

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**July 16, 2014
reconvened from July 9, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak;
Members John Wyckoff, George Melchior, Dan Rawling; Planning
Board Representative William Gladhill

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Alternate Regan Ruedig, City Council Representative Esther
Kennedy

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

The Board's action in New Business and all Public Hearings 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. PRESENTATION

Richard Katz was honored for 16 years of service to the Historic District Commission.

Chairman Almeida presented Mr. Katz with a gift and stated that he had always considered him to be a strong, thoughtful and fair member of the HDC. The Commissioners wished him well and made several comments. Vice-Chair Kozak admired his contributions because they were always based on logic that helped the Commission's process. Mr. Wyckoff agreed and said that Mr. Katz always gave well thought-out and educated responses and was an advocate for people. Mr. Gladhill stated that Mr. Katz had always made him think and listen to the other side. Mr. Melchior said what he would miss most about Mr. Katz was his understated passion for doing the right think for the City and helping the applicants. He added that when Mr. Katz was Chairman, it was a very challenging time, and his passion and self-initiative led the HDC through 18 months of challenge. Mr. Rawling told Mr. Katz that he admired the heart and soul that he had brought to the job and his years of dedication.

Mr. Katz thanked the Commissioners for their kind words and said they were the most capable, best-credentialed, and most effective Commission during his time on the HDC. He would count on them to exercise due diligence in the big projects that were driving the City. They had accomplished a lot of things they could be proud of, and they should continue in that direction.

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. Request for a one year extension of the Conditional Use Permit granted on August 7, 2013 for 173-175 Market Street and 65 Ceres Street - submitted by Eport Properties 1, LLC *(This item is for informational purposes only this evening. The Commission will take action on this at the August 6, 2014 meeting.)*

Mr. Cracknell stated that the Conditional Use Permit would lapse on August 7, so it was an extension request and not a public hearing.

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. Petition of **Tess Casey and Michael J. Dipleco, owners**, for property located at **1 Jackson Hill Street, #2**, 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 141 as Lot 30-2 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 9, 2014 meeting to the July 16, 2014 meeting.)*

WORK SESSION

Mr. Dipleco and his project manager Mr. Ross Kramer were present to speak to the application. They discussed the existing 2/2 windows and the vinyl windows that were installed without a permit. There were a total of 18 windows, 10 of which had been replaced. Mr. Wyckoff and Mr. Melchior stated that the vinyl windows were inappropriate for the structure. There was discussion about the 6/6 windows and the non-vinyl 2/2 windows that would continue the Victorian pattern. Chairman Almeida stated that 2/2 or 6/6 windows were appropriate and suggested that all the windows be painted to match, with no full screens, and kept in the correct plane with the casings intact. Mr. Wyckoff was willing to overlook the window in the dormer on the back of the house if it were painted. Vice-Chair Kozak noted that the back of the house faced the Jackson House, so the window should not be allowed. Mr. Wyckoff mentioned a few options, one of which was to replace the vinyl windows with wooden clad simulated divided light windows. Another option was to keep the 2/2s, weather-strip them and put wooden storms with replaceable sashes over them and replace the vinyl windows with double hung, single-pane 2/2s on the 2nd floor. A third option was to do all 6/6 single pane windows with wooden storms.

Mr. Dipleco asked if he could replace the 2nd floor windows on the front and side that faced the power plant with the Woodwright Series 400 and leave the back wall facing the water with the existing windows as well as the ones on the 1st floor. Mr. Gladhill said the public could view the side that faced the water. Mr. Dipleco then suggested replacing all the windows with the 2/2 400 Series windows. Mr. Kramer suggested adding wooden extension jambs to cover the vinyl, paint them green and use a double screen. Chairman Almeida said he would support it except for the screen. Vice-Chair Kozak said the vinyl itself was not the problem, but it was the profile and shape of the vinyl window and the fact that they could be seen from the street. She was willing to concede on the water side with extensions. Chairman Almeida said he would support the front

and sides only with the 400 Series replacement sashes. Mr. Melchior disagreed and wanted all the vinyl removed in accordance with the standard the Commission used with other applicants. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that the two sides with the vinyl could stay.

There was no public comment. They went into the Public Hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Ross Kramer, the project manager, and the owner Mr. Dipleco were present to speak to the application. Mr. Kramer stated that he would replace the windows on the south and east sides of the house with existing frames that would include wooden extension jambs, painted green with green mullions, 2/2 windows, and screen replacements with space bars also painted green.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what he would replace the windows with. Mr. Kramer said there were two options, one of which was to continue with the replacement windows and include wooden extension jambs and replace the screens with ones split in the middle. Mr. Wyckoff said that wasn't what they had discussed at the work session. Mr. Kramer then stated he would replace both sides with Andersen 400 series composite windows and replace the sashes as well. Vice-Chair Kozak noted that the east side of the house was actually the west side, and the east side faced the water. Mr. Dipleco said they would keep the 1st floor windows and replace the 2nd floor windows on the front and west sides with the 2/2 Andersen 400 window with half screens. They would remove the full screen on the east elevation and replace the bathroom window on the south side that faced the Jackson house. Mr. Rawling asked if the storm windows on the existing windows would be wood, and Mr. Dipleco said he would put them back and paint them.

Chairman Almeida summarized that Mr. Dipleco would replace all the vinyl windows on the two sides, for a total of five windows, with the back window making six, using half screens and the Andersen Woodwright series. Mr. Wyckoff suggested putting barn sashes on both attic windows. Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Dipleco to submit the specifications for the record.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That the vinyl windows on the south and west sides and on the 2nd floor of the north side of the historic structure will be removed and replaced with Andersen 400 Series Woodwright double hung replacement sash windows with a 2/2 grill pattern, half screens, and will have the same profile as the existing windows.*
- 2) The existing windows shall be retained or replaced with the same Andersen Woodwright 400 Series windows. If used, wooden storm windows shall be used.*
- 3) The remaining vinyl windows shall be painted to match the historic windows.*
- 4) Barn sashes shall be installed for attic windows.*

Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion.

Mr. Melchior stated that he would not support it because it was counter to preserving the integrity of the District and the architectural value of the structure. The Commission would not have approved the compromise if the application had been brought to them before the window installation, and he felt it encouraged future applicants to ask for forgiveness instead of permission. Mr. Gladhill thought the applicant had moved in a positive direction but not enough for him to support vinyl windows. Mr. Wyckoff noted that there was a compromise, but it established the relation of the historical and architectural value of the structure and was consistent with the defining character because of the added Victorian trim details. He felt the compromise would enhance the character of the District and preserve property values. Chairman Almeida stated that the Commission was not setting a precedent.

The motion passed by a 4-2 vote with Mr. Melchior and Mr. Gladhill opposed.

Mr. Wyckoff mentioned a procedure that Mr. Cracknell had come up with that would require people purchasing a home in the Historic District to sign an agreement at the closing to indicate that they understood they were buying a home with HDC requirements. The application they had just approved made it obvious that the HDC needed that procedure. Mr. Cracknell stated that he would look into it.

IV. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

A. Work Session requested by **Christopher D. Clement, Wendy L. Courteau-Clement, Andrew R. Courteau, Jr., and Elaine M. Perry, owners**, for property located at **41-43 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (upgrade the lower front portion of the building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 29 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 9, 2014 meeting to the July 16, 2014 meeting.)*

The owners Mr. Christopher Clement and Ms. Wendy Clement were present to speak to the application. They wanted to upgrade the front façade of the building's lower portion to match it with the upper half of the building. They would remove the brick that was installed in the 1970s that didn't match the original brick and replace it with Spanish cedar wood and paint it. The existing windows and front door would remain.

Mr. Wyckoff felt that the storefront windows were inappropriate for an important building. Mr. Rawling thought a weak spot was the transoms over the existing windows and recommended spandrel as an improvement. Mr. Wyckoff thought the wooden sign and the crown molding were big improvements but had a problem with the panelizing underneath. Chairman Almeida thought the removal of the inappropriate brick was an improvement and suggested that they expose the transom window showing more vertical glass. Mr. Wyckoff thought the windows

would look more proportioned if the panel were painted a darker color, making the other panels not as repetitious. He also liked the idea of a glass panel.

Vice-Chair Kozak noted that they were not restoring the original façade, but there was a precedent for wooden storefronts on Market Street. What was different about their building was that the vertical piers were not continuous to the ground, which didn't match the neighboring buildings nor the spirit of the original façade. She thought it would help if the piers were more continuous down the street. Chairman Almeida suggested reintroducing the forms on top of it. Mr. Rawling agreed that carrying the pilaster look to the ground and the transom panels were important, and layering of the storefront was a good idea but not as important. Mr. Wyckoff thought the window sill band was too continuous and horizontal and looked too busy in the wrong places. They discussed using plywood as a durable material at the sidewalk level. Chairman Almeida encouraged the applicant to examine the prized storefronts on Market Square that were referred to as the standard, but thought they were moving in the right direction.

There was no public comment.

*The Commission **recommended** a Work Session/Public Hearing.*

B. Work Session requested by **Dale W. and Sharyn W. Smith, owners**, and **Green and Company, applicant**, for property located at **275 Main Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of existing structure, demolish existing buildings, construct two multi-family structures on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 1 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **postpone** the application to the August meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

C. Work Session requested by **Mark A. and Deborah Chag, owners**, for property located at **404 Middle Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (upgrade foundations, permit for additions 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.

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **postpone** the application to the September meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

V. WORK SESSION/PUBLIC HEARING (CONTINUED)

D. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Eport Properties 1, LLC, owner**, for property located at **173-175 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct side and rear additions) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to existing structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 3&4 and lies within

the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. (*This item was continued at the June 18, 2014 meeting to July 9, 2014 meeting.*)

Ms. Carla Goodknight of CJ Architects, Mr. Heinz Sauk-Schubert, and the owners Messrs. Ken, Chris and Corey Erickson were present to speak to the application.

Ms. Goodknight went through an overview of revisions and architectural style choices. The building was pulled back to create 18 feet of roadway and the five-foot sidewalk at the back of the site. She showed the setbacks and said the building was pulled back 8 feet off the property line, and a 5'2" recess was introduced at the connection to the historic structure. The Market Street level recess was also deepened. They aligned the 1st floor and 2nd floor to create a single plane with no setback. Ms. Goodknight showed a panoramic view of Ceres Street and pointed out the mill-like window patterns throughout, saying it was a simplistic feeling to the elevation that became multi-dimensional and shows hints of the physical history and evolution of the buildings. The core design principle of the project was to take the perceived simple forms of Ceres Street and make a new building that was responsive to those forms, but in reality, the forms were not simple at all. There were a lot of details, which they would incorporate into their building without all the texture.

Ms. Goodknight stated that all the keystones over the windows were integrated into the plan, of which they took some elements but needed variety to make them fit into their building. She discussed large windows, lintels, and brick work and stated that her goal in taking another look at Ceres Street was to illustrate where the vinyl inspiration came from in pulling the elements. The dormers were switched to skylights, and the shutters were changed to metal. The brick would be painted. They would adopt the brick façade because everything else was brick on the Market Street side of Ceres Street but it would also differentiate from their building's painted portion. The storefront was reminiscent of the Ceres Street side by going to a new angle on the corner and eliminating the offset. They put a small awning over the entry door to give it presence and moved the connection back further to expose the second window bay. The penthouse was pushed back 14' from the retail and upper three floors. They were still deciding whether to have a shed dormer, and they brought in some wide arches on the new building. Ms. Goodknight said she preferred Option 1, where the style was wrapped around Market Street and the variety was translated into the new construction.

Mr. Chris Erickson stated that they tried to reference and pull pieces of Ceres Street and connect them to their building but keep it a new building. They brought over the lintel cornice detail to the addition in the back and keeping the storefront a single plane. Mr. Sauk-Schubert spoke of walking down Ceres Street and seeing masonry arches, keystones, varying heights and extensions as well as attachments like signs and Comcast cable wires, and all the occupancy and functional changes that had occurred to the buildings throughout history.

The Commissioners indicated which options they preferred. Mr. Gladhill liked Option 1 but asked about the firewall. Mr. Erickson said that a faux firewall wasn't successful. Mr. Wyckoff thought the storefront revision on Ceres Street was a successful design but had trouble with the rounded roof dormers in Option 1 on the back side and the shed dormer in Option 2. Mr. Rawling agreed that the design was successful but thought the railings should be more than

conventional metal and have a distinctive design. In Option 2, he noted the change in the fenestration pattern affecting the walls below and suggested that the shed dormer continue all the way across, making it clean and simple. Vice-Chair Kozak was disappointed that there was no firewall to separate the buildings but thought the design had come a long way.

Mr. Rawling asked about the metal brackets, and Ms. Goodknight said they could back to a metal theme instead of a wood theme. Chairman Almeida asked about a note on the Ceres Street level indicating a wooden fence and thought it should be on the Market Street level. Ms. Goodknight agreed. He asked if they would cover up a little bit of the storefront, and Ms. Goodknight said they would. He also asked if they would have an appropriate product for painting the building in time for the public hearing, and Ms. Goodknight agreed that they would.

Chairman Almeida stated that he had spent several hours studying the view down Ceres Street and was convinced that the applicant's design was a good thing to view. He did not see it as cutting Ceres Street in half or terminating the street. He thought the sage green and the dark storefronts were wonderful as well as the change to brick on the back of the building. He noted that the column between the two storefront windows seemed misaligned. He found both options on the back successful and suggested that they express the firewall more.

Mr. Chris Erickson talked about the 1st floor residential windows on the newer piece, saying one window was rectangular and one had an arch. He asked if the Commissioners had a preference. Mr. Gladhill liked the arch. Chairman Almeida liked Option 2 for its simplicity and being in keeping with nearby buildings. Mr. Rawling preferred Option 1.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Joe Caldarola of 170 Dennett Street stated that he liked the gabled end because it was believable and did not dominate the existing building. He did not like the repeating arches in Option 1. His key objection was that the applicant violated the rule that additions needed to be subservient, and the scale and the dominance of the addition over the existing building was apparent. The building had two fronts, the Market Street view and the water view, and the addition blocked three-fourths of the building. He wondered why the Commission had not discussed it. The top level stepped back but wasn't perceived from the water, and he thought it made more sense for the 4th story to be stepped back. The existing building ran past further than the addition and the back appeared to be two equal-sized buildings, which detracted from the historic importance of the building. He agreed about running the simple shed dormer all the way across because it was simple, and he thought the nine arched identical windows ran counter to the variety on the rest of Ceres Street.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street thought it was a great building and had come a long way because the applicant had listened to the comments of the Commission and the public. Pulling back the Ceres Street side didn't block the historic view, and she thought the back of the building had greatly improved. She disagreed with the windows all being the same.

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

*Mr. Melchior moved to **continue** the application to a public hearing on at the August 6th meeting. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

VI. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

E. Work Session requested by **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use, 3 ½ to 5 story structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the June 18, 2014 meeting to the July 16, 2014 meeting.)*

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios presented on behalf of the applicant. She stated that she had revised the site plan and would discuss massing and context. She showed photos of a series of buildings and pointed out eave lines and window heights, elevations, massing, roof lines and styles, dormers, chimneys and penthouses. Massing models showed the building in context. She stated that two feet of additional headroom was added on the first floor, as previously discussed.

Chairman Almeida noted that the massing appeared to be much larger in one location than in another. Ms. Ramsey said it was because of the view and of being up in the air, but said it was accurate pedestrian-wise. Mr. Gladhill liked the varying heights of the chimneys and asked about a roofline to give it more dimension. Ms. Ramsey said it was the angle of the drawing. They had chimney masses associated with different parts of the building and had been applying them based on the building style. Mr. Cracknell stated that the project was vested under the current Zoning Ordinance, so the Conditional Use Permit was available. Chairman Almeida said he was anxious to test the Conditional Use Permit because it had specific criteria and any applicant could request it.

Mr. Rawling stated that he was glad to see the setbacks because they welcomed people to the building, and he also appreciated the amount of articulation on the building and the various chimney elements. He thought the building's scale was very important and appropriate for balancing the Portwalk structure scale. The massing modeling was starting to express itself, but all the building edges had articulated cornices and projectiles, and refining details would do a lot to scale and articulate it. Vice-Chair Kozak liked the vertical rhythm as it marched down the street and thought it was a healthy pedestrian experience. The height and scale were a good transition between Portwalk. She didn't think the top penthouse related to anything below it in form and thought the project would be more successful without it. Varying the eave line with a subtle variation of cornices would also help.

Mr. Wyckoff thought the Deer Street rendering was successful because the two stories with a third story in dormers had a similar feel to Congress Street. He suggested doing it on the Maplewood Avenue side instead of having four stories. He also thought the penthouse was awkward. Chairman Almeida noted that there were many chimneys and asked if they were real. Ms. Ramsey said their stacks related to the interior in the way they were arranged. Chairman Almeida agreed that the penthouse looked awkward in its present state. The rest of the mass conveyed that the building had a responsibility to go to a point where it eased the Portwalk height back to a normal neighborhood height. He would be convinced that the top level would

be appropriate if the rich details from the drawing were carried to the 3D model and the window sill and head heights could be varied to denote separate buildings. Mr. Rawling thought the elevations were reflected as extremely flat. Ms. Ramsey said they were not flat but there wasn't much variation in the size of the site. She further discussed sloping aspects.

Mr. Wyckoff said the Portwalk site had 4-5 feet of difference in grade from Deer Street to Hanover Street which he didn't see in her drawing. He asked if it set back from the sidewalk or the street. Ms. Ramsey said it sat back 5 feet from the sidewalk and they would landscape 5 feet of area. Chairman Almeida thought it was an opportunity for a Conditional Use Permit if they allowed the public to walk through the site. They also discussed parking spaces. Ms. Ramsey stated that there would be outside and underground parking.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street stated that the mass and scale were huge. He had thought the project would be broken up a bit more, but instead the applicant had created a false break-up by using false materials. He was outraged that they were comparing the project to Portwalk. There was nothing else of that scale and size. He suggested separate buildings that people could walk through instead of creating corridors, which he felt were detrimental to the City and did not relate to why people come to Portsmouth. He hoped the Board realized it and started listening to the public.

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

*Mr. Melchior moved to **continue** the application to the August meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

F. Work Session requested by **HarborCorp LLC, owner**, for property located **Deer Street, Russell Street, and Maplewood Avenue** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use building including hotel, conference center, condominiums, supermarket, etc.) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 21, Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 28 and Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the June 18, 2014 meeting to the July 16, 2014 meeting.)*

Mr. Cracknell stated that the Commission postponed this application at a previous meeting and noted that the applicant would have to refile.

G. Work Session requested by **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct three story mixed use building with below grade parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Steve McHenry and Mr. Brandon Holben of McHenry Architecture were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry said they were starting fresh with new ideas, and the impetus for that was the failure to get ongoing approval for the third time due to legal issues. There were significant changes to the Zoning Ordinance due to the adoption of the Character-Based Zoning and the criteria for setback heights, and one change required parking in residential business districts. Mr. Holben said that the CBB was now the Character District Corridor, with and minimum zero-foot setback in the front of the building and a 5-foot setback in the rear. The proposed design included a parking credit for four spaces. He went through the packet, showing photos of existing context, the split-level parcel to be removed and the scales and heights of surrounding parcels.

Mr. McHenry said the purpose was to explore various masses within the zoning regulations and consistent with the character of buildings around it. He showed photos of volume, fenestration and mass variation from the Bridge Street perspective. Mr. Holben stated that they had looked at modalities and decided on the single-building approach, which was an evolution of a colonial style and looked like one prominent building. Mr. McHenry said that factors that contributed to the design included a grade change from one side of the lot to the other. They also tried to reference the abutting buildings on the left and right on Bridge Street by dropping the rooflines to those buildings. Mr. Holben noted that 50% of their building had to maintain a zero setback. Mr. McHenry discussed access and parking and had a conceptual plan of the below-grade level. They tried to create an easement across the lot behind to prevent a ramp from going down to the low-grade parking.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there had been a problem with the Tanner Street access in the initial plan. Mr. McHenry replied that they were going to use the 1st floor plan for parking, but it didn't work because of the required curb cuts on Tanner and Bridge Streets. Mr. Wyckoff mentioned the legal problems with parking spaces. Mr. McHenry stated that the required number of parking spaces for the residential component was eight, and they were providing eleven. The total number would probably be twelve spaces, with a credit for four parking spaces.

He asked for the Commission's feedback on how the massing approached the new Zoning Ordinance and whether it followed the four-step process.

Mr. Melchior thought the building was too tall by one story, and the massing made the block look squeezed in. Mr. Rawling noted that Sheet 6 indicated a mass that was similar to adjacent buildings, but Sheet 6a showed something that reversed it. The scaling elements dominated the streetscape, so he felt that Sheet 6 was more successful and compatible to rhythms seen on the street. The penthouse that was set back worked well as a transitional element. Chairman Almeida referenced Sheet 6a, the portion of the mass up against the Buckminster House, and said if the applicant removed the tall box-like structure on the left, it would be more successful. The mass next to the Buckminster House without the 2-story mass would push it back and allow it to be the dominant structure on the corner. He stated that he appreciated the mass and traditional design on Sheet 6 that respected the gable forms and windows along the street because it was inviting. He thought the small porch structure crowded the Buckminster House a bit and was concerned about the amount of rooftop units.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the height in one particular location near the Buckminster House seemed a bit high. He appreciated the shingle style but thought it was almost too mountain resort-looking, like a North Conway ski shop design. He thought the side porch was a good thing to have up against the Buckminster House. Mr. Holben stated that the building height was not much different from the other side of the Buckminster House at 39 feet. Vice-Chair Kozak remarked that Bridge Street had predominantly wood construction and not masonry. The gable forms and two-story houses with sloped roofs were everywhere. The Middle Street styles were more restrained and less pre-formed. She agreed that the building was a bit tall compared to its neighbors on Bridge Street and that the double row of dormers looked crowded. She suggested shrinking the form down 90%.

Mr. Rawling talked about the porch setbacks, the plane of the building on the street edge, and the two masses with the recess between them. It looked like a wall was raised up as shown on Sheet 6, and he liked the pedestrian experience that was created. He saw creativity in the fresh new looks in style, but the selected styles were not characteristic of the street. He said the Commission's job was to ensure compatibility and felt that the applicant should follow some of the context of the street rather than introduce another new style.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bill Brassil, President of the 7 Islington Street Condominium Association, stated that the building was too big. He noted that Sheet 6a that showed how the building abutted the Buckminster House. Their roofline lined up with the top of the Buckminster House's cupola, which was just decoration, and the use of it as the lot line to their building and the buildings behind it had no relation to Bridge Street and should not be considered part of the massing site. He said the condominium residents still needed the three extra parking spaces, whether they were on Tanner Street or Bridge Street. He also mentioned that the blasting may have an effect on the Buckminster House and should be taken into consideration.

Attorney Paul Pudlowski stated that he was the lawyer for the three residents of the Buckminster House and spoke of the lawsuit that was in place concerning the promised parking spaces. He referenced the court order stating that any final development of 7 Islington Street must make accommodation for three parking spaces. He was concerned about where the parking spaces would be. As far as the massing, the two buildings on either side of the project were 26 feet and 28 feet, and the proposed building was 45 feet, which didn't match up well in massing. He also noted the proximity to the 1720 Buckminster House and said the HDC had to recognize its historical value. Chairman Almeida asked him if there was any language in his documents saying where the parking must be. Attorney Pudlowski said it stated that parking would either be at 40 Bridge Street or 29 Tanner Street. Mr. Cracknell stated that it was relevant to the HDC and was important to address early on. Chairman Almeida said the Commission would ask the Planning Department if it was compliant and if the legal requirement had to do with compliance. Mr. Cracknell added that it also required site plan approval from the Planning Board.

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said the building was too big. The Ordinance stated a maximum height of 45 feet. The size and height did not complement the Buckminster House,

and the Commission's job was to protect the buildings around it so that it blended in with the neighborhood rather than took away from the neighborhood.

Mr. Ed Carrier of 7 Islington Street stated that everyone was trying to do the right thing, but what kept him up at night was the potential danger that could be done to the Buckminster House if something went wrong with the project. If damage was done by the blasting and could not be repaired, he asked what would happen to their condos.

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

Chairman Almeida stated that the Buckminster House commanded a great deal of respect, and he expected to receive several responses from the public about it as well as about the massing issue. Mr. Cracknell passed out copies of the Interim Guidelines to everyone to review before the next work session.

*Mr. Melchior moved to **continue** the application to the August meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*At 10:50 p.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 August 6, 2014.