Mr. Cracknell said they would need a training and storage of the program as well, but he said they would look into it.

Chairman Almeida announced that the opening session of the Form-Based Zoning Charrettes would start the next night at City Hall. Mr. Cracknell went through the schedule.

\*\*\*\*\*

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

At 10:25 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane K. Kendall  
Acting Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on Feb. 12, 2014.