

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**January 28, 2015
reconvened from January 7 & 14, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members John Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; and Alternates Vincent Lombardi and Richard Shea

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chairman Joseph Almeida, 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. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

H. 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 containing hotel, conference center, condominiums, supermarket, and parking) 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 continued from the December meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida was not present, so Vice-Chair Gladhill conducted the work session. He noted that three letters were received from the public regarding the HarborCorp project.

Ms. Carla Goodknight of CJ Architects, Ms. Susan Duprey, Mr. Chris Thompson, Mr. Gatchell Gatchell and Mr. Nadeau were present to speak to the application. The applicants thanked the Board for taking an extra evening for them. Mr. Thompson stated that prior comments helped the team put together a project that they were proud of and helped integrate the key elements into the project.

Ms. Goodknight began with an overview of the various segments. She pointed out the hotel, the conference center, the Whole Foods Market, the green roof, the parking garage, and the

condominiums. The highlights from the previous meeting were the redesign of the Whole Foods entrance, the lightening of the garage with less brick, the varying roof lines, the additional landscaping on Vaughan Street, and the activation of the pedestrian way. She then focused on the north end plaza, the café area and outside seating. Councilor Kennedy felt that there were several small entities that had reappeared, giving the building a cluttered look. Mr. Cracknell asked if the client was satisfied with the Whole Foods section and Mr. Thompson said they were. Ms. Goodknight then reviewed the design elements including the granite banding, the added expression to the brick, the rail detail, and the windows. Ms. Duprey added that they were all high-quality materials. The north end section and roof area were new open space that would contribute to the context and quality of the neighboring properties and to the District as a whole. The view to the hill from the roof garden provided a new view as well as a view of the North Church steeple. She noted that there were wide sidewalks throughout the property, and the lower part of the building was stepped back to contribute to the pedestrian experience. Ms. Goodknight said that the area created at the north end plaza was a result of the Russell Street land taken from the Sheraton side to accommodate roadways.

Mr. Wyckoff liked the quality of the materials and the granite banding. He asked if the beams holding up the second floor were real wood, and Ms. Goodknight said they were heavy timber. Councilor Kennedy asked how wide the sidewalks were, and Ms. Duprey stated that the sidewalks were 14 feet wide, with the exception of the Maplewood Avenue section, which were five feet wide. Ms. Goodknight then addressed the massing overview from Maplewood Avenue and Deer Street and said the condominiums and retail would act as a buffer between those streets and the garage. A door was placed in one section of the retail section per the Commission's request to activate the corner. She pointed out the brick façade with the setback and said a pitch roof form was added. The railing was adjusted to make it less vertical. Traditional windows had added elements to differentiate them and make a focal point for the corner. Ms. Duprey showed other setbacks and materials and said the retail contributed to the pedestrian scale of the property by drawing people in from Portwalk. She also pointed out the grove of trees on City property between the railroad tracks and the Vaughan Street pocket park.

Mr. Rawling stated that he saw a lot of positive things that had been added to the building, such as the roofline forms and more expression of the 3-dimensional forms that broke up the flatness of the building. He thought the railings were handsome but thought that embellishments and a unique design could add a lot. He could accept the railings as a design concept, but for a final design he felt that something more unique would go a long way to give identity to the building. He suggested that the developer consider more accentuating of the bases throughout the building, but overall he thought of a lot of positive things had developed in the last round of that part of the building. Mr. Shea asked if the doors on the curved part were entry points, and Ms. Goodknight said they were. Mr. Shea asked if there was a recess indicating an entry into the building. Ms. Goodknight stated that there would be signs but it wasn't recessed. Mr. Shea thought it would help give it more pedestrian scale. He asked if the ground floor windows were transparent, and Ms. Goodknight said they were. Mr. Shea asked about the pedestrian flow connection from Maplewood Avenue to the building. Ms. Goodknight showed two ways to get to the building from Portwalk. Mr. Shea verified that the deck would be a usable space for the condominiums, and he asked how far back the wall was set on the penthouse. Ms. Goodknight said the top floor was back seven feet. Mr. Shea concluded that a pedestrian would not be able

to see the top floor. He asked how they could make the sidewalk more intimate for the pedestrian by breaking up the elevation, which they further discussed.

Mr. Lombardi said he saw great improvements but was concerned about the proximity of the granite brick and the brick sidewalk and asked if it carried through the whole building. Ms. Goodknight replied that the granite base did carry through but would rise and fall with the slope of the sidewalk. Mr. Cracknell asked if it carried through the pilasters, and Ms. Goodknight said it presently did not, but they could accommodate it. Mr. Wyckoff commented about the flow of the sidewalk and its relationship to the Maplewood Avenue condominiums and was concerned that it wasn't square enough and would cause the wall project out and reduce the size of the sidewalk and not match the flow of Maplewood Avenue. Ms. Goodknight said the building followed the street line. Mr. Cracknell noted that it looked set back a bit further, and Ms. Goodknight said they wanted to make the sidewalk wider. Mr. Wyckoff felt that it was necessary due to the inside of the building, and if that corner of the building was pulled back, it would appear that it would be following Maplewood Avenue. He suggested more sidewalk at the rounded corner to continue the flow of people walking across from Portwalk.

Ms. Ruedig stated that her reactions to the building were mostly positive, and she agreed that the overall design worked well. She said she wanted to see the railing in the penthouse developed with a higher quality detail. She also felt that the constant repetition of the materials of brick and granite could be a higher quality of material. She wanted to see more variety and more contemporary materials. She also wondered if the door at the corner of the utility entrance on Maplewood Avenue was too far wrapped around from the main hub of activity and thought the door in the commercial space could get lost. She asked if the entrance in one bay could be moved to keep the activity more centralized. Ms. Goodknight pointed out the entrance going into the condominium lobby section, saying the lobby was pulled back behind the stair tower to keep the retail facades the way they were. Mr. Cracknell felt that moving the door would tie it in better with the rest of the north end. Councilor Kennedy wondered if the penthouse would be visible to the slope the slope coming down Maplewood Avenue and wasn't sure the setback was enough. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there were two retails on the front, and Ms. Goodknight agreed. Mr. Rawling thought that by moving the door over, it would afford a better retail space. He also noted that the railings and the roof overhangs brought down the height of the building.

Ms. Duprey noted that most of the comments from the Commissioners centered more on details and that they seemed happy with how the building looked. She said the project team could improve the details. Mr. Cracknell agreed that there were seven comments related to detail and one related to massing and the setting back of the penthouse. Ms. Duprey asked the Commission if they wanted the penthouse set back further. Councilor Kennedy said she didn't want to walk down Maplewood Avenue and see the penthouse. Mr. Shea thought that the penthouse may be more usable by bringing it in a bit. He said he liked the mix of the new and the old, and that the corner felt like new architecture because it had a lot of glass. He suggested taking the penthouse in that direction to make it lighter and more contemporary. Mr. Rawling said he agreed with Councilor Kennedy about the view going up Maplewood Avenue. Mr. Wyckoff thought the penthouse looked out of scale in one view. Ms. Goodknight said that it was the massing model in context. Mr. Cracknell asked Ms. Goodknight for renderings of the building on the left not being an image on the right to help address concerns.

Ms. Goodknight then went over the proposed view from Portwalk Place. She discussed the pitched roof forms, the 3-dimensional brackets, the canopy over Whole Foods, and some curved signage elements. She also indicated the main entrance into Whole foods, the retail entrance, the entrance into the condominiums, and the door into the retail at the corner. Ms. Duprey noted how the wrapping of the garage contributed to the context of the neighborhood. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the glass tower next to the Maplewood Avenue retail building had an elevator or stairs, and Ms. Goodknight said they were stairs coming down from the parking area and the condominiums. Mr. Wyckoff said he liked the detail element and thought the utilitarian garage was unique. He was also pleased with the masonry base and liked the Whole Foods entrance. Councilor Kennedy asked whether there was only one entry into Whole Foods, and Ms. Goodknight said there was another entrance at the cafes. Councilor Kennedy asked about the entries to the towers. Ms. Goodknight said the left-side entrance was a staircase only, but the right-side tower would have an elevator and circulation to the conference center, parking, and the green roof. Councilor Kennedy asked how wide Whole Foods and the access area to the garage were. Ms. Goodknight stated that the garage opening was 38 feet, Whole Foods was 45 feet, and the tower was 51 feet. She emphasized that they would thoroughly document and dimension in greater detail as they moved into Step 4.

Mr. Rawling stated that he liked the roof forms, the tower, the depth that was added to the upper levels to give it substance, and the introduction of the dormer elements. He thought that extenuating the dormers would enhance the building. Looking at the building from a distant perspective, it looked flattened out, so he thought it needed more work in that area. He thought the tower on the left could be too austere, and the tower on the right could use more architectural detailing or 3-dimensional qualities. He felt that the section had to be considered as a terminus to the building, and they should try to relate the whole piece as a composition. There were a lot of different things happening. Mr. Rawling thought the lower level of Whole Foods was successful, with the canopies and wood bracketing. The segmental arches on the next level up seemed to have lost the feeling of the composition, with the garage hovering over them. The garage and the store itself were not in any of the composition as a whole but rather, two separate pieces stacked on top of each other. It was important to establish a design and coordinate the elements. He noted the expression of double piers stacked up on the garage that was carried by single tiers at ground level and the garage ramp over the roof of Whole Foods. He felt that the more the developer could do to minimize the ramped appearance of it, the better. He thought the canopy portions on top of the building might be more effective if they shifted up and worked as a railing edge. Ms. Goodknight told him that they had considered it but felt that keeping it much lower gave a closer perception from the street that was pleasing.

Mr. Rawling thought that there was a lot going on with the garage entrance and the piece next to it due to the segmental arches and the big garage entrance openings. He noted the glass storefront support that would normally have a heavy masonry support element and suggested using a more traditional expression. He also felt that there was a lot of 'laciness' in the garage that created a lot of open space but thought it was too much in contrast with the building and suggested adding more masonry to it.

Mr. Lombardi discussed the three towers, saying that the one on the far left was austere. He liked the curved elements in the design and also the Savannah-like grillwork that gave an open feeling between massive structures and provided a definition between the building segments. He thought the building had to make a statement and felt that the applicant was getting there. He said he would like to see something out front that would be a primary pedestrian access to the building. Ms. Goodknight said the garage had been rotated back and the first floor was activated with a non-garage function. Ms. Duprey added that space indicated on the renderings was for Whole Foods displays, which were not added in because they didn't want to cover up the building. Mr. Lombardi thought the elevator tower columns looked massive and suggested other elements that would give relief in that structure. Ms. Goodknight said they would try to lighten it up. Ms. Ruedig thought there was not a lot of connection between the ethereal upper part and the base below. She wanted to see vertical connection of those components and the simplification of the roofline on the glass tower and the other tower. She felt that the laciness was busy and suggested that it be refined. She also liked the central tower above the garage entrance but thought the sides needed to be refined.

Councilor Kennedy recommended that cars be shown on the garage rendering and was also concerned about where the concrete column supports would sit. She thought the garage had become the focal point instead of Whole Foods and that the elevator tower stuck out. She asked if the concrete and metal were high enough on the garage so that cars wouldn't be seen. Mr. Nadeau replied that the garage design had no concrete piers and would be steel-framed. He said ramps were always a challenge and that transitional elements had to be created. Railing panels and opaque panels would be placed to encapsulate sounds, and they could use contrasting colors and materials. He felt that light and the elegant design of the garage helped a lot and didn't impact the archways next to it. It gave a feel of open sky as well as a varied skyline element.

Mr. Shea said that he liked the idea of bringing the garage down in the center and wanted to see the lacy aspect used more consistently. He thought the tower on the left could be improved by putting some masonry on the other side of it and stepping it down a bit to break it up. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there were glass blocks on the elevator tower on the right. Ms. Goodknight said it was fenestration. Mr. Wyckoff wondered if the element should be built of another material like granite instead of brick. Mr. Rawling thought that eliminating the masonry on the ground level might separate the building more. He discussed the relationship of the two towers to the condominium building, saying the tower seemed to be set back from the masonry building. He suggested that the tower project out enough for the building to go into it and have a more rational support system.

Vice-Chairman Gladhill said he was enthusiastic about the variation, elevation and style of the building. He thought it would be nice to have a closer garage detail and suggested using a different color that would denote a see-through wall. Mr. Lombardi asked if the elevator tower entrance had weather protection for people entering the building, and Ms. Goodknight said she was thinking of a larger opening. Mr. Shea thought it would be nice if the garage panels were high enough so that headlights were not seen at night. Ms. Goodknight said she would eventually move into the detailing and explore simplification of the garage detailing and the further development/complication of central forms, like the tower.

Ms. Goodknight then discussed the view from Maplewood Avenue and Vaughan Street. Mr. Nadeau said the idea was to break the garage up into two segments and bring the façade in to integrate it more with the retail section. There was a lot of discussion about the ramps, the railing element, and tracks and clump of trees. Ms. Travis Nadeau said the heights and volumes of those elements would be a nice scaling element. Ms. Ruedig said she first thought it was very busy, with the different heights, the lacy ornamentation, and she found it overwhelming from that particular view perspective. Since the building would not be viewed by a hovering pedestrian, however, she asked for a view perspective from the ground so that she could see what a pedestrian would view. Overall, she thought it was a huge expanse of wall and façade elevations with too much ornamentation.

Councilor Kennedy thought the trees were too close to the train tracks and wanted to know what people would see coming up Maplewood Avenue. Ms. Goodknight showed her the landscape plan for the area instead of the 3D design tool. Mr. Wyckoff said he didn't understand the garage entrance and exits. Mr. Nadeau further explained how it was all interconnected. Ms. Goodknight also discussed the green roof structure that she felt would activate pedestrian activity. Mr. Shea suggested that the façade and elevation be more consistent, that the garage be brought down to the entry level to match the front part, and that some of the decoration from the garage be brought to the penthouse to give it some consistency. Mr. Lombardi asked if there was roof parking, and Ms. Goodknight told him there was and that it went up to the conference center line. Councilor Kennedy asked what the vehicle total was. Mr. Nadeau said it was 538, with room for 110 of those vehicles on the roof.

Mr. Rawling discussed the façade treatments on the garage's upper levels difficult and suggested bringing them around. He liked the comments about the style of the garage and breaking it out from the rest of the building. He found the broad expanse disconcerting and thought it needed bricks or materials to break it up so that it wasn't a long continuous wall. He suggested articulating the skyline to give the building some relief. Councilor Kennedy wanted to see a rendering without trees because she thought it looked like the applicant was trying to cover something up. Ms. Duprey said they were trying to dress up the City's land. Councilor Kennedy also had concerns about the garage exit and the walkability on Maplewood Avenue.

Vice-Chair Gladhill opened up the Public Comment session for people who had to leave the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Dixie McLean of 25 Driftwood Lane said that she appreciated that the building paid homage to historical aspects and liked the roofline's varied levels and the skyline. She thought the laciness captured light and air and looked elegant. She liked the arches above Whole Foods because they reminded her of Italy. She also liked the wider arches on the towers. She had a letter from Mr. Ken Murphy, a Board member of 3S Art space, which said he supported the project and was impressed with the façade and architectural details.

Seeing no one else rise to speak, Vice-Chair Gladhill closed the public comment session.

Ms. Goodknight then discussed the Deer Street view and the Whole Foods Café, touching on the large timber elements, the conference center, the market's storefront windows, the railing off the green roof, and the garage set back from the green roof. She said the plaza was recessed to differentiate it from the public square. Mr. Thompson added that they were creating an open space that would be activated with a stone fruit tree, which Mr. Wyckoff thought was a great element. Mr. Shea asked if the café entrance also went into Whole Foods and was told that it did. He asked if the applicant could incorporate a covered entrance and how much overhang was over the tables. Ms. Goodknight said it was eight feet. Mr. Gatchell explained the main entrance to Whole Foods and its internal spaces. Councilor Kennedy asked about sidewalk logistics and things like shopping carts and signage. She thought the in-between brick building was a large expansion and needed an entrance. She also agreed that every door should have an overhang. She asked if there was a step-down to get to the door, and Ms. Goodknight said it was and that it was perhaps four feet and that it was four feet to the planter area.

Mr. Rawling felt that the middle section needed to be broken up because it looked like a courthouse. Ms. Goodknight said they were trying to vary the mass with lightness. Mr. Rawling thought the ride-hand side brought up the arch section and that the segmental arch supported a lot of weight but had very thin material. He thought there were a lot of combined disconcerting elements, which formed different expressions, and he had a difficult time accepting the arch. He felt that the granite banding on the brick section of the building between the first and second floors seemed large and suggested breaking it up. He also suggested getting rid of the planter wall near the tables. He thought it was a challenging space with little or no doorway access and questioned why people would want to sit under the umbrellas because there was no activation in that plaza. Ms. Goodknight replied that it would be activated by Whole Foods. Mr. Rawling felt the developer needed to start focusing on what would happen to that space. Ms. Duprey said the City owned the land and that the project team couldn't do anything at that time. Mr. Cracknell said the issue had come up before and was happy that the applicant was considering activating that space and linking it to the hill. He thought that the doors at the recessed cafe seating looked lower and asked whether it made sense to have a disability ramp on both sides. He suggested removing 4-5 feet of the landscaping up against the building to make it more inviting to walk there. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked about forums where it could be discussed. Mr. Cracknell said that 15-20% of the suggested improvements were not on the locus itself and what was unique about the project was the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the civic space, the pocket park, and so on. Ms. Goodknight noted that the applicant had contributed a big space in the straightening of the road and transplant of the property.

Mr. Wyckoff said he had trouble with the segmented arches and thought it wasn't up to the Commission to examine the rationale of whether anyone would use the café or not. He thought that the café area was important but also needed another element instead of the flat brick expanse. He liked the planter because people would sit around it. He believed that it would be a very active place due to Whole Foods and the civic center. Councilor Kennedy thought the wall next to the café was too expansive without an entrance. Ms. Duprey stated that the design was related to what Whole Foods required and that they couldn't just stick a door in that area. Mr. Thompson said they would discuss it with Whole Foods. Mr. Cracknell thought it was almost a free-standing café. Mr. Gatchell discussed the access to the café from Whole Foods.

Ms. Ruedig said that she liked the simple concept of the brick sections, but a potential flag was the scaling of the windows that echoed the residential windows. She didn't think they were on a human scale because they looked huge. Ms. Goodknight replied that it was a scaling element and pointed out that the windows just looked larger due to the large wall. Ms. Ruedig then discussed the separation of the buildings in terms of design, comparing it to the Christmas Tree Shops that had a lot of designs masking one big building. She said there was an opportunity to create separate, distinct buildings that were still attached to one another. Ms. Goodknight discussed the different forms to the building and how tricky it was to bring them across. Mr. Rawling liked the large size of the windows because they looked grand. The stacking of the same window patterns had bothered him before, but he thought Ms. Goodknight had broken it up more and, as a result, added more interest on the ground floor. He thought the plaza needed more work to make it successful.

Vice-Chair Gladhill opened up the Public Comment session again.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Doug Bates of 380 Ocean Road said he was happy that the finer details were being discussed and liked the separate building aspect. His main concern was the people of Portsmouth and knew that HarborCorp would do a great job of the café going forward. He liked the laciness look of the garage but also wanted to see the motion of cars, which he thought was important for the energy. He commended the applicant and said he supported what they were trying to do.

A woman (name inaudible) from 218 Rockland Street thought that pedestrian traffic to the building would be important and parking would make it work. Parking on Deer Street would be lost, but parking spaces in front of the new building would make it look friendly. She also thought that pulling the retail around the end corner of Maplewood Avenue would be good.

Mr. Drew Schulthess of 14 Central Avenue stated that the plans had come along nicely. He loved the café and the outdoor space and hoped it would replicate the vibrant space in front of Breaking New Grounds. He thought the recess broke things up well. He said he'd like to see the Maplewood Avenue side improved and felt that the long stretch of steel was overwhelming. He suggested breaking it up with a mural or perhaps making every other panel open.

No one else rose to speak, so Vice-Chair Gladhill closed the Public Comment session. He noted that Chairman Almeida and Mr. Melchior were not present and thought there should be a full Commission, so he suggested that they end the work session and continue to the following month. Ms. Goodknight felt there had been incredible progress and that she was clear about the details the Commission wanted and how to integrate them. However, they discussed a few more issues. Councilor Kennedy mentioned a rule in the Interim Architectural Design Guidelines that stated if a façade was greater than 60 feet, an entrance should be provided every 30 feet. She felt that the Commission should be looking at six entrances within the 200 feet. Mr. Cracknell replied that it was specifically for the Character Zoning District and did not apply outside that district, but there was still an interest in getting more entrances.

Ms. Goodknight discussed the massing overview from Market Street and the architectural style, comparing the building to the Sheraton's traditional elements and saying it was a lighter-weight hotel with a non-masonry expression and varied fenestration on the top floor. They further discussed the plaza, the larger fenestration on the ground floor, and the iconic restaurant space. Mr. Lombardi suggested that the end of the building be curved or have segmented features because it would make the interior spaces more interesting. Ms. Goodknight said she had considered it but thought the window expression worked better on a flatter façade. Mr. Shea asked if there was an entrance to the hotel on Russell Street and was told that there was, and he was also told that there was parallel parking in the front and the top two floors were condominiums. He thought the penthouse could be stepped back further because it was tall. Councilor Kennedy asked if the TAC Parking Committee had approved and was told that it had.

Ms. Ruedig felt that the last portion of the building worked well. The vertical piers broke it up, but she wanted to see more contemporary elements. She asked about the firewall element. Ms. Goodknight replied that the wall was a good separation and also a common feature of the Sheraton design. Ms. Ruedig thought it seemed a bit big and seemed to bring back historic elements that weren't necessary anymore. Mr. Rawling suggested some framework for the dining terrace with the umbrellas that would lure people out. He said he was comfortable with most of the elements but thought there might be a better way to do the larger picture windows in the middle of the building. He discussed the piece at the end of the building and its skyline element and the need for a pitched roof. He said he felt strongly about articulated skyline elements and roofline.

Mr. Wyckoff agreed with Mr. Rawling about the end of the building but did not agree that it had to be divided into two buildings. He thought it would be a great spot to have an octagonal-shaped roof over the end and treat it as more of a tower. In general, he was satisfied with the building and the middle building and thought the firewalls were a nice element. He said he was taken aback by the bridge and felt that it was not up to part with the rest of the development, but he encouraged the developer to continue the idea. Councilor Kennedy agreed that the penthouse was too extensive and was concerned about the view coming up the bridge. She didn't care for the flat roof and thought the firewall was too tall. She was concerned about the windows on the two hotels being too wide and questioned the bridge and the window motif. Mr. Wyckoff said he could not see the separation between the firewall. Mr. Shea wondered if the bridge would be more successful if it came into one of the junctions between the buildings. Ms. Goodknight said it was the hub for getting into the conference center.

Vice-Chair Gladhill opened up the Public Comment session again.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jeff Kisiel thought the developer did a great job of architecturally wrapping the building and thought the next step was activating Maplewood Avenue. He agreed about sliding the entry door over and thought the main entrance had a better appearance.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said she was anxious for the building to be built and didn't think it would be a problem with people coming to sit at the plaza. She thought it

would draw the tourists and help the Deer Street shops. She thought the building looked like separate buildings.

Mr. Jerry Zelin of 70 Kensington Road said he would submit his comments in writing before the next meeting. He thanked the Commission and the developer for spending so much time on the details. He noted that he had a letter from Mr. Joe Caldarola that critiqued the design and praised some elements of the building. He was concerned about the traffic on Maplewood Avenue that would be created.

No one else rose to speak, so Vice-Chair Gladhill closed the public session. He stated that the people at home should feel free to email or write a letter to the Planning Department.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Wyckoff and Ms. Ruedig left the meeting.

Ms. Duprey said she wanted to respond to a comment that Mr. Zelin had made at a previous meeting about the developer misrepresenting the scale to the Board. Ms. Goodknight said they took the perspective of someone walking down the street and looking at the project from on high, making some things look smaller and others elongated. It was a design tool that was not the same as looking at the physical building. Councilor Kennedy said people had told her they wanted to know actual sizes of the units, the sidewalks, and so on, and she asked the applicant to document actual measurements. Mr. Zelin spoke and said the graphic scale was helpful from a bird's eye view but was not useful for the height. The scale didn't note which portions were more than 45 feet, which was important when dealing with the CUP. He thought it was essential to call out every segment of the building. Ms. Goodknight replied that the final submittal would do that. Mr. Zelin asked how tentative decisions could be made on mass without knowing the height of the building. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that nothing was decided in a work session. Mr. Cracknell stated that the drawings had been submitted and there were cross-sections. Every building exceeded 45 feet in height, except for Whole Foods and the conference center, and the HDC was well aware of it. The drawings were honest.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **continue** the work session to February or March meeting. Mr. Lombardi seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor, 5-0.*

II. ADJOURNMENT

*At 10:45 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 July 1, 2015.