

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**June 12, 2013
reconvened from June 5, 2013
to be reconvened on June 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; Alternate Dan Rawling, Alternate Reagan Ruedig

MEMBERS EXCUSED: George Melchior

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARINGS)

A. Petition of **Mill Gate Condominium Association, owner, and Kristin Goodwillie, applicant**, for property located at **17 South Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing entryway with cedar shakes) as per 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. *(This item was postponed at the June 5, 2013 meeting to the June 12, 2013 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Gladhill moved to postpone the application until the June 19, 2013 meeting. Councilor Kennedy seconded and all were in favor, 7-0.

B. 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. *(This item was postponed at the June 5, 2013 meeting to the June 12, 2013 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. MacFadyen verified that the HDC had received her revised plan. She changed the footprint of the covered area from 11'x10' to 10'x10' so that the roof could be slanted and she added

lattice to all the edges to clearly define that it had a covered porch and not an addition. She also added sill plates to continuously run under the windows. The windows would be 2'x2' to match the addition and would be separated by a 3-1/2" casing to make it more porch-like. They dropped the porch floor 7" from the house to differentiate it as a porch addition.

Mr. Rawling asked for a description of the materials that they would be using. Ms. MacFadyen said the material would be the type of siding currently on the house, and the materials between the windows would be an AZEK-like substance that would be painted white. The roofing material would match the existing roof material, which was a black asphalt architectural shingle.

Mr. Wyckoff said the plan was much improved, and his only comment was that the window sills on that type of porch usually go around the corner, and the corner board sits on top of and beneath it. Ms. MacFadyen said it was an easy thing to do and her contractor would do it.

Ms. Ruedig said there was no information about the door and asked if she was using the old door. Ms. MacFadyen verified that she meant the door on the porch, and it would be a new door because the current door was held together by duck tape. Ms. Ruedig asked what the material of the new door would be. Ms. MacFadyen said it would be a wooden door with glass on top. Chairman Almeida asked if the door would match the exact rendering. Ms. MacFadyen said yes.

Councilor Kennedy said she appreciated the extra effort Ms. MacFadyen had gone to and she knew it was a slight hardship.

Vice-Chair Kozak mentioned the dividing bars on the windows and the note that referenced snap-in grids. She said the rendering looked like it was just a snap-in piece from the inside. Ms. MacFadyen said the snaps were outside, that they were Harvey windows and met the requirements. She said if they were not, she would switch to Andersen windows.

Chairman Almeida asked if the approval on the full window replacement of the house was the same specification or the same product. Ms. MacFadyen said she put Andersen windows on the rest of the house but her contractor recommended Harvey because it was a superior and less costly product and met the requirements. She understood that the requirement for the outside of the window was wood.

Chairman Almeida asked what the material on the outside of the window was. Ms. MacFadyen said the outside material was vinyl clad and the inside was wood. Chairman Almeida asked if the windows that were put in the house recently were all wood. Ms. MacFadyen said they were Andersen Woodright. Mr. Gladhill said Ms. MacFadyen had just mentioned vinyl clad exterior. It was supposed to be aluminum clad, so he asked her which one it was. Ms. MacFadyen said it was whatever it said. Mr. Wyckoff said it was aluminum clad. He also clarified that the Andersen Woodright window was not wood on the outside, that it was made of Fibrex, which was a fiberglass material. He said they approved them a lot.

Ms. Ruedig said she realized it was a later addition to the house and Ms. MacFadyen was matching two older windows from the 19th century, but she thought a single pane, undivided piece of glass on top of the door would be more appropriate in keeping with the time period. Ms.

MacFadyen said the door currently on the porch had nine separated panes, but it was a narrow door and not reusable. Councilor Kennedy said she agreed with Ms. Ruedig and for the sake of safety and the wind factor, she would want to see the smaller pane.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made the motion to approve the application with the stipulations that the window sill be continuous around the corner, and that the door match the rendering.

Mr. Gladhill suggested that the material be put into the stipulation. Chairman Almeida said the muttoms should be internal grills. Mr. Wyckoff said that there should be simulated divided light windows. He said the application had come a long way and it looked like the porch had been done over.

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

- 1) That the door on the proposed porch shall match the rendering as submitted.*
- 2) That the window sill shall be continuous as it wraps the corner of the proposed porch.*
- 3) That the windows will be simulated divided light windows.*

Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.

II. NEW BUSINESS – PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

8. Petition of **RKDOLLA, LLC, owner**, for property located at **198 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (changes to planter layout, remove dormer) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 20 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Bill Bartell of CJ Architects came before the Commission to discuss his project. He pointed out Sheet 1 that showed the approved plan layout of the existing building on Islington Street with a larger addition at the back, set back from the street, and a common entryway between the two. The amendment that they are requesting deals with the approved elevation on Islington Street and the two locations of the amended items, the dormer to be removed at the top of the elevation, and the planter to be removed near the egress door location. Mr. Bartell showed Sheet 3 which had the approved elevation of the setback addition and the entrance elevation that was approved.

At the top of the approved elevation, the dormer could be seen as it was before and then as it would look when removed. They wanted to remove the dormer because it was adjacent to a building separation wall that was highly fire-rated. The second item to be revised was the brick planter at the bottom of the elevation. The planter was located near the egress door and the area had become congested due to the lower planter wall. They proposed removing part of the planter wall to free up the entry to the egress door. Sheet 3 showed the proposal to extend the existing hand rail pattern with a brick screen material under the deck at that location. The area seemed to be well hidden from the street and was necessary for access to the egress door.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the handrail was a manufactured product. Mr. Bartell said the handrail system was called out in a previous approved submittal and they were matching the existing approved product.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

There was no one 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. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Kozak said the modifications were minor and not visible from the street and were in keeping with the objectives of the addition.

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

9. Petition of **Rockingham House Condominium Association, owner, and Sean Tracey, applicant**, for property located at **401 State Street, Unit 104**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install AC compressor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 3HH and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Frank Smart of Dead River Company said he would be the contractor doing the work. He met with the Board at the Rockingham facility after he had spoken with Mr. Tracey. They viewed the Rockingham site and found a location on the western side of the building that could not be seen from the road, so the compressor would not be noticeable. The compressor would be by the pool area in the back and would connect to two mini-split systems. They would not need to drill holes in the building or run piping on the side of the building. It would be just a freestanding a/c mini-split system with pipes running up the building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the piping and what floor the unit was on. Mr. Smart said the unit would be on the first floor, and the pipes would run down to the basement and then to the outside

unit. Mr. Wyckoff asked how much piping would be exposed. Mr. Smart said there was an air vent that the piping would be run through. The piping would be run along the ground up to the unit, and the unit would be in the back corner by the stairs, where it could be tucked into the corner. He said a plant could be placed next to it.

Chairman Almeida asked whether or not it would be on a platform. Mr. Smart said it would go on a low-profile base of a few inches. Chairman Almeida asked what the unit's dimensions would be. Mr. Smart said the unit was 35" high x 35" wide x 12" deep.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

There was no one 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. Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.*

Councilor Kennedy said she was okay with the application because the unit would not be seen and the condominium association had agreed to it. She was also glad that the piping would go inside the building rather than up the building and that it would not affect the Rockingham at all.

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

10. Petition of **Maplewood and Vaughan Holding Company, LLC, owner**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct multi-story mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 8 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects presented on behalf of the applicant. She previously had a conversation with the Planning Board and wanted to request a work session that evening with the HDC.

Chairman Almeida said they could do it. Mr. Wyckoff made the motion to do a work session.

Councilor Kennedy asked if they were just doing a work session and not returning to the public hearing for 111 Maplewood Avenue. Chairman Almeida said it would make sense to move the work session to the end of the evening so they could hear the other petitions first.

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **amend** the motion to move the work session to the end of the evening and bring the work session back up after hearing the other petitions. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **postpone** the public hearing to the July 10, 2013 meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

11. Petition of **Riveredge Condominium Association, owner, and Leathe and Associates, applicant**, for property located at **117 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing storefront, install awning) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 57A and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios presented on behalf of the applicant. She said the project was a renovation that had been before the HDC back in 2006, so some of the members may be familiar with it. They split the floors and put a condominium on the upper floors and office suites on the main level. They had a buyer for the space. At that time there was an awning system approved but it was never installed. They were asking that the storefront to the office space be changed out and that the awning be put back. The change-out system was broken into twice and they couldn't resolve it, so they wanted to change to the egress with a 3-pt walking mechanism. The inside lobby with a panel would be appropriate and she showed a picture of how the front currently looked and the previous rendering. The tree was removed and a Japanese Maple put in. She showed the elevations. She said the renovation would be relatively similar – they would use the existing opening and just replace the panels, and the difference would be that the two adjacent sidelines would have solid panels below. The light fixture would remain and the awning would be installed over it. There would not be too much change in the interior courtyard space. The condominium association signed off on it. The awning would be black to match the other businesses in the area, and the 117 address would be installed in gold.

Chairman Almeida said that the photo showed the awning's address as 121 and the valance was scalloped. He asked if it would be an exact match. Ms. Ramsey said the intent was to do a match. Chairman Almeida asked if the sides were closed. Ms. Ramsey said they were closed so that the light fixture could not be seen. Chairman Almeida said it looked like the awning came in just under the windowsills of the window below, and Ms. Ramsey agreed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

There was no one 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. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy felt it was an improvement from what was currently there, that it softened it a little and supported the structure and the district.

It passed unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.

12. Petition of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (misc. changes to doors, windows, and parapet wall, add roof structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios presented on behalf of the applicant and said the proposal came before the Commission the previous month as a work session to discuss the penthouse. The majority of the changes were around the first two floors, and the changes were minor. The cover sheet showed that the proposed new structure was considerably more aligned with the elevations below it.

They were proposing a long, relatively short structure on the center of the roof to create a spine along with a centerpiece aligned with the main entry of the building. The space was mainly living space on the upper floor with decks for the units. The two arms of the penthouse were clad in a zinc product, and the centerpiece was a cypress material that was previously approved for other parts of the building, like the awnings and the lower portion of the building. They were using a mix of a familiar material with something more present-day to give the centerpiece more interest as far as color and texture.

On the building's lower levels, the replacements included a minor change to the parapet rail system by 4-3/4", which came about by working with the existing building structure and figuring out how to attach the parapet wall to it.

The closed shutter details flanking the entry were changed to accommodate the living space layouts, and the larger metal awning was changed to a black awning to match the others. There were also additional door and window changes, for example, the closed shutter detail was now a door. An existing set of double doors that went into a restaurant space before was removed.

The Hanover Street elevation's view of the penthouse structure showed that the tower piece was slightly forward to create more space for the unit to the back of the site. Guard rails were changed. On the top floor and the one-story addition, a window was added and there was a Nano window system. Locations of doors and windows were spanning a series of window openings.

Councilor Kennedy asked how tall the structure was. Ms. Ramsey said it was 6' from the railing height. Councilor Kennedy then asked how tall it was from grade to the top of the penthouse. Ms. Ramsey said it was 37'.

Chairman Almeida asked what the dimensions were to the top of the ridge structure of the tower from the existing roof surface. Ms. Ramsey said it was 9' to the main section and 15' to the top

of the tower ridge. Councilor Kennedy asked if that was a total of 40' from the grade. Ms. Ramsey said yes, that they removed the large metal awning on Hanover Street and replaced it with a black awning, and a series of French balconies were replaced by windows.

The back view on Bridge Street had some window openings changed to doors to facilitate the interior layout of condominiums. An awning was added over the residential entrance, and a window was moved 3' to the right. A bay window was replaced with a set of double doors. Materials on the penthouse stayed the same, cypress in the center and the zinc in the better part of the building. An entry to the left was changed to a series of windows. The second entry into the back was changed to windows due to interior changes.

Chairman Almeida asked if the openings were existing openings. Ms. Ramsey said they were, except for the 1-story addition. She said the penthouse was relatively simple and matched the lid wraparound of the 2-story structure. Chairman Almeida also asked about the height to the midpoint of the ridge. Ms. Ramsey said it was the midpoint of the ridge to the tower, which was 37'.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked about the fascia and bracket materials. Ms. Ramsey said the fascia was wrapped in the zinc material and the bracket detail matched the brackets below.

Councilor Kennedy told Ms. Ramsey she would like her to go through the specifications, and Ms. Ramsey did so. Ms. Ramsey said the first sheet of specifications was the Eagle window system. On the lower levels under the penthouse, they were going with the more subdued gray. She said the second and third sheets represented the Eagle and simulated divided light product. The fourth sheet showed the zinc product, namely the roof of the two arms of the penthouse as well as the pitched roof on the taller portion of the penthouse and the walls. The following sheets showed photos of the roof application as well as photographs of the proposed way of using it on the building and a different way of using it.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the windows were pre-approved. Ms. Ramsey said they were the same style of windows that were previously approved for the building. Mr. Wyckoff said he was not seeing screens, except for almost invisible ones. Chairman Almeida said they would discuss screens at a later date.

Chairman Almeida asked about the talon specification and noted they came in separate colors. He asked if there was an option for the base track to be colored with the window. Ms. Ramsey said the tracks and Eagle systems came in black, white and beige, but the beige was the most common color.

Mr. Gladhill told Ms. Ramsey that he noticed she had created something ornate in the triangular center instead of a flag rectangular box on top of the roof, and he asked what her idea behind it had been. Ms. Ramsey said one reason was because it was a penthouse on a 2-story building, so it was relatively visible. Also, the previous month they had the barebones structure that housed the stairs only and they wanted to build a structure that reflected more closely what was happening on the elevations below, so the tower piece was aligned with the two main entries on

Bridge Street and Maplewood Avenue. She said the building had a glass pyramid before when it was a marketplace, so it reflected the same form as then.

Councilor Kennedy was concerned about the roofing material and asked if Ms. Ramsey could think of anything else. Ms. Ramsey said a similar type of product like a standing seam metal might work. The body of the penthouse was drawing attention to the roof, but they could do a metal roof. Ms. Ramsey asked if it was the color or the material that Councilor Kennedy was concerned with. Councilor Kennedy was concerned that it would look like the houses in the North Country with metal roofs and she was not sure about the sun and the glare.

Mr. Wyckoff remembered that a Bow Street building had corrugated siding on the fifth floor. He believed it was a zinc product and he had complained about it because it was extremely shiny. He was told that it dulled over time and turned to a gray color. He hadn't looked at it recently and asked if anyone else had seen it. He recommended switching the roofing material.

Chairman Almeida said the zinc was an upgrade to the common metal roof and had a better quality and finish. The common metal roof was shiny and glossy, but this zinc one was very flat. Ms. Ramsey agreed and said it was the aged zinc material that might be seen on Bow Street. Chairman Almeida thought people may be hesitating because they were afraid if they switched to a lesser product it might be very glossy and shiny.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if it was a standing seam. Ms. Ramsey said that, on the roof itself, it looked like it, but the photos in the specifications show two applications, one of which was board and batten on the vertical surface. Chairman Almeida said it was a great thing to be concerned with because if it was glossy, it would not be successful.

Councilor Kennedy said when she was driving, she saw glare and shine, and where the building was only 40', she was thankful it wouldn't be noticed that much. Ms. Ramsey said the pitch was only a 3 pitch, so it was light compared to how it would be seen in the elevation.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how long it took to dull. Ms. Ramsey said it was pre-dull finish, and depending on pollution and dust, it might start to look a little dirty but it would take a lot to make it look really dirty. Chairman Almeida agreed that it was very flat and it would be difficult to get a reflection off of it.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said she wanted to clarify for the Committee members that she was not Lisa DeStefano's mother or any blood relationship. She said when she looks at the current 30 Maplewood Avenue building, she finds it ugly and thinks it will be greatly improved, at least until Phase 3 of Portwalk, which will tower over everything and then 30 Maplewood will not be seen. There will be no problem with the 'shiny roof' because it will be blocked from the sun. She was disappointed that the indoor Farmers Market didn't go through, and she hoped that they would keep the line of trees in front of the building.

No further discussion was added, and 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. Gladhill seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff said the downstairs was previously approved and the changes were benign if not improvements on some sides of the building. He was pleased with the small penthouse, even though it had an apartment that stuck out. He said the building was not too high and the design changes had really brought it together with the front and rear entrances on Maplewood Avenue and Bridge Street. It was a very important building and the developer had set a standard for the City. He felt very comfortable approving it.

Mr. Gladhill said the Commission appreciated the tower because it broke up a flat roof line, which was beginning to be common around the City.

Vice-Chair Kozak said one of the distinguishing features of the building was its length and horizontal proportion, and the 3rd-level addition helped relieve the low horizontal line. She mentioned that one of the earliest historic roofing materials, which was a lead zinc material, was as close as they could come to that, except for copper, and that it fit the historic character.

Councilor Kennedy said she would approve it with the rationale that the surrounding areas would work with the building design. There were some warehouses on one side of the proposed building that fit in with the character. Otherwise, she would have had a hard time with the penthouse.

Mr. Rawling said he supported the plans as presented and hoped the design would become an example of an articulated roof line, and that the setbacks would be used as scaling elements on larger buildings as well.

Chairman Almeida said he would support it because it met the purpose and intent as well as findings of fact. He said he would like a little bit more visibility of the penthouse because it was very well designed, and he felt that once people saw the zinc, they would be standing on their toes to see more of the building.

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

13. Petition of **Victoria Condominium Association, owner, and Clyde C. Logue, applicant**, for property located at **210 South Street (also 10 New Castle Avenue)** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 35 and lies within Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Logue presented and said they had an existing fence that was installed in the early 1990s. It was a cheap fence and had been painted a few times and was now falling apart, so they were replacing it with an unpainted Northern Cedar fence that the Upright Fence Company would install. A portion of the fence would be solid underneath with lattice on top, and the rest would be just solid fence, which was a classic look around the neighborhood. He showed photos of the proposed fence as well as a diagram of the planned extended fence.

The Commission members reviewed the photos and verified that they were looking at the top piece of the fence with the lattice and the lower pieces of the fence.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

There was no one 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 the proposal was straightforward and appropriate to the site.

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

14. Petition of **High Hanover Condominium Association, owner, and Alex Vandermark, applicant**, for property located at **93 High Street (also 55 Hanover Street)** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace front window and door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 23 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Chairman Almeida recused himself and turned the gavel over to Vice-Chair Kozak.

Alex Vandermark, owner of The Juicery Smoothie and Juice Bar, and contractor Tom Hammer were present.

Mr. Hammer presented the photographs to the Commission of the The Juicery as it presently existed and of the building next to it. One photo had the proposed configuration of the windows and door in the existing building; one photo was of the corner building, the 100 Club entrance; and one photo showed the existing storefront and a pictorial representation of the Conair System with an awning (pictorial presentation) as well as cut sheets from the typical Conair catalog. He also presented a photograph of another City storefront that showed the pictorial configuration that they would do on their building, but they would have one sidelight instead of the two shown in the configuration.

One reason they were making changes was because the existing condition was hazardous. They were proposing to place a short step where the existing door was that would increase the visibility into the space and that was consistent with other commercial storefronts in the City.

Councilor Kennedy felt that it was a huge change. It presently was very historical and she liked the granite step as well as the window along the side of the door. She was not comfortable with the change and asked if they would consider coming up with a more historical look. She said it reminded her of her grandmother's 1970s basement going up to the porch. Mr. Hammer said the building was built in 1989, and they could consider putting muttons on the windows to increase the value of the divided light consideration. They could also place muttons on the awning windows and on the door and to the windows themselves. He said Conair made a light development that they could place on applied grills.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how the improvement would affect the extra step and how it got rid of the step, whether they would go lower with the new door or whether the door would be at the same elevation as the existing door. Mr. Hammer said the door that was installed was not the original door and was the type of door that would be put in a garage with a step-up threshold. He said when you walk up to the door, it was an 8" step, which was not a legal step. The 8" step had a threshold of 2" high. They wanted to push back the door assembly by 3" and get an 11" step to improve the ability to walk in and out of the place. The other issue was that the door also had a screen door that swung out onto the sidewalk and presented a hazard.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they had considered taking the screen door off and hanging the door properly or using the jambs as they were, i.e. repairing what was currently there. Mr. Hammer said they would have to replace the entire door and assembly and they wanted to replace it with a more commercial grade application because it was a retail space. He said the other retail spaces had the same environment installed, as he had shown in the presentation. The door and windows were rotted, and the hazardous step created a liability for the owner and the public. They wanted a safer situation. Mr. Wyckoff said the step was a hazard because someone else installed a door after the fact. Mr. Hammer agreed. They didn't know when it was installed, but the threshold was about 2" high, and he said when you walk out of the store, you have to step over the threshold onto the 8" threshold, then the next step was about 11". They didn't want to change the brick step but simply move the door back and put in a more adequate threshold, maybe like a handicap one, which would be safer and more commercial.

Mr. Vandermark said the existing door was black with no visibility and he wanted a new door that would be more inviting.

Mr. Gladhill said the building was built in 1989 but did not 'scream' 1989 architecture. He said it was historical and the existing door was appropriate for the building. He felt that the examples given to the Commission showing the storefront of Nahcotta, etc. were not appropriate and were more of the 1920s era, when Market Street was built. He said their building was the first building people saw when coming out of the parking garage, so he would like something more historically appropriate than what was proposed, which seemed too modern. Mr. Hammer asked him what was more historically appropriate. Mr. Gladhill said what was presently there seemed more appropriate.

Mr. Katz said that, however ungainly and inefficient the present situation was, it just looked right and appropriate. The windows lined up with the windows above and had a welcoming aspect to them. The windows they were proposing were very grim and unwelcoming. The Nahcotta building was “old time storefront”, given the time period that the structure was built. He said Congress Street had a lot of experimentation with different styles, some successful and some not, and he agreed that the applicant needed to do something but was not sure if what they submitted was the answer. Mr. Hammer said the Hilton Garden Inn and the Marriott were built within the last few years, and they also had the storefront on the lower level and more of an historical presence on the top. He asked if the Commission was against the storefront application from metal to wood. The door was the biggest issue. A clear door would be more appropriate for a commercial application. Doors with small glass panes created problems for customers seeing in. The applicant didn’t have the luxury of having a 5’ sidewalk. They wanted to take down the screen door completely and install a more commercial application that could be opened and closed automatically, and the exiting door had spring hinges and did not meet the day-to-day operation of a commercial application. The other buildings were built recently and had a historical significance on top and a commercial element on the bottom, so the wood windows were something that they would consider, or maybe larger panes of glass on the doors. However, they would not prefer that option because it was not a residential application but a commercial one.

Mr. Katz said he would like to schedule a work session, and he would walk downtown in the future in an effort to derive a sense of what might work in this situation.

Mr. Rawling said they had to look at the character of the building because it was more of a residential look and not a commercial look. The single side light on the top would be a more contemporary look relating to a style that was different from the building. It needed a more balanced arrangement like the State Street Marple and James building that recently had doors approved with glass panels and a solid wooden panel at the bottom.

Mr. Katz asked if the applicant would consider postponing to a work session where they could talk in greater detail about options and possibilities. It seemed like the majority of the Commission would not approve the application as presented that evening. Mr. Hammer said his client needed to move forward with the project and asked if they could just leave the existing windows in place and install a door like Marple and James and then resubmit the application. A nine-light wooden door like at Marple and James would solve the immediate problem of a more visible door and they could replace the door and the threshold and add lights. If the more immediate needs were met and they then wanted to pursue the rest of the storefront, they could do a work session.

Vice-Chair Kozak said they could do a work session/public hearing. A week from then, the applicant could bring the proposed materials and present something at the end of the work session. Mr. Hammer said he was not sure if they could be prepared for everything because he was focusing just on the door. Vice-Chair Kozak said to just bring a picture of the door.

Mr. Wyckoff told Mr. Hammer that if he were to replace the door with a nine-light wooden door similar to Marple and James and he was not doing anything with the windows, he could amend his application and the Commission would approve it because it would be simple. Vice-Chair Kozak said it would be difficult to do that for the record. The lack of images or information would not inform people of what the door looked like.

Mr. Hammer said he was not very familiar with the work sessions, but if they brought the door's cut sheets and said they would replace it, would the Commission vote on it and approve or deny it? Councilor Kennedy said if the applicant was just going to do a door like Marple and James, she did not think they would need a work session. However, if the applicant did all the windows and everything else, then they would need a work session. She recommended that the applicant just submit the plans the following week and make them clean, and they could postpone it until then. Mr. Hammer agreed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **postpone** the application to the June 19, 2013 meeting for a work session/public hearing. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

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

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Maplewood and Vaughan Holding Company, LLC, owner**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct multi-story mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 8 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. (***This work session was moved from the beginning of the meeting so that other petitions could be heard.***)

Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects, Jaime Pennington of RJ Finley, and Rob Harbeson of DeStefano Architects were present.

Ms. DeStefano said she would present areas of detail that were discussed at their last meeting.

She showed the roof plan and the site plan and said they layered all the implied rooftop units centered over the common corridor and had given dimensions as to how far they were set back. Other adjustments would be shown on larger drawings. She said there were no changes to the roof plan except for noting the rooftop units. There were no changes made to the site plan other than detail flags. The front elevation drawings were adjusted for the 2-story form. At the

previous presentation, there had been three options: a 3-story form, a 2-story brick form, and the clad form. They had discussed a lighter cap and façade detail. Ms. DeStefano labeled the detailing into the central panels and reinforced an infill against the clad forms and also added a much tighter cap.

There was also a concern at the last meeting about the parapet caps throughout the rest of the building. They originally were a 3' projection, but after further investigation, she reduced them to 2'. Their new perspective showed 2" overhangs.

Mr. Pennington said there were comments at the last meeting about keeping some depth for shadow lines, and they agreed it was important and did not reduce them.

Relating to the penthouse sloped wall and sloped glazing, at the last presentation, they had a series of skylights and Mr. Ruedig was concerned that it looked like skylight sloped on the roof. Consequently, they got a new manufacturer. Previously there were six separate units they were mulling together, and they found a new system where it would be one opening so they would get the glazing as one piece framing around and it would be visible where the unit or room dividing walls were in-between. All this was on the new façade and on the first bay as it wrapped around.

Councilor Kennedy said it looked like they changed some windows in the center. Ms. DeStefano said they did, and were working with window manufacturers on window patterns and size standards, so there was a slight change in the window patterns as well.

Ms. DeStefano said the wrapping around on Raynes Avenue emphasized the similar cap and the curving slope they spoke about before, and there were detail bubbles pertaining to large elevations. She said they were still working with other layers of approvals in the city, so there were some deeper landscape and civil drawings. They had met with TAC and layered those issues into the design.

As to the rear of the building, originally the pedestrian entrance was more centered into the parking lot and they moved it down. They detailed what the balustrade was above the covered parking. Ms. DeStefano showed the inside courtyard legs and the slab of the covered parking area. There were changes in ventilation, and the sliders in the penthouse looked different from the windows alongside them, and there was an enlarged detail for parapet caps with revised dimensions.

There were perspectives layered in because of requests to see what the building looked like from further back on Maplewood Avenue. She showed a drawing of the 2-story building, the tower, and the slope glazing.

There was also a request to see more of what the view would be focusing on near the residential buildings, and they also looked at what the pedestrian link would be. He showed a drawing of how the curve at Maplewood Avenue would look and how the pedestrian link would connect to what they already had. She also showed a rendering of Portwalk.

She said there would be the typical street lights in front of the building that are typically specified for the street and the lights would reinforce the pedestrian link by getting people from the bridge into the downtown area.

Ms. DeStefano also showed the three previous proposals for the curve.

The Commission had asked for night shots, so Ms. DesStefano showed a rendering of the view and what they were able to do. Chairman Almeida said he thought the lights shown would slow people down as they were coming into the City and make them think they were still on the highway because the lights were 30' in the air. Ms. DeStefano said they would be more of a human scale.

Ms. DeStefano showed her favorite rendering. She said when they met in November, they were talking about the pedestrian feel and this rendering reinforced what they developed. It showed jewel boxes and resting spots on the sunny side of the building, and wider sidewalks. They met the new Ordinance for height and they purposefully stepped back. The pedestrian would get the benefit of the façade pulled back.

She said the neighborhood is a unique district in the City. There will be further development at the Sheraton and she did not know what would happen to the rest of the lot, but the view coming in from Maplewood Avenue would reinforce what the development would be.

Mr. Pennington said another change on the rendering showed that a drive going into the parking lot would be removed and the sidewalk and grass would be connected. Ms. DeStefano said it reinforced the pedestrian connection. Councilor Kennedy said she went to see the development and found a lot of green there, so she was confused as to where they would get the additional green space shown on the picture. Mr. Pennington said the shrubs were hiding it. There was a curb cut then a drive that would be replaced with green space.

Ms. DeStefano said the Commission's site walk request to expand the view of Mill Pond was done.

Mr. Pennington said he had spent time with every abutter and they had been part of the process. Letters submitted from abutters were in the package.

Ms. DeStefano showed enlarged elevation details of the building sections and the canopies. One curved up against the building and around the building, and it looked forced to them, so they simplified it as a straight canopy that still took the curve. She went through the enlarged details such as the brackets, the cable connection points, the window and door openings, the jewel boxes and the casement windows.

A Commission member asked how the casement windows worked. Ms. DeStefano said they projected out and were larger than the typical Valex ones. Chairman Almeida said they would like more detail at the next meeting relating to how the windows sat within the roof plane.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the actual window glazing in the units was coated. Ms. DeStefano said all the glass would have the low E and would be the same kind of glass. There was no tint or reflective coating.

The next drawing showed the small parapet caps, the penthouse pulled back behind, the balcony rails further back, and the canopies. Another drawing showed the enlarged curve piece with the flat panel detail similar in color to the window. Ms. DeStefano had material samples of the colors for the Commission to look at.

The size of the pier was 3' wide and for its height, Ms. DeStefano believed it was the right proportion and similar to the ones on Market Street. If it were narrower, it could not support the weight.

Mr. Wyckoff confirmed that they were using shiny metal and that they felt that it was friendlier for people walking through the arcade. He asked if there were samples. He wanted to see them because he was concerned about the metal.

First, Ms. DeStefano showed the brick they were proposing and passed out samples. They wanted a solid red brick, not flashed brick, because solid brick was a cleaner line. Ms. DeStefano then showed the metals that would be on the curved areas –the light metal on the perimeter, the gray panel on the recesses, and the darker gray on the window frame. She said she was trying to give some hierarchy to the metal frame.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how the corners were finished and whether there was a metal molding that held the corners together. Ms. DeStefano said they were actual panels so there was no outside corner trim or molding, and she showed the detail of how it worked around the corners.

Ms. DeStefano showed the colors that work together in the daylight with the metal roof and the window system and said the trim would match. She also said she would do a mock-up of the brick work. She also showed that the sloped skylight color and the metal roof going alongside it matched.

Vice-Chair Kozak was worried about the metal sloped panels because they might appear heavy and said it was starting to look like a roof that disappears, which could help bring the building down to the 3-story look. She thought that too much of an intense high contrast dark color might pull it forward more and was concerned that it might be too dark and intense. She said the whole key to it working was that the upper story 'disappeared', so they had to be careful with the finishes. Ms. DeStefano said her preference was to have the windows match the roof as much as possible and they had always done it darker and sloped back.

Discussion:

Chairman Almeida said he was struggling with whether the roof was right. He was excited about the glazed roof, but it was hard to pull off. The system on the back side was very elegant – it was vertical and fit in well. He asked if they would consider bringing it to the front side and standing it straight up and setting it back to have roof terraces looking over Maplewood Avenue. He asked

her to describe the system a little more and the potential of employing that in place of the sloped roof. Ms. DeStefano said that it read as a penthouse. One of the reasons it was set back so far was to meet the height requirements at the corner. They tried to balance quantity of units so it worked for the client and she did not know how far back it could be pushed. The material was cement and did not have the richness that they had with the metal roof or the sloped glazing. Mr. Pennington said the sloped glazing had been challenging, and pushing it back might not cost units but might make the present units shallow.

Chairman Almeida said one idea was to bring the bottom in at the top so they were not losing much ceiling area. Ms. DeStefano said the structure was already back a few feet due to the slope. Mr. Pennington said the benefit of doing the slope was getting 5', and they could not get that if it were vertical. Chairman Almeida suggested dropping the vertical from the top or introducing the idea of a roof terrace, which would be far more valuable than a few more square feet of interior space. Mr. Pennington said they could consider that option.

Vice-Chair Kozak said that it either had to be so far back it was not seen at all, or it needed to seem like a roof. If it read as a penthouse, it would add bulk and not relate to anything. There was a character to the old streets with 3-story buildings and pitched roofs, and if the developer could keep that idea but in a new way, it might work, but she was worried that it would look too much like sliding doors and metal panels instead of a roof. Mr. Gladhill said he would like to see the penthouse pushed back because the front looked flat. Pushing it back would make the variation of the roof line distinct. Chairman Almeida did not think it was a compromise, that it was well designed at the top. Mr. Pennington said they were optimistic that they were heading in the right direction with the sloped glazing. Ms. DeStefano did not think they would be able to pull the upper core back enough to give it the penthouse feel. Chairman Almeida said it would accentuate the tower more, which was a good thing. Mr. Pennington said another option would be to insert a dormer so that it still looked like a roof but could be a lighter color.

Councilor Kennedy was uncomfortable with the massing because most of the properties in that area were 1-story and 2-story buildings. She asked if they could do anything to make it less intrusive, and she felt the roof was very intrusive due to the glare.

Ms. Ruedig thought the sloped roof was more interesting than just putting a penthouse up there but wondered if it could be recessed more. She thought the area was a unique spot with many different styles and asked if the elevation could be brought down to match the height of the eave line across the street. Mr. Rawling pointed out a page from the plan that had estimates of building heights across the street. Mr. Pennington said they tried to be accurate when measuring the other buildings and the estimates were reasonable. That was why their building had five bays and the rest of it was set back so that the bays related to the building across the street.

Mr. Rawling was comfortable with the scale and massing and thought the forms and the plan worked, but he was struggling with the building elevation on Maplewood Avenue. When relating it to the streetscape and the Herald building, he did not see the pattern as a whole. It seemed to emulate the Shoe Mill building but it looked really contemporary and reminded him of a monumental courthouse. There were porches on the other side of the street, a colonial pattern glazing and postwar deco addition as an entryway. The styles were confusing and he was not

sure why they were all attached to the building. The brick scaling elements meant to project and bring some of the neighborhood feel out seemed to fade away and needed more light colors on them. He felt that the light colors were correct on the curve piece but there was too much brick on the highlights, and he wanted to see some of these things relating to one another. He asked why the developer did not have a nice-looking apartment building with retail stores on the main floor. Instead, it looked like a confused factory building with a civic building attached to the end.

Chairman Almeida asked him if it would alleviate his concerns if the Maplewood side had a base similar to the backside or if there was a different material at ground level. Mr. Rawling said that the dimensional and scaling components of the bump-out and accessory pieces would be lost. He compared it to a buffet where each of the dishes might be nice but would be different from a whole prepared meal.

Mr. Katz said he saw some elocutions of 19th century industrial architecture and thought that was neat. He thought one reason to have big buildings in Portsmouth was to accomplish a material purpose, and the building had that aspect, however faint, and the curve structure tugged people a little closer to it. He had no problem with the concept and thought the roof would work. He said as far as 'living' with what was across the street, there was no way to do that. This was the start of a process that would march down to Market Street and they could see what was going on at the Westin project under another name. He thought what would be ideally appropriate for the site would be a wood-frame clapboard church with a modest steeple and a little parsonage, but no one would go for that. There were demands being made in the City for space to do things, and some would work better than others. If the Commission ever figured out how to access proportion in the City, they would be better able to forecast what the final result would be. In the meantime, they worked with what they had, and he saw it as a first step of further development in the area.

Comments:

Mr. Wyckoff said he expressed his concern with the rounded portion and the end of the building looking like a county courthouse. From the perspective of the views as people were coming into the City from the bridge, it was an introduction to a taller building and he thought it would work. He was not going to pick away at a number of details at that time because it was either yea or nay. He was satisfied.

Mr. Gladhill mentioned the penthouse on the roof and the fact that Vaughan Street and Raynes Street were being developed. He thought the penthouse side of the building looked like the back of a building on Vaughan Street. If they were trying to bring in more pedestrians, residents and businesses, it looked like a secondary façade on the back side, and the two sides of the street had active pedestrian uses. They had talked a lot about Maplewood Avenue and Vaughan Street, but maybe they needed something different on the back.

Ms. DeStefano said the corner that they could respond to was the gray level they were working on. The street wall hid the parking, which was part of the variance to screen the parking. They gave a pedestrian link with the unique fences, the green space, and the anchor, but they did not

have a front door because most of the pedestrians who would park would walk through the gateway or park along the street.

Mr. Gladhill said Ms. DeStefano's building was going in first, so it was hard to predict what would happen, that maybe the economy would tank. He was talking about making that side more retail friendly. He understood the concept, but if her building was last, and the other side of the street was lively with stores and restaurants, he would think she would install a different façade to that side. Mr. Pennington said they tried to bring as much energy to that corner as they could and had to meet the parking requirement. There was discussion about the lights along that street and they felt comfortable with the size and scale of the street legs. He said the landscape plan was not just focused on Maplewood Avenue but focused on the whole site.

Vice-Chair Kozak felt that the roof was important if it was going to be a sloped glazing system. She referenced Mr. Rawling's comment of detailing between all the parts beginning to tie the different parts together. The added detail on the curb was a huge step forward, but they could go further with a more uniform theme. She thought the actual stepping down on the front was effective, and the jewel boxes worked for the pedestrian experience. Shortening the 3rd story would help bring the building into a better relationship with the houses across the street. Most of the buildings had a shorter 3-story and it helped bring down the scale.

Mr. Rawling brought up the massive piers on the curved portion and suggested putting in brick panels that would break down the scale and be more compatible with the other side of the street. It would bring the red brick down to the other end of the building. The elevations seemed fine and showed a lot of space, and the bottom elevation seemed to be less. He felt that all the brick pieces needed more white and also that more brick should be brought into the curve so that things would weave somewhat. Establishing a motif and working with it around the building would work better than trying to introduce new motifs, as if were an evolved building. A person would look at the building knowing it was built all at once and appreciate the scaling elements.

Councilor Kennedy said that Mr. Gladhill's point was good. The Charette stated they would not see any parking from the street but it could be located behind a small area. She had not thought of Vaughan Street being an active street, and she agreed with Mr. Gladhill that it could very well become active in the future. She felt it was a major change to the area and was not completed until the public spoke. It was appropriate to have a lot of work sessions and be open-minded right to the end, and she felt the public hearing was important. She said she had taken photographs to verify that what she was seeing was accurate, e.g. the cemetery, the 1-story and 2-story buildings, and how they were in contrast to the new massive building. She was still uncomfortable with the project and said that she would be in favor of it if the developer could do anything to make it at least look smaller and fit in more.

Ms. Ruedig said it was such a mixed area because there was not a predominant style. The only thing she could think of to help make it fit in was to make connections to what was across the street. She said the developer had done a great job in stepping everything back and incorporating the pedestrian experience. She was looking at the prospective views and felt it was a great change.

Chairman Almeida said he accepted the fact that it was a very large site and consequently a large building. He also accepted the series of buildings behind that have been approved and had considered all the new development behind it. The building was across the street from a historic concept, but it was at the seam of what was becoming the new section of the City. He told Ms. DeStefano that he appreciated that her team had reached out to the abutters and he would read their letters. However, there were some changes that he would prefer they do. He wanted the roof pushed back on the 4th floor to make it vertical. Vaughn Street had a special sidewalk and he wanted the developer to continue that walk onto their sight. He was aware that the developer was attempting a park and thought that would be nice. He asked if it was possible to increase the square footage of the small storefront piece adjacent to 3S Artspace because there seemed to be a lot of leftover space in front of the parking area. He felt that the elevation lost some of the pedestrian experience due to the grades and the garage, and with the commercial space, they could engage more. There would be small spaces, but they would not be difficult to fill in. It would be a huge plus if the commercial space could wrap the corner by stealing parking space.

Chairman Almeida was concerned that the rotunda piece did not engage the rest of the building. It was a beautiful structure but did not meet the building right, and maybe a change in the material of the infill pieces or something that separated the top of the building from the bottom to reduce the brick might help. He said there was opportunity for more pedestrian energy on Raynes Avenue, that they could extend storefront space on an imposing side. He thought the back penthouse pieces were successful and would like to see more. The rotunda evoked a campus library or a municipal building but needed to be made more pervious to the building.

Chairman Almeida thought that a park would engage the pedestrian area because presently it looked just like heavy plantings were there, but it was a property line so it may be a mute point. Ms. DeStefano said they could raise the screen wall higher to anchor and hide the vehicles more. Chairman Almeida thought people would like walking by a nice patch of grass.

He liked the fact that there was a defined real base of material on the back of the building and thought the front would benefit from that. Two stories were red brick and the street level was different, with the top recessed in dark panel. He suggested bringing down a base that was 16' high. He said Raynes Avenue and Vaughn Street were equally as important as Maplewood Avenue.

He also asked if there was extra parking in the Site Plan because removing one or two spaces could achieve a lot of change. Mr. Pennington said it fluctuated through the TAC process. They had begun with a few extra spaces, but the City requirements ate away at them. He said they could look into it. Chairman Almeida said the value of the commercial space would outweigh the parking space.

He liked Ms. DeStefano's favorite rendering and the human scale of it, and he asked if there were any entrances in the spaces or if they were just windows. Ms. DeStefano said when they did the 100 Market building, they had storefront infills, so if someone wanted an entry door instead of a display area, they could fix it. She said flexibility was important because the worst thing to happen would be paper windows if they built the building and did not design the space to be an office or a restaurant.

Chairman Almeida said the connection points should be more prominent and asked if there were gutters. He saw very large parapets. Ms. DeStefano said there were internal roof drains and gutters on the canopies.

Chairman Almeida said there seemed to be 19 window types and 6 window styles, which might be excessive, too much going on at times on certain elevations. Reducing the window styles might help, but he did not think it was so significant that they would have to get rid of it.

Mr. Wyckoff said a few retail places might make a big difference to the pedestrian experience.

Ms. DeStefano said she appreciated all the time that the Commission has spent with her and her team.

Chairman Almeida said he encouraged that citizens send their letters to the Planning Department and they would then be emailed immediately to him. He said it was the best way to receive information, even though it was not a public hearing. He said the clarity at the public hearing is not always achieved.

B. Work Session requested by **Eport Properties 1, LLC, owner**, for property located at **173-175 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct addition) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 4 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the May 8, 2013 meeting.)*

Ms. Carla Goodknight and Mr. Bill Bartell of CJ Architects representing owners, Messrs. Chris, Jim and Corey Erikson, were present.

Ms. Goodknight said the package she was presenting to the Commission was more of a technical analysis and detail nature.

She presented Page 1, which showed the building elevation, and said there was no real views of it other than standing across the street. On Page 2.a, there were minimal changes to the plan with the exception of an areaway for parking ventilation on the north side facing the salt piles. Much of the landscaping and paving areas were the same. On Page 2.b, she said there were no modifications to the footprint except for the areaway that was flush to the ground. There would be plantings so it would be invisible.

Page 3.a showed photos of the site treatment. She confirmed that the building's north side and front had a paint material on the surface. They considered three different types of paint to paint over the brick, one of which worked very well, and that was displayed. Unfortunately, on one side of the building the coating under the paint had given them a problem due to the brick.

There were problems with the brick, layers, fusing and cement layer put over the brick. The same material that stripped the paint on the building's Moffatt side did not work on this side. They tried multiple locations on that one side, even behind the plantings. Their proposed solution was to apply a new media brick over the existing brick. They spoke with various contractors about how to do it and met with a Moffatt Ladd House member, who had an appropriate take on it, which was to just leave it and wait for a better answer in a hundred years. In other words, just encapsulate it. Ms. Goodknight said that she would like to apply the brick in such way that it would allow for "weeping" and the wall would function and the brick would be as it was.

Mr. Rawling wondered if there were any concerns about the cementitious materials sealing water vapor in from the inside. Ms. Goodknight said they would try to remove as much of the material as they could and see if it allowed for breathability but they would have to wait and see. She added that the technique would not apply any abrasion to the physical brick.

Chairman Almeida asked if a new veneer layer would be a full layer of brick. Ms. Goodknight said yes, she had been told there was a way of constructing it behind the veneer that would allow the system to function properly.

Chairman Almeida asked about the cornices and she said they were going to return the cornices.

Mr. Wyckoff said he was worried about the structural integrity of the building and removing a layer of brick, and he would not advise it. Mr. Gladhill said he did a site walk and asked if the material was used before. Chairman Almeida said it only covered a certain portion of the building. After more discussion, Chairman Almeida said it seemed like a clever solution to leave it and not risk damage to the building. If they chose the appropriate brick, it should be fine. Ms. Goodknight said she consulted an expert from Goffstown Masonry Supply to match the existing brick.

Chairman Almeida said the brick had a hand-packed look rather than a cut look and as if one side was flashed. Ms. Goodknight said they would just match it.

Page 4 showed the streetscape and views of the building with a 3-dimensional design. Ms. Goodknight said they revised the addition to the left of the original building per their discussion with the Commission. Some of the columns were designed and detailed more, e.g., the sills were more in focus.

Councilor Kennedy asked if they had taken a picture of the building from the water. Ms. Goodknight said they took multiple panoramic photos from the dock.

Looking at the back of the building, the Market Street view was essentially the same, with the previously-discussed changes incorporated into the storefront to the left. The Ceres Street view had been refined in detail, and the Ceres Street north view had not changed. The Piscataqua view had a cable rail system introduced to it.

The balcony had more of a curved linear shape for a softer interpretation. The roof wrapped a little bit around the opening, which softened the rectangular cutout that was the objective at the earlier meeting.

Page 5.a depicted the front elevation at an 8-scale elevation. From left to right, they keyed the windows and dormers, still using copper flashing on the fire walls, and were thinking of using slate for the roofing in various colors. They would also include asphalt shingle roofing as a fallback position. They were using a granite base, making wood doors to go in the storefront assembly, and considering a clad window due to the 7x8' rectangle.

Mr. Wyckoff advised them that when they looked at products made by Marvin or Andersen, to be sure the custom muttoms had some depth and size to them because on Bow Street, there were unsuccessful windows that had slipped into the Martingale project.

Chairman Almeida said they should divide it into separate pieces of glass. He also said he loved the front elevation, that it was amazing and beautiful. Ms. Goodknight said she was eager to continue the detailing and do more of it.

She said they would use PVC trim assemblies, cutting and painting it like lumber so it had longevity unlike some of the City's rotting storefronts. The old building will have the clad window and the PVC trim assembly, and would be painted. The doors would be wood with panel detail similar to the Frank Jones house. They would retain existing brackets, do the shutters out of PVC and paint them, and use copper gutters and downspouts. They were originally considering the fluted interpretation, but with the veneer setback, they can go either way. Chairman Almeida said he preferred the round smooth style.

Councilor Kennedy asked what happened to the detail of the existing building, the 'dental' work. Ms. Goodknight said the brick chorus was drawn on the plan, and to render all the detail was very cumbersome.

Page 5.b showed brick type A (veneer) and brick type B. She pointed out Detail 217c as outlined and said it was basically a study of the existing building's profile and should be easy to recreate. The circular portion was recessed brick panel from the vertical rib, and the outer panel edge roll-off would go all the way around with subtle dimensions.

Ms. Goodknight said the window lintel and sill details would match the existing details on the building. A banding granite piece would be done on one window. Chairman Almeida said the top of the cornice bothered him because they were sharing the roof line but they should terminate the roof and not wrap it around. Then they would have two gables meeting at the ridge.

Ms. Goodknight said it looked more appealing in the 3-dimensional version and they decided the curve was a nice smooth finish and they wrapped it.

Chairman Almeida asked if she could terminate the roof and not wrap around the top of the two gables. The tiny little piece in between did not fit. Ms. Goodknight said it looked strange on the technical details. Chairman Almeida said they were all on the same plane, and that was

contributing to it, and he asked if they could be on different plane. Mr. Wyckoff said it looked like tucking a curve into a right angle would not work. Ms. Goodknight said it was a quarter cone and she would make it very clear so they could see it.

Page 5.c showed a brick type 'A' veneer and brick type A, then the switch to brick type B, the cable rail system cut sheets, and then the cornice detail wrapping around the building with a slight tweak variation on '3 on 7c' vs. '2 on 7c'. Light fixture #1 and fixture #2 were still under consideration but would be similar and appropriate for the street level.

The ceiling in the recessed balcony would be a matched mahogany. The facing deck would be metal clad, wrapped to the underside, and then would change to mahogany as it reached the building plane. She said they introduced a roll-off at the garage level, which added interest without being glaring. They were considering metal grates with black garage exhaust louvers behind them. It was the same grating system and they would put glass behind them for the garage occupants. She went over the garage door specifics and showed a picture of the top of the Breaking New Grounds building with the standing seam copper intent so the Commission could imagine how it would look on the building's front banding. The copper profiling would go on all the other parts of the building and be similar in layout and scale.

Ms. Goodknight showed the proposed rail system that was solid, welded, and one-piece and could be tweaked to any height. She said it was similar to the cable rail on the back of Bow Street but more of a solid state.

Page 5.d showed the matching of the lintels and sills, the wrapping around the store front and the burlap detail and cornice carried all the way around.

Chairman Almeida said he liked the huge improvement of the north elevation, the window additions and pulling it back from the property line. He had one question pertaining to the side and the built-in chimney detail that did not exist on the historic side of the building and asked if they had considered a smooth flat side all across the building. Ms. Goodknight said they could do that, but they were trying to differentiate the buildings from one another.

Mr. Wyckoff said he liked the step-look of the building next door, like old Amsterdam. He noted there was just a little walkway and asked if anyone would be able to walk around the corner and look in the window. Ms. Goodknight said yes, and that they would extend the brick sidewalk into it and probably fence it off afterwards for liability reasons.

Ms. Goodknight showed the ground face block that the retaining wall would be veneered in. Chairman Almeida asked if they could put in a natural stone wall. Ms. Goodknight said the wall was so utilitarian that she would prefer to do brick, not stone. Chairman Almeida suggested that she could do one like the stone wall across the street near the Moffatt Ladd building.

Ms. Goodknight went over Page 6.a and said she would try and get labels on the actual details instead of on the sections so that it would be more effective. Section 1b showed a detail through the circular form and the balcony above, and she said they had reviewed most of the materials.

She said the owners were excited to make the curved wood balcony door in their Maine woodshop. She would do a copper cap with a roll-off course and granite and recessed sill panels.

The details on Page 6.b showed configurations, additional granite banding and the lobby entrance door. Section 1b showed the roll-off course and the granite lintel. Section 2b showed the balcony conditions and the details, plus the venting concept. The panel where they recessed the roll-off course and the running panel course came out again and stepped back from the background brick about an inch, making a nice look. The header course would be done every 8 to 10 courses and would vary around the building.

Page 6.c showed the balcony conditions. They outlined the eave above the balcony, showing the brick detail and the header course as well as how the interior of the balcony would be cut brick. They were keeping an option open for the floor surface of the balcony to be wood or tile, whichever was the owner's preference. Page 6C also showed the rail system profile.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the balcony opening would be covered in metal. Ms. Goodknight said it would, and there would be a wood finish to the interior. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was a dental situation on the back, and Ms. Goodknight said no, that it was better to protrude.

Page 6.c also showed the position of the garage exhaust louver system behind a metal bar and panel, with grate system to the front, and a similar look on the bottom.

Page 7.a showed all of the windows and detailing. The windows were keyed back and they refined the dormer construction considerably. The facing of the dormers would be the 1" PVC flat stock and they would run it along and run the roofing material against the back side. The dormer windows would be clad and casement style. They would be considering Marvin and another manufacturer and would consider an alternate if the Commission had suggestions.

Chairman Almeida said the Commission had a hard time in the past with exterior screens, even half screens, and said that screens on the exterior of this building would be difficult to accept. He asked if there could be a pull-down screen. Mr. Wyckoff said maybe a half screen would be better and they decided it could be discussed at a later date.

Ms. Goodknight said it was important to note that the window sills and lintels would match what was on the existing building. The copper roof could be seen on the dormer side of the side elevation.

Page 7.b showed further elevations of the storefront, and Ms. Goodknight said the purpose of Page 7.b was to provide detailed dimensions for window panels and mullions for the windows that would be developed in the next round with the Commission.

Chairman Almeida asked if the light fixtures on the back of the building were shown and if the front light fixtures would be different. Ms. Goodknight said they thought about putting lights in the door recesses but not on the face of the building. Chairman Almeida said the lights on the back were appropriate but not for the front because it was so different from the back.

Ms. Ruedig said she liked Door #2 because it was modern and in the new part of the building. She would carry that over to Door #1 with the different storefront because one is the restoration of the old building, and she thought it was important to continue the detail to that part. Chairman Almeida asked if the door was the one that appeared in the historic image. Ms. Goodknight said the door in the historic image was a double door and they could not recreate that by code, but they made it look large and oversized.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they were doing double doors. Ms. Goodknight said yes, and the tallest door was 8-1/2'. Councilor Kennedy said it was two-man wide and was probably close to being unacceptable.

Ms. Goodknight said the piers had been changed and they were all uniform to the new thicker ones. Page 3.b had denoted the challenges and what had been done to the piers. Rather than vary the pier width, they adjusted it. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the doorway would be narrower than presented, and she said yes.

Chairman Almeida reminded everyone that the renderings were conceptual, and the facts and the details were shown on the architectural elevation.

Ms. Goodknight showed Page 7.c, the final detail sheet having to do with the dormers. She said it met the basic energy code by using exterior insulation. Chairman Almeida thought he saw the screen track sticking out beyond the trim. Mr. Wyckoff said they just needed to beef up the trim a little.

Detail 2 showed a shadowbox of the existing building to give an idea of how it related to the proposal. It showed an overhang, but they would create a slightly larger overhang by putting a rigid material on the roof, which was highly recommended because of water sheeting down the face. There was some discussion about three brick courses being the 8" standard. She said they would do two running board courses and a single roll-off.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked how that married up with the old brick, that the new and brick sides came together. She asked how they would resolve it and where it happened. Ms. Goodknight said it happened in two places, on the inside corner perpendicular and the other connection would be in a joint and pointed out Page 5.c to show the differentiation.

Page 7.c addressed their concept of how the veneer would meet the corner and setback with the gutter system.

Councilor Kennedy said it was non-negotiable with the dormers on the front of the building and she was also uncomfortable with the massing on the back side.

Mr. Katz thought Ms. Goodknight did a super job, especially since they started the previous year, kicking and screaming. He said it really worked out.

Mr. Wyckoff thought the dormers on the front were successful because they shrunk the wall down. Making the dormers as slender as they did, like the ones on the corner of Market and Bow

Streets, was energy-efficient, and it was wise to put the roofing material on the sides of the dormers because it helps them go away.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought they had come a long way, and she was happy to see the development on the Market Street side. She said it looked like it had been there a long time. She thought the back was improved, but the roof line was still a bit busy. The dormer seemed to be elbowing its neighbor off the roof, and she felt it would be more successful if they got rid of that dormer and realigned the left larger dormer with the windows below. Right now it looked like “too many fish in the fishbowl.”

Ms. Ruedig said the back elevation seemed to lose the delicacy of the other areas, especially the garage door with the three repetitive windows assembly. It lost the human scale of the other parts, and maybe they could reduce the scale of the upper floor a little.

Mr. Rawling wondered if the curved entry could be a different color of masonry material, and if they could work on breaking up the building a little bit but still be durable. Ms. Goodknight said she hoped the panel detail would give it that extra punch. They originally had the continuous banding and then set it back and brought in a different detail, different from the rest of the building. They were afraid if they changed the color, people would complain that it appeared too ‘busy’.

Vice-Chair Kozak said she was concerned with the façade, that maybe it could be a new color. It matched well with the proportion, but she wanted to see more with the details, maybe some streamlining and continuing the line that she had in the doors, updating it and making it a little more modern.

Ms. Kennedy said it was an old building, and at the next meeting she would bring some pictures of the view from the water, looking at the building from a further distance. They had made a deal that the front of the building would be historical and true to form, but the dormers did not do that.

Vice-Chair Kozak said she had addressed the idea of putting an addition to the back of an historic building, a topic they had covered numerous times. She struggled for six months with the thought of blocking the view down Ceres Street until the Commission presented the historic photos showing the building that used to be on Ceres Street, when she noted that Ceres Street had an end to it historically. Consequently, she could justify recreating the terminus to the street, even though she loves the view of the salt piles. She said Ceres Street was designed as a dead-end, and she thinks the building will be a successful draw as a destination viewpoint if they can get rid of the telephone poles and wires.

Ms. Goodknight said one of the things they had talked about a while back was that there were two lots, and if they were developing only one and not the other, then it would be a non-buildable lot based on that concept. Also, the building back was covered with that horrible substance, so that would be a challenge to deal with that as a restoration project. It was larger and more compromised. She said she had been thinking of covering the brick with an interior wood.

Chairman Almeida said he was at 100% on the Market Street side and 100% on the elevation overlooking the Moffatt Ladd garden side. He was not 100% on Page 5.c because he thought the radius piece should be a very different material with the same scale, size, etc. but something other than brick.

He agreed with Mr. Wyckoff's comments about the dormer, with the exception of the little roof piece, which he wanted to see more detail on.

The height of the back addition concerned him and he thought it could be resolved by a few feet. The Market Street building needed to poke a few more feet above. It would lessen the idea of overwhelming the historic buildings on the front. He was 100% for Page 5.d. and thought it look great. However, he wanted to caution about the overhangs of the dormers and the little details on Dormers 2 and 4, the overhangs looked exaggerated and went over too much. He thought it should be half of that.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:55 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
Acting HDC Recording Secretary

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