

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**June 11, 2014
reconvened from June 4, 2014
to be reconvened on June 18, 2014**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: George Melchior, Dan Rawling

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner



*The Board's action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (CONTINUED)

- 4. May 7, 2014
- 5. May 14, 2014

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **approve** both sets of minutes as presented. Ms. Gladhill seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he had only received the emailed version of the May 14 minutes and that he preferred the hard copy version to review. Councilor Kennedy stated that she had not attended the May 14 meeting and asked if it could be voted on separately from the other set.

*Vice-Chair Kozak **retracted** her motion, as did Mr. Gladhill.*

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the May 7 meeting minutes. Councilor Kennedy seconded. The motion to approve the minutes **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **approve** the May 14 meeting minutes. Mr. Gladhill seconded.*

Councilor Kennedy recused herself from the vote, and Mr. Wyckoff abstained from voting.

*The motion to approve the minutes **passed** unanimously, 4-0.*

Chairman Almeida stated that the applicant for the petition of Joseph and Zulmira Almeida for property located at 27 Rogers Street, Item 1 of Old Business, Public Hearings, had requested that it be postponed to the June 18 meeting. He recused himself from the application due to its personal nature. Vice-Chair Kozak took over and read the petition aloud and asked for a vote.

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **postpone** the application to the June 18, 2014 meeting. Councilor Kennedy seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 5-0.*

Chairman Almeida stated that he received a letter from the State of New Hampshire Department of Transportation. In summary, the letter stated that the DOT would hold a public informational meeting about the reconfiguration of the Portsmouth Park and Ride, the purpose of which was to solicit public input to ensure that the project decisions met public transportation needs, community goals, and protected and enhanced the environment.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the Commission had received two re-hearing requests for the Portwalk project regarding the final approval of Phase 2 of the hotel portion, one from the Planning Department and the other from some residents, Mr. Joe Caldarola being the primary author. The HDC would schedule a vote on whether to re-hear the case. Relating to the re-hearing request from the Planning Director, there had been some confusion regarding the Letter of Decision and the Certificate of Approval issued on May 12 for the project. The HDC had approved all the required design changes, many with mitigations, but the decision was labeled final approval by the HDC, and one of the stipulations was that a mockup would be done of the substitution for putting pre-cast on the building. Most HDC members had approved it with the understanding that they could review a mockup and then make a final decision. He and the Planning Director wrote a report to make it clear that the applicant had to do the mockup by stating that the word 'conditional' would be inserted in place of 'final'. The Commission would review the mockup and vote in final form for the Certificate of Approval. Mr. Cracknell said there were two ways to remedy a potential defect in using the work 'final' instead of 'conditional approval'. One option was to submit the documentation to the HDC and go through a re-hearing process simply to fix that word, and the other option was for the applicant to review the request and agree with the HDC that the purpose of the stipulation was to bring it back to the HDC for final approval.

Portwalk had agreed with the request and stated that they would provide a letter within 24 hours. When the HDC received it, they would agree to withdraw the request from the Planning Department. Attorney Peter Loughlin on behalf of Portwalk rose to speak and stated that they had learned about the motion for re-hearing that day and agreed that it should have said 'conditional approval', so the applicant had to come back with a mockup. Attorney Loughlin said that he spoke with the City Attorney, who told him that if he came to the HDC meeting and stated on public record that he concurred that it should have said 'conditional' instead of 'final approval', that would bind them.

Councilor Kennedy asked how the Commission would proceed. Chairman Almeida stated that a letter was forthcoming and would be put on another agenda. Mr. Cracknell said they had to act on the re-hearing request within 30 days, and the mockup would be voted upon after the Commission saw it. Mr. Gladhill asked if they should do a site walk before the meeting. Mr. Cracknell said they should do it before the mockup.

II. OLD BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARINGS)

1. Petition of **Joseph and Zulmira Almeida Revocable Trust, owner**, for property located at **27 Rogers Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear addition) Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 at Lot 41 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the June 4, 2014 meeting to the June 11, 2014 meeting.)*

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **postpone** the application to the June 18, 2014 meeting. Councilor Kennedy seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 5-0.*

2. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Portwalk HI, LLC, owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (changes to all facades) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1-2 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the May 21, 2014 meeting to the June 11, 2014 meeting.)*

Councilor Kennedy stated that people were concerned that the Commission was doing work sessions and voting on them that same evening because they might have questions and weren't there for the public hearing. She asked if there was a way to have a work session and have the public come back with input. Chairman Almeida didn't know the legalities but knew it had become standard practice to do combined work sessions/public hearings. Mr. Cracknell stated that all work sessions/public hearings were on the agenda as potential public hearings, and no one should assume that a work session/public hearing would not go into public hearing right after the work session. There was nothing illegal or inappropriate about coming out of a work session and voting on the project if it had been posted as a public hearing. The public just needed to know if it was on the agenda. Councilor Kennedy replied that a project as large as Portwalk took time to process, and the public would have liked to comment on the HDC's thoughts of doing a mockup.

Mr. Jeff Johnston of Cathartes Private Investments and Mr. Matt Worth of Pro Con, Inc. were present to speak to the application. Mr. Johnston apologized to the Commission about the mockup. Mr. Johnston stated that he received a letter from Mr. Cracknell about the third part of the review and said he incorporated comments from the Commission and made some changes. Mr. Johnston mentioned that they had the photos that Chairman Almeida had requested as well. Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Johnston to begin with Facades 1 and 2.

Mr. Worth said that, based on discussions with Mr. McNeely and the concerns about the corner and how the column related to the bay, they kept the color of the base and lightened up the piece at the bottom of the bay using fiber cement banding for detailing in the same materials. It had been originally approved as FRP, but they did the fiber cement so that it blended together. They added trim to the top of the column to tie in with the gray bands of the storefront, and they added the granite base. The retail doors at the corner would be retained. The residential door, which

was the main entrance on the right side of the tan building, and another door were enhanced with oversized poles to differentiate them. Mr. Johnston asked if the Commission preferred a solid door for the residential entrance, and Chairman Almeida agreed and said his suggestion was that all doors at ground level would be changed. Mr. Johnston said they would change out the residential doors that they knew were fixed, but the other doors were retail and they would draw those doors out. The retail was expanded on Hanover Street, and the tenant would come back with their own signage and elements. The space would be leased within a year or so, but they could change the doors to wood beforehand. Councilor Kennedy asked the rationale for making the gray column gray. Mr. Worth told her they tried to disconnect the column from the bay, and the gray portion was the base of the entire structure, as suggested by Mr. McNeely.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought Building #2 had gone backwards by having a fourth bay added and felt that one façade was at odds with the rest of the complex because of the diamond pattern. Chairman Almeida said they should discuss a way to mitigate it. Mr. Johnston said the diamond building was a big departure, and there was concern about the amount of glazing because it was not as much as previously approved. The base had been changed so that the pilaster centered on the windows, but the new design concept had windows and glazing that broke up the diamond. Chairman Almeida noted that other comments had been previously made about the piece being set back further, and the biggest concern had been the first two floors relating to the pedestrian experience. He preferred the offset central door balcony scheme and the awnings going all the way across. Ms. Ruedig preferred the centralized look as well because the offset made it look like a secondary building. Vice-Chair Kozak found the diamond pattern the most objectionable part and thought it needed something more traditional. There was a lot of brick in downtown Portsmouth as well as granite and wood buildings, and her biggest fear was that the whole city block would be a mass of red brick. She suggested that Bay 2 be more like Bay 3. Mr. Johnston said they would look into it. Ms. Ruedig felt that they couldn't hide the fact that it was a new building and felt that it was a new design introduced Downtown. She liked the color and the fact that it wasn't shiny diamond glass or metal, and she thought the fiber cement gave it a stucco or terra cotta look. Mr. Wyckoff asked why the symmetry of the window openings came into play in a contemporary building with siding on it. Chairman Almeida said it was a secondary building and could be set back further as an infill piece because it was not the formal entrance and could be treated differently. Vice-Chair Kozak thought the proportions of the façade would improve. Mr. Gladhill thought it would have the same roofline. Mr. Worth said they could bring in a small piece to break it up or bring it down or up. Mr. Wyckoff asked if he meant breaking two windows off from the triangle. Mr. Worth told him that it would read as another material. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a small 500 square-foot storefront.

Chairman Almeida summarized that there was concern from Vice-Chair Kozak, Mr. Gladhill and Councilor Kennedy about the loss of symmetry in Façade 2 because of the addition of the row of windows, and the suggestion was that there be a material change on the added row of four windows, leaving behind the symmetry. He thought the Commission felt that the awnings traveling along the base was a good thing that would provide shelter and interest at the street level. Mr. Johnston said they could make the awning different on the last bay. Mr. Worth said there had been a concern that the spandrel glass at the bottom of the tenant spaces on the Hanover Street side would be too close to eye level, so they took the spandrel out and would fabricate it all the way down to get rid of the hard line of the spandrel glass. He agreed with Mr.

Cracknell on the makeup of the bronze historical plaque. Vice-Chair Kozak asked about the plaque's purpose, and Mr. Worth told her it would be used as a reference to the North End and the changes over the years. Mr. Johnston stated that the additional amount of storefront caused the trash room to shrink and the pedestrian experience to be improved. Chairman Almeida brought up the single door on Hanover Street and asked whether the bay of storefront could be brought down to street level, with a second egress coming out of the larger tenant space. Councilor Kennedy asked what happened to the original two doors. Mr. Worth told her the tenant space was expanded. Mr. Johnson added that it had to do with the parking garage and the steel pieces behind it. They could step the door back and change the material, but they didn't want to draw people to it because it was on a back street. Chairman Almeida said he didn't want to see it recessed or be able to see through the garage and thought it would be better to leave it and mitigate it. He felt that Hanover Street was not a friendly pedestrian experience.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought the window sill height was too high and should be made eye level. Mr. Worth said they had done that by taking the spandrel out. Vice-Chair Kozak thought the windows looked like they were 5' tall. Mr. Worth agreed that they were tall at the very end but were less tall before reaching that point. Chairman Almeida said that he had asked if the sidewalk could be brought up so that the sill would be at knee or shoulder level and was certain that they would have the City's cooperation. Vice-Chair Kozak stated that Hanover Street was a tough place, with the parking garage and the solid masonry walls, and she felt that the window sills needed to be lowered on that important corner. Mr. Wyckoff thought if the windows could go no lower than floor level, the elevation could be lifted. He referred to the unfinished arch and thought they had discussed that it could take on the whole section with perhaps trim color changes. Mr. Worth told him that they had, and that the panels below and the trim color matched the windows, and also the corbels were back. Mr. Wyckoff thought they could add more interest on Hanover Street just by taking away the mass of bricks. Chairman Almeida asked how wide the sidewalk was and was told 7'. He said that people enjoyed seeing things like benches, trees and planters when walking down Market Street, and the applicant had the opportunity to place planters between every bay. Councilor Kennedy wanted to see a design of how they could make it better, like the arch material. Mr. Worth said they had changed the color of the trim and had removed the corbels. Chairman Almeida asked if they could see down into the parking garage volumes. Mr. Johnston said it was all foundation. Vice-Chair Kozak referenced the building by the Memorial Bridge that had parking below the sidewalk and had half-round windows, which was better than seeing a solid wall. Vice-Chair Kozak asked about decorative grates. Mr. Worth told her that they had planned to use grates as part of the ventilation system but discovered that the system had to come out of the center of the deck, so grates were no longer required. They had discussed the trim details on the arch, and the trim details that were on the windows of the second façade now matched the windows and the panels below them. Within the green section of the facade, the trim details matched the windows. Mr. Wyckoff confirmed that the windows, trim and the panel below were dark, and asked if the fiber cement siding color was a separate color. He was told that it was. Chairman Almeida asked if they had done it so the same window wouldn't march across the different piece. Mr. Worth said that it was more in height with the patio doors. Mr. Johnston said the piece was set back and the railing still had to go in.

Vice-Chair Kozak said that she was initially upset to see the added rows without the railings, but she eventually felt that it was an improvement because the column piers related more to the

windows above them. She asked if they could reduce the railings because they looked flat, and she also felt that it would be better if they didn't have the odd column window arrangement that they previously had. Mr. Wyckoff confirmed that the doors opened and said they needed a rail. Chairman Almeida said that he appreciated doors that actually opened because they activated the street more. He didn't have an issue with more doors being added, but he thought the metal railings might fade and the shine bothered him. Vice-Chair Kozak asked how far the railings projected off the face of the brick and was told it was less than 4". She said there were great metal balconies on Ceres Street and had seen beautiful ornate metal railings connected with brackets. The way they were connected was important, and the proposed railings didn't have that, but she thought more detailed railings would help. Chairman Almeida said that he had encouraged people to come up with ideas, and the Commission hadn't discussed sculpture. Something like the information kiosk in Market Square or small wood-frame structures at pedestrian level were items that could mitigate and were preferable to shiny railings.

Mr. Worth next discussed Facades 5, 6, and 7 and said they removed the spandrel panels at the bottom to bring the glass down to minimize its impact. Since Maplewood Avenue went uphill, the amount of glass would be less as it went further up the block. They also had discussed making the entry canopy at the storefront a rigid one and bringing it down to the pedestrian level or changing its shape to give it more style and presence. Chairman Almeida verified that the awning was still fabric and asked whether they could do a lightweight metal structure to celebrate the entrance. He referenced the awning over the aluminum and iron double doors and thought an awning should be substantial when placed over a primary entrance. Mr. Johnston said there was more glazing and the awning detail had changed, so it wasn't like any other awning. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the round portion was. Mr. Johnston said it was just to celebrate the entrance. Chairman Almeida thought it looked like a Blockbuster awning. He compared the awning on the corner with the steel frame and the one on Portwalk Place that could have a steel-bracketed shelter instead of fabric. Mr. Johnston told him that they could make the doors more interesting. Chairman Almeida suggested mahogany doors with a plain awning. Mr. Johnston told him he would input from the tenant. Ms. Ruedig thought the widening of the bay was more successful, and Vice-Chair Kozak thought it accentuated the doors well. Chairman Almeida said he'd like to see all the features put back. Councilor Kennedy requested a drawing with and without the pieces because she needed to see the height of the windows. Mr. Worth said there were only light fixtures and no trees or planters on Maplewood Avenue due to the electrical duct work. Councilor Kennedy asked what they could do to the building to make it look like an entryway to the City. Mr. Worth mentioned the brick sidewalks. Chairman Almeida asked if there were more light fixtures than shown and Mr. Worth told him there weren't. Vice-Chair Kozak noted that three of the window bays had shifted over and didn't align. Mr. Wyckoff said that the storefront bay could be modified to make it more significant so that it was not the same as the rest of the sidewalk experience. Mr. Johnston replied that all the spandrel had been taken off the bay. Councilor Kennedy asked if a marquee could be installed instead of an awning. Mr. Johnston said they would come back with different components.

Mr. Worth said they had a few options for the transformer gate, such as a lower option that was the same material as previously approved and was used in other places on the building. Their goal was not to invite people to it because it was utilitarian. The Commission had felt that it should be high to mimic the wall. Mr. Gladstone asked if they could see through the proposed

gate. Mr. Worth said that it was perforated and one could see through it but wouldn't see the transformers. Chairman Almeida asked if they had a landscape architectural design for the wall, and Mr. Johnston showed him a sketch. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if a vehicle could go through the gate, and Mr. Worth explained that access to the transformers involved a crane on Maplewood Avenue. Vice-Chair Kozak said she had voted against it the first time, but the second time she had approved it because of the changes in the wall. The back of the building faced Maplewood Avenue and she thought they needed to make it look more like the front. When they originally had a dumpster gate on Maplewood Avenue, she had brought up the historic precedent of a formal gate centered on an axis to a view of a building behind. At that point, it was centered behind but it was a dumpster, so it went away and became a sidewalk. By adding a gate to the end of it that went to the transformer, she thought they were back to square one, which was the back alley wall. She felt that good walls provided a public outdoor space. She liked the landscaping and thought it would transform the wall, but the punctuation at the end was ruining it. She thought it could be relocated to the center to create a formal gesture. If the capstone were carried across the lintel and had the gates under it, the profile would be unbroken. Ms. Ruedig said it was a grand front piece wall and thought some symmetry could be put in the wall or some lights that would be like a central marker to the wall. Vice-Chair Kozak mentioned Sir Christopher Wren who built the Cathedral of St. Paul that had a building behind it like the Warner House house. Her point was that there was always a view.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was a way that the granite planters could continue across the gate. Mr. Worth said that they already did, with a solid top. Mr. Wyckoff asked why it couldn't be planters. Mr. Johnston said there was one planter at the pilaster, but the rest of it was access for PSNH. Councilor Kennedy thought the greenery was great but wasn't permanent. Chairman Almeida mentioned a detailed landscape architect's concept from 2012 that he had liked because it was a place to sit, yet he didn't see it in the drawing. He thought the wall was misunderstood by everyone and asked if the applicant had considered a vertical garden on the gate or something sculptural. The public had suggested eliminating the wall by using greenery. Mr. Worth said he would like to put trees down Maplewood Avenue, but it was all utilities. Mr. Johnston said that Maplewood Avenue was a four-lane highway, so people walked up against the building due to the traffic. The reason they had put a metal grill had been to make people comfortable. They had improved it by growing the retail by 70', and they took the exit out of Maplewood Avenue and put it on Portwalk Place, which they thought was a great solution. Vice-Chair Kozak asked Chairman Almeida to explain the sketch for the public's benefit, which he did. Vice-Chair Kozak asked how they would hide the gate. Mr. Gladhill said the gate should be the same height as the wall. Johnston said it was set back 4'. Mr. Wyckoff verified that the pilasters were 3' squared and asked if it would look formal by adding finials. Mr. Johnston mentioned a few painted brick examples in Portsmouth. Vice-Chair Kozak said that she preferred not to see it as a gate because it was in the wrong place and should be camouflaged. Chairman Almeida suggested a mahogany gate, and Mr. Johnston told him they could do it in wood. Councilor Kennedy said the gate had to be metal. Mr. Wyckoff thought it should be a continuation of the wall with the same height and plane and asked if it had to be recessed. Mr. Johnston said it would stick out onto Maplewood Avenue if it weren't. Ms. Ruedig said the Commission didn't want to see a gate at the end of a formal wall. Chairman Almeida thought that if they brought it forward, it would be seen, but Mr. Wyckoff thought it would make it go away more. Vice-Chair Kozak suggested that a wrought-iron vine leaf design would be beautiful.

Chairman Almeida told the applicant to come back with a revised design for the gate. Mr. Johnston asked if the Commission could approve a motion stating that the height perforated behind the gate be subject to the plane so that they'd know there was a gate there and they could go to the Planning Board with it. Chairman Almeida asked the Commission if they could make a motion to get the height, location and material. Councilor Kennedy thought the height was the only choice they had. Mr. Worth mentioned a previous discussion when Mr. McNeely had been concerned that the paint on the 5th floor would fade and would not match the brick. They had originally chosen a tan color to be close to the brick, but the Commission had asked for a lighter color. He showed an alternative tan shade. Chairman Almeida thought it was an improvement that the Commission would approve. Mr. Worth also stated that they added transom windows from inside the tenant space to get a more pedestrian-level window. Chairman Almeida thought it was a minor change. Mr. Wyckoff suggested adding a wood rail to the top of all the balconies because it would help warm the balconies up. Councilor Kennedy agreed that the balconies needed something, especially on Maplewood Avenue. Chairman Almeida thought it wouldn't have to return back. Mr. Worth asked if he meant Maplewood Avenue or Hanover Street. Councilor Kennedy told him both, but Maplewood Avenue was more important because it was the 'front door'. Mr. Wyckoff thought it should be all the balconies. Mr. Cracknell reminded them of the polished granite panels. Mr. Worth said the Commission's biggest concern was that the granite was broken up into smaller pieces, but it actually wasn't. Mr. Johnston said that the black metal grill had been previously approved and the granite material was an upgrade with a nicer detail. He asked if they wanted it ripped out and the old grill put back. Vice-Chair Kozak replied that it was more interesting than a blank wall.

Chairman Almeida opened up the public comment session.

Mr. Joe Caldarola of 170 Dennett Street placed a poster of a sketch on the easel and said that the top of the towers facing Deer Street did not match the originally-approved plan. Portwalk Place and Deer Street bothered him the most. He advised the Commission that when they went on their site walk, they should look closely at the painted concrete panels that replaced the aluminum panels facing Maplewood Avenue and Deer Street. It was originally approved as painted aluminum. Mr. McNeely had considered them to be equal materials, but the Board had dismissed the issue. At the time, they weren't painted, but not they looked cheap. In the sun, one could see the spray lines and the inconsistencies, and close to the panels, the texture was inconsistent. In all, they had little resemblance to the approved prefinished aluminum and had a shoddy appearance, both from a distance and up close. He disagreed with Chairman Almeida about the wall because of the human scale problem. The wall started at 9'6" on the Deer Street side, and the only thing separating a pedestrian from the wall was the 2' planter. The wall started at 9'6" and ended at Hanover Street at 11'6". It felt like a prison wall, and he felt it would feel that way even with greenery on it because of its scale. Placing the grate in front of it wouldn't address the scale because the depth of it would be perceived as 3' thick due to the towers. He had learned that the transformer access situation could not allow the planters to be widened into the property. In trying to figure out what could be done to reduce the scale, he came up with the idea that a planter could be added to the deck to have more depth perception and also lower the element directly against the sidewalk. The planter would start out at 6" above the sidewalk on Deer Street and end up at 30" on the other end. He showed how his poster illustrated his

solution. Chairman Almeida thought it seemed a bit counterfeit because they didn't have 9' sidewalks or a parking or bike lane. Mr. Caldarola told him that was Part 2. He said that the deck was shown as 20" off the sidewalk. Mr. Johnston told him that it varied and asked Mr. Caldarola if his idea eliminated parking spaces. Mr. Caldarola replied that it did not. Mr. Johnston said it wouldn't meet code. Mr. Caldarola talked about Planning Board regulations and said that a visual barrier would not be perceived as one to pedestrians because of the distance. Instead of a vertical wall of vines, there would be a variety of plants and more texture.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street stated that she had lived at Portwalk for three years and faced the diamond-shaped section. She didn't feel that it had to be all brick. Her balcony was not shiny. However, the wall drove her crazy. Walking around the building, one would see that it was the only solid wall in the entire structure. Everything else was open and glass, but once people moved in, there would be lights and activity, so the wall wouldn't be a big deal. The applicant changed the top windows, but one couldn't tell the difference on the Portwalk side. They looked the same because the brick came up and covered them. She thought the mitigation could have been different. She felt that the developers were doing a great job and suggested that they stay with the diamond pattern because it made the buildings look different.

No one else rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public comment session.

Chairman Almeida stated that they could go into the public hearing if the Commissioners felt that they could make motions. Mr. Wyckoff said they had started with Mr. McNeely's items on Facades 1 and 2, the color changes and additional trim around the column. Councilor Kennedy wanted to see what Façade 2 looked like but was willing to make motions on the gate and the color. Mr. Johnston asked the Commission how they would feel about the detail on the diamond building being treated as one. Chairman Almeida said it would create a different symmetry, and he offered another approach of having the two center bays the same.

They next went into the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Chairman Almeida requested that the applicant present only the three items that they would vote on that evening to prevent them from discussing items they knew would be continued to the following month. He read the application description into the record as a public hearing. Mr. Johnston re-introduced himself and stated that the items for consideration that evening were Item #3, the band modifications, which were the pier details; Item #1, the storefront modifications including the mahogany door at residential and the band height on the diamond building, knowing the diamond building had to come back. Mr. Johnston was reminded that he should refer to the items by their facades, so he started over.

Mr. Johnston stated that the changes for consideration that evening were Items #1 and #2 on Facades 1 and 2, Items A#3 and perhaps Item #4, changing the residential door to mahogany. Item #1 on Façade 5, deleting the spandrel glass, installing a bronze historical marker, installing trim detail including trim detail around the windows; and Item #5, the narrow section windows will be approved. They were seeking approval for the storefront modifications, excluding the

entry to the Maplewood Avenue entrance, and approval for the transformer gate, Option A or B. Chairman Almeida confirmed that the only difference between the two options was the height. Mr. Johnston said they were seeking approval for Item #2 on the plan, the 5th floor siding and door modifications and window modifications, the color, the window and door heights on the 5th floor, and the façade abutting the parking deck. The spandrel glass would be deleted at floor level. On Facades 5B and 7, they were seeking approval on the storefront and window modifications and the columns shifting. Mr. Gladhill asked if he wanted approval for the metal grill changing to polished granite on Façade 5, and Mr. Johnston agreed. Mr. Wyckoff clarified that Mr. Johnston had said Option A or B for the height of the transformer gate because he saw Option 1 and 2. He asked if Option 1 was the higher gate, and Mr. Johnston agreed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Joe Caldarola of 170 Dennett Street didn't think the Commission could vote on the height of the gate without acknowledging the wall's existence, and he questioned whether the wall should remain. The building had many unauthorized changes, saving the developer a lot of money, and he asked if the Board could mitigate a portion of the building even if it had been originally approved. Many people believed that the wall was the worst part of the building and needed to be mitigated. He referred to his poster and talked about the street study that the City, illustrating what would happen if some of the City's recommendations were included in pedestrian improvements on Maplewood Avenue. He felt the best improvement would be the creation of human scale on the property and changing a traffic lane to a parking lane to use the extra 4' for a tree strip. He believed it would calm the traffic and create more pedestrian use. He told the Commission that they had the power to make Portwalk address their portion of it, and the City could follow up and do what they thought was right.

Mr. Bill Healey of Dennis Street stated that he had not understand Mr. Caldarola's concept until just then when Mr. Caldarola explained what the City would do independent of what the HDC would do. He thought it made a lot more sense than the wall and encouraged the Commission to consider Mr. Caldarola's suggestion.

Mr. Peter Weeks of Newcastle said he recognized the problems the Board had in sorting everything out, and he thought they and Mr. McNeely had good suggestions. He had gone on the site walk with the Planning Board when the landscape plan for the wall on Maplewood Avenue was presented, and he thought it was much better than the current wall. He believed that the whole context would change when the planters and vines were added and thought it was a mistake for the Commission to say that they would make the changes without seeing the finished product. He believed that it would be a great improvement and hoped that the Commission would consider the suggested changes and move forward.

Mr. Jonathan Gilbert of 15 Thornton Street supported Mr. Caldarola's ideas and thought the building was out of human proportion for Portsmouth. Anything that could be done on the sidewalks would help attract people to it. The calming of Maplewood Avenue would be a great idea, as well as lowering the wall. People had concerns about human scale and the attractiveness of being down on the sidewalks, and he supported Mr. Caldarola's scheme or something similar.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street told the Commission that the wall should not be up for discussion because it had been built as previously approved. The discussion should only be about the gate, which she agreed should be taller and have decorative designs. The purpose of the wall was to block the lights from the parking deck, and the lights wouldn't work if the wall was lowered. She couldn't see busy Maplewood Avenue reduced in width for the sake of a short span of solid wall. She asked that the Commission approve the other items so that they could move on. People were waiting to move in and work there.

Ms. Carolyn Gregory, General Manager of the Burger Bar, agreed with Ms. DeStefano and said The Burger Bar and other restaurants were waiting for things to be finished, like the retail on Deer Street and the hotel occupancy. It would support the economic development in the City, and she suggested that the Commission move on it quickly.

Mr. Kevin Walker, General Manager of the Hilton Garden Inn and the Hampton Inn at downtown Portsmouth, stated that he had been involved in Phase 1 of the Hilton Garden Inn and was proud to work at Portwalk. It was exciting to see it come together. He said the Hilton Garden Inn and Residence Inn repeatedly won awards, as he was sure the Hampton Inn would. He asked for their support with opening their hotel in late June or early July. The guests were ready to go and the employees were ready to work. He said he had already hired 15 employees and had 20 more positions to fill. An additional 120 hotel rooms would maximize revenues. The garage was also ready to open and would alleviate parking issues.

No one else rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public session.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **approve** Item #4 in Facades 5, 6, and 7, the color on the top of the building. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** Item #3 in Facades 5, 6, and 7, the transformer gate Option 1 as presented with the following stipulation:*

- 1) that it be just the gate and the height, not the final decorative*

Mr. Cracknell told Mr. Wyckoff that he needed to stipulate that Option 1 was not as presented but was the metal with the height as shown.

*Mr. Wyckoff **rescinded** his motion to discuss it more.*

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** Item #3 in Facades 5, 6, and 7, the transformer gate Option 1, with the following stipulation:*

- 1) that the gates be at the plane of the existing wall and not have a final design element on the outside.*
- 2) That the final design be revisited.*

Mr. Gladhill seconded.

Councilor Kennedy stated that she would not vote for it because she wanted to get it right. She wanted to see the final item and the design before voting. Mr. Gladhill said that the applicant needed the approval so they could get site approval before the Planning Board the following week. Mr. Cracknell stated that the issue was the design, and he didn't think the Planning Board needed a final vote on that item in order to proceed. Mr. Gladhill said the wall had already been approved, and they were looking at changes done without their approval to see how to make them better. The developers had to know where they stood. Mr. Cracknell stated that the stipulation was that Option 1 would be revised to have the same height as the wall. Stipulation #2 was that the final design of the gate would be subject to final HDC approval. Chairman Almeida wouldn't support it because he thought they should solve the gate all at once. Mr. Wyckoff was comfortable with Option 1 as presented and said he had made the final design a stipulation as a concession to move it along. Chairman Almeida said he wouldn't approve half a gate but would support a motion to approve Option 1 as presented.

*The motion **failed** to pass, with 3 in favor and 4 opposed (Councilor Kennedy, Chairman Almeida, Vice-Chair Kozak and Ms. Ruedig).*

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** Item #3 on Facades 5, 6, and 7, that the transformer gate be approved as presented in Option 1. Mr. Gladhill seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the design was within the integrity of the District and would maintain it. It was a quality gate and he supported it. Ms. Ruedig said she was not clear about the gate and wanted to think about it and also consider the idea for a better design, so she wouldn't vote for it.

*The motion **failed to pass** with 3 in favor and 3 opposed (Councilor Kennedy, Ms. Ruedig, and Vice-Chair Kozak), resulting in a tie vote and ultimate failure of the motion.*

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** the following items: Item #1, the change in the column color; Item #2, the FRP trim change at the bottom of the fiber cement; Item #3, additional trim and the granite base increase; Item #4, the retail door at the corner retained as originally approved but changed to a wooden door as presented; and Item #5, the residential door would be wooden.*

Vice-Chair Kozak seconded.

Councilor Kennedy stated that she was not comfortable closing out Facades 1 and 2 and wanted to look at a new design. Vice-Chair Kozak agreed that Facades 1 and 2 were not comprehensive, but it was only five items.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **approve** Façade 5, Item #1 on Hanover Street, that the spandrel glass be removed and the windows lowered to floor height; Item #2, the bronze marker; Item A#3, the trim detail at the arch; Item #4, that the trim around the details match the windows colors; and Item #5, that the narrow green section of façade on Hanover Street with the panels and trim detail match the windows. Mr. Gladhill seconded.*

Mr. Gladhill asked if the Commission wanted to add Item #6, the metal grill changing to polished granite. Mr. Cracknell asked if they should add the stipulation that the HDC review the final plaque design as discussed. Vice-Chair Kozak agreed that it should be conditional to the HDC's review and approval. Vice-Chair Kozak stated that all the items were improvements. Getting rid of the spandrel was wonderful, and the bronze marker added interest at eye level. Improving the trim details and colors to correspond better with existing was an improvement. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that they were all improvements and met the criteria. Vice-Chair Kozak added that the five items were not comprehensive of all the changes on Façade 5 on Hanover Street because there were other items on that street that were not included in the motion. Mr. Wyckoff said it preserved the integrity and maintained the special character of the District. Adding trim around the windows complemented the building's architectural character.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **approve** Item #6, changing the metal grills to polished granite and accepting the change as constructed. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **approve** Items #1 and #2 on Facades 5B and 7, along the parking deck behind the wall, the modifications to the storefront windows and the shifting of the column. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

Vice-Chair Kozak said they were impossible to see from anywhere and were not out of keeping with the language of what had already been approved around it.

*The motion **passed** with 5 in favor and 1 opposed (Councilor Kennedy).*

Mr. Cracknell stated that Items #5 and #6 on Facades 5, 6, and 7 had not been addressed. The window and door heights on the 5th floor parking deck had been decreased and the spandrel glass removed on that elevation.

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **approve** Item #6, removing the spandrel glass and lowering the windows to floor height. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

Vice-Chair Kozak thought it improved the pedestrian experience by getting rid of the spandrel glass at eye level.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

In summary:

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to grant **partial approval** of the apartment portion of the application with the following items approved (as enumerated in the principal planner's memo to the HDC dated June 11, 2014 (see attached memo) in reference to the submitted plans prepared by Pro Con Incorporated, dated 5/27/14 and date-stamped June 4, 2014 by the Planning Department). *

Facades 1 & 2 – Portwalk Place

- #1 – The column color shall be changed to gray;
- #2 – The FRP trim at the bottom shall be changed to fiber cement to match the rest of the bay;
- #3 – Additional trim shall be added and the height of the granite base shall be increased;
- #4 – The retail doors at the corner shall be retained as originally approved;
- #5 – Pulls shall be added to the residential doors and the residential doors shall be upgraded to be solid wood;

* Other modifications to the apartment portion of the building are pending Commission approval.

Façade 5 – Hanover Street

- #1 – The spandrel glass along the floor level shall be removed and the window openings shall be lowered to the floor height;
- #2 – A bronze historical marker shall be added along the blank portion of the wall below the trash room on Hanover Street. The applicant shall come back to the HDC for final approval of the plaque design for this location;
- #3 – The trim detail shall be refined and corbels shall be added at the arch location as previously approved;
- #4 – The trim detail around the windows in the second façade segment shall match the color of the windows;
- #5 – The panels below the windows in the narrow green section of the façade shall be removed and trim details shall match the windows;

Façade 5,6 & 7 – Maplewood Avenue

- #5 – The window and door heights on the fifth floor section next to the parking deck shall be decreased and the windows sizes shall be increased on the abutting façade;
- #6 – The spandrel glass along the floor level of the entire elevation shall be removed and the window openings shall be lowered to the floor height;
- #7 – Polished granite panels shall replace the previously approved metal grills;

Façade 5B & 7 – Parking Deck along Maplewood Avenue

- #1 – The storefront windows shall be modified as presented;
- #2 – The window columns on fifth floor shall be modified as presented;

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **continue** the Portwalk project to the July meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Kevin M. Semprini, owner**, for property located at **300 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish house) and allow a new free standing structure (construct 2,200 sq. ft. home) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 36 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

The designer Mr. David Witham and the owners Mr. Kevin Semprini and Ms. Maureen Semprini were present to speak to the application. Mr. Witham stated that Mr. Semprini grew up in the house, which his father built in 1958, and he wanted to move back. The foundation was solid and the house itself had good bones but did not meet his needs or the HDC criteria. They wanted to raise the house and save the first-floor deck and the foundation. He showed the existing footprint and the proposed addition with a 2' partial bump-out in the front and a bump-out in the rear to extend the garage. He showed a model that he had built to illustrate the house's volumes. They could have taken a traditional approach, like a Colonial or Cape with a center door and two double hung windows on the side, but it didn't meet the client's needs or the enjoyment of the property. The house was 5' from the grade of the road, with great views of the water. They decided on more of a New Englander vernacular with additions that appeared to have been added to the structure over time. The basic ell-shaped structure was the main house based on a 16' width, not common but in line with the South End. The narrow width with a steep pitch would be kept. The middle section had the look of a later addition, taking the views in consideration and keeping the traditional elements of the window style. There were water views from the kitchen, so they would have a 21" wide window at the sink for an open kitchen. They designed an open porch that later got enclosed. The garage itself was on the same footprint, and he put a 12/12 pitch roof with cedar shakes in keeping with the area and moved the roof orientation 90 degrees to echo the other end of the house. He did a simple shed roof off the back based on the foundation and to keep the 16' width of the house. They had put a lot of thought in their floor plans, foundation and setbacks. They buffed out 2' to get 16' for the visual interest so that the volumes read clearer, and he created a few jogs so that the main volumes would be stronger. He studied the mix of Colonials and New Englanders in the area to pick up on those themes.

Mr. Gladhill noted that the house was next to other 1950 homes and asked why they felt that the 1950s architecture was not worth saving in the District. Mr. Witham said that the house next door was a ranch that had gone through renovations and ended up with windows changed to 4/1, and it wasn't a ranch anymore. His objective had been to add more living space to the home by going up to get the volume to get the setbacks, so he had to lose the Ranch style. He didn't think that a Ranch really added to the historic character of Portsmouth nor to the District, and he didn't think residents would ever go back to the Ranch style. Vice-Chair Kozak stated that she hated the demolition of anything in the District and thought that some Ranches were beautiful in Portsmouth and exemplified great features. The applicant's property was missing one of the defining characteristics of a classic Ranch, the deep eave overhang with a strong horizontal design. The massive masonry chimney, usually a prominent feature, was also missing. The windows were okay but not typical of a high-style Ranch. If it were a monument to its type, she would say that it had to be saved. Ms. Ruedig didn't feel that it was even one of the very common types of Ranches. It wasn't a high-style Ranch, but even if it were a medium style, she

would make an argument to save it since it had the context of other 1950s construction and felt that it didn't have to be a monument to save. Mr. Semprini mentioned that it was the only property his parents could afford at the time because it faced the river and people thought it would be too cold to live there. Mr. Wyckoff thought Mr. Witham's design was a good one. Chairman Almeida especially liked the enclosed porch area in the front and the covered breezeway. Mr. Gladhill thought that some of the house was facing the side lot and asked why the front façade was not facing the road, which was a major thoroughfare. Mr. Witham said they hadn't considered it the front façade and viewed it as a secondary entrance to the home. The home didn't really have a formal entrance due to the covered porch. Chairman Almeida agreed that it didn't look like a formal entrance on the side but didn't think it was a bad thing because it would be seen and it didn't look like the back of the house. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the tree would be kept and was told it would. He said it obscured the side that looked like the front.

Councilor Kennedy concluded that it would be a New Englander on the water and had no problem with the demolition and the facades. Ms. Ruedig was not for reconstruction of a house that was meant to look old because she thought it was a fantasy creation of an old house. It was disingenuous, not authentic. She preferred to see traditional designs and the construction of a new house with a clear entrance on the front façade. She suggested they make the eave the front of the house. Mr. Witham disagreed and thought that even if he built a reproduction Colonial, he asked what the difference would be with a reproduction Colonial addition on the side. He had picked up on elements from the street and there wasn't a way that he could make the house look new, although there was leeway in making it the front of the house. A lot of the design was program-generated, they had changed all the windows, and he thought they had a new house. Ms. Ruedig said that perhaps it was the way he presented it, but it was meant to look like a historic house, with all the ells and additions, and was not a new design.

Chairman Almeida didn't feel that it looked like a bunch of additions that just happened over time but thought it looked cohesive and interesting. Mr. Wyckoff said every constructed new house looked like something else, and the current rage was a 1920s Craftsman-style house with the farmer's porch on the front, but they were still new houses. He felt that Mr. Witham had designed a new house with a concrete foundation, and no one would try to pass it off as something else. Vice-Chair Kozak thought it was appropriate to look for historic forms. She felt that she was looking at the back, and the shed addition that melted into the porch addition made her think of a farmhouse. She suggested that it be simplified like the front. If the porch ell became more of a unified element instead of all the sheds on the back, it would simplify it. A New Englander style of bay normally had a front door next to it with an ornate canopy or a small porch and railing. Mr. Witham could reinterpret it and make it a balustrade across the top for a roof deck over the porch that would be more cohesive. Councilor Kennedy was comfortable with it and didn't believe that one house should be a focal point in any neighborhood.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Witham if he had considered extruding the roof pitch all the way across the house. Mr. Witham replied that it had felt too wide. Ms. Ruedig stated that she didn't mean that no new architecture should be derivative. It was all derivative of some sort of previous style, which she thought should be captured because it was in context. All she had suggested was that Mr. Witham not try so hard to make it look like an old building. He could clarify the front entrance by putting a cut in the roofline to announce that it was the entry to the front. Mr.

Wyckoff thought the covered landing could be too deep. Mr. Gladhill said it worked as a porch but not as the front main entrance to the home. Mr. Witham said he had tried to find elements that everyone would be comfortable with to create a house that fit the foundation. He didn't feel that people would drive by and think there was something not quite right with the house. It wasn't a New Englander. He noted that a lot of the area's homes started as one style and became something else when the vernacular took over.

Chairman Almeida opened up the public comment session, but no one rose to speak, so he closed the public session.

Chairman Almeida suggested another work session. Mr. Semprini asked if the Commission would consider a small balcony over the porch. Mr. Gladhill didn't think it would be a problem if it was on the side. Mr. Wyckoff said he hadn't seen much success with second-floor balconies. If someone changed the siding, they realized that all the sheeting was wrong.

The Commission recommended another work session.

B. Work Session requested by **402 State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **402 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear additions) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct staircase addition) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding windows, add skylights) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 12 and lies within the CD4-L, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Jason Beane of Blue Water Construction was present to speak to the application. He wanted to convert a mixed-use building into a 3-unit condo. They would focus on the back elevation to bring back traditional features of the building like the 2-story bow windows on the back area. They would eliminate the vinyl siding and replace it with traditional or concrete clapboards. They wanted to remove the two one-story wings for parking and the appearance of the building as well as to open up the area for more space. They wouldn't touch the front elevation but wanted to carry a lot of those details to the rear of the elevation and continue it. Mr. Beane showed the first wing's oversized picture window that would be removed. He said the other wing was a one-story decayed wing of newer construction that didn't have the same foundation.

Chairman Almeida the Commissioners if they had comments from the site walk. Mr. Wyckoff said he had noticed the height of the bow windows on the 2nd story and thought it was important. He asked about the projecting windows. Mr. Beane said they would maintain them and put a window seat inside. They eliminated another secondary addition and would add a rear entrance to the building that had no new addition. It would basically mimic the front entrance. He took the front bump-out with columns and granite steps and put it on the back as a rear entrance. Chairman Almeida thought what Mr. Beane had done was wonderful and had no issue with the removal of the secondary buildings because what he was exposing was far more valuable. Ms. Ruedig wanted more information on the one-story addition on the back because it was an older foundation and she wasn't sure that it would add much to the back of the building. She had no problem with the loss of the picture window addition but asked Mr. Beane to tell her what the

bottom of the bay window was originally. Mr. Beane said that the two-story shape could still be seen from the office. It was never clapboarded, and only the front window had been replaced with a door. Ms. Ruedig suggested making the rear entrance simpler. She was undecided about the decks on the back, especially on the bay window. Mr. Beane said the reason for the decks was the secondary egress. Each unit had part of the 3rd floor, so it was important to provide a patio deck for the second-floor units. Ms. Ruedig thought there was no strong glimpse of the back of the building. Mr. Gladstone asked how old the current windows were. Mr. Beane said they were a mix of original and replacements. The front windows were all original as well as the two gable end ones, and the back area was a mix that they would change out. Mr. Gladhill confirmed that Mr. Beane wasn't replacing the front end gable windows. Mr. Beane said he was concerned about the mechanisms on some of the windows and didn't know how they would repair them while still keeping the design intent. The only window he wanted to add near the gabled ends on the west side was above the door. Chairman Almeida confirmed that the next time they saw Mr. Beane, he would have removed those pieces and the remaining portion of the building would have the granite block foundation and would be moved back to the original. Councilor Kennedy said she preferred to see the old windows stay on the front and sides and was also concerned about the skylights in front of the buildings. Mr. Beane told her that they added the skylights to provide daylight in the upstairs bedrooms because there were only two windows, the gabled ends. The middle skylight was over a staircase to provide light.

Mr. Beane asked the Commission if he could apply to get the non-operative chimney on the 2nd floor removed. Ms. Ruedig and Mr. Gladhill stated that they wanted it to stay. Mr. Beane asked about a fake chimney. Chairman Almeida told him that people had to convince the Commission with a lot of details, such as using actual brick, flashing, replicating the chimney in every way and not fiberglass or cement board, and grouted lines. He said that, in essence, Mr. Beane would be building a brick chimney. Mr. Beane thought it would help his floor plan.

*The applicant indicated that they would **move forward** with a public hearing.*

C. Work Session requested by **Joan S. Davis and Charles P. Allard II, owners**, and **Elizabeth Levey-Pruyn and Bruce Erickson, applicants**, for property located at **35 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish exterior stairs, chimneys, and shed) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct addition, dormer, roof extension, decks, stairs) 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 29 and lies within the Waterfront District and Historic Districts.

Councilor Kennedy recused herself. The applicants Mr. Bruce Erickson and Ms. Levey-Pruyn and the architect Ms. Alyssa Murphy were present to speak to the application. Ms. Murphy told the Commission that the goal was to restore a lot of the features in the house. It was constructed in 1899 and had been converted into a two-family home. They wanted to make it a one-family home again and make some improvements to restore the historic character, improve access, and take advantage of the waterfront view. It was the only true New Englander among an eclectic mix of styles on the street. The site plan had been approved for the lot coverage by the BOA.

She had drawings showing all the exterior deck proposals. Mr. Erickson said they had not added the interior space to the drawings because it made it too difficult for the layout. Ms. Murphy said they wanted to retain the existing on the south elevation and reconstruct the deteriorating elements. A stair on the side that went up in to the 2nd floor apartment would be removed and the bump-out on the east side of the house would be clapboarded to match the rest of the house. Mr. Erickson said the two deteriorated chimneys were in the worst space for a layout and were not functional. Ms. Murphy said there were a few changes on the east elevation, one of which was adding a dormer to make a third bedroom.

Mr. Gladhill asked why they would not re-use the slate roof where the dormer was going. Ms. Murphy said they would retain the existing slate but instead of coming off the pitch of the roof, they would keep the dormer smaller to bring it down, which seemed to be more appropriate. Mr. Gladhill asked if they had thought of using faux slate. Ms. Murphy thought the metal would be a better contrast. Mr. Gladhill said he was not in favor of metal. Ms. Levey-Pruyn said she had photos of the house on the side that had a metal roof. They discussed the roof further. Mr. Erickson told them that architectural asphalt that looked like slate was less expensive for them. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a meltdown, which was melting it down as it was installed. Ms. Murphy said the roof wouldn't really show but they were open to materials. Mr. Gladstone mentioned a standing seam copper. Vice-Chair Kozak cited an example on Breaking New Grounds, where they had discussed standing seam versus a flatlock seam. The expert they spoke with had been against flatlock seam on a pitched roof because of the thermal expansion of the joint, so they had approved standing seam copper. Ms. Levey-Pruyn confirmed that the Commission would prefer to see that instead of fake slate. Chairman Almeida said that PVC membrane or painted aluminum standing seam roof would not be appropriate. Ms. Ruedig felt that the shed dormer was enormous and similar to one they had voted against on another project, so she suggested a bank of windows on the 3rd floor. Ms. Murphy told her they were improving upon the precedents that went all the way out to the edges by bringing the roof down as a more traditional dormer as well as bringing it in on both sides. Chairman Almeida noted that the dormers wouldn't go all the way to the main ridge and would be held in by significant amounts of the eave. Requests for South End shed dormers were normally to bring them within less than a foot to the edge, otherwise the original roof and eave lines would be eliminated. The side the applicant had chosen was hidden to New Castle Avenue, so it would hide it more. Mr. Erickson said they had thought the same thing when they designed it and hadn't liked the aesthetics of overbearing dormers, but there was the water view to think about. Ms. Ruedig said that even though it would be hidden by the side roads, it would be viewed from the water.

Chairman Almeida asked how they were treating the space between the windows and thought they'd be forced to use vertical boards between them because there was no space for clapboards. Mr. Wyckoff said they could drop a window and have four windows instead that could be grouped together to give it more room for siding. Ms. Murphy said it would be trim or vertical siding. Chairman Almeida said the Commission would not want to see little bits of clapboard. Mr. Wyckoff said that if two windows were grouped together, they'd like to see at least a stud pocket between them. Mr. Erickson thought the obvious window to remove would be the middle one, but that was where the proposed bathroom would go. He suggested a transom window in the middle. Ms. Ruedig was still uncomfortable with the large expansive dormer and thought two dormers would work better. Ms. Murphy said the house was very close to the neighbor's

house, the façade being 3' away from the neighbor's, so odd things had been done to it over time, like windows stuck in corners and under the outside stair. They wanted to change the windows to make them normal and match the windows on the other side in size and shape. Chairman Almeida asked that they show the Commission a photo of where the dormers would be seen. Mr. Erickson said the view of the dormers would be only from the water. Chairman Almeida said they still needed to understand where it would be seen from, no matter how subtle.

Ms. Murphy showed the rear elevation where most of the changes were proposed and said they were only visible from the water and would maximize the view from the interior out. There was evidence of an original larger window that had been replaced with a much smaller vinyl window. The windows had some space between them, but maybe not enough. The biggest change was the addition of the decks, one from the ground level to the 1st floor and the other a 2nd-story deck. Mr. Wyckoff verified that they would have cable rails. Chairman Almeida thought the loss of the little gable piece was unfortunate and asked if it was possible to do the deck over the bottom deck and have the doors come from where the double windows existed to preserve that little dip. Ms. Murphy said they had problems with the joint between the gable roof and the deck. Chairman Almeida said it appeared to be high quality and original to what was a deteriorated building and thought the scalloped shingles and tiny window were wonderful. Mr. Erickson agreed but said the interior floor plan was horrendous. Chairman Almeida asked if he had considered opening it up to the space below and having a high ceiling. Mr. Erickson said he had. The back area would become a walk-in closet, which destroyed the whole idea of being on the water because there would be no window. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the scalloped panels on the uppermost gable would remain. Ms. Levey-Pruyn said their intention was to restore the whole exterior except for that, and to also keep the slate roof. Mr. Gladhill said the drawings didn't reflect that. Mr. Wyckoff said the drawings didn't show the scalloped panels on the peak.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought it was great that the applicant was restoring the home to its original glory. Mr. Wyckoff suggested that they paint it another color instead of white. Ms. Levey-Pruyn agreed. Chairman Almeida referred to the floor plan and said he could see the door into the crawlspace but suggested that the deck come from another place. Mr. Erickson said the benefit of that space staying was debatable because it wasn't very high. Chairman Almeida said he could have a tall ceiling on the first floor. Ms. Levey-Pruyn said they had thought of that, and even though it would aesthetically look better from the back by breaking up the decks, it would eliminate the view because there would be no window. Mr. Wyckoff was convinced that the applicant had put a lot of thought into the project, and the fact that they were preserving the home meant a lot. The chimneys would be a problem they'd have to address.

Ms. Murphy stated that one of the chimneys was prominent and seen from all directions. The other chimney was where the proposed dormer was and wouldn't really be seen. Keeping the chimney in that location would create a conflict for a dormer. They wanted to have a small dormer in the front. If the chimney on the back had to remain, then the dormer conversation would change. They could preserve the more visible chimney on the southwest side. Mr. Gladhill said she had to look at the context of the entire project. Chairman Almeida thought the best thing would be to not assume the chimney would go away but to have an alternate plan thought out. Mr. Erickson asked if he meant from the roof line up. Mr. Wyckoff said that other chimneys had been made with thin-sliced brick adhered to cement board, and as long as they

were properly flashed and looked appropriate, they were fine. He thought the applicant could preserve the chimney top and support it underneath because it looked like there was room in the floor plan. Mr. Erickson said they had thought of a more gracious chimney just from the roof up.

Ms. Murphy said another aspect was a new door. There was an existing protrusion on one side, and the rest of the west façade would stay the same except for the door. They wanted to extend the slate roofline over and bring in an entrance on the side. They were dealing with a front door on Salter Street with no parking, so no one would really use the front door. A side entry would be in keeping with New Englanders. The protrusion was not lined up, so they had to extend it, and it seemed like the less intrusive way to do it. Chairman Almeida thought it was appropriate and that the door might give relief to the corner a bit to make it stronger. He wasn't sure if the proposed cable rail would look right. Ms. Murphy thought they would either make the side match the decks of the back or have the side look like more a traditional white railing matching the street on the front. Mr. Wyckoff told her that cable rails were popular and made sense because the only thing one saw was the top rail. Ms. Murphy said the view would be from the water, so the railing wouldn't really be seen. Mr. Gladhill asked if the railing would be on the house or further away from the house. Ms. Ruedig said it was painted wood so it would be visible on the front. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that the front was important.

The Commission recommended a work session/public hearing.

D. Work Session requested by **393 New Castle Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **393 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild back addition (Unit 389) with added entry, rear porch, and dormers, at Unit 391 move entry door to rear and add dormer) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 5 and lies within Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

The architect Ms. Anne Whitney and the owners Mr. Mark Kemp and Ms. Ellen Kemp were present to speak to the application. Mr. Kemp told the Commission that he and his wife had owned the house since 2001 and gave a brief history of the circa 1800s property. Ms. Whitney stated that the main part of the project was the back building. The existing trim was plywood and the timbers and cupola were original. The building itself was in poor condition. They wanted to rebuild the structure and make it a bit taller. Currently it was an apartment with a loft area, and they wanted to bring the building up to two stories but still keep the knee wall. She showed the existing cross-section and the elevations and discussed massing and rebuilding the structure. There was a one-story section that bumped into the original back building. They wanted to bring the 2' knee wall to 5' and do a dormer but let the wall go up two stories. They would remove the cupola because it was intact but had lots of caulking but would rebuild it.

Chairman Almeida thought the cupola looked like it well built at one time, and he asked if it could be restored or if it was salvageable. Mr. Kemp said it was completely rotted on the inside. Ms. Whitney said they would remove it intact. There was a clerestory in the structure that was original and they wanted to recreate it. Other additions were the 6' wide deck that wrapped around and got bigger. They would remove part of it and create steps and a front entrance. They

would pull the porch out where the dormer was and make it a covered porch that would transition back to the deck. The brick foundation had rodent issues due to the tide problems, so she would remove it and recreate the footprint. On the waterside rear elevation, she would cut the deck back from 12' deep and do a two-tiered porch. Chairman Almeida asked if she could take the transom window higher, and Ms. Whitney agreed. She had looked at a triple-glazed door with a full transom and she could make it a taller transom. She wanted to stay with traditional white railings. It would have a roof system so that the water wouldn't drip on the lower portion. The current floor plan was the living room on the second floor and bedrooms on the first floor. The west elevation was hidden. There was an existing entry to the unit that was a recessed porch and she would infill it. Mr. Kemp mentioned that it was carved in about 40 years before. The building was about 18" higher than the rest of it, so the set of steps were built into the building to get up to the right elevation. It looked like the foundation had been cut away. The chimney looked like it was done in the 1970s for a woodstove. Chairman Almeida asked if she planned on carrying over the eave boards. Ms. Whitney said she might bring the 28" overhang back and would work out the details.

Councilor Kennedy thought the dormer was a unique and historical look but didn't want to take away from the cupola. Ms. Whitney thought they could have brought the structure up into a full two-story but felt it was better to keep the sense of the lower building and allow the windows on the second floor. The main house was tall and 7-8' above existing, so she thought the scaling would be better with the 5' wall and the dormer to create some light. Ms. Ruedig also had an issue with the dormer windows because it was a historic view that was well documented. She suggested that a dormer on the other side might work. Ms. Whitney showed more views from New Castle Avenue and said the addition really wouldn't be visible from it. Ms. Ruedig told her there should be a way to keep it simple yet make it still look like a secondary building. Chairman Almeida thought the dormers were small enough and set so far back from the elevation that it was wonderful the way it was. Ms. Wyckoff thought it was okay but felt that the cupola had to be copied exactly because it was an important element. Mr. Gladhill thought the secondary building looked ornate and asked what its original use was. No one knew but thought it could have been a barn. They further discussed the cupola and the ornate features.

Chairman Almeida asked Ms. Whitney to have the decorative features the next time they saw her. Mr. Wyckoff asked if Mr. Whitney had considered a vertical siding instead of clapboard. Ms. Whitney showed the band line that she created and said she had thought about the vertical band line and doing clapboards above it. She said the main issue was that it was important for them to go to two stories and asked if she could have a consensus before going into the details. Chairman Almeida said they probably got a good sense of what the Commission felt, but also wanted to ensure they have more detail on the chimney the next time they met.

Chairman Almeida opened up the public comment session, but no one rose to speak, so he closed the public session.

Mr. Wyckoff thought that if it were a two-story building, it wouldn't be much taller and the roof would be simplified. Ms. Whitney thought it wouldn't have a big overhang. Chairman Almeida felt that what she proposed had playful features, i.e. the dormer decorated a certain way, and for those reasons, simple and straight lines were not the way to go.

Ms. Whitney showed photos of the back elevation of the little ell on New Castle Avenue and said she wanted to eliminate the door and move it to the back. It was currently an access to the basement with a funky roof, and she wanted to extend the roof up to make an enclosed entrance and still keep the door to the basement, which was the only access to it. The original roofline was shallow, so where the loft area was 12" in to the edge, she would bring the roof up into the dormer to allow head room in the loft area. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the octagon window would stay. Ms. Whitney said she hadn't planned to get rid of it.

*The Commission **recommended** another work session.*

Ms. Ruedig left at this point in the meeting.

E. Work Session requested by **Peter N. Floros, Jr., owner**, for property located at **282 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, trim, and molding, replace exterior stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 8 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

Mr. Michael Keene was present to speak to the application. He stated that the project had snowballed. He and the Commission had previously discussed the decayed egress stair that would be replaced in kind, but there were code issues with the handrails, so he had modifications for it. When they removed the egress stair, they discovered that the siding was in deplorable condition, so they wanted to replace it in kind and wouldn't change any of the period details. He had certain replacement materials in mind for the decking, balustrade, clapboard siding, and the trim molding. He proposed using fiber cement instead of the wood clapboards, which would match the existing exposures, and he would ensure that the trim details had the same relationship. They were considering PVC trim replacement for the period detailing and corner boards, decking material for the stairs and deck, and composite material for the railings. The building was an apartment building with offices, so there were not a lot of deep pockets to put into the building. Mr. Keene wanted the least expensive costs along with life cycle and maintenance considerations and felt that the material he had chosen would best satisfy all the requirements.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the railing was on the first floor only. Mr. Keene told him that there was an additional railing on the egress stair that would be removed and replaced in kind. Chairman Almeida thought that the best clapboard to replace the existing on the main structure that would last the longest and be most cost-effective would be the straight grain spruce wood. He asked whether all the claps were beyond repair. Mr. Keene replied that not all of them were. They were scattered throughout the building and there most likely had been a flashing problem at one time. There was rot on the clapboards, and most had trouble holding paint. Mr. Wyckoff stated that there was no way to replace the clapboard with cement because it was not only inappropriate for an 1810 former Federal mansion but the reveal was 3-1/2". The stairway could be rebuilt on the side with fiber covers for posts and handrails and balusters as opposed to the existing horizontal mess. He would not replace the window trim with Azek because it wasn't appropriate for the building's front porch. He suggested that perhaps the columns could be the fiber material

because wooden columns were poorly made. The building just needed some TLC and he was against the idea of replacing everything. Chairman Almeida noted that 80% of the building needed scraping and paint, and he hoped that new clapboards could replace the ones that were rotten. Vice-Chair Kozak remarked that the building was on a prominent street and was a primary entrance into the City. Chairman Almeida asked about the sides, and Mr. Keene replied that a lot of the period detailing was missing from them. Vice-Chair Kozak stated that it was difficult to match the coursing and gradation of the wood claps with cement siding. The back of the original 3-story building was ell-shaped and had to be consistent, while the 2-story and 1-story ells on the back were not ell-shaped and perhaps could be alternative materials. Mr. Keene asked if the level of detail for the stair replacement was adequate and was told that it was. He said they would examine the siding and see if they could do spot repairs on one particular side.

*The applicant indicated they would **move forward** with a public hearing.*

F. Work Session requested by **Mark A. and Deborah Chag, owners**, for property located at **404 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (upgrade foundations, exterior modifications and additions) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 21 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

The owner Ms. Deborah Chag and the architect Mr. Dan Rawling were present to speak to the application. Ms. Chag told the Commission that she had lived on the property for 22 years. The main house was quite large, and she and her husband wanted to live in something smaller now that their children had left home. Since they wanted to remain on their parcel of land, they wanted to renovate the barn so that they could live in it. Mr. Rawling gave an overview of the site and concept, showing context photos and views from different streets. He stated that the brick foundation in the main house was typical of most houses in the area, and the basement level had been raised and the house built on top of it, so a large amount of foundation was exposed. The barn was set on 6' x 9' granite piers. Detail features of the barn included decorative brackets and hoods over the doors and a cupola that would be restored. The barn required a foundation and would have to be jacked up. The Chags wanted to add a garage under the raised barn with a masonry foundation that was similar to the main house. Some piers were adjacent to a shed addition about 10' out, and their goal was to make it an entrance to a gallery or solarium room to enjoy the garden and serve as an entry to the upper levels. They wanted to do a covered entrance to the porch and have it glazed. Where it intersected the large opening on the side of the barn on the second level, they would install doors and openings and modify the shed design to be a flat roof deck. There were currently no windows on the second level, so they were considering adding small 4-lights with barn sash to let some light in. On the rear of the barn, the desire was to build and raise a deck to the second level. They had discussed placing elements on the lower level, perhaps windows added to the outdoor area and a deck on top of it. They would glaze the back of the building and reconstruct the chicken coop. The new glazing would be an expression of similar openings carried through on the front of the house. If they added more windows for light on the right side of the structure, they would use a smaller barn-type sash as a punctuation mark rather than large double-hung windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about a third-floor window with a panel under it. Mr. Rawling said they were repeating the front of the building where there were existing double doors. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the second floor would have doors. Mr. Rawling said they would be windows. They would need a rail on the interior for code requirements because the glass would be down low. They were considering a 3-light sash unit with sizes proportional with existing windows.

Mr. Rawling next showed existing conditions of the barn and stated that there was an asymmetrical arrangement that was a unique feature to the barn. The east elevation would have three openings. There were shutters on the existing windows as well. He showed a rough expression of the chicken coop with one window. The west elevation had three smaller windows that backed up to a neighbor's yard. Chairman Almeida noted that the barn looked higher and seemed to increase as much as the new foundation. The previous grades on the existing looked bermed up, while the proposed looked flat. Mr. Rawling said it was ramped up to get in the door. There was a hollow in the barn and a low spot in the center. Chairman Almeida asked what the total increase was in height, and Mr. Rawling told him 8'. Chairman Almeida asked how much lower it was than the main house and was told that the main house was 45'. Vice-Chair Kozak thought it would be helpful see both structures together in color photos. Councilor Kennedy asked about the zoning, and Mr. Cracknell said they would need variances and setbacks. Chairman Almeida thought that the barn was beautiful and was amazed that it had lasted as long as it had on granite blocks. Mr. Gladhill thought the project would make a huge difference by raising the barn a floor and adding a lot of windows. He didn't think it would look like a barn anymore. Vice-Chair Kozak thought it would look more a house than a barn.

Mr. Rawling said the challenge with barn conversions was adding the windows. Chairman Almeida commented that barns usually had large openings to pass hay and lift machinery and felt that large openings in the gable ends were appropriate. Councilor Kennedy thought it was important to save barns and there was a way to do it and still keep the barn features. She asked if the proposal was to keep it looking like a barn or make it look like a house. She would be in favor if it looked like a barn but would have to think twice otherwise. She suggested a barn door that looked like it could slide over but didn't need to. Mr. Gladhill mentioned French doors on the barn. Mr. Rawling said they were interior sliding doors. Mr. Wyckoff felt that it was an overly-ambitious design. By jacking it up 8' and adding all the elements they had spoken about, it would not be a barn. It would be reframed and would be just a living space but wouldn't look like a house. He felt that it should be left at its present elevation.

Chairman Almeida mentioned the irony of a barn in a city that wouldn't even allow chickens and said that it couldn't be used as a real barn. Mr. Wyckoff replied that the correct term was 'carriage house'. Ms. Chag said the barn supported the house and was full of life, and that was what they wanted to do. She asked Mr. Wyckoff whether he really thought it would be better not to raise the barn, and Mr. Wyckoff agreed. Vice-Chair Kozak said that if were truly a barn, they wouldn't have an entire glass of wall and suggested that they look at some prototypes. Ms. Chag stated that she and her husband had designed it the way they had because they didn't want to be surrounded by cars and wanted to keep the integrity of the parcel. Mr. Rawling said they had considered pushing the doors together to make a big opening and have it be more characteristic. Chairman Almeida noted that Mr. Rawling had said they were keeping the openings as they

were, and he asked whether the doors could remain and the windows covered. Mr. Rawling said the doors slid on the interior and wouldn't be visible from the exterior, plus it affected the layout.

Mr. Rawling then showed Plan B that focused on not raising the barn. An extra parking space would be added by the side of the barn and one on the side yard on Cabot Street. The elevations and existing door openings were similar. A shed addition would be put on site with glazed infill. On the east elevation, the porch would be modified and continued along the sides. There would be four light sashes to get light to the second floor of the barn. On the rear, there would be a placeholder for a deck on the second floor with a terrace below it, and perhaps a second-level porch with windows and a door. The chicken coop would be reconstructed and perhaps raised a bit to let the roof edge be the rail on one edge of the deck.

Mr. Wyckoff said he preferred Plan B. Mr. Gladhill said that he liked the glass situation better. Councilor Kennedy thought all the elements on the side would make it look like a New Englander with lots of windows, and the barn would be lost. Chairman Almeida thought it was lovely and liked the proportions and the height. Mr. Gladhill thought there was still too much glass, however. Ms. Chag said it wouldn't be seen from the road, and Mr. Rawling said only part of a window would be seen. Chairman Almeida said that if it were seen, it would be a wonderful thing, based on the proportions. Mr. Rawling said that the roof read strong. The goal was to have the posts, frame and roof read the same, with glazing and perhaps a dark-colored sash with a lighter-colored trim, similar to the existing back sash with white trim. The frame would be the strongest element. Councilor Kennedy stated that she couldn't decide and would have to look at it, but she still wanted to keep the barn looking like a barn. Chairman Almeida saw it as saving the barn because the applicant was putting a foundation under the barn that was currently sitting on the ground.

*The Commission **recommended** another work session.*

IV. ADJOURNMENT

*At 12:20 a.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on July 9, 2014.