

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**July 17, 2013
reconvened from July 10, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joe Almeida; Vice Chair 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 (PUBLIC HEARINGS)

1. **(Work Session/Public Hearing)** 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 storefront 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. *(This item was postponed at the July 10, 2013 meeting to a work session/public hearing at the July 17, 2013 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Maynard if he had something to present that was different from the previous meeting, and Mr. Maynard no, he was just looking for suggestions. Chairman Almeida asked him to present his application again.

Mr. Maynard said he was the owner of the 1st floor unit, which was previously a storefront. The house presently had vinyl windows with the exception of one 2nd floor wooden window. The adjoining houses had wood clapboards but vinyl windows. The large floor-to-ceiling window panes had been there a long time. He wanted to get rid of the floor-to-ceiling windows and put in normal siding and windows that matched the rest of the house.

Chairman Almeida asked if the Commission members remembered the comments from the previous meeting. Mr. Katz said there was some difference of opinion about the application. The house had vinyl siding, which was not going to change. The windows were vinyl. The adjoining houses had wooden clapboards and vinyl windows, so vinyl was predominant in the neighborhood. The applicant wanted to put two double-hung vinyl windows in the front and one on the side. Mr. Katz thought it would be unproductive to turn the house into something that it

was not, and he could not suggest anything that would give the house a more historic appearance. He thought it would be foolish to require Mr. Maynard to do more than he wanted to do and incur additional expense.

Vice-Chair Kozak said the essence of the previous week's discussion was how that part of the house was originally a porch and how the floor-to-ceiling, wall-to-wall storefront windows would be replaced with some sort of double-hung windows. Ideally, the Commission would love to see it all restored to a porch, but that would not happen. The trick was trying to fit three windows in a way that was appropriate to the enclosed porch. The only parameters the owner had was the existing base of the house, and if he could somehow align the new windows with the windows above, it was probably as far as he could go. The other trick was incorporating it into the vinyl siding. Mr. Maynard said he would replace all the siding on the front because it would not make sense to try to match new siding with existing siding. Vice-Chair Kozak said it was all or nothing, and if he was not going to restore the entire porch, then he should do as little as possible and put in the windows, but be careful to align them with what was above and trim them out and separate them with stud pockets. Mr. Katz agreed.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Maynard how he would document it. A Commissioner had previously commented about the lack of documentation and thought that the submitted drawings did not convey the proposal.

Mr. Rawling said he had started the alternate discussion because he looked at a pair of double-hung windows and they seemed to fill up most of the space that the existing windows occupied. He showed Mr. Maynard a diagram that illustrated how to re-establish the porch look with posts and a sill line that set the porch base, and where to install the double-hung windows with stud pockets in between. Mr. Katz commended Mr. Rawling for his work on the diagram but said that historically, the Commission had been careful not to design applications for the applicant. They made suggestions and let the applicant do the design. Mr. Rawling said he only did it because the applicant did not seem to understand the recommended changes, so he thought a simple diagram would help.

Mr. Katz asked how many windows there were in all. Mr. Maynard said there were two pairs of double-hung window, two windows on the front and one on the side. Mr. Katz said the reason due to the divided lights and that they were two windows.

Chairman Almeida said making suggestions was okay. He considered Mr. Rawling's suggestion to be more graphic than verbal. He would support the design and mentioned the similar New Castle Avenue case. Mr. Katz said that case was different because they had made conceptual suggestions and the applicant had returned with a drawing. Councilor Kennedy agreed with Mr. Rawling and said she did not have a problem with a simple visual to get their point across. However, she saw four windows, too. So, that was a problem.

Mr. Katz said he was extremely uncomfortable with the situation because the Commission had procedures that had been followed in the 15 years he had been on the HDC. The procedure stated that the applicant would make the presentation. The Commission did not make a presentation in response saying "I like this better". Suggestions could be made, but the applicant would have to

say he had listened to the Commission and would present what he wanted to do. A Commission member had never said, "This is what I suggest you do" and asked if the applicant liked it. He was very upset and felt it was completely backwards. Chairman Almeida asked if it was a concern for anyone else. Mr. Wyckoff said it would require more than a work session, at least some working drawings.

Chairman Almeida said they were trying to get the applicant to a place where he could get an approval. If they voted on the application, they would not understand what the applicant was trying to do and they were trying to walk him through it. Mr. Wyckoff said it was sort of a do-no-harm proposal. Mr. Maynard could place the two windows under the 2nd floor windows with the spacing the same and put a piece of trim between the two windows. It was a vinyl-sided house with vinyl windows and a metal door with no casing, so Mr. Maynard would at least be upgrading totally inappropriate storefront windows with double-hung windows. It would do no harm because anyone who eventually wanted to do a restoration of the porch could remove the windows.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked Mr. Maynard to clarify how many windows he wanted to install. Mr. Maynard told her three, two on the front and one on the side. Vice-Chair Kozak verified it would be a unit with top and bottom sashes, and Mr. Maynard showed her the drawing. Chairman Almeida said Vice-Chair Kozak's comment happened to be a graphic suggestion. Mr. Katz said it was a step they should not be taking. Mr. Rawling said he did not know how they could approve anything because they did not have the graphics to represent things realistically. Chairman Almeida said they were trying to do the applicant a favor because they did not have the details they typically required. Councilor Kennedy agreed that the Commission did not have the right information. She had seen it as four windows and felt it was misrepresented, so she felt that the applicant should do his own appropriate drawings and attend the next work session.

Mr. Katz said he had no problem with a stipulation stating the windows that replaced the slider would align with the windows above and be the same size, and the window on the side would be centered in the opening and be the same size as the window above it. Vice-Chair Kozak said it depended on what Mr. Maynard wanted to do. He could do another drawing and return for another work session, or he could accept the stipulation.

Mr. Maynard said they had spent over three hours at the last meeting and could not believe the Commission wanted him to come back. Chairman Almeida told Mr. Maynard that his one-line drawings were insufficient, and the Commission was trying to help him. Chairman Almeida did not want to be accused of leading him on and felt it was not fair to them. He asked the Commission to move forward and vote on it and stop arguing among themselves.

Councilor Kennedy said she was not comfortable with moving on because of the drawings and because she had visualized four windows instead of two. Chairman Almeida said the last time they went out on a limb they had gotten into real trouble. They had to go by the book. Mr. Katz suggested a poll. Mr. Maynard said he could redesign the sketch. Chairman Almeida said Mr. Maynard could not redesign the sketch that night, and that was the problem. The application required 1/4" scaled drawings, and so on.

The Commission voted to see if they had enough information to vote on the application. Mr. Wyckoff, Mr. Katz, Vice-Chair Kozak voted yes. Chairman Almeida, Mr. Rawling, Ms. Ruedig, Councilor Kennedy voted no. Chairman Almeida ruled that the Commission would postpone the application.

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 a motion to **postpone** the application to a work session/public hearing at the August 7, 2013 meeting so that additional drawings can be submitted and reviewed. It was seconded.*

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

2. Petition of **Ryan P. and Crystal L. Cronin, owners**, for property located at **180 Gates Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 18 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts. *This item was postponed at the July 10, 2013 meeting to the July 17, 2013 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Cronin told the Commission he wanted to replace the 60-year-old windows in the house. The previous owner had added a new construction window to the kitchen addition, and Mr. Cronin wanted to match the new windows exactly to that particular window.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the existing windows were single-pane Brosco-style windows circa 1970. He had stopped by to look at them and verified that they were not historic. Councilor Kennedy agreed. Mr. Wyckoff said they had been discussing only half screen windows and asked Mr. Cronin if they were half screens. Mr. Cronin said they were full screens. Councilor Kennedy asked Mr. Cronin if he would consider half screens. Mr. Cronin said they wanted full screens so they could lower the top sash instead of raising the bottom sash. The house was right on the street and they kept the shutters closed to prevent people from looking in, and he mentioned that his neighbor had full screens.

Chairman Almeida questioned whether the Commission had approved those screens because it was not typical, and if the Commission felt strongly about half screens, they should voice it then. Vice-Chair Kozak said it may be a priority to the front façade versus the back façade. She would not have a problem with the full screens on the sides or the back, but she would with the street front on Gates Street because they were trying to preserve the historic look. Chairman Almeida said the Commission had been firm on the issue of half screens in the South End and he could not support a full screen. The house views on Gates Street were seen from many angles and he did not want to set a precedent with full screens on Gates Street. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the

screens were removable. Mr. Wyckoff said they all were and they also slid up. Vice-Chair Kozak asked Mr. Cronin if the half screens slid up, and he said they did not because they were connected to the bottom of the top sash and that was why he wanted full screens. A double-hung window with a half screen did not make sense. He said the Andersen window half screen fit under the upper sash and he would look into it. He had been told they hooked in. Mr. Wyckoff said they did not hook in, and he knew because he had Andersen windows. Mr. Cronin said he had the existing half screens now and questioned why he would need full screens. Vice-Chair Kozak said she understood his concern and had seen windows with half screens that could move up or down, so she knew they were manufactured. Mr. Cronin said the windows were also reverse cottage windows, so the half screen would not be the same size for the top and bottom sashes because the top was larger than the bottom.

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 moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the request as presented with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That half screens shall be used for all of the windows.*

Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff said the full screens obliterated the muntins of the windows from every angle. The saving grace of the modern replacement windows was that you could not see the muntins from the window, but they would not approve them at all if it weren't for the true divided light look of the windows. With that in mind, they were trying to preserve one of the most important streetscapes in Portsmouth. Councilor Kennedy agreed and said she was comfortable with the back but not with the front. They had to protect Gates Street.

The motion passed with a vote of 6-1 with Chairman Almeida voting opposed.

II. NEW BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARINGS CONTINUED)

10. Petition of **Eport Properties 1, LLC, owner**, for property located at **173-175 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to existing building) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct mixed use, multi-story addition to rear and sides of the building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 4 and lies within Central Business A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Tim Phoenix, attorney for Eport properties, Carla Goodknight and Bill Bartell, architects with CJ Architects, and Scott Whitaker, consultant for Building Envelope Specialists were present.

Attorney Phoenix told the Commission he was there due to the recently-approved City Council proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. The amendments were still in process and had not yet gone to public hearing but could affect this project if they were passed. As a result, there was a question as to whether the project would meet the amended Ordinance or not. He had submitted a Memorandum of Law to the City suggesting that they meet the requirements by filing a petition with the Planning Board prior to the effective date of the proposed amendment. So far the City Attorney had felt that they did not need it and would have to come back before the HDC for a Conditional Use Permit as the new Ordinance permitted. However, the decision on the vesting was not yet final, so he was there to advise them of the situation and state that they wanted to go forward that evening. If it ended up not being vested, they would apply for the Conditional Use Permit, but in either case, the design, height and structure of the presentation would not change, so they wanted to move forward and address their design concerns. At that point, the Commission could not issue a final decision on approval. Mr. Phoenix also had a question as to whether the Commission could grant conditional approval based on vesting or getting a Conditional Use Permit at a later date.

Chairman Almeida said he had a similar public hearing the previous week where they heard a public hearing all the way through but did not vote on it and continued it to a later time. He asked Mr. Cracknell to elaborate because he had not heard the Planning Department discussion. Mr. Cracknell said Attorney Phoenix gave a good summary of how the project was caught in the Zoning Amendment transition that had been to the City Council, voting for a first reading and posting the legal notice. There was some dispute between Attorney Phoenix and the City Attorney as to when the magic moment was when the property rights were vested. The City Attorney believed the project was not vested yet and could be subject to the proposed Zoning Amendment should it pass. The State Statute made it clear that until such time the City Council acted on the proposed amendment, the applicant and the permit-granting authorities had to assume it had been adopted as submitted. Therefore, as Attorney Phoenix had suggested, the HDC could either continue to open the public hearing that evening and allow public comment or leave it open and continue it to August, at which time they would apply for a Conditional Use Permit at the HDC for the same project for the same design. In his opinion, it was not the 45' height that was non-conforming because it was the allowable height under the proposed Zoning Amendment. It was the number of stories. Their building looked like it was between 4 and 5 stories, and the Zoning Amendment that was drafted and presented to the City Council said that the building shall be no taller than 45' or 3 stories, whichever was less. It was the story count that created the rub for this application and made it necessary for him to come back in three weeks with a Conditional Use Permit. So, the HDC might have an application in three weeks to go with the final chapter of the public hearing and also have a Conditional Use Permit for the same project with no design changes. He said it was unlikely that there would be design changes, so it was reasonable to open up the hearing tonight. He was cautious about the idea of voting on the project tonight through a conditional approval. He was more comfortable with opening the hearing, taking testimony, providing comment and ideas, leaving it open and extending it to August 7. If they filed the Conditional Use Permit, the HDC could open the hearing then and render a decision on both, and they would be done.

Mr. Katz asked if they could make a motion to approve that night if the applicant made a final presentation and the HDC asked questions. Mr. Cracknell said no, that the HDC would make a motion to continue the public hearing and keep it open so in three weeks they would continue the presentation and the public would have another opportunity to provide input. Mr. Katz clarified that it would be Chapter 2 when they came back and they did not have to start over. Mr. Cracknell agreed and said it would be a continuation. Chairman Almeida clarified that there was nothing that guaranteed it would be decided in three weeks, that it could go on for months. Mr. Cracknell agreed but said it was reasonable to assume, based on the circumstances and the applicant's intentions, that in three weeks there would be a decision and a final form from the Legal Department in writing as to whether the project was vested or not. If it was not vested, the applicant would file a Conditional Use Permit that would have a public hearing on August 7, and what happened from then would play itself out. If the HDC was ready to vote, they would vote, and if not, they would continue to the next meeting. Mr. Katz clarified that they could allow public comment that night. Chairman Almeida said they could, but only if the City Council did not act on it in three weeks. Mr. Cracknell said the City Council would not act on it in three weeks, so the HDC would have the ability to render a decision on a Conditional Use Permit in advance of it being acted upon in final form by the City Council. The City Council could take up to three months to render a final decision on the Zoning Amendment that could affect the project. If the City Council did not adopt the Ordinance amendment, all it would do is make the Conditional Use Permit mute.

Mr. Katz asked for additional clarification about the process. Mr. Cracknell explained again that the HDC could not grant approval that night because the applicant had not filed an application for it. They were still discussing it with the Legal Department and there was a disagreement as to whether they were vested or not. The application did not meet the Zoning Amendment because it was 4-5 stories instead of 3 stories. The City felt they were not vested, which meant they would have to remedy the defect through a Conditional Use Permit, and they could not get there earlier than August 7. The HDC could vote on it then, regardless of what the City had done or not done. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the definition of story had been defined by the City. Mr. Cracknell said there would be a definition before the City Council voted.

Chairman Almeida asked the applicant how they wanted to proceed. Attorney Phoenix said he would like to proceed as if the Zoning Amendment were approved. The City had to follow it and they could follow it also and could apply for a Conditional Use Permit. The project would remain the same whether they were vested or not. He would prefer that the Commission give it a Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Gladhill asked about a conditional vote. Mr. Cracknell said they could vote to approve the project, contingent on the applicant correcting the zoning defect if they should have one. However, not being the City Attorney or the Legal Department representative, he was not sure if it was appropriate for the HDC to vote on the project and have that kind of contingency. He said the HDC could not vote on an application that did not meet the Zoning Ordinance, and that was why people went to the BOA before coming to the HDC. Mr. Katz said there was no irrefutable opinion that it did not meet the amendment. Mr. Cracknell said the Legal Department's position was that the project was not vested because it did not meet the Zoning Amendment. Mr. Gladhill

said the project was only vested if it had notice of a public hearing with the Planning Board before the City Council notice. Mr. Cracknell said this was not the forum to have that conversation. There were multiple ways to vest a project other than that method and it was not worth spending the time to describe the methods. The City Attorney could do a better job of it than he could. The Legal Department said the project was not vested and did not meet the Zoning Amendment, but that could change in the next few days through the review. Mr. Wyckoff said if they could not discuss whether it was a legal project to be voted upon, then they should not spend the time going through a public hearing on a project that may not meet the City's latest criteria.

Attorney Phoenix said he understood that position. To make it easier, he would withdraw the request for conditional approval. If the HDC continued it to the August 7 meeting, they would talk about the same project. So, it was a little convoluted, but the applicant would come forward with the same project whether they were vested or not. They could discuss all the issues that night or in three weeks, and they were asking to do it now. Chairman Almeida said the agenda allowed it, and if they heard the presentation that night, they would also hear the public comment and the final presentation and then it would be in a holding pattern, so he said to go ahead.

Ms. Goodknight told the Commission she wanted to introduce the Building Envelope Specialist Scott Whitaker who was involved with the project based on recommendations from the previous meeting. He would give a little background and some recommendations for the restoration and improvement of the existing structure. Mr. Whitaker said he had been with the consulting company for about 30 years and was asked to comment on the exterior façade of the existing building. First, he explained that Building Envelope had a full range of services and had gone from working with the National Park Service with design teams and masonry contractors in Florida all the way to working with developers who were purchasing old City properties and re-using them. They worked with homeowners as well, and they also did Plan, Design and QC Reviews for architectural firms and managed masonry contracts. He explained that a QC review was a process by which they looked into masonry procedures and audited the clients for compliance. Mr. Whitaker's role in this particular project was as a masonry consultant, and he would guide the design team in issues such as moisture migration through masonry walls and design issues blending old with new. He would do some site inspections and oversee the masonry projects to ensure the specifications were being adhered to. He had also been asked to supply pre-qualified lists of masonry contractors who would perform to the client's expectations.

Mr. Whitaker spent some time the previous week walking through and around the perimeter of the building and made some observations. The exterior coating of the building was blended from a latex paint over to a sealed type product, which was a sedimentitious coating that was pigmented. On one elevation, the latex paint was a damaging coating to put on a masonry building because it did not allow it to breathe and there would be areas where the brick faces could fall off or moisture could get trapped in. The double jeopardy with this building was that a high gloss sealer had been applied to the interior masonry face so there was a sandwiching effect with any moisture migrating through the walls. Consequently, there was some damage because of it. They could remove it using a chemical gel paint remover that did not disintegrate the paint and could also do a light soda blasting instead of sandblasting, which would not beat up the mortar joints or scar the brick face. Mr. Whitaker's job was to make sure it did not affect the

masonry and the historic component of the building. There were some areas under the coatings where the masonry had been under some stress. The masonry assembly was fracturing on the back of the building and showed a lot of sagging in the mortar joint, so they needed to reestablish the structural nature of those areas to preserve the structural integrity.

Other areas of concern were the raised parapet walls and the splash planes in the roof where the water got caught up. The parapet walls tended to sag because they were thinning and protruding up. Those were issues he would take care of, like bringing in anchor for stabilization without having to rebuild. There were a few other typical fractures. He felt that the building was better than average because when he worked on other buildings, they were usually beyond normal maintenance. Their building was not like that. The shutter anchors were a great feature, but they were wrought iron and stuck in the masonry, so they expanded and cracked. In the past, his company has removed the inserts, taken out the back and attached a stainless insert that was not visible to maintain the historic feature on the outside. Those were examples of what he would bring to the project to maintain the structure.

Chairman Almeida told Mr. Whitaker there was a wall facing the garden that had seen a significant amount of damage, and the architect had proposed veneering the entire wall rather than saving it. Mr. Whitaker said if there was foliage on one side of the building and the water table was drawn up, the plants would emit a lot of vapor, so there was a driving range that came up. The coating held and trapped the moisture, so the masonry on the whole façade was under a lot of strain. As the moisture migrated through, it brought the salt in the air and the brick and mortar and effervesced on the building's interior. Once the wall was stabilized, the effervescent cycle would stop. An exterior façade wall should be erected to maintain the inside and create a stable environment, and the trick was to make sure that any interior moisture was able to migrate through and be managed as it went through the original wall and into the outside skin wall. Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Whitaker if he agreed that the brick wall was not salvageable. Mr. Whitaker said he had not done in-depth research on it but thought the inside had some issues in a few areas and noticed that there was some bad cracking.

Mr. Gladhill said there was a historic building on Bow Street that could not handle the proposed additions and had to be demolished, and he asked if this brick masonry could handle the additions to the building. Mr. Whitaker said it could. A building with lime mortar aged at a rapid rate, especially along the coast where the calcium carbonate and lime reacted harshly to the salt in the air. The deterioration would have happened a long time before and progressed to a point where it should have been torn down years before. The proposed building was not like that, and he felt there was a lot of life left in the building.

Ms. Goodknight said she hoped Mr. Whitaker was able to address all their concerns. She began her presentation with Page 1 and the Market Street view, showing the existing restored building and the proposed addition. They would re-expose the existing brick work and granite lintels and would re-roof with either a faux slate or asphalt product. Firewalls and the dormer roofs would be capped in copper and the storefront recreated to be similar to the Frank Jones facade they had previously discussed. The addition would have similar treatments with the granite sills and lintels. They were using a brick arch with a keystone component and the storefront assembly, and it would all have a granite base. Councilor Kennedy asked what the roof material was. Ms.

Goodknight said they were presenting a full slate with an optional asphalt shingle, the grade of which was detailed further in the packet.

Ms. Goodknight next talked about the site plan. At the Ceres Street level, there was parking and pavers wrapping around the building through the private right-of-way. On the Market Street level, there was the brick sidewalk extending across the front and wrapping the corner. There would be brick and a fencing material at the corner of the property. She showed proposed elevations and the Ceres Street garden view, the existing building elevation with the existing window openings, the restored elevation with shutters, and the new construction that would match the window patterns at the back corner as well as carry the existing eave line around to the additional construction. There would be a soft corner element that would have recessed brick panels surrounded by Roloc coarse, with granite sills and landscaping. The North view facing the salt piles was all new construction on the Ceres Street and Market Street levels and had similar roof lines, copper, granite sills and lintels, double-hung windows, and the same firewall treatment. The water view illustrated the addition to the existing structure and the concept they reviewed at the work sessions to create a look of two separate buildings and carry the historic details across the addition's small portion and then change to a complementary color of brick so as to introduce the keystone arch detail.

Page 5A illustrated how custom PVC shutters would be installed in coordination with the existing window openings on the front façade of the building, with the existing brackets remaining. The storefront's front doors would be recreated in solid wood. Councilor Kennedy asked if they would consider wooden shutters instead of PVC. Ms. Goodknight said the PVC shutters were better from a maintenance standpoint because they looked exactly the same as wood when finished and they lasted a lot longer. Councilor Kennedy said she would prefer that what was on the old part of the building be considered for the new part. Mr. Rawling said PVC reminded him of vinyl and asked about the dimensional material. Ms. Goodknight said it was cut, finished and painted like real wood and was solid. Mr. Rawling clarified that it was fabricated like real wood. Ms. Goodknight said they were not molded units. Chairman Almeida asked her to bring a sample at the next meeting. Ms. Goodknight said shutters would have to be custom made and may not be ready in three weeks, but she could get more specifications on them. Chairman Almeida said any further information would help.

Page 5b illustrated how the shutters would have to be custom made to fit the openings. A new recessed opening showed where the brick veneer ended and Brick Type A began. They were similar in material and would have matching coarsing and patterns per Mr. Whitaker's specifications. Page 5c was a technical representation of the balconies with a metal clad finish and metal cable rail system. They would have powder-coated metal grates with the garage exhaust louvers concealed behind them. The light fixtures in the private balcony areas would have two different types, one for the upper levels and one for the 1st floor locations. Page 5d showed the dormer sides. Ms. Goodknight said they were continuing the roofing material to the side of the dormer and showed a fencing detail that would continue along the sidewalk edge as it wrapped around the corner of the storefront.

Page 6a illustrated more details and materials. The balcony doors at the top of the curved form would be curved wooden doors, installed under a copper cap roof. A balcony section illustrated

the material. Page 6b showed the details on the brickwork, the typical rail system with the copper cap, the eave profile delineating the existing profile, and the new eave detail that was similar to the existing eave but not duplicating, showing delineation between the two buildings. It also showed the planned detail for the dormer, for which they researched the assembly required to achieve the narrowest sidewall possible and still meet energy code standards. The narrow sidewall would closely match the dormers of that historic period. Page 6c showed the wood and tile finishes with a matching mahogany material so that the vinyl would not be seen when looking up.

Page 7a showed details on window sizes and assemblies, including the 1” standing seam copper roofing on the dormers. Page 7b illustrated advanced details for the storefront and the layout of the paneling, the casing and panel insert details, the typical shutter details, and the custom wood door sizes.

Page 8 showed examples of the copper downspouts and gutters that would replace the current ones because they were worn. The new ones would keep the water off the building. Also shown were steel doors by the carriage house, a stone round-faced block material for the side wall on the Ceres Street northern wall. Page 8b had illustrations of the proposed railing system, which was a welded, powder-coated product with a cable rail, and smaller light fixtures for residential units and larger light fixtures at street level.

The proposed roof products were faux slate or IKO Cambridge shingles, and examples were shown of similar copper installations. Councilor Kennedy said her previous question was not clarified because there was an ‘or’, showing an option, and she asked Ms. Goodknight to choose one. Mr. Wyckoff said he agreed with Councilor Kennedy and strongly suggested that Ms. Goodknight stop thinking about IKO Cambridge shingles because he had seen them fail throughout Portsmouth. The faux slate or the da Vinci slate made out of polymer sounded like a good prospect on a building on the river, but the difficulty of re-roofing the building in ten years was something she would not want to consider. Chairman Almeida told them to pick an option and get the issue behind them. Councilor Kennedy asked Ms. Goodknight what she would like for the windows. Ms. Goodknight said her option was faux slate, not asphalt.

The last page showed three window manufacturers who had been approved in the past with high-quality options and details. Chairman Almeida said the applicant would have to illustrate the masonry opening because the manufacturer’s cut did not show how it fit the masonry opening.

Councilor Kennedy asked about screens. Ms. Goodknight said they had no problem with half screens. Chairman Almeida said they had discussed screens on the interior of the window, the roll down from the head type or roll from the side behind the glass. Ms. Goodknight said she could accommodate that on the square openings but maybe not the curved openings because at that elevation, screens were typically installed on the interior. She would note on each unit what their plan was. Page 7a identified the multiple window types, and she said she could add a layer to those that would address each type of screen. Chairman Almeida said they needed to find an interior screen solution on the Market Street side because he could not accept screens facing the Moffatt Ladd House. Ms. Goodknight said they could do exterior screens and would need them on the sliding balcony doors as well.

Councilor Kennedy noted that one of the plans mentioned a proposed garage door and then stated that the manufacturer would give them a sample photo. Ms. Goodknight said the manufacturer would create the pattern for them. It was not a standard pattern but was an example of their work and they would create the pattern she proposed. Councilor Kennedy verified that she would propose the garage with no windows with the same pattern. Chairman Almeida said he did not think that was what Ms. Goodknight meant. The photo showed an example of what the manufacturer was capable of doing. The pattern was on the proposed garage door with no windows. Councilor Kennedy said it was still not clear to her. Ms. Goodknight said the sample pattern from the manufacturer would not appear on the building, just the proposed garage door shown on the design line drawing as opposed to the photograph. Below it were the actual specifications showing what the door was made of, the installation, and so on.

Chairman Almeida said there was another 'or' option having to do with the copper downspouts that said smooth round or fluted round. Ms. Goodknight said she wanted approval for either one because she was concerned about which weights were available and whether the round ones would be more susceptible to denting on the Market Street side. Chairman Almeida said the round ones provided the opportunity to use an actual copper pipe rather than a piece of gutter and created a study round copper. It was actually a plumbing pipe. Vice-Chair Kozak said there was a picture of a round downspout on the roofing material drawing. Ms. Goodknight said she would omit the fluted round and go with the smooth round.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked Ms. Goodknight if she had further descriptions or samples of Brick Type A and Brick Type B. Ms. Goodknight said she using what was presented at the last work session. Vice-Chair Kozak said there should be something describing it in the application. She also hoped to see some description of a bond pattern and wondered if the hatch pattern shown as a running bond would be the intent everywhere. Ms. Goodknight said it was noted on the elevation and previously discussed. The intent was to duplicate the brick pattern on the existing structure across the veneer wall. The new Brick Type A would have the same layout as the existing building as well as the same coursing, pattern, and so on, and Brick Type B would be the running bond. Vice-Chair Kozak asked that she have an additional description of the existing bond for the next meeting because the drawing showed a running bond. She also did not see Brick Type A. Brick Type B was the older type and was a different height to match with the new, so she wanted to make sure Ms. Goodknight would document it.

Vice-Chair Kozak referenced the detail on pages 5b and 6a about the eave return at the rounded corner on the dormer base and said the HDC avoided that pork chop-shaped triangular piece of trim. In a Federal style, the eave detail would be some sort of return of the trim around the corner whether it continued around the back or ends. Ms. Goodknight said they typically took the eave from the existing building. The pictures showed that it was more of an industrial finish in one spot and was unique to the location. She said they tried to carry it through rather than make it look more Federal or ornamental in that area. Vice-Chair Kozak said the only difference was that they had an extended soffit overhang on the new roof that did not exhibit on the old roofs, so it was harder to pull off. There was no enlarged detail of it and she asked that it be clarified with more detail.

Vice-Chair Kozak said the garage doors looked like a bead board pattern. Ms. Goodknight said they were embossed by the manufacturer. Vice-Chair Kozak said the profile details on that would help so they knew what to expect in terms of relief and shutter.

Mr. Rawling said he was uncomfortable with the granite lintels on the building addition. All the windows in the building had brick lintels and then four granite lintels. He would like all brick lintels instead of the mixture because it made it a different building. It seemed to be bounding back and forth. He said it would also apply to the water view side on the rear where the arched brick windows were in the center and granite lintels were on the side. Ms. Goodknight said it would be an easy adjustment to make because it was a small number and not a large grouping.

Ms. Goodknight asked if she should submit an amendment to the application at the next session to reference some of the items discussed. Chairman Almeida told her she could if they were changes she wanted to make and he said they were basically suggestions. Councilor Kennedy asked that it be done in ample time so that the public could look at it. Chairman Almeida said he would speak to the Planning Department about it.

Chairman Almeida pointed out the small amount of fencing turning the corner with the storefront system shown on Page 2 and assumed it was for safety reasons. Ms. Goodknight agreed. He referenced the wood fence on Page 5d and doing it at minimal cost. Having the actual brick, grout and slate to touch would be necessary for the Commission to vote on it. He also asked if they could add the slate itself and a piece of the material for the shutter. On Page 5b, he asked about the constructability of the roof at the balcony on the radius section where the section turned the corner and the copper did not go all the way to the peak. Ms. Goodknight said it was similar to the photograph. Chairman Almeida said it was appropriate either way, but since they were definitely using slate now, he asked her to make the tight radius without the slate lifting off each other.

On Page 6b, Detail #2, the section detail for the exposed steel lintel above the windows, Chairman Almeida thought when they looked up they would see the steel rusting at some point. He said it was a common problem and would like to see something cover it, just as an improvement. The last issue was the need to show the windows within the masonry.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Ms. Kerry Vaultrot, Chair of the Portsmouth Advocates, said she wanted to speak about the project from the historical preservation aspect as it impacted 175 Market Street. She showed Preservation Briefs # 14, which was the National Park Services Guide on how to sensitively add an addition to a historic building. She said it was a National Standard updated in 2010 that offered four points for guidance in designing a new exterior addition to a historic building in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the treatment of historic properties.

Point 1 said 'the new addition should be simple and unobtrusive in design'. The proposed design was not simple and introduced a variety of complex forms and rooflines that detracted from the historic building. Point 2 said 'it should not be visible from the public right-of-way'. The proposed building was visible from every public right-of-way. Point 3 said 'the addition should

be smaller than the historic building and be subordinate in both size and design to the historic building'. With nearly the same height at the ridgeline and obscuring nearly 5 out of 6 bays of the Ceres Street elevation, the project created an addition that was not deferential to the top of the historic structure. Point 4 said 'the construction material should be harmonious with the historic building'. Ms. Vaultrot felt that was one point the architect got right.

Ms. Vaultrot said the dormer as shown proposed to recreate a condition that never existed historically and went against the Secretary of the Interior Standards. If dormers were desired, a more modern and simple design would be more compatible with the structure than what was shown. As for the treatment of the historic brick, she worried about the use of soda blasting. It was an abrasive form that was warned against because it could erode the surface and could drive salts into the masonry, especially given the delicate condition of the brick. In conclusion, she felt that the design needed further work to make the addition more subordinate to the historic building and more conforming to the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Mr. David Nord of 90 Fleet Street said he was glad he was there because it had been interesting how they presented the shingles issue and opened up a Pandora's Box. He saw the quality and history of the design team, yet felt the choice of the material was wrong and wondered what the investors would think when the problems were pointed out so quickly. The developer had an expert on masonry whose role was to distract the Commission from the inappropriate style and size of the building. They offered details that they could correct so the Commission would not keep their eye on the inappropriate nature of the building. They wanted to make people forget about the enormous return of the investment simply by adding dormers. They would rent the apartments at exorbitant rates and the penthouse may have a leak in ten years. They needed to begin with the nature of the building, where it was and what it was. Sure, they could address plastic shutters or how expensive it was to maintain the shutters versus the cash flow on the building. There were serious issues to address on the building and he hoped the Commission took their responsibility seriously. They had a lot of community support that would find the Commission's responsibility irreversible. The developer could move on to another project, but Portsmouth would be stuck with the building and could not move on. He asked the Commission to please examine the nature of the building and then examine the details.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Nord if he had specific comments about the details of the building design. Mr. Nord said there was too much going on in the visual sense. The building was simply too large and too high. The details were important, but the first thing to examine was the oppressiveness of the building. The details contributed to that, but he questioned what the nature and the feeling of the building were and the feeling people would have in front of the building.

Mr. George Dodge of 175 State Street, said he lived in a brick building that had all the problems this building had, if not more. He asked Ms. Goodknight why she felt it was necessary to cover over the original brick. Ms. Goodknight said an exposure face had been coated with cementitious material and another face was painted with a latex paint. It was difficult if not impossible to remove the cement without damaging the face of the bricks. She had researched various options, and the best option was to remove as much of the brick as they could without creating damage to the brick face, and then encapsulating it. Mr. Dodge asked her how she would fasten the veneer. Ms. Goodknight said she was working the detail out with Mr. Whitaker, the building envelope

specialist, to figure out the best way that would work with the wall conditions due to unevenness and a shelf at the bottom. Mr. Dodge said essentially she was looking for the natural brick look and could not remove the coating, so she would just rebuild the wall surface. Ms. Goodknight said that was correct, that they were using the waterstruck brick that was the same size, portion and pattern. Mr. Dodge asked why it was painted in the first place. Ms. Goodknight said it was because it was very porous due to rain. The brick was beautiful, but soft and porous and would never meet brick standards required in a new building today. The solution carried out through Portsmouth was to paint the brick buildings and provide a waterproof skin. Mr. Dodge thought the idea of putting a veneer on it was the equivalent of asking for a demolition permit. There was nothing left of the old building to look at. He said the HDC had to protect the building's historic heritage and not cover it up with veneers or brick work. Chairman Almeida asked how they could achieve that. Mr. Dodge said there were technical ways of dealing with the brick. They could take off the cementitious coatings and reveal the surface of the original brick, but it would reintroduce the moisture problem, so they had to figure out a way to reduce the velocity, maybe a sealant to spray on the brick with repeated treatments. There were technical caveats about hanging veneer on that building in the long run. They had to correct the deficiencies.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Dodge how he handled his similar situation. Mr. Dodge said he had to rebuild the top 4' of the wall because the capstones were cracked and the flashing was deteriorated. He reminded them that the process took 200 years to happen. He did not find any fault with the proposed building's original construction, but it was two centuries old and needed serious repairs. He did not see why the repairs could not be done to preserve the original appearance. If they wanted the red brick look, they would have to deal with the moisture penetration problems.

Chairman Almeida said he was right to bring up the very important subject. The Commission had attended a site walk where they put hands on the brick, and there were several test locations done on the wall. The images on Sheet 3a in the packet showed that the cementitious coating was put on because the brick had decayed to a point where it required a stabilizer. A bonding agent was put on and clung to it so much that it pulled the face of the brick off. He said the Commission was not taking the issue lightly. Mr. Dodge said he also looked at the brick and had not seen deterioration. It was a good, hard brick. Chairman Almeida said they saw several different conditions on the garden wall where it was simple to remove the coating. Mr. Dodge said to just take off what was loose and give the building another coat of paint. It had been that way for over one hundred years.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said she was strongly in favor of the project. She had watched every work session in person or on television and saw the building changed as requested, like the dormers. She thought the dormers added a lot of detail to the old and new sides of the buildings and liked that they were different on both sides. She did not think the building was too big or that the addition was larger than the original building. If it were made smaller, it would look funny, like an added piece that did not match. The back side looked nice with the curve coming down Ceres Street. She thought it should be approved and hoped the issue with the height would not interfere with the approval because the issue was not the height but the number of stories. She thought it fit in perfectly. Driving up Market Street, it did block a bit of

the bridge view, but a driver should not be looking in that direction anyway because he would rear-end someone stopped in traffic.

Ms. Erica Dodge of 175 State Street was very interested to hear what people had to say about the project. She felt it was too large of an addition and they should follow more what the Portsmouth Advocates Chair said in being more subordinate because it was overpowering the original structure. She understood the need for a more modern back but thought the fenestration was too dense. The building should be lessened or simplified, and then it would complement the simplicity of the original structure's warehouse industrial look.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **postpone** the application to the August 7, 2013 meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

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

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **126 State Street Condominium Association, owner, and Brian Johnson and Robert Keefe, applicants**, for property **126 State Street, Units 5 and 8**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (construct decks off of Units 5 and 8) and new construction to an existing structure (construct new porch and new deck). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 57 and lies within Central Business and Historic Districts.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **postpone** the application to the August 7, 2013 meeting. Mr. Katz seconded the motion.*

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

B. Work Session requested by **Peter Cass and Mara Witzling, owners**, for property located at **33 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing porch) and new construction to an existing structure (construct new porch and new deck). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 38 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

*Vice-Chair Kozak made a motion to **postpone** the application to the September 4, 2013 meeting. Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion.*

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

C. Work Session requested by **Bo Patrik and Eva Frisk, owners**, for property located at **44 Pickering Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing garage and one story addition, and deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct one and two story additions, porch addition, and detached garage) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in

the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 19 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Anne Whitney, architect for the project told the Commission that the property was a good-sized lot on which the front of the house was on Pickering Street but the bulk of the property was on Pickering Avenue, and that was where the entrance was. The original 30'x20' New Englander already had a 1-story addition wrapping around a garage addition on the back, for which they had gotten BOA approval. They were proposing to add another 2-story structure to the existing structure but dropping the rear addition down half a level to match the gable on the existing house. She wanted to keep the scale down because they had a window in the existing house on the 2nd floor and she did not want to lose both windows on that elevation, so she was coming up 4-1/2' and doing a dormer. There was a large dormer on the Pickering Avenue side and a larger dormer on the opposite side. The other addition was a 1-story off the Pickering Avenue side that wrapped around and turned into a porch. They also wanted to add a detached garage on the back corner of the lot to work with the existing driveway. They would have to cut down one tree but were working around a cherry tree off the porch.

The 1st page of photos showed Pickering Avenue views and the garage. The 2nd page showed the front of the house and the garage addition, a 5' setback behind the building and a back view of a nearby building. The next building was 10' away from the existing building. They wanted to replace all the existing windows in the house, which were replacement windows except for one. Some were vinyl and others were Brosco replacements. They were all converted to one-over-one windows, with no muntins.

They also wanted to add solar panels. The envelope of the house was not in great shape, so they were thinking of adding a deep energy retro fit and taking all the siding and roof trim off the existing structure and gutting the attic. Ms. Whitney said she could do a future work session with more details. They were looking at 85% panel independence. There had been a lot of breakthroughs in panel efficiency with small unit parts, and most of the solar work she had done had been water-based for heating. The key was having a tight envelope and doing exterior insulation. Chairman Almeida said they had approved solar panels in the District and typically asked if they were in the same plane as the roof. Ms. Whitney said the panel that would be seen the most was on the Pickering Avenue elevation. The existing building was 25' from the street, so the addition would drop it back another 5' and she would fill the entire dormer with the array. She said her packet had a few pictures of similar panels and installation covering most of the roof, and she had them sized so that there would be very little roof edge around. The panels were dark and covered the entire roof surface. On the east elevation, the panels would be on the dormer of the elevation. On the south elevation of the garage, 18 panel arrays would barely be seen from Pickering Avenue but would face the neighbors, and she would talk to them. On the east and west elevations, the orientation was not great but still viable. On the west elevation that abutted the neighborhood, there were two locations that she would step back, one on the addition and one on the roof. The issue with the panels on the west elevation addition was big trees on the abutting lot behind them, reducing the efficiency in the summer. It would be one or the other of

the two locations. If they put the installation to the west, they would get rid of a skylight, but they wanted to keep the skylights.

Chairman Almeida noted that she was adding a few windows. Ms. Whitney said there was a new addition going back that was a different shape and they would take off the existing 1-story additions and put in the new additions. Chairman Almeida asked about reflectivity and gloss and options for the panel to not be so reflective. Ms. Whitney said she intended to have dark and non-reflective panels that would feel like a roof surface. The roof pitch affected the reflectivity. She asked if that was something they should be pursuing, given the locations. Mr. Rawling felt that the amount of solar panels was disturbing. They usually attempted to hide the panel locations and only approved them because they were hidden. Ms. Whitney said the domestic water systems were a little smaller. Mr. Wyckoff said the south facing panel on the garage was the least visible and the most efficient.

Ms. Whitney said if they had to give something up, it would be the east view. The panels on the east side would not be looked at directly where the buildings were versus the land, but she wanted to do enough panels to make it worthwhile. Chairman Almeida said the distant views might also catch the roof surface from the west side. Mr. Wyckoff said you could see the east surface from Prescott Park and the view from the back could be seen obliquely. Chairman Almeida said it would be a major concern if you could see the panels from Peirce Island. He liked the west side more. Ms. Whitney said the west and east were the same orientation. The east side would have a small number of panels, so the tradeoff would be to have panels in both locations. Mr. Wyckoff said he was comfortable losing the east side array and also thought the fenestration was complicated and awkward. He thought they should have a model for it because it was such a large addition. Ms. Whitney said she could do a model with elevations.

Chairman Almeida asked her about the double dormers and if she considered taking the roof line up and simplifying the form. Ms. Whitney said she could not because she wanted to maintain a window. If she matched the pitch of the existing house, she'd lose the attic window and she did not want to go above the existing eave line. Mr. Rawling asked if she had considered adding divided lights to the replacement windows. Ms. Whitney believed the house was originally two-over-twos. Mr. Rawling suggested just bringing the house back and asked how she would add 2" to the roof and maintain some kind of molding. Ms. Whitney said the molding had already been taken off and the returns were just boxes now. She was going to take the trim off and recreate it and put in new wood gutters so that it would go back and be slightly higher. She could recreate everything as it was. Chairman Almeida asked her to show the details at the next meeting.

Her main concern was whether the solar panels were viable. If so, she would have comparative details of their proposal at the extended work session in August. Chairman Almeida told the Commission to be clear about the solar feedback and reminded them that it was not an 18th century home. Ms. Whitney said it was a big lot and set back a bit. The part that was on the street would remain the same. Mr. Rawling asked if she would have to take the bay off the front. Ms. Whitney said she might not do the bay. The key thing was the window section and the roof eave and how to deal with the front elevation. The bay was deep enough that she would either rebuild the trim or make it a bit smaller. Mr. Rawling asked if it was worth going to all that trouble just

for the bay. Ms. Whitney said no, but there was a lot of trim, so she thought they would take the entry surround off and not do the bay.

Vice-Chair Kozak said the Commission had heard similar questions before in projects and Ms. Whitney had good examples of them working. She mentioned the Georgian house on Maplewood Avenue that had insulation added to it all the way around by Petersen Engineering and said it was tough to resolve the foundation details. She suggested recreating the two-over-two window pattern. She was concerned about solar panels facing the water because it was a street front and they had to deal with it. She thought the scale was right and had no other issues. Chairman Almeida said it was hard to picture it outside of the flat plane, and further drawings or a model would help. Ms. Whitney said it was a funny site to photograph and easier for her to do a quick model with elevations. Mr. Rawling said it was a sensitive area and neighbors may come out and make comments. Ms. Whitney said she talked to the neighbor who lived behind the house who was okay with it because the garage would be going away. The other neighbors liked the solar panels. She had gotten a zoning variance and people were happy with the scale. Mr. Katz said that a few years back, they decided solar panels would be fine if integrated into the design. Ms. Whitney said the site gave her the opportunity to have the panels, especially on the west side.

Ms. Ruedig brought up the awkwardness of the shed dormer on the addition and said it looked like a big bracket coming up. Ms. Whitney said the shed might disappear if it was a deal breaker. Ms. Ruedig said she should make it look more like a bungalow style or like a more simple New England style. Ms. Whitney said she would make a model and it would look better.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **continue** review of the application to the August 7, 2013 meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion.*

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

D. Work Session requested by **Temple Israel, owner**, for property located at **200 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install gate, install granite posts/chains) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add opaque film to some windows, add matching grillwork). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 66 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Mr. Bob Bradbard said he had four items to present to the Commission. Item #1 was to basically match a prior approval on the Court Street addition they had done around 2005 on the State Street view. The Portsmouth Police and Homeland Security had visited them in light of the criminal mischief that had recently taken place. The Temple did their due diligence and decided that one way to add more security was to duplicate the grill work to match the Court Street door.

Item #2 did not affect the sanctuary, which was the historic part of the complex. He had samples of three different colors of a film that would go over the windows and decrease the ability of anyone to see inside the building. The best way to see what it looked like was to put it up against

a pane of glass. Each sample was identified, and the film would be applied to the inside of the glass. Chairman Almeida asked if it would reflect on the outside. Mr. Bradbard said it should not. The company who manufactured it, New Hampshire Solar, had also done a lot of work at Pease, and he could get photos of the buildings it was on. The choices were a reflective gray, a regular gray, and a bronze. They thought the bronze would be the best choice because it matched the building's color. Mr. Cracknell asked him to tape up the samples on the building so the Commission could walk by and view how they looked. Mr. Bradbard mentioned that when they built the sanctuary, it duplicated the appearance of insulated glass and the Commission had not wanted them to touch the windows, so Mr. Bradbard wanted to make sure the Commission would approve the film. Chairman Almeida asked which windows the film would go on. Mr. Bradbard said they would go on the Court Street building on the 1st floor. He would put up all three films the next day and label them to differentiate them, and he would keep them up for two weeks.

Item #3 addressed erecting a 6' high x 10' wide fence with a gate to the left of the sanctuary entrance on the river side to block an alleyway that was between that side and the property at 170 State Street. They had a lot of problems with unsavory individuals hanging out in the alleyway late at night, so they wanted to put up fencing with a gate. The gate was available in different styles, and they were considering Style ESF-10. Chairman Almeida asked if there was a diagram showing exactly where it was going. Mr. Bradbard said it was going straight across. Councilor Kennedy said Style EFS-55 would match their circular window. Vice-Chair Kozak said there was an iron fence across the street that they could match. Chairman Almeida said a true wrought iron fence would be nice. Vice-Chair Kozak said all those options were great, but it was a back alley that did not require something expensive. She thought the style Mr. Bradbard chose was fine. Mr. Bradbard said it sat back 40' from the sidewalk and landscaping would hide most of it.

Item #4 concerned the State Street parking lot. Mr. Bradbard thanked the City for installing landscaping and the sidewalk and beautifying the area. There was a surface area they wanted to enlarge by eliminating the curbing blocks, and the critical area sat between the two beddings that contained a utility box, a bench and a bike rack. They wanted to know if they could put up a granite post and black chain across that area, which would eliminate all of the curbing. Councilor Kennedy asked if they needed a bollard, given the electrical box, and was not sure if the HDC took care of that. Mr. Cracknell said if the granite bollards were mounted, they would be in front of the car stops, so it would fit in along the line. He thought they should make an effort to have one bollard in the stall to protect the bench and utility cabinet, and it would be better than a hanging chain. He asked if the chain would be painted black. Mr. Bradbard said it came in black. Mr. Cracknell was not sure it would stay black. Chairman Almeida said it could be a powder-coated black.

Mr. Bradbard said they would like to do whatever they could before the holiday season in the fall. He knew it was just a work session, but other than the film, there seemed to be no opposition to anything else and asked when the formal approval would take place. Mr. Cracknell said Mr. Bradbard would have to file an application for the August 7 meeting.

The Commission recommended a public hearing.

E. Work Session requested by **Dale W. and Sharyn W. Smith, owners**, for property located at **275 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 8 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the June 19, 2013 meeting.)*

WORK SESSION

Steve McHenry and Brandon Holben of McHenry Architecture, Brandon Holben and Mike Green, option holder, presented themselves.

Mr. McHenry had been before the Commission for a few work sessions and needed a fresh look at the site. He participated in the site walk the day before with some of the Commissioners, and one issue that needed to be addressed was the New Englander on the lot. It would not be compatible with anything new done on the site and would be incongruous next to the new building. The New Englander was the plainest among the other houses next to it, and the buildings beyond it were not in the Historic District, so he did not know if that played into the HDC's purview. He felt that removing the New Englander was key to the plans and also was a strong point regarding parking. The building would be self-supported for parking, which was a plus as an urban planning tool.

He addressed the zoning issue by pointing out the Central Business District. Coming from the west end of Portsmouth down Islington Street toward downtown, the Centennial Park and some buildings on the left were the gateway to the Central Business District, and that would affect what the Commission thought of the project's design and scale. Mr. McHenry knew it would be controversial to demolish a house in the Historic District but had some good points to make.

Mr. Holben did a PowerPoint presentation and showed the 2-1/2 story mill housing in the back, the series of New Englanders, the old Port Traders Building, and 2-story and 3-story houses at McDonough and Rockingham Streets. He talked about building heights, soffits, measurements, and so on. He showed photos of Rockingham, McDonough, and Cornwall streetscapes and pointed out the height differences. He spoke about the new building's design process and said they were working with eight building blocks and the central courtyard idea, four stories up to 30' holding 24-30 units, and pocket gardens between the forms. Chairman Almeida asked if the undulating blocks were truly separated. Mr. Holben said no, that the courtyard would create an intimate community inside the larger community. He said the open courtyard entry and undulating street front created a nice break and reduced the building's scale. The building created individuality as it started to extrude with each of the units. He pointed out views, maximum sun exposure, corridors, parking, and so on.

Mr. Wyckoff said he did not understand what was going on. Mr. McHenry said he and his team got a strong feeling after the last work session that they needed to start from scratch and rethink the massing. They were thinking of a continuous U-shaped building with a center courtyard, and the u-shape could be modulated to the street and have varying heights so it could respond to the Islington streetscape and have a 3-dimensional form that was interesting on all elevations rather

than being a big slab. The CBB had a 60' height restriction but in that zone, the transitional requirement was 40' heights with 10' setbacks and 60% lot coverage, so it was an effort to stay in those constraints first before getting variances. He was starting with those constraints to help them understand the questions the HDC had raised about how they would fit into a residential neighborhood. He wanted to start at Ground 0 and then get into the actual building massing and 3-dimensional models.

Mr. Holben showed diagrams of the new building and focused on Option 1. Chairman Almeida said it looked a lot lower than what they previously saw and he did not see a step up at all from the other buildings when considering the ridge. Mr. Mc Henry said they would further develop the models, but that the point of the center courtyard responded to the park next to it. Mr. Holben showed Option 2 diagrams. Mr. Rawling asked if it was all CBB and was told yes. Mr. Holben then showed the setbacks and the building heights. Chairman Almeida asked if both options assumed the removal of the house and was told yes. Mr. Holben talked about the 'big picture', massing models, street setbacks and undulations, and so on. Chairman Almeida noted that they were getting a bit beyond massing. Mr. Holben agreed and showed the formal court entry, unit downsizing, bandying, and façade.

Mr. McHenry said they would like the Commission's reaction to getting rid of the New Englander and the basic concept of the u-shaped structure that modulated in various ways to decrease the mass along the street and meet the developing requirements. Chairman Almeida said the New Englander was the last house within the Historic District and the HDC was protecting this house because it belonged to the set of houses beyond it on Rockingham Street, a set that was outside of the District and unprotected. Mr. McHenry said everyone talked about the context, but the context defined was a difficult issue. Mr. Katz said that what struck him during the site walk was that the New Englander's placement was an anomaly because there was a parking lot across the street from it instead of another house. Mr. McHenry said the parking lot was now new construction. Mr. Rawling said that the New Englander was therefore out of context to what was across the street. He was not impressed with the significance of the house and was convinced that the project depended on its removal. He thought that what replaced it would contribute more to Portsmouth and Islington Street than the New Englander did.

Mr. Rawling brought out a few planning documents to illustrate what he thought was keeping the house from reflecting the streetscape's pattern and rhythm, and he was going to suggest another method. Mr. Katz commented that the Commission was there to work on that particular petition and not there to provide alternatives. That was not the function of the HDC.

Mr. McHenry said it was an important issue from the last work session. What he felt was really relevant was looking at the map and seeing the big parcel of the park and the furniture company across the street. The proposed building was a large parcel as well, and every other parcel was a small single-family lot. In terms of zoning and the Historic District location, he felt his building should be arrhythmic, meaning the rhythm in the streetscape didn't have to have everything the same. The Form Based Zoning Charette was a reminder. Variety was the spice of life, and the image with commercial and residential buildings close together with 3-story eave lines expressed all around made it look charming and livable. That was what they were trying to do.

Chairman Almeida told the Commission that he wanted their input on the fact that they had to convey their ideas to the applicant as Commissioners. Whether they did it verbally or graphically, the best way to convey their thoughts on any of these applications was the way they were obligated to convey them. Mr. Rawling conveyed his ideas graphically, and Chairman Almeida was for it, but he wanted to know if the applicants welcomed the medium for discussing ideas and felt that it was a very graphic exercise. Mr. Rawling asked whether or not they had a right to present an idea. Chairman Almeida asked him if he was presenting an idea or a development plan. Mr. Katz said Mr. Rawling should not say anything except respond to the applicant. Chairman Almeida asked what the difference was between explaining something and presenting an idea. Mr. Katz said it was not appropriate for Mr. Rawling to present his idea. Chairman Almeida asked why they were even there, in that case. Mr. Katz said they were not there to be in competition with the applicant.

Chairman Almeida said the Commission would have to pause for a moment to resolve the issue among the Commissioners. If they felt they were out of bounds for presenting graphic ideas, they had to realize that. Mr. Katz said he would go beyond that and would ask the City Attorney and the Planning Director whether it was appropriate or not. Chairman Almeida asked what he meant specifically by 'appropriate'. Mr. Katz said he meant presenting an accurate version for the applicant's presentation. Mr. McHenry was saying his approach was what he wanted to do and Mr. Rawling was saying he had an idea also that he wanted the applicant to consider. Councilor Kennedy said she had not heard that but had just heard an example of how they could meld residential with commercial, that it was just a thought or an image. Mr. Katz asked how that applied to the applicant. Councilor Kennedy said the applicant could take it or leave it. She did not see a design of the building or area but simply a thought process, like when she brought pictures to the meetings. Mr. Katz repeated that he would ask for a judgment from the Planning Department. Mr. Rawling said in that case they would not get anywhere that evening.

Chairman Almeida said they had a lot of business to attend to and asked Vice-Chair Kozak her opinion. Vice-Chair Kozak said the Commission offered design ideas to a degree at all work sessions. If they commented that the buildings were too tall, that was a design review. It had to respond to the application, and none of their comments should ever say that they just had a complete design and it was what the applicant needed to do. It was a fine line. The Commission has had people bring images of the city from a different time period, and that was a graphic idea. Some graphic ideas relayed a thought process as opposed to a graphic that was a whole new design. Eliminating all graphics from the meetings was going too far, but it was important not to show a graphic that redesigned the project. Chairman Almeida said it could convey an idea. Mr. Katz said Mr. Rawling's suggestion was not an idea asked for by the applicant. Mr. Rawling said he just meant to show scaling elements in a large structure as part of an urban planning excerpt. Mr. McHenry said the study of that kind of thing was what we did, and images like the one shown were not relevant to their proposal, but everyone had different opinions.

Chairman Almeida said he needed more opinions about the building. Mr. Wyckoff felt that the comment about the group of houses was a false comment. Looking at the four houses was looking at what was left after the furniture company tore down a long line of houses. The grouping of New Englanders was important. It was happenstance and could have been six houses left over. He felt the New Englander in question was a very generic style and the house next to it

was far more important as far as a New Englander went, and he did not see historic value to the house nor feel that the McDonough Street area would suffer from its loss. If the tradeoff was to get a quality development worth millions, he did not know why they were spending so much time discussing it.

Mr. Katz had no problem with the removal. Mr. Gladhill was opposed to demolishing the house and felt the purview was the surrounding properties. The purview was in the State Statute and City Ordinance and he asked if it applied to just the inside of the Historic District or the outside as well. There was no clear-cut answer and it was based on interpretation. He felt the house was in the context of its own neighborhood, and tearing it down for something else that was not into the context seemed wrong. He knew from sitting on both Boards that residents did not want large commercial properties encroaching into a residential neighborhood. It had been that way for 50 years. He could not support demolishing the house and putting up a big building that could potentially be commercial up against another house further into the residential district. Vice-Chair Kozak said she missed the site walk so she would defer, but she would take any demolition very seriously. Chairman Almeida said he initially was very protective of the house and had not made up his mind yet. He would reference purpose and intent, District character preservation, historical significance, property values, consistency with surrounding property characters, and so on. He was on the fence and his gut reaction said the New Englander was part of a collection of buildings making up a classic street language. He had not yet seen from the proposed size, density and massing of the building that it even considered working with the New Englander, and the assumption of it gave him pause.

Mr. Rawling said he took the demolition seriously when evaluating the pattern and rhythm of the streetscape. The neighborhood was concerned and did not want to lose the feeling of their streetscape. There were already several large block buildings on Islington Street that did not scale down to the homes. Councilor Kennedy was against the house demolition because it was all residential and a pattern of houses. The neighborhood chose to save that house. She wanted a design that fit into the neighborhood and was not comfortable with the housing coming down. She felt bad for the neighbors and said the Commission needed to look at all of the streets. She had walked there twice and it was primarily a residential area. She heard several complaints about the other large buildings and how they affected the residents. She knew it was zoned CBB, but it went right up against residential and she was concerned.

Ms. Ruedig was on the fence as well and felt there were many ways to assess significant architecture and integrity, so it would need a thorough study. She used to live in the neighborhood and found it to be a hodgepodge of styles and patterns and sizes. Islington Street was a major part of it, and what was designed should help them feel comfortable with the demolition of the house, so it should be something that tied in to the rest of the street and neighborhood rather than just a big building.

Chairman Almeida asked if there were comments about the massing. Mr. McHenry said they were in listening mode and wanted to come back and present more options. Chairman Almeida told Mr. McHenry that he had a team with experience and success, especially with the 6-16 Congress Street building. He remembered the process and it was similar to what the proposed building would be, so much so that he looked up the file. The studies that Mr. McHenry did back

then were more useful and the diagrams showed neighboring buildings on either side as well as massing studies. They had more options and reasons for eliminating a lot of things. The massing involved 20 options and zeroing in on the options was very easy for the Commission. Mr. McHenry said the Chairman was looking at several months of work, and he wanted to maintain the same standard of presentation so the scaling and massing decisions would be easy for the Commission. He thought the Commission wanted him to be proactive graphically and articulate the various options of how they got where they did, but they had just stated the process and wanted to continue. He welcomed the criticism but said it still had to work on other levels such as space planning and financial. It was not just about the building style and size. If they stuck to the Zoning Ordinance Transitional Requirement criteria and pushed in 10' on the setback, he thought the scales would work. The Congress Street building worked because it was a different horizon line and field of vision, and they wanted to express that in the new building by the setbacks helping the building become larger.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought he was on the right track by breaking it down to that sort of scale because it responded to the single family blocks up and down the street. She liked how they created an entry and setback responding to the park. Her biggest mantra was relating to the huge urban feature across the street. She was not convinced with the angular language and how it fit on Islington Street and thought it would be a struggle to pull it off. If the visual tied into the established language of the street, they could probably get away with it here and there, but overall she did not think a twisted form dominating Islington Street would work. Mr. Rawling liked how Mr. McHenry made the gesture to the park. The park was a choice feature of the property and would add value to the units. The more angular form worked with the neighborhood better. He thought there could be a larger building there but had always looked for scaling and sizing elements related to parts of the neighborhood. Mr. McHenry said they had just done a modality study in showing the two options and felt it was productive to show multiple views and would eventually show the Commission 3-dimensional views.

Chairman Almeida told him he was so successful in Market Square and coming up with the best product added to Portsmouth in several years, plus removing two buildings to boot. There was a recipe for success there and they should remember it. He said Mr. McHenry showed images of architectural language and would need to ask the Commission soon about their feelings for traditional versus modern architecture. Some of Mr. McHenry's language was more modernist than traditional, and some of the Commissioners were in different camps. Mr. McHenry said they were ready to have that conversation and would show how they approached and justified it.

Councilor Kennedy saw on Page 3 that the park was a big feature of Islington Street and she was uncomfortable with a building that would become the major feature and would subtract from the neighborhood.

Councilor Kennedy said the houses were minimized. Mr. Gladhill liked that the design had a big open space. Mr. McHenry said they had a cascading form so the tallest part of the building was the least visible. Mr. Gladhill said that was why he could not support tall buildings abutting residential homes. Mr. McHenry said he had not seen the completed elevations yet.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. McHenry what he needed from the Commission. Mr. McHenry said he needed to work on more options and refine them, especially massing. Mr. Katz said a

significant number of people on the Commission were willing to remove the house. Mr. McHenry said he wanted to talk to the neighbors and see if the demolition would really make their project work.

*Mr. Gladhill made the motion to **continue** review of the application to the August 7, 2013 meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion.*

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

F. Work Session requested by **143 Daniel Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **143 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add second story to gymnasium section, construct multi-story building at rear of lot). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 19 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the June 19, 2013 meeting to the July 17, 2013 meeting.)*

WORK SESSION

Ms. Ruedig recused herself.

Carla Goodknight, architect from CJ Architects, and owner Steve Wilson presented.

Ms. Goodknight said her development was the site of the Connie Bean Center and the Army Navy Building. She showed pages that contained the tax map and location, an aerial image showing the Army Navy Building roof line, an open area to the rear of the building on Chapel Street, and the gymnasium footprint. Page C showed the existing views of the surrounding buildings on Daniel Street, the Chapel Street entrance with existing elevation of the Army Navy Building, the back lot and back of the building, and the Wright Avenue corner with the significant view gateway of the bridge. Page D showed more of the Chapel Street context and structures in the area.

Ms. Goodknight said Page 1a illustrated an interesting option of doing a modern structure that was completely separate looking from the buildings on the site, or doing something more conventional. Option A explored a complete break of style that was not in competition with existing structures, and she said that was a positive. They would be able to maintain an upper story separation of the two buildings because they were not relying on one style. One of the drawbacks was that they were still maintaining the floor heights of the existing building, which was 7' above the sidewalks, so there was a disconnect from the pedestrian way of the 1st floor. The historic building to the right had 92', and the use of the 1st floor would become residential because of its layout and distance from the street. The buildings on the left did not have that option and would become commercial, and the distance from the sidewalk was a big obstacle. The other issue was creating a 3-story volume on top of the raised existing space, making it very high as a structure, even taller than the adjacent building. The corner views stayed the same. A Commissioner asked if there was an end view. Ms. Goodknight said no, they were trying to highlight three different approaches to the building. Mr. Wilson said they built a model out of

glass, but it was not a design he was interested in. He was surprised that some people liked it, but a lot of people said they did not because it was so out of character.

Page 2a showed the modern option that was more traditional and reflective of what currently existed. Ms. Goodknight said they realized they were still bringing the baggage from the existing structure, however. They still had 92' plus 80' of uninterrupted inaccessible sidewalk cut off from the pedestrian way. Any vertical from the street would be awkward and take up sidewalk space. It was also difficult from a retail standpoint because the windows were not visible from the street. Another thing was, in responding to the symmetry of the existing gymnasium, they had to bring the building over because the symmetry was solid and they did not want to leave a big chunk out. They would have to drive it up out of the ground significantly higher and the mass would be higher to capture three floors.

Page 3a explored the option of complete separation by bringing retail space down to pedestrian levels, pulling the corner back due to a 12' sidewalk on Daniel Street and a 12' sidewalk on Wright, and a pinch point up to the property line to about 6' on the corner. The erosion of the corner was appropriate in that case because it was a hard edge that pointed way out and they could make an adjustment. The other positive was that they separated from the existing building so they could restore the entire face that was currently covered by the gymnasium addition. They could also create a second commercial alley between the buildings. They could circulate around the building to the other side and the whole form would become more proportional to some of the nearby buildings. They would further develop the Wright Avenue side. The architecture was preliminary, just an idea to illustrate the massing and was not carved in stone. It was another way to bring back pedestrian access and try two ways of making it work.

They wanted to know how the Commission felt about the removal of the gymnasium. Vice-Chair Kozak said she could not support the removal of the gymnasium because it was a key point in the history of the neighborhood and had too much architectural merit. Chairman Almeida said he had very fond memories of the gymnasium, such as the Father/Daughter dances, the basketball games and other great experiences. The worst experiences were outside the gymnasium, like walking around it. It was a giant wall that was not inviting. He felt the addition of the gymnasium was a mistake, and its removal would be a huge opportunity to engage the street level rather than walking by a blank wall 8' high that did not relate to pedestrians or the Warner House across the street. He felt the gymnasium was limiting a great building from happening. If the gymnasium stayed, it would always have to be worked around. The images of the building from the 1940s before the gymnasium was added were far superior to what they had now.

Mr. Wyckoff agreed that it had always been awkward walking around it. He thought a lot could be done with the basement windows. He also thought the space would be great for a large open air farmers market, in which case they would not need the retail window. However, the proposed addition made more sense with the gymnasium gone. He was on the fence a little. Mr. Katz said he was off the fence and thought the proposal would solve a lot of problems. Mr. Gladhill was hesitant about getting rid of the gymnasium because it told the story of the building itself and was history. Mr. Rawling said after the gymnasium was added, people commented on what a nice building it used to be. He admitted that the streetscape would be changed by removing it and it would be brought down to the pedestrian, which was something needed. The addition itself

was an awkward piece not quite scaled properly enough to look like it belonged there, so he was open to considering the alternatives.

Councilor Kennedy heard a lot of negativity about the first pictures but was excited about the other options. The history of the gymnasium was very important to the community and she wanted to incorporate that history and look by keeping longer windows on the side. They had to honor everyone's feelings about it. However, she was okay with looking at creative ways of doing a circular completeness like the Press Room down the street, but it would have to be soft circular versus something 'Army'. A lot of people had fond memories of that gymnasium, and she encouraged anything to honor that. Ms. Goodknight said she recognized the identity and wanted to keep it but make it accessible to pedestrians. She had a design approach analysis, and they could do multiple things.

Mr. Wilson said he had thought the gymnasium was great for about six months and wanted to find a way to keep it intact, so he spent a few months understanding what the neighborhood would become and then found it difficult to put into context with the neighborhood. Being a contractor, there had to be a way he could figure out of how to make the gymnasium work, and he looked at the Wright Avenue parking lot and the monument as well as the Daniel Street improvements, the sidewalk, and so on. While he was contemplating what to do, he realized that the Army Navy Building was architecturally important to the City. When they buried the Army Navy Building with the gymnasium, they covered up the most architectural aspect of it. He felt it was important to keep the separation at the upper level to get a look at the building. He finally realized that it was the gymnasium's texture that appealed to him, the arched windows and brick. He understood the memories are what made people fond of it, not the architecture. When he knew he could explore the Connie Bean end and provide an alleyway to break up the 170' block into two elements, he thought they could preserve the texture of the property but change the form of it. The brick could be cleaned and re-used along with the trusses, etc. His idea was to use the same window dimensions so they could keep the existing granite, and he liked the waterstruck brick and keystone. He finally realized that the proposed building would be more attractive than the existing one. There were two physical obstacles. The gymnasium floor was 7' above the sidewalk and could not be cut down to street level without being in the garage. The retail would have an awkward mezzanine or 20' high space, and the top 10' would not be used for anything other than absorbing heat or coolant. Now that he had seen the rendering, he wanted to develop the plan. He was also attached to the gymnasium memories, but the gymnasium reminded him of a broken tooth in a nice smile and he could not figure out how to put the cap on the tooth. He wanted to be faithful to the gymnasium's history, but when he saw the rendering of the building from 60 years before without the gymnasium, he liked it better, so he felt two distinct buildings would be attractive. The concept of using the same design elements and materials was great.

Councilor Kennedy asked him how he was going to access parking. He showed a plan for Chapel Street and a concrete ramp driveway going down. Parking would be under a certain portion of the building. Lowering the scheme would push the parking a bit lower. He had checked the soil and foundation walls and footings the previous week and thought they could leave the foundation in place. There was a physical issue with the gymnasium because it was built to carry itself, and the roof had deflection issues, so there was no application of the current code to keep the roof intact.

If it changed from a gymnasium to commercial, he had to do it to code, so there would be structural issues having to do with foundation, the concrete, the new façade. If they took a whole block and broke it into thirds and applied it to the site plan, it would make the block work better. They would apply an elevation to the next door's proposed building and it would fit. Last, the plan would reduce square footage by 4,000 s.f. and would make it more usable and productive by providing a more inviting space and making it more pedestrian friendly. He had gotten lots of comments about the relief from the long continuous straight facade block, even at the right elevation. He was confident they could come up with a plan for a new building with the same footprint but smaller by the alley way and corner radius and make it look like it belonged.

Ms. Goodknight said Mr. Wilson had been struggling for months with it, and she had been thinking of what they could do with the gymnasium. At their meeting, they discussed the modern departure and Mr. Wilson said he didn't want to rule out a more conventional approach and had told her what he just told the Commission. She thought it made a lot of sense and they should be looking at that option. There were still major functional issues in connecting to the existing historical aspect, however. Vice-Chair Kozak told them to look at the Pleasant and State Street Post Office. The main floor was 6' above street level, and it had tall windows and high ceilings, yet the building worked and had a lot of architectural merit and was significant. She had no sentimental feeling toward the gymnasium but felt what it did for the City was important. The connection to the streetscape was a requirement that could be done.

Mr. Katz asked if Versions A, B, and C had evolved over time and was told yes. When Version A made the papers, Versions B and D did not exist. Ms. Goodknight said the traditional concept had not been done at that time. Mr. Wilson said he did not object to it being in the newspaper. The gymnasium was no longer a civic structure but would be part of the mixed use building. If the structure was modern, it could have holes cut into it, but if the arched windows were taken out, the building could fall down because the façade was old and not modern. Chairman Almeida said he was very protective of the whole building including the gymnasium, and people were tied to memories of the gymnasium, not tied to the architecture. The architecture was not significant, it was the history. Mr. Wyckoff said the windows made the building.

Councilor Kennedy said the gymnasium had simplicity and hoped others were seeing it. A lot of people would be upset and protective, and keeping the simplicity might help the situation. Mr. Wilson said whatever they replaced the gymnasium with would help. He liked the simplicity as well and the clean granite sills, the cut keystones, and attractive brick.

Chairman Almeida told Mr. Wilson to keep in mind that there were two Commissioners they had not heard from yet. It was a compelling case, but they would have to sell it to the City. Mr. Wilson said he would come back with more detail about the Chapel Street Building and would continue to develop the plan with simplicity in mind.

*The Commission voted to **continue** review of the application to the August 7, 2013 meeting.*

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

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:45 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 March 5, 2014.