

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**January 14, 2015
reconvened from January 7, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice-Chairman and Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members John Wyckoff and Dan Rawling; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy Alternate Reagan Ruedig, and Alternate Vincent Lombardi

MEMBERS EXCUSED: George Melchior

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. PRESENTATION – Design Guidelines kick-off, Dominique Hawkins of Preservation Design Partnership, LLC

Mr. Cracknell gave a brief history of the Design Guideline process. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was a preservation architect and worked hard to make guidelines very specific to their location. She said she would submit monthly chapters of the guidelines to the Commission and would try to have the entire document written by summer. Chairman Almeida welcomed Ms. Hawkins to Portsmouth. He said that the Commission needed new guidelines because they had been operating for decades with very thin ones. He thanked Ms. Hawkins for her help. Mr. Wyckoff said he hoped that the guidelines would be easily understood and distributed to the public and would help the applicants. Ms. Hawkins said her goal was to make the guidelines user-friendly and clear, and she would put the chapters on-line so that they could be downloaded.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS (continued))

1. Petition of **29-41 Congress Street, LLC**, owner, for property located at **41 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install 16" x 24" duct for restaurant hood) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 10 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Brendin McCord, owner of Bennett's store in Kennebunk, Maine, was present to speak to the application. He discussed the restaurant hood duct and showed photos of it, saying that the duct would go along the commercial alley and would not be seen from other buildings.

Mr. Wyckoff noted the photo that showed three windows and asked if they would be impacted by the duct. Mr. McCord stated that the windows would be on top of the wall-mounted duct and would not be impacted and that the unit would be mounted on top of the roof. Mr. McCord showed how the vent would come out 3-4' from the door and snake up to the roof. Mr. Wyckoff asked for a stipulation that the ductwork be painted in a brick color to match the existing brick.

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 made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That the duct work shall be painted to match the existing brick.*

Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the alley was the most closed-in one that he knew of, so it would not interfere with the historic building.

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

At this point in the meeting, Councilor Kennedy arrived but recused herself for the next application.

2. Petition of **Dale and Sharyn Smith**, owners of property at **275 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested for demolition (existing commercial structure) and for new free standing structures (construction of 14 residential units in 5 separate buildings including the renovation of an existing structure (wood framed single family home) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown as Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 8 and lies within the CBB and the Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Bernie Pelech, the architect Ms. Wendy Welton, and Mr. Richard Shea presented on behalf of the applicant. Attorney Pelech stated that the project had been ongoing for many months. He felt that Ms. Welton had done a masterful job incorporating all the comments from the previous work session and hoped that they finally had a plan that met approval. He noted that they had received many positive responses from the neighborhood. Ms. Welton distributed

copies of her packet to the Board. She stated that, since the last work session, they had not made significant changes to volumes, building placement and the overall concept but had considered the Board's previous comments and improved a number of items. She discussed the improvements and minor changes.

Chairman Almeida confirmed to the public that there were only minor clarifications and ensured that the Board had received the exact same number of drawings as before, only with better information. Ms. Welton reiterated that only the transformers were added. Mr. Shea then discussed in more detail changes that were made to the various buildings.

Vice-Chair Gladhill noted the fact that the gas and electric were not near the front facades and asked if the utility companies had approved it. Ms. Welton stated that they had and that she had chosen locations that would be readily accessible. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked about the type of roofing in the mansard building, and Ms. Welton replied that it was a classy-looking shingle. Several shingle samples were passed out to the Board.

Mr. Rawling stated that he felt the changes had brought the buildings a long way and appreciated that the applicant had incorporated the Board's comments. He felt, however, that it was difficult to approve a whole package for so many different buildings without going into further detail on each building, especially the mansard. One comment he had for most of the buildings related to the amount of banding and the projection work. He thought the half-inch dimension was too flat and that a 1-inch dimension would be more appropriate. He also had comments about the ridgeline and the entry detail. He found it awkward that the detail of the window trim on the heads of the window equally matched in their spacing and thought there should be greater dimension between the different parts of it. He had similar comments about the eave gutter detail, saying the top layer should be much thinner and the bottom layer heavier. Mr. Rawling also had concerns about the gutter looking blocky, the roof termination on the large portico, trims, projections, and overhangs. Mr. Rawling strongly felt that there were several items that needed fine tuning and said he had tried to focus his comments on items that he felt would be glaringly obvious once the project was complete. Ms. Welton felt that it was important to clear the hurdle so that they could get approval by revising details and getting stipulations.

Chairman Almeida believed the Commission was at a point where the details before them were very detailed, but any changes that made a difference could be stipulated. Mr. Rawling said he welcomed advice on how to do those stipulations but questioned how they could do it in a public hearing. It was decided to go into a public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made the motion to enter into a work session. Mr. Rawling seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor, 7-0.*

WORK SESSION

Mr. Rawling presented his issues in more detail, and there was much discussion. Several stipulations were decided upon.

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

It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to move into the Public Hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Welton went through her presentation and included the changed items that were agreed upon in the work session.

SPEAKING TO, FOR OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Rick Becksted, 1395 Islington Street, told the Commission that the neighborhood loved the project, and he thought it would be used as a model because it would set a precedent on what everyone wanted to see on Islington Street. He felt that the applicant did a commendable job. His only suggestion was that they use cedar shakes on the upper level of the buildings.

Ms. Mary McDermott of 40 Rockingham Street said she was an abutter and that she and her neighbors were 100% for the project and wished it would start soon.

No one else spoke, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing. He noted that the Commission needed to approve a demolition with the application. Vice-Chair Gladhill remarked that the Commission usually asked for internal and external photos of the building to be demolished and asked if it could be added to the stipulations. Chairman Almeida agreed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1. The trim exposure shall increase from ½" to ¾" on all buildings;*
- 2. The depth of overhang on detail M:3 shall increase to 5" on sheet A13;*
- 3. A 1" x 3" shadow board shall be added to typical deck column on sheet A4;*
- 4. Change return detail (N4) at main gable to 2 ½" and 5 ½" on sheet A5;*
- 5. That the porch beam shall be increased from 6 ½" to 8" on porch roof detail (G3.2) on sheet A10;*
- 6. Replace the blocking with PVC cove (as shown on M:5) on M:3 cross section at eave on sheet A13;*
- 7. The trim on Unit 14 shall stop at the siding on the entry detail and replace the arch with 12" horizontal lintel as shown on the front elevation on sheet A15. Eight inch back ban pilasters shall be added on sheet A16;*
- 8. That the PVC panel on the G2 dormer shall be replaced with painted 1" x 6" wood lap siding on sheet A10;*

9. *That the applicant shall provide a photographic record of the existing building prior to demolition.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff noted that it was a chance to put something nice where the Governor Wentworth Building used to be. The Port City Traders building didn't have any historical context and was in poor condition, and everyone in the neighborhood wanted it removed, so that resolved the demolition aspect. The integrity of the District would be preserved because the project's buildings all had a feeling of belonging on Islington Street, and the shape and mass were very similar. There was no historical significance because the buildings were brand new but would enhance surrounding property values and maintain the special character. New technologies would come into play. The PVC, central air conditioning, and the condensers had all been planned. He thanked the applicant for planning the electric and gas meters ahead of time because normally it was an afterthought. He hoped it all worked out well.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said it had been a long time coming to fruition, and he was thankful that they had been able to save the New Englander. He thanked the applicant for being a great team and working with the Commission to come up with a great project.

Ms. Ruedig stated that it was a big property and a significant one in terms of its placement on Islington Street and in the Historic District. She thought the overall massing scale of the project as well as the window choices and general details were good but felt that the applicant seemed to pick and choose a cornucopia of historic buildings. She had a problem with all the plastic and would rather see more authentic materials on such prominent property on Islington Street. She thought overall that the buildings were more appropriate for a suburban setting rather than a more urban one. For those reasons, she stated that she could not support the project.

Mr. Lombardi said he thought the project was good and that it was a modern project. He agreed with Ms. Ruedig but thought that what had happened on Islington Street over the years had resulted in things like the Port City Traders building, so he thought the project fit in very well and that the scale and mass were appropriate.

Chairman Almeida stated that he was in complete agreement with Mr. Wyckoff and other Commissioners and that a 'thank you' was in order. It had been a long process for the applicant. He reminded everyone that he had promised that the Commission would not make a mistake on Islington Street on that site, and he believed that they didn't. He appreciated all the details that were put in late during the work sessions. He thanked Mr. Rawling for pointing out the items that needed more detail and he thanked the applicant and the designers.

*The motion to grant **passed** by a 6-1 vote with Ms. Ruedig voting in opposition.*

III. WORK SESSIONS (continued)

C. Work Session requested by **Timothy and Alexandra Lieto, owners**, for property located at **454 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct second story addition, window relocations on first floor of north, south, and west facades) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 77 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the December meeting.)*

The owner Mr. Timothy Lieto and the Project Manager Mr. Chris Martin were present to speak to the application. They discussed the history of the house and said their goal was to gain more livable space and keep the addition to its original height and size so that the porch roof could be tied into it. They noted that a 3-pitch shed dormer on the back side faced west off the original Cape and was inconspicuous from the road, and that the second-floor gable window was enlarged and matched the first-story windows.

Councilor Kennedy asked if the window was original, and Mr. Martin said he thought it was. Mr. Lombardi asked if it was a 4/4 window and was told that it was. Mr. Wyckoff noted that one of the few black families in Portsmouth used to live in the house, headed by a Mrs. Goodwin. He said he was familiar with the house because he bought the house from her and asked whether he should recuse himself but was told that he didn't have to. Councilor Kennedy said she was not in favor of removing original windows or in favor of dormers. Vice-Chair Gladhill thought that the south-facing elevation looked more like a one-room schoolhouse, which he felt was a big change. Ms. Ruedig agreed and asked if at least the look of the door could be kept. She thought the plans were better in terms of keeping true to the original masses and feelings of the house, but she agreed with Councilor Kennedy about the historic windows and suggested that they be restored because they could be an asset.

Mr. Lombardi thought that adding the four inches to the original house and moving the door contributed to the schoolhouse look and felt it changed the house, as did the dormer. Chairman Almeida agreed that it looked like a schoolhouse because it was becoming taller. Mr. Wyckoff thought it changed the Cape into a 1850s building, and he was also against removing the door. He felt that the placement of the second new window would be trouble because of the heaving framing element. Mr. Martin said they were open to keeping the door and moving window locations. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it was necessary to add the 40 inches, and Mr. Martin thought so. Chairman Almeida suggested increasing the pitch of the Cape and then using dormers as a way to get more height on the second floor. Mr. Martin questioned going to a 12 pitch just to bring the ridge up and suggested using dormers to get the clearance. Chairman Almeida was open to having the dormer. Ms. Ruedig asked that the applicant deal with the elevation of the house as little as possible. They discussed dormers in more detail. Chairman Almeida said a roof plan would be helpful. Mr. Rawling said he supported building the addition in the corner to preserve as much of the original house as possible.

Public Comment

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to continue review of the application to the February meeting.

D. Work Session requested by **Hayscales Real Estate Trust, owner**, for property located at **236 Union Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct two family residential home) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 22 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the December meeting.)*

Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to postpone the application to the February meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion passed unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.

E. Work Session requested by **Peter Cass and Mara Witzling**, owners, for property located at **33 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (room additions and windows and doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 38 and lies within GRB and Historic Districts.

The architect Ms. Anne Whitney and the owners Mr. Peter Cass and Ms. Mara Witzling were present to speak to the application. Ms. Whitney said that they proposed to take the front porch off and redo the entry with a small entry roof. A deck and a bay window would also be at that elevation. A 10'x14' two-story addition on the rear elevation would be lower than the existing roof height. The one-story addition on the east and north sides would wrap around. Because the house was very tall, the project was a challenge, and another piece of it was the attic dormer. The house would be re-sided in vinyl and the trim would be redone. They would add a 6/6 bay window, and the entry deck would come down the side of the house.

Ms. Ruedig asked Ms. Whitney if she pulled up some of the siding. Mr. Cass said that the original owner removed two windows and re-sided, and the inside of the porch was taken off, exposing original clapboards that were in good shape. He thought the vinyl was added to give a half-inch of insulation beneath it. Ms. Whitney said she would peel some vinyl back in the attic, and if she found shingles, she would replace in kind. Councilor Kennedy asked if some of the windows were original, and Ms. Whitney said she didn't think so. Mr. Cass said most of the windows on the second floor were double-glazed and thought they were replacement windows. At that point, Mr. Hugh Jenks, a direct abutter, spoke up and said the application lacked BOA approval for variances to complete the project and he thought the Commission required zoning permission first. Mr. Cracknell stated that permission was only required for a public hearing and not for a work session. Ms. Whitney stated that the only variance they were requested was the 8-foot side setback above the entry deck and the bulkhead in the back, otherwise everything else met code. The existing was 4.8 feet and she was proposing 8 feet.

Ms. Whitney discussed the windows, the views, the skylights, and keeping the gable. Mr. Wyckoff asked the width of the one-story addition on the side, and Ms. Whitney said it was 9

feet and then 6 feet as it transitioned around. Mr. Wyckoff thought it could be a problem. Ms. Whitney said she could change the pitch of the back side but it would make it more complicated to build. Chairman Almeida asked why the addition even existed, and Ms. Whitney said she would transition and wrap the same pitch. She discussed the steps being removed and the profile of the shed dormer and further discussed the entry deck, angled roof, brackets, and windows.

Councilor Kennedy thought the house could have been built the same time that the New Englanders and Victorians next to it were and was concerned about the side profile because it would be visible, as would the dormer on the side. Vice-Chair Gladhill thought the back-of-the-house rule didn't apply because the house was a direct abutter of the Tobias Lear House, from which the back of the house could be seen. He had no problem with the 2-story addition on the back but wasn't sure about the side/back porch. Ms. Ruedig said she was comfortable with the massing and the addition because the side yard was big, and she thought the front was better than before in terms of scaling. Because the house was stark and very tall, the addition would help its proportions. She said she normally didn't like shed dormers on attics, but because it was tucked behind an existing dormer, she didn't mind it. Mr. Lombardi thought the front of the house treatment was appropriate for the period.

Mr. Rawling discussed the functional components of the front of the house, saying that he preferred that the porch be covered completely. Ms. Whitney said she felt it was too close in massing to the bay and wanted it to drop back a bit. Mr. Wyckoff was concerned about the front porch, saying that if it was original to the building, it should stay. He had no problem with the massing and the 2-story addition on the back and agreed that the 1-story addition on the side helped take away from the verticality of the house. Chairman Almeida said he was satisfied with the massing but thought the dormer could match the eave better and align. He agreed with comments about the porch and was supportive of the design in general. Mr. Cass asked if the front porch could be rebuilt. Mr. Cracknell stated that if the porch did not exceed the front setback of the street, they could put it back, but if it was a nonconforming porch, they'd have to get a variance to remove and replace it. Chairman Almeida thought it could simply be repaired.

Public Comment

Mr. Hugh Jencks of 25 Hunking Street said he was a direct abutter and that the house was the last one built on a street that went back to 1740. It was a classic New Englander vernacular style house, very simple, and also quite tall at 3 stories while other houses around it were 2-1/2 story Colonials on original foundations without significant expansion. He believed that the treatment of the house on that streetscape was incompatible with all the others. He noted that the house was next to a National Register historic property.

No one else spoke, so Chairman Almeida closed the public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed to continue the application to a Work Session/Public Hearing at the March 4, 2015 meeting.

F. Work Session requested by **Ronald C.J. Cogswell**, owner, for property located at **180 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a discussion concerning the existing 2 story structure and options for site (including demolition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 19 and lies within CBB and the Historic Districts.

Mr. Rawling recused himself.

Ms. Sarah Hourihane of DeStefano Architects was present to speak to the application and stated that she wanted direction in how to develop the property. She presented two options. Option 1 was to maintain the existing Colonial with new trim and windows and redevelop the additions off the back for a mixed-use commercial first floor and perhaps two residential units; have two doghouse dormers on the front; and replace the storefront windows and the garage. Option 2 was to demolish the building and move a similar Colonial building forward and lower it for 1st floor commercial use with a 2-car garage in the rear and residential above.

Vice-Chair Gladhill and Councilor Kennedy stated they did not care for Option 2. Mr. Lombardi noted that the house was built around the 1830s for the steam factory and was significant. Councilor Kennedy asked if Ms. Hourihane knew the history of the house or had photos. Ms. Hourihane said she had not found anything on the Athenaeum website. Ms. Ruedig thought the only course was to keep the building because so many houses had been lost on Islington Street already. She suggested that the main house be worked on and made a charming building again because it would add a lot to the street and highlight some of its character. Mr. Wyckoff thought the building needed a full restoration and encouraged the applicant to come up with a good plan of restoring and also tucking additions on the back.

The Commission discussed the dormers in more detail as well as the mixed use and Form-Based Zoning concerns. Mr. Rawling said that he favored the mixed use and felt that the storefront and windows should be upgraded to reflect the evolution of the building. Ms. Hourihane asked if it should be kept as commercial and said she was concerned about a building code issue. Councilor Kennedy told her that there were special rules for historical homes that provided exemptions. There was discussion about the railing and the ramp. Ms. Hourihane asked about garage doors on the streetface. Vice-Chair Gladhill favored a carriage house style of garage.

Ms. Hourihane said she had a good direction of keeping the storefront on the 1st floor but treating it differently. Mr. Rawling mentioned that divided lights had character but didn't work on Islington Street and suggested that she look at similar buildings in own.

Public Comment

Ms. MacAlaster of 188 Summer Street said she was an indirect abutter and stated that the neighbors had been impacted by the 198 Islington Street project, so they were concerned about the neighborhood in the back. She said close attention would be paid to the project to see how the back of the property was treated. She supported keeping the commercial aspect.

Mr. Jeff Noury of 202 Summer Street said he echoed the same sentiments because the neighbors had been severely impacted by development in the back. Mass, density and scale were major concerns relating to the impact on their back yards.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to continue review of the application to the February meeting.

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. *(This item was continued from the November meeting.)*

Mr. Steve McHenry and Mr. Brandon Holben of McHenry Architects were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry said he believed they had been successful in further evolving the massing of the building. He had a new option to present, Option 10R. The center portion was simplified, the window patterns had changed, and the northern module was stepped back, with its window patterns more respectful to the house to the right on Bridge Street. The storefront was articulated. Mr. McHenry discussed building materials and siding, the differentiation between the two main modules, and other details.

Ms. Ruedig asked about landscaping. Mr. McHenry said there was a hardscape on Bridge Street that shared the right-of-way on the side of the building and didn't leave any room for plantings. He also said they were at 82% of lot coverage. He showed conceptual upper-level floor plans and discussed how they would focus on the general level of quality for the building relating to material for windows, porch details, roofing, siding and trim. Mr. McHenry summarized that changes had been made from the prior design, including that the center atrium was lowered and made smaller, the center bay was simplified, the rear elevation was more consistent with other elevations, multiple storefronts were introduced, back portions of the southeast corner near the Buckminster Building were pulled back, and the north elevations were reduced.

Mr. Wyckoff noted that Mr. McHenry had pulled the south corner away from the Buckminster House and pulled the other side from the green house, yet one diagram showed that the building was actually closer to the Buckminster House and to the green house. The mansard was back to where it originally was, and the windows only appeared to bring the structure back but in reality did not. Mr. McHenry said the actual configuration of the deck on the third floor was far smaller than what was previously shown.

Councilor Kennedy referred to the previous application and what happened to some of the neighbors, saying that it was the Commission's purview to ensure that it wouldn't happen again. She said she still had a hard time with the massing because it overwhelmed the Buckminster House, the green house, and houses on Tanner Street. She was glad it looked like two buildings

but thought the scale still didn't meet the surrounding environment. She didn't care for the Asian influence of the building in-between and felt the project still did not meet the Board's criteria. Mr. Gladhill felt that two separate buildings would work best but hadn't seen anything yet that told him it would fit into the neighborhood as it currently was. Mr. Lombardi said he still thought the building was too high and wide and dwarfed everything around it. Mr. Rawling thought the gabled roof was a definite part of the context but strongly discouraged the mansard. Ms. Ruedig thought the applicant was going in the right direction as far as the façade and the height but that the whole massing was still too big. Just because the applicant was allowed to cover a certain amount of the footprint didn't mean that it was appropriate to, especially in the Historic District. She felt that the amounts that the building was brought in were still too small.

Mr. McHenry stated that he understood the Ordinance as to what was buildable but that it was not where they started with design. The Commission's purview was to interpret how much less they could make something fit within that Ordinance and still be appropriate. In the past, the Ordinance had simple criteria, but now the criteria were more complex and intricate. He felt that his project met all the criteria, yet the Commission thought they were still way off in massing, and it was frustrating. He was trying to be compliant, yet do something aesthetically pleasing.

Chairman Almeida said he liked that there were two separate forms on Bridge Street and they were stepping down. He had always pushed to get the building further away from the Buckminster House, and he felt that more of that had been achieved. He thought the penthouse structure was problematic because it gave so much height. Looking at it head on without the depth, the sides were like saddlebags that added too much mass. Existing units looked like they had been made bigger. He noted some progress on the Tanner Street side. He saw improvements but also saw problems that had stuck around for a while. He didn't think the applicant should throw the design away, but they were at the point where they had to take the 'bites' out that the Commission insisted they take out, like the penthouse.

Mr. Wyckoff felt that the Commission had repeated things they had said at the last couple of meetings, and it didn't feel just like tweaking anymore. The Bridge Street side looked like two buildings, and if the center mass was more conservative and not a giant wing structure, it would look more appropriately like a 3-story mansard.

Public Comment

Mr. Bill Brassil of 7 Islington Street told the Commission that he had a document that was recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds in January 2011 stating that the driveway would be prohibited. It was black and white and had not changed, and it had to be taken into consideration for the building. Parking had to be someplace.

Mr. Ed Carrier of 7 Islington Street said he had been so focused on the Buckminster House and the front view that he had forgotten about his neighbors. He thought the large ramp was well camouflaged and would have an impact on the Tanner Street residents. He also thought that the underground parking would require a variance. His last point was that when 51 Islington Street was proposed, it was for a few buildings and underground parking, but then changed. He was concerned about the Buckminster's foundation, blasting, and proximity to the project.

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street stated that concerns about massing and scale were repeated over and over, but the project had still not changed a whole lot. He thought it would help if the penthouse came down, but that the building would still impact the buildings around it. Mr. Paul Mannle of 1490 Islington Street noted the concerns about the ramp and the parking and said it wasn't a question if the ramp was illegal or not. Both items affected the design, which was the Commission's purview, and if they couldn't be done, the design would have to change.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig made the motion to **continue** review of the application to the February meeting. Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

H. Work Session requested by **HarborCorp LLC, owner**, for property located **Deer Street, Russell Street, and Maplewood Avenue** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use building containing hotel, conference center, condominiums, supermarket, and parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 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 continued from the December meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** unanimously to **postpone** the application to a meeting on January 28, 2015.*

I. Work Session requested by **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue (46-64 Maplewood Avenue)** wherein permission is 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 continued to the December meeting. The applicant has asked to postpone to the February 2015 meeting.)*

It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to postpone the application to the February 2015 meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

*At 11:15 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 February 4, 2015.